158. Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Phillipson, Robert (1996). The possible role of donors in a language policy for all. In Brock-Utne, Birgit & Nagel, Tove (Eds.) **The Role of Aid in the Development of Education for All**. Report no 8. Oslo: University of Oslo, Institute for Educational Research, 161-201.

Plenary paper, 1996 NASEDEC (Nordic Association for the Study of Education in Developing Countries) Conference "The Role of Aid in the Development of Education for All", 15-17 June 1995, Oslo, Norway.

"The dominant monolingual orientation is cultivated in the developed world and consequently two languages are considered a nuisance, three languages uneconomic and many languages absurd. In multilingual countries, many languages are facts of life; any restriction in the choice of language is a nuisance; and one language is not only uneconomic, it is absurd." (Debi Prasanna Pattanayak 1984, 82).

"Language development in India has by and large remained a governmental programme and not people's programme."
Annamalai, 1994.

"Many of my contemporaries have only learned Spanish in school, but they never learn it perfectly. At the same time they stop speaking their own language which in my case is Aymara. They end up as people without identity, people who belong nowhere." (Vice-president Victor Hugo Cárdenas, Bolivia, in an interview by Steffen Knudsen, in **Zig Zag - en verden i bevægelse**, 26, 1994, p. 9.; our translation from Danish).

"Berlin of 1884 [when Africa was divided between the European empires, our remark] was effected through the sword and the bullet. But the night of the sword and the bullet was followed by the morning of the chalk and the blackboard. The physical violence of the battlefield was followed by the psychological violence of the classroom. But where the former was visibly brutal, the latter was visibly gentle ... The bullet was the means of the physical subjugation. Language was the means of the spiritual subjugation. (Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, 1987, 9).

"... attempts to artificially suppress minority languages through policies of assimilation, devaluation, reduction to a state of illiteracy, expulsion or genocide are not only degrading of human dignity and morally unacceptable, but they are also an invitation to separatism and an incitement to fragmentation into mini-states." (Jurek Smolicz, 1986, 96).

"The real issue, therefore, is not whether, how or under what forces does an individual or a group become bilingual; it is whether and at what cost does one become a monolingual..." "If social integration is taken to be a psychological state characterized by positive self/ingroup identity along with positive other/outgroup identification (Mohanty 1987), then bilingualism, both at the individual and at the social levels, seems to promote social integration." (Ajit K. Mohanty, 1994, 163; 158).

"Africans have been psychologically conditioned to believe that only European languages are structured to aid development."
Mubanga Kashoki, in UNIN 1981, 41.

"Ninety percent of the population in Africa today speak only African languages."
Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o 1992, 27.

"Formal education in Africa and Asia in its present form tends to impede economic growth and promote political instability... (it) is an obstacle to development."
Hanf et al 1975.

"... a multicultural and monolingual curriculum is a useless palliative in a society that claims to promote cultural pluralism ... multiculturalism cannot be genuinely achieved without an adequate policy of multilingualism." (Tosi 1984, 175).

Introduction: the role of language is seldom considered in educational or other development policies

The assessments quoted above indicate that the enormous potential and resources of linguistic diversity worldwide have not been harnessed to the task of development as this has been understood hitherto. Language issues permeate educational, human rights' and development policies, but in most cases implicitly. That all these policies invariably strengthen some languages and weaken others is seldom part of the overt development agenda. In our view, development policies may reflect linguicism, a sophisticated form of linguistically argued racism. Racism, ethnicism and linguicism can be defines as

"ideologies, structures and practices which are used to legitimate, effectuate and reproduce an unequal division of power and (both material and non-material) resources between groups which are defined on the basis of "race" (biologically argued racism), ethnicity and culture (culturally argued racism: ethnicism), or **language (linguistically argued racism: linguicism**)" (Skutnabb-Kangas 1986).

The Secretary General of the UN's **Agenda for development** is intended to promote goals of peace and democratisation. It acknowledges the value of cultural diversity and stresses the importance of culture and education in development. At a recent conference in Australia in March 1995 to celebrate the 50th anniversary of UN, called Global Diversity, Boutros-Ghali in his oral presentation discussed and affirmed both cultural and linguistic rights. In the written version (1995) linguistic rights disappeared...[i]

It is striking that in much educational policy work, the **role of language** is seldom considered. Thus in King's major study of aid to the developing world, and in particular of the role of donor agencies in educational analysis (1991), "language" does not figure in the index[ii]. The same blindness to the issue characterizes a major British study of education priorities and aid responses in Sub-Saharan Africa, even though attention to it was drawn by one South participant (Hawes & Coombe 1986, 26).

This myopia on the part of the donors and the researchers who guide them continues a pattern set at the first UNESCO conference of African Ministers of Education, in 1960, which set a target for universal literacy, but gave no thought to the language in which literacy should be achieved (Cawson 1975, 412-3). The same was true of a succession of British conferences held to "assist" colonies to organize their education systems when they became independent states in the 1960s. Invariably language was given very little attention, and if raised, the focus was only on the learning of English (ibid.).

A continuing focus on colonial languages

The old colonial powers have strong links with their former colonies. Language support figures prominently in "aid" budgets, though for the British Council, English teaching is increasingly a source of revenue. There is a considerable literature on language aid mediated via English. A recent study of curricular innovation in second and foreign language education confirms the general failure of much language aid work (Markee, in press), echoing earlier reports over a period of more than 20 years (reviewed in Phillipson 1992)[iii]. Markee comments on his experience of development work funded by the British government: "my expatriate aid worker colleagues and I were linguistically, culturally and professionally ill-equipped to devise solutions that were appropriate to local conditions" on a project that had been imposed on the host country's institutions by the donor (Markee, in press, 22).

Such work appears to fall into the pattern of linguistic imperialism, which has been very functional in maintaining the dominance of English in former colonies and effectively serving to deprive local languages of resources and of the ideological underpinning that extension of their use required[iv] (Phillipson 1992). A continued reliance on colonial languages is one dimension of the failure of much educational policy in former colonies (see references to Akinnaso, Bamgbose, Mateene, Ngũgĩ in the bibliography; on educational failure see Craig 1990, Haddad et al. 1990, Psacharopoulos 1990, Twahirwa 1994, World Bank 1988).

Education and training is a priority area for francophonic solidarity, along with cultural activities (books, TV, etc) and social concerns (women, health, etc). The Haut Conseil de la Francophonie clearly exists to strengthen and promote the French language. Even though past language policies are part of the problem, in "French-speaking" former colonies (in which French is only spoken by a tiny fraction of the population), solutions are sought which strengthen French. French interests and influence can also be maintained by a modest amount of support for the

promotion of African languages, as has happened in recent years. A more thorough-going reassessment of language policy and its relationship to development has not been undertaken by French aid bodies, though some individual scholars are concerned[v].

A recent study by researchers from the Central Institute of Indian Languages (CIIL) identifies some of the weaknesses of implementation of language policy and stresses the absence of political will to change the linguistic hierarchy[vi]. Annamalai, director of the CIIL, attributes the failure of Indian language policy to four factors (Annamalai 1994):

1. language development was not coordinated with economic development,
2. lack of a unified strategy for the use of Indian languages in a variety of domains (education, administration, law, medicine etc),
3. absence of a coherent strategy to reassure minority language speakers, or to counter-balance Hindi, led to a clinging to English.
4. development planning was top-down, elite-mass, e.g. massive creation of technical terminology and no implementation or use made of it.

Similar analyses seem to be emerging in Africa (see Akinnaso 1990, forthcoming).

As a result of failures in economic, educational and language policy, it is apparent that the gulf between English-educated elites and impoverished, marginal, under-educated masses is growing in India and elsewhere[vii]. The underlying educational philosophy seems to be not an integration of local, national and world languages, but a choice between one or the other. In towns there is a choice between private English-medium schools or public, under-resourced schools with the local Indian language as the medium[viii].

Invalidation of dominated linguistic and cultural resources - a strategy in the global distribution of power

The available research evidence confirms the pattern of a glorification of dominant languages (see Table 1), the stigmatisation of dominated languages, and the rationalisation of the act of glorifying and stigmatizing and of the relationship between the languages, all reinforcing and reproducing linguicism, hierarchisation of groups based on language. One of the strategies in the global unequal distribution of power and resources involves the invalidation of the non-material resources of dominated groups, including their languages and cultures (Figure 1). Non-material resources can be invalidated by making them invisible, as for instance African languages are in much development discourse, or by stigmatizing them as handicaps or problems, rather than resources, as in development discourse and in minority discourses in Euro-American contexts. The same strategies are also used in education.

Table 1 approximately here

Figure 1 approximately here

High levels of multilingualism through education are necessary

Attaining a high level of multilingual competence has been common for the **élites** in most countries in the world. For them, multilingual proficiency has been part of the symbolic linguistic and cultural capital necessary for maintaining and reproducing their material and political capital (wealth and power). For them, multilingualism is a question of enrichment and benefits, validating their non-material resources.

By contrast, the attempts of **dominated/subordinated linguistic (minority) groups** to become **high level** multilinguals through education have in most parts of the world met with considerable difficulty and often direct or indirect resistance and sabotage from the educational system. Still, for them, becoming at least bilingual and biliterate has been and is in most cases (except if some kind of isolation is possible) necessary for survival, economically, culturally, psychologically, even politically. For them, high levels of multilingualism or at least bilingualism involves the assertion of basic human rights.

But there are many reasons for not restricting the right to become bi- or multilingual to minorities, for whom it is a necessity. Ethnolinguistic majority populations should also be given the opportunity to escape monolingual stupidity/naivety/reductionism[ix], and to do so at a level whichgoes beyond studying a foreign language for a few

years as a subject in school, something many children are already doing. If one believes - and there are good reasons for doing so[x] - that high levels of multilingualism are an advantage to people, opening up horizons, enabling contact, enhancing development, and, as hinted at above, escaping the imprisonment of the narrowing of horizons implied by monolingualism, then everybody should be offered this opportunity. And "everybody" includes majorities, even if many of them are still unaware of the linguistic cages many of them live in and of the fact that they and the rest of the world pay a high price for their monolingualism[xi].

If we are to make virtually monolingual dominant groups/majorities support multilingualism, in the first place by granting dominated groups/minorities linguistic human rights[xii], also in education, and in the second place by them wanting to become high level multilinguals themselves, the dominant groups/majorities themselves have to have educational programmes which really **work** in making them multilingual, at the same time as they do not lose content matter. Joshua Fishman has frequently noted that dominant groups will not start developing (or even allow minorities themselves to organise) educational programmes which lead to multilingualism before they are convinced that they (i.e. the dominant groups) can benefit too. Offering dominant groups an opportunity to become multilingual may make them great supporters of language maintenance programmes for minorities too.

In an ideal world, minorities and majorities should of course be given the opportunity to become multilingual together, in programmes which are not geared towards élites (only), but towards ordinary people.

How should education be organised in order to lead to high levels of multilingualism: the principles

Many people might agree with what has been said so far about the desirability of multilingualism as an educational goal. But then they start asking: how? What do we do, then, if we want to make everybody multilingual. What are the "recipes"? Are there any?

Since schools are part of societies and societies differ, programmes leading to high levels of multilingualism necessarily also vary a great deal - and have to. What suits multilingual élites in Brussels may not be directly applicable in bilingual Estonia or Catalonia. What is new in some parts of Europe or North Americas or Australia may for somebody from India be reinventing the wheel. What is a dream in Moscow, may be reality in San Diego, and vice versa. Still, there are also some similarities in contexts, ideologies, organisation and methods that work. What works for Finnish migrant minorities in Sweden (e.g. late-exit bilingual programmes, see Skutnabb-Kangas 1994) also seems to work, for instance, for Puerto Ricans in New York (e.g. Beykont 1994) and several groups in Nigeria (Akinnaso 1993). We firmly believe that we now know enough about educational language planning for high levels of multilingualism to start making at least some cautious generalisations.

We will draw conclusions about general principles on the basis of several experiments: mother tongue maintenance programmes, immersion programmes, two-way programmes, alternate-days programmes, the European Schools, International Schools, early reading programmes and Kōhanga Reo.[xiii] First an ultrashort summary presentation of some of these.

Mother tongue maintenance programmes are programmes where minority or dominated group children are educated in their own classes, by a bilingual teacher, mainly through the medium of their mother tongue, and where they study the dominant or power language as a second language and may have it as the medium of education in a few subjects after the first 6 to 8 years, but where their own language continues to be the medium in several subjects throughout their education.

Immersion programmes are programmes where majority or dominant group children voluntarily choose to be educated in their own classes, by a bilingual teacher, mainly through the medium of a foreign minority language. Their mother tongue is studied as a subject, and becomes the medium of education in a few subjects after a few years. After grade 4 they often use both languages equally as media of education. French immersion for English speakers in Canada is the best known example.

Two-way programmes or dual-language bilingual programmes are programmes where 50% minority children and 50 % majority children study together, initially mainly through the medium of the minority language and where they study both languages as subjects. After a few years both languages are used as media.

Alternate-days programmes also have the same combination of children, half-and-half, and the medium of education changes daily. Both these programmes exist mainly in the United States.

The European (Union) Schools model for children of European Union officials has subsections for each European Union official language, and each subsection uses its own language as the main medium of education initially. Other languages are studied as subjects, then used as media in easy contextualised areas and finally also used as media of

education in more demanding decontextualised subjects.

The principles and comparisons make the models somewhat more concrete.

It seems to us 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 and bi- or multiliteracy, a fair chance of success in school achievement, and positive intercultural attitudes), can be formulated as 8 recommendations. We will present them with a few comments. In the following table (Table 2, from Skutnabb-Kangas 1995) the principles have been applied to some of the models presented earlier (immersion, two-way bilingual, European Union Schools, language shelter/mother tongue maintenance and alternate days models. We have also included a "utopian" model which would get a plus-rating on all the principles. Alternatives, further developments and discussions about both possible principles and, especially, concrete experience, are vital.

We ask you to compare the principles with how the education is organised for, firstly, immigrant students in your own or some European/ized country and, secondly, for ordinary students in your own or some underdeveloped country. Do the schools follow the principles? If not, education is unlikely to lead to high levels of multilingualism:

Table 2 approximately here

1. Support (= use as the main medium of education, at least during the first 8 years) the language (of the 2 that the child is supposed to become bilingual in initially) which is least likely to develop up to a high formal level. This is for all minority children their own mother tongue. For majority children, it should be a minority language. (The European Schools do not follow this principle completely, because they also teach majority children initially through the medium of their mother tongues, e.g. the Italian-speaking children in the European School in Italy are initially taught through the medium of Italian, instead of a minority language).

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. (Spanish-English Two-way programmes in the U.S.A. are an exception: they have mixed in the same class 50% minority, 50% majority children. All are initially taught through the medium of the minority language, later through both. 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 too 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 the status of their mother tongues and their knowledge of the language of instruction**. Nice phrases about the worth of everybody's mother tongue, the value of interculturalism, etc, serve little purpose, unless they are followed up in how the schools are organised.

There has to be equality in the demands made on the children's and the teachers' competencies in the different languages involved, so that the same demands are made on everybody (both minority and majority children and teachers must be or become bi- or multilingual).

There has to be equality in the role that the languages are accorded on the schedules and in higher education, in testing and evaluation, in marks 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 late 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 in an immigration context, 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. A high level of competence in a minority language is thus more important for a teacher than a high level of competence in a majority language. In a foreign language context the teacher has to have a good command of both or all languages.

The same demand of bilingualism should of course also be valid for all development workers in the field. It is impossible, in most cases, to take a poverty orientation seriously, if those who are supposed to advise do not know the language of the poor. Interpretation solves only some of the emergency problems - for development cooperation to work, the contact has to be direct.

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 via Turkish).

7. **All children must study both L1 and L2 as compulsory subjects through grades 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 in how and how much each is used seems to vary 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 - and remember, most children in underdeveloped countries are in this position - 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 the choice of 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 used for all children in the European Schools seems close to ideal for minority children:

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

1. **All subjects** are taught **through the medium of the mother tongue** during the first 2 years.

2. **All cognitively demanding decontextualized core 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 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 schooling**, from 1-12.

2. **The second language** becomes **a 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.

It should be clear by now that very few countries follow these principles in their ordinary, state-financed educational systems. It should also be clear that a wrong educational language policy in relation to the medium of education is the main pedagogical reason for illiteracy in the world. Instead of literacy and high levels of multilingualism, schools participate in committing linguistic genocide in relation to dominated groups and violate their linguistic human rights. Schools participate in spreading monolingual reductionism in relation to linguistic majority groups,

with the exception of elites.

Our conclusion is that languages in education policy in relation to both majorities and most minorities[xiv] in most European/ized[xv] countries, instead of making everybody multilingual, functions today in conflict with most scientifically sound principles about how education leading to high levels of multilingualism should be organized. Education participates in attempting and committing linguistic genocide[xvi].

The following definition of **linguistic genocide** was included in Article III in the final draft of what became The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (E 794, 1948) of the United Nations. Even if Article III was voted down in the General Assembly and is not part of the final Convention, most countries who were members of the uN in 1948 agreed on how to define linguistic genocide:

"(1) 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."

Por claim is that "prohibition" can be direct or indirect. If there are no minority teachers in the preschool/school or if the minority language is not used as a medium of education, the use of the language is indirectly prohibited in daily intercourse/in schools, i.e. it is a question of linguistic genocide.

In most underdeveloped[xvii] multilingual countries most of the domestic languages are treated in the same way as minority languages in European/ized countries. The same is to some extent true of Africa. As Birgit Brock-Utne observes, "[I]n many of the African countries the majority language is treated in a way that minority languages are treated in the industrialized world" (1993a, 39)[xviii]. 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.

There is a considerable body of scholarship on the complexity of multilingualism in underdeveloped countries and strategies for successful education. Some of the dimensions that need to be attended to are the fact that children are frequently bi- or multilingual when they start school, and this source of richness needs to be built on, to the point of regarding bilingualism as the child's mother tongue, as Mohanty, the Indian psychologist, puts it (1994). Initial literacy in a lingua franca that is related to the mother tongue, or is one of the languages that the child is already familiar with, is a pedagogically suitable route to follow in contexts where it is likely that local languages have a rich oral tradition but limited literacy utility beyond initial reading skills (Akinnaso 1993), though it needs to be recalled that there are many different types of literacy (Street (Ed.) 1993). An active policy of promoting those African or Indian languages that have expanded their range as lingua francas and serve a wide range of social purposes should lead to their increased use in education systems and less concentration on European languages, as well as their use in official functions (Akinnaso 1994, Dasgupta 1993, Djité 1993a). Such issues have tended to be neglected in educational language policy in underdeveleoped countries, which reflects their eurocentric focus, and indicates that the policies endorsed at the highest level (by the government of India, and African Heads of State in the Cultural Charter for Africa), which involve less dependence on European languages, have remained pious rhetoric. By contrast, in South Africa, educational language policy is being guided by a wish to democratize the education system, and this can only be achieved through the promotion of African languages and concomitantly "reducing English to equality", as Neville Alexander has put it (in Bhanot 1994, see also Cluver 1994, Desai 1995, Webb 1994). Sensitivity to context is naturally essential for educational success, but those responsible for educational policy would need to escape from a monolingual perspective and analyse the relationship between conditions for success in multilingual education worldwide, and local variables in teacher training, curriculum and pedagogy.

Some conclusions

When global control to an increasing degree happens via language (Table 3), through colonising the consciousness via the ideas of the dominant groups, through the consciousness industry (education, mass media, religions), instead of using more brutal means (despite some of the signs of the opposite today) and instead of or in addition to using more expensive means like remuneration, the role of languages is vital.

Table 3 approximately here

Enabling control through consciousness industry is the main reason for why dominated groups have to learn the dominant languages and everybody has to learn English - only then can the ideas of the dominant groups penetrate the minds of the dominated. Present reductionist educational language choices (cf. monolingual reductionism above) do not support the diversity which is necessary for counterhegemonies and necessary for the planet to have a future. Yukio Tsuda (1994, 58) writes of the "Ecology of Language Paradigm" as the alternative to the present "Diffusion of English Paradigm" (Table 4).

Table 4 approximately here

The linguodiversity needed in addition to biodiversity is part of the urgent human ecology approach to languages in education and elsewhere.

Still, all the evidence is that the development business[xix] has served to promote dominant languages, resulting in an intensification of links between South élites and North élite interests, whereas local South languages and the interests of the masses everywhere remain marginal.

Present policies are therefore in conflict with the declared goal of the UN **Agenda for Development** of respecting and promoting cultural diversity.

If the world's languages are to contribute to social change and improvement, and their speakers to experience basic social justice, language policies in each state are needed that aim at building on their linguistic resources, deciding which languages can contribute best from the bottom up to facilitate elementary education, participation and democratisation, and addressing the reality of multilingualism. Structural changes in global relations are of course a necessary prerequisite - but not sufficient.

Such a policy will only emerge when there is a change of heart on the part of South leaders, many of whom endorse such principles in their rhetoric in India and Africa but fail to act on them. It also requires a change of policy on the part of the North development business. And this is where our role may be important.

As an absolute minimum for development work, it should be a requirement that any **donor agency elaborates and follows a language policy** that conforms to principles of linguistic human rights. Observing the principles about education leading to high levels of multilingualism presented above respects linguistic human rights in education. Just as some development agencies aim to incorporate a gender dimension or a human rights dimension (e.g. in Scandinavia), the language dimension should also be made explicit. This would imply, for instance, that any poverty-oriented projects would necessitate support to local languages. It could well mean that in aid to education there should be a major shift to teacher training, curriculum work and materials production in local languages rather than European languages. Ultimately this could lead to the South setting the agenda for development work. But this only works with leaders in each South state being democratically accountable to their constituencies - a problem which is acute also in the European Union, as the recent White Books for the governmental 1996 conference document.

There are some changes in the North that may increase the sensitivity of North development professionals to the nature of language rights: some acceptance of minority language rights, as evidenced in a recent Human Rights Committee General Comment[xx] successful examples of multilingual schooling (see Skutnabb-Kangas (Ed.) 1995), and the way the European Union has been forced to address multilingualism[xxi]. Whether a major change in the development business is imminent, is possibly in part a question of whether we can make our voices heard.

References:

Akinnaso, F. Niyi (1990). The Politics of Language Planning in Education in Nigeria. **Word** 41, 235-253.

Akinnaso, F. Niyi (1993). Policy and experiment in mother tongue literacy in Nigeria. **International Review of Education** 39:4, 255-285.

Akinnaso, F. Niyi (1994). Linguistic unification and language rights. **Applied Linguistics** 15:2, 139-168.

Akinnaso, F. Niyi (forthcoming). The National Language Question and Minority Language Rights in Africa: A Nigerian Case Study. In Cohen et al (Eds).

Altbach, Philip (Ed.) (1992). **Publishing and development in the Third World**. London/New York: Hans Sell.

Andrýsek, Oldrich (1989). **Report on the definition of minorities**. Netherlands Institute of Human Rights, Studie-en Informatiecentrum Mensenrechten (SIM), SIM Special No 8.

Annamalai, E. (1994). Multilingual development: Indian experience. Paper at the UNESCO-OAU conference, Addis Abeba, 21-25 November 1994 "The definition of strategies for the promotion of African languages in a multilingual environment".

Apple, Michael W. (1993). **Official knowledge. Democratic education in a conservative age**. New York & London: Routledge.

Baker, Colin (1993). **Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism**. Clevedon & Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Bamgbose, Ayo (1991). **Language and the nation. The language question in Sub-Saharan Africa**. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Besikci, Ismail (1990). A Nation Deprived of Identity: The Kurds, Report to Minority Rights Conference. In **Minority Rights, Policies and Practice in South-East Europe**.

Beykont, Zeynep F. (1994). **Academic Progress of a Nondominant Group: A Longitudinal Study of Puerto Ricans in new York City's Late Exit Bilingual Programs**. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Harvard University, Graduate School of Education.

Bgoya, Walter (1992). The challenge of publishing in Tanzania. In Altbach (Ed.) 1992, 169-190.

Bhanot, Rakesh (1994). Rakesh Bhanot interviews Dr. Neville Alexander. **Language Issues** 6:2, 36-39.

Boutros-Ghali, Boutros (1995). Unity and diversity: the contemporary challenge, Paper to the Global Cultural Diversity Conference, Sydney, 26 April 1995.

Brock-Utne, Birgit (1993a). **Education in Africa. Education for self-reliance or recolonization?** Rapport Nr. 3. Oslo: University of Oslo, Institute for Educational Research.

Brock-Utne, Birgit (1993b). Language of instruction in African schools. A socio-cultural perspective, **Nordisk Pedagogik**, 13, 225-246.

Brock-Utne, Birgit (1994). Reconstruction of Curricula in Africa - a Feminist Perspective. In Takala (Ed.), 243-262.

Brock-Utne, Birgit (forthcoming). The role of higher education in Africa. This volume.

Byrne, Heidi (Ed.) (1992). **Languages for a Multicultural World in Transition**. Illinois: National Textbook Company.

Capotorti, Francisco (1979). **Study on the rights of persons belonging to ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities**. New York: UN.

Cawson, Frank (1975). The international activities of the Center for Applied Linguistics. In Fox 1975, vol 2, 385-434.

Centre of African Studies (1986). **Language in education in Africa**, Seminar proceedings 26, Proceedings of a seminar at the Centre of African Studies, University of Edinburgh, 29-30 November, (1985). Edinburgh: Centre of African Studies.

Churchill, Stacy (1985). **The education of linguistic and cultural minorities in the OECD countries**, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 13.

Cluver, August D. de V. (1994). Preconditions for language unification. **South African Journal of Linguistics**, supplement 20, 168-194.

Cohen, R., Hyden, G. & Nagan, W. (Eds.) (forthcoming). **Human Rights and Governance in Africa**, Gainsville: University Press of Florida.

Craig, J. (1990). **Comparative African experiences in implementing educational policies**. Washington, DC: World Bank (World Bank Discussion Papers, Africa Technical Department Series, 83).

Cummins, Jim (1984). **Bilingualism and Special Education: Issues in Assessment and Pedagogy**, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters 6.

Cummins, Jim (1988). From multicultural to anti-racist education. An analysis of programmes and policies in Ontario. In Skutnabb-Kangas & Cummins (Eds.), 127-157.

Cummins, Jim (1989). **Empowering Minority Students**, Sacramento, California Association for Bilingual Education.

Cummins, Jim (1989b). Language and literacy acquisition in bilingual contexts. **Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development** 10:1, 17-32.

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 (1994). The discourse of disinformation: the debate on bilingual education and language rights in the United States. In Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson (Eds.), 159-177.

Cummins, Jim and Danesi, Marcel (1990). **Heritage Languages. The Development and Denial of Canada's Linguistic Resources**. Toronto: Our Schools/Our Selves Education Foundation.

Cummins, Jim and Swain, Merrill (1986). **Bilingualism in Education: Aspects of theory, research and practice**. London and New York: Longman.

Daes, Erica-Irene (1995). Redressing the Balance: The Struggle to be Heard. Paper to the Global Cultural Diversity Conference, Sydney, 26-28 April 1995.

Dasgupta, Probal (1993). **The Otherness of English: India's Auntie Tongue Syndrome**. Delhi: Sage.

Desai, Zubeida (1995). The evolution of a post-apartheid language policy in South Africa: an on-going site of

struggle. **European Journal of Intercultural Studies**, 5:3, 18-25.

Department of Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government (1993). **Education for all: the Indian scene**, A synopsis, Delhi: Government of India.

Djité, Paulin (1993a). Language and development in Africa. **International Journal of the Sociology of Language**, 100/101, 149-166.

Djité, Paulin (1993b). Book review of Robert Chaudenson "Vers uns révolution francophone" (Paris: Harmattan). **International Journal of the Sociology of Language**, 100/101, 257-264.

Eide, Asbjørn (1990). **Possible ways and means of facilitating the peaceful and constructive solution of problems involving minorities**. Progress report submitted to Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities at its 42nd session (E/CN.4/Sub.2/1990/46).

Eide, Asbjørn (1991). **Preliminary report submitted to UN Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities at its 43rd session** (E/CN.4/Sub.2/1991/43).

Eide, Asbjørn (1994). **New approaches to minority protection**, London: Minority Rights Group International.

Eide, Asbjørn (1995a). Economic, social and cultural rights as human rights. In Eide, Krause & Rosas (Eds.), 21-40.

Eide, Asbjørn (1995b). Cultural rights as individual human rights. In Eide, Krause & Rosas (Eds.), 229-240.

Eide, Asbjørn, Krause, Catarina & Rosas, Allan (Eds.) (1995). **Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. A Textbook**. Dordrecht, Boston & London: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.

Fox, Melvyn (1975). **Language and development: a retrospective survey of Ford Foundation language projets, 1952-1974**. New York: Ford Foundation (Vol 1, report; vol 2, case studies).

Freeland, Jane (1994). The NGO/Government interface in language related projects. **Language and gender in development**, symposium report. Manchester: British Council, 59-69.

García, Ofelia (1992). Societal multilingualism in a multicultural world in transition. In Byrne (Ed.), 1-27.

Genesee, Fred (Ed) (1992). **The teaching of ESL**, New York: Newbury House.

Haddad, W. D., M.Carnoy, R.Rinaldi & O.Regel (1990). **Education and development: evidence for new priorities**. Washington, DC: World Bank (Discussion paper 95).

Hakuta, Kenji (1986). **Mirror of language: The debate on bilingualism**, New York: Basic Books.

Hanf, T., Amman, K., Dias, P.V., Fremerey, M. and Weiland, H. (1975). Education: an obstacle to development? Some remarks about the political functions of education in Asia and Africa. **Comparative Education Review**, 19, 68-87.

Hawes, Hugh & Coombe, Trevor (Eds.) (1986). **Education priorities and aid responses in Sub-Saharan Africa**. London: HMSO.

Hernández-Chávez, Eduardo (1994). Language policy in the United States: a history of cultural genocide. In Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson (Eds.), 141-158.

Human Rights in Kurdistan (1989). **Documentation of the international conference on human rights in Kurdistan**, 14-16 April, Hochschule Bremen, Bremen: The Initiative for Human Rights in Kurdistan.

Human Rights in Kurdistan (1990). **Silence is killing them**, Bremen: The Initiative for Human Rights in Kurdistan.

Hulstijn, Jan H. & Matter, Johan F. (Eds) (1991). **Reading in Two Languages**, AILA Review 8, (1991)., Amsterdam: Free University Press.

Hettne, Björn (1990). **Development theory and the three worlds**. Harlow: Longman.

Helsinki Watch (1990). **Destroying ethnic identity. The Kurds of Turkey. An update**, September (1990)., New York & Washington, D.C.

Jayaram, B.D. and Rajyashree, K.S. (1994). Development and implementation of the official languages of the states: an overview of Indian situation. Ms. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.

Jussawalla, Feroza & Reed Way Dasenbrock (Eds.) (1992). **Interviews with writers of the postcolonial world**. Jackson: University Press of Mississipi.

King, Kenneth (1991). **Aid and education in the developing world. The role of the donor agencies in educational analysis**. Harlow: Longman.

Lambert, Wallace (1975). Culture and Language as Factors in Learning and Education. In Wolfgang (Ed) (1975).

Leontiev, Alexei A. (1994). Linguistic Human Rights and Educational Policy in Russia. In Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson (Eds.), 63-70.

Markee, Numa (in press). **Managing curricular innovation in second and foreign language education**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mateene, Kahombo (1985). Colonial languages as compulsory means of domination, and indigenous languages, as necessary factors of liberation and development. In Mateene, Kalema & Chomba (Eds.) 1985, 60-69.

Mateene, Kahombo, Kalema, John and Chomba, Bernard (Eds.) (1985). **Linguistic liberation and unity of Africa**. Kampala: OAU Bureau of Languages.

Minority Rights, Policies and Practice in South-East Europe, Reports for the Conference at Christiansborg, Copenhagen, March 30th - April 1st (1990). (1990). Copenhagen: The Danish Helsinki Committee & The Minority Rights Group.

Mohanty, Ajit K. (1994). **Bilingualism in a multilingual society**. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.

Morris, Glenn T. (1995). 12th Session of UN Working Group on Indigenous Peoples. The Declaration Passes and the US Assumes a New Role. **Fourth World Bulletin. Issues in Indigenous Law and Politics**. University of Colorado at Denver. 4: 1-2, 1ff.

Ngũgĩ, wa Thiong'o (1987). **Detained. A Writer's Prison Diary**. London: Heinemann.

Ngũgĩ, wa Thiong'o (1992). Interview. In Jussawalla & Dasenbrock, 24-41.

Obura, Anna (1986). Research issues and perspectives in language in education in Africa: an agenda for the next decade. In **Centre of African Studies**, 413-444.

Ogoa, Cristina (1994). **The Inner World of the Immigrant Child**. New York: St.Martin's Press.

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, 120-130.

Padilla, Raymond V. and Benavides, Alfredo H. (Eds.) (1992). **Critical Perspectives on Bilingual Education**

Research. Tempe, Arizona: Bilingual Review Press/Editorial Bilingüe.

Palley, Claire (1984). **Possible ways and means to facilitate the peaceful and constructive resolution of situations involving racial, national, religious and linguistic minorities**. Working paper submitted to UN Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities at its 41st session (E/CN.4/Sub.2/1984/43).

Pattanayak, D.P. (1984). Language policies in multilingual states. In Gonzales, A. (Ed.) **Panagani. Language planning, implementation and evaluation**. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines. (quoted in Mohanty, forthcoming, 166).

Pattanayak, D.P. (1986). Educational use of the mother tongue. In Spolsky (Ed.), 5-15.

Pennycook, Alastair (1994). **The cultural politics of English as an international language**. Harlow: Longman.

Peura, Markku and Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (Eds.) (1994). **"Man kan vara tvåländare också". Den sverigefinska minoritetens väg från tystnad till kamp** (You can be twocountrial too. The road of the Sweden-Finnish minority from silence to struggle). Stockholm: Sverigefinländarnas Arkiv.

Phillipson, Robert (1992). **Linguistic imperialism**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, Robert 1995 The UN Agenda for Development: The Role of Language. In Fettes, Mark and Legér, Sylvie (Eds.) **Towards a Language Agenda: Futurist Outlook on the United Nations**. Papers from a Conference organised by the Canadian Center of Language Rights and the Law Department, Ottawa, 25-27 May 1995.

Phillipson, Robert & Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (1994). Language rights in postcolonial Africa. In Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson (Eds.), 335-345.

Psacharopoulos, G. (1990). **Why educational policies can fail. An overview of selected African experiences**. Washington, DC: World Bank (World Bank Discussion Papers, Africa Technical Department Series, 82)

Ramirez, J. David., Yuen, Sandra D. & Ramey, Dena 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, CA: Aguirre International.

Rodney, Walter (1983). **How Europe Underdeveloped Africa**. London: Bogle-L'Ouverture.

Rubagumya, Casmir M. (1991). **Language, social values and inequality in Tanzania: reinterpreting triglossia**, Lancaster University, Department of Linguistics and Modern English Language, Centre for Language in Social Life, Working Papers 26.

Rubagumya, Casmir M. (Ed.) (1990). **Language in education in Africa: a Tanzanian perspective**. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Rumpf, Christian (1989). The Turkish Law Prohibiting Languages Other Than Turkish. In **Human Rights in Kurdistan**, 69-87.

Saado, Hussain (1989). Document on the United Nations and the Kurdish Question. In **Human Rights in Kurdistan**, 171-179.

Sachs, Wolfgang (Ed.) (1992). **The development dictionary. A guide to knowledge as power**. London: Zed Books.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (1984). **Bilingualism or not - the education of minorities**. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (1988). Multilingualism and the Education of Minority Children. In Skutnabb-Kangas & Cummins (Eds.), 9-44.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (1990). **Language, Literacy and Minorities**. London: The Minority Rights Group.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (1994a). Sverigefinnar förhandlar om etnisk identitet (The Sweden Finns negotiate about ethnic identity). In Peura and Skutnabb-Kangas (Eds.), 98-128.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (1994b). Language and gender in development. **Language and gender in development**, symposium report, Manchester: British Council, 15-45.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (1995). Introduction. In Skutnabb-Kangas (Ed.), 7-20.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (in press a). Language, Racism and Linguistic Human Rights. In **Global Cultural Diversity Conference, Strength in Diversity - an Investment in Our Future**, Conference to celebratate the 50th Anniversary of the United Nations, organised by the Australian Prime Minister's Office, Sydney 26-28 April 1995.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (in press b). Promotion of Linguistic Tolerance and Development. In Fettes, Mark and Legér, Sylvie (Eds.) **Towards a Language Agenda: Futurist Outlook on the United Nations**. Papers from a Conference organised by the Canadian Center of Language Rights and the Law Department, Ottawa, 25-27 May 1995.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (in press c). Educational language choice - multilingual diversity or monolingual reductionism? In Hellinger, Marlis and Ammon, Ulrich (Eds.) (in press). **Contrastive Sociolinguistics**, Part III, Language planning and language politics, Mouton de Gruyter.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove and Bucak, Sertaç (1994). Killing a mother tongue - how the Kurds are deprived of linguistic human rights. In Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson (Eds.), 347-370.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Robert Phillipson (1994). Linguistic human rights, past and present. In Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson (Eds.) 1994, 71-110.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove and Toukomaa, Pertti (1976). **Teaching migrant children's mother tongue and learning the language of the host country in the context of the socio-cultural situation of the migrant family**. A report prepared for UNESCO. Tampere: Department of Sociology and Social Psychology, University of Tampere. Research Reports 15.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (Ed.) 1995 **Multilingualism for all**. Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove and Cummins, Jim (Eds.) (1988). **Minority education. From shame to struggle**, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove and Phillipson, Robert (Eds., in collaboration with Mart Rannut) (1994). **Linguistic Human Rights. Overcoming linguistic discrimination**. Contributions to the Sociology of Language 67. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. (paperback version 1995).

Stavenhagen, Rodolfo (1995). Cultural rights and universal human rights. In Eide et al (Eds.), 63-78.

Street, Brian (Ed.) (1993). **Cross-cultural approaches to literacy**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thu, Nguyen Xuan (Ed.) (1994). **Vietnamese studies in a multicultural world**. Melbourne: Vietnamese language and culture publications.

Tosi, Arturo (1984). **Immigration and Bilingual Education**. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Tsuda, Yukio (1994). The Diffusion of English: Its Impact on Culture and Communication. **Keio Communication**

Review 16, 49-61.

Twahirwa, André (1994). **Politiques et pratiques linguistiques en Afrique: Rapport d'un travail réalisé pour l'UNESCO**. Paris: UNESCO, Division of Arts and Cultural Life.

UNIN (United Nations Institute for Namibia) (1981). **Toward a language policy for Namibia. English as the official language: perspectives and strategies**. Lusaka: UNIN.

Webb, Vic (1994). Language policy and planning in South Africa. **Annual Review of Applied Linguistics**, 14, 1993/93, 254-273.

Wolfgang, A. (Ed.) (1975). **Education of Immigrant Students**. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Wong Fillmore, Lily (1991). When Learning a Second Language Means Losing the First. **Early Childhood Research Quarterly** 6, 323-346.

World Bank (1988). **Education in sub-Saharan Africa. Policies fo

---

i   To be exact, Boutros-Ghali **said and wrote**: "The right to live one's culture is among the most basic rights of life." (p. 3). Then he **said**: "Article 22 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that everyone is entitled to realization of the cultural rights indispensable for dignity and the free development of personality. Thus, the Charter and the Universal Declaration establish culture <u>and language</u> as fundamental human rig<u>hts</u>." But when we look at the **written** text, there is nothing about language (p. 4): "...establish culture as a fundamental human right". And later, only culture is affirmed as a right: "This, then, is the fundamental approach to culture as found in basic documents of the United Nations: every person has a fundamental right to his or her culture" (p. 8).

ii   When considering the quality of science education, King refers (1991, 51) to a study of education in Tanzania which indicated that learners had too little English to enable them to benefit from the instruction, but this does not lead him to investigate language in education policy. See also our analysis of King's monolingual vision in an earlier study of African education reported in Phillipson 1992, 240.

iii   Phillipson 1992, particularly chapter 8, draws on material from the Ford Foundation (Fox 1975), the British Council and a considerable amount of work done by African researchers. Much of the aid is regarded as failing because of political disconnection and an inadequately narrow technical professional base.

iv   In linguistic imperialism, the dominance of a given language is asserted and maintained by the establishment and continuous reconstitution of structural and cultural inequalities between that language and other languages. Structural refers broadly to material properties (for example institutions, financial allocations) and cultural to immaterial or ideological properties (for example, attitudes and beliefs). Asymmetrical exploitation involves language learning and language use being subtractive rather than additive, for instance when competence in a dominant language entails the marginalization and loss of others (Phillipson 1992).

v   A good starting-point is Paulin Djité's review (1993b) of Robert Chaudenson's book "Vers uns révolution francophone" (Paris: Harmattan), which also refers to some of the literature.

vi   This is a detailed study involving field work in several states (Jayaram & Rajyashree 1994). The authors regret the lack of coordination between language specialists, the private sector and politicians, and make suggestions for the kind of training that would assist policy implementation. They regard popular pressure and the involvement of intellectuals and journalists as important in facilitating executive commitment and the necessary political will.

vii   Symptoms of crisis make injections of cash from the World Bank more attractive, as for instance in Indian elementary education after Jomtien. While the historical record inevitably makes one sceptical about the quality and relevance of World Bank and other North development agencies' work, we would not wish to give the impression that all aid projects are necessarily doomed, nor that individual participants are unwitting stooges in a structure of North-South exploitation. The reality is more complex. There are doubtless many development projects that achieve some success, but few if any in top-down educational reform. There are elite education institutions in many South states which offer high quality education, but this invariably consolidates the linguistic hierarchy. There are scholars, for instance in India, who feel they are setting the agenda for externally funded projects. There are also NGOs which are attempting to resist the pattern of North-South dependency, sometimes with success. However, the position of such bodies tends to be marginal, with concomitant problems in "scaling up" their successes. An important task in

language development work would be to integrate the dimensions of language, gender and ethnicity (Freeland 1994, Skutnabb-Kangas 1994b). There are also many individual scholars in the South who have analysed the failings of development efforts and some from the North who are working for change. Whether one can believe in a paradigm shift, as some do (Pennycook 1994), is more doubtful.

viii "More and more English medium schools are opened every year in the private sector including kindergarten schools and even poor parents pay high premium to get admission to their children in these schools. The students who opt for Indian language medium in higher education are a small minority and are poor scholastically and economically." (Annamalai 1994, 6)

ix For a development of these concepts, see Skutnabb-Kangas (in press a,b).

x See e.g. Baker 1993 and Mohanty 1994 for a good combination of summaries of the issues.

xi See e.g. Mohanty 1994 for evidence.

xii What are linguistic human rights? In a civilized state, there should be no need to debate the right to identify with, to maintain and to fully develop one's mother tongue(s) (the language(s) a person has learned first and/or identifies with). It is a self-evident, fundamental **individual** linguistic human right. There should be no need to debate the right for minorities and indigenous peoples to **exist** and to reproduce themselves as distinct groups, with their own languages and cultures. It is a self-evident, fundamental **collective** human right.

 In our view, universal linguistic human rights should be guaranteed in relation to the **mother tongue**, in relation to an **official language** (and thus in relation to bilingualism), in relation to a possible **language shift**, and in relation to **drawing profit from education** as far as the medium of education is concerned.

 In relation to the **mother tongue(s)** a universal convention of linguistic human rights in our view should guarantee that

 1. everybody has the right to identify with their mother tongue(s) and have this identification accepted and respected by others,

 2. everybody has the right to learn the mother tongue(s) fully, orally (when physiologically possible) and in writing. This presupposes that minorities are educated through the medium of their mother tongue(s), within the state-financed educational system),

 3. everybody has the right to use the mother tongue in most official situations (including day-care, schools, courts, emergency situations of all kinds, health care, including hospitals, and many governmental and other offices).

 4. any change of mother tongue is voluntary, not imposed. (If parents/guardians, choosing the medium of day-care and education for children, are not offered alternatives or do not know enough about the probable long-term consequences of their choices, the change of mother tongue which mostly is the result of majority-medium education for minorities, cannot be designated voluntary).

 In relation to an **official language** a universal convention of linguistic human rights should guarantee that everybody whose mother tongue is not an official language in the country where s/he is resident, has the right to become a high level bilingual (or trilingual, if s/he has 2 mother tongues) in the mother tongue(s) and (one of) the official language(s) (according to her own choice). This presupposes bilingual teachers. In our view, for instance a monolingual English-as-a-second-language teacher is per definition incompetent. A teacher **must** know both English and the student's mother tongue. Likewise, here the parents **must** know enough about the research results when they make their choices - minority parents must e.g. know that good MT-medium teaching also leads to better proficiency in the dominant language, for instance English, AND in the mother tongue than English-medium teaching.

 In relation to **drawing profit from education** a universal convention of linguistic human rights should guarantee that everybody can profit from formal education, regardless of what her mother tongue is. "Profit" should be defined in educational equal outcome terms, not just in terms of having the right to receive marks (as it has been interpreted in human rights courts so far). See our edited book **Linguistic Human Rights** (1994) for details.

xiii Some of my earlier generalisations have been built into models comparing different educational programmes on the basis of various factors. See e.g. Tables 3, 6, 7 and 8 in my **Bilingualism or not** (1981, in English 1984), 1.3 and 1.4 in **Minority Education: from Shame to Struggle**.

xiv "Minority" is a notoriously difficult concept. Partly, because there is, despite many attempts (see e.g. Capotorti 1979 and Andrýsek 1989; see also Eide 1990, 1991, 1995b, Palley 1984) no legally accepted universal definition; partly because of the many connotations which place the concept differentially in several hierarchies. Many groups therefore do not wish to be called "minorities" but prefer other terms. Many indigenous peoples do not see themselves as minorities but as peoples - accepting to be a "minority" would connote accepting the legitimacy of

the jurisdiction of the state which has colonised them, and might prevent certain preferred interpretations of self-determination. Some groups see a hierarchy where nations and nationalities are "above" minorities - here both nations and nationalities would have a certain right to political self-determination (including having their own state if they so wish) whereas minorities might only have the right to cultural autonomy - this has been the interpretation in several central and eastern European situations under communism. Some groups think that "minority" necessarily has negative connotations of "dominated", "poor", "less worthy", even "primitive" or "backward" - many Nort American immigrant groups have held this view. On the other hand, other immigrant groups, e.g. in northern Europe, have claimed that "minority" connotes a group which intends to and is allowed to settle permanently and is therefore a preferred label to "guest worker" or "immigrant", for a hyphenated group, e.g. Sweden Finns (Finns in Sweden), Greek-Australians (Australians of Greek origin). Likewise, these groups see that being accepted as a "national/ethnic) minority confers many more legal rights in international law to a group than the rights which immigrants or refugees have, and therefore becoming a minority has positive connotations. In this article I use "minority" in a general, positive sense, of groups which are "smaller in number than the rest of the population of a State, whose members have ethnical, religious or linguistic features different from those of the rest of the population, and are guided, if only implicitly, by the will to safeguard their culture, traditions, religion or language. Any group coming within the terms of this definition shall be treated as an ethnic, religious or linguistic minority. To belong to a minority shall be a matter of individual choice" (see Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson 1994, note 2 for details of this and other definitions).

Dominant groups are not always numerical majorities, but for the purposes of this article "dominant group" is in most cases used synonymously with majority, If a numerically small but economically and politically dominant group is meant, we use "élites".

xv   Europeanized countries are those countries which were originally colonized from Europe, i.e. Australia, Canada, the United States, New Zealand, for some purposes possibly also South Africa.

xvi   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 voted down by 16 states (some of the "great powers"), and it is thus **not** included in the final Convention of 1948. But what remains, however, is **a definition of linguistic genocide**, which most states which were members of the UN in 1948 were prepared to accept. The "group" that is mentioned in the definition refers to a minority group or an indigenous people. Linguistic genocide is defined in Art. 3, 1 of the final Draft of the Convention as

"Prohibition of 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".

I claim that the use of a minority or indigenous language can be prohibited overtly and directly or covertly, more indirectly. Turkey prohibits the use of the Kurdish language brutally and directly, by law and by killing, torturing, imprisoning, threatening and fining heavily people who want to use Kurdish. - See e.g. Human Rights in Kurdistan 1989, Helsinki Watch Update 1990, Besikci 1989, (Ali) Bucak 1989, Rumpf 1989, Saado 1989, Skutnabb-Kangas & Bucak 1994. Since 1991, when some of the laws prohibiting Kurdish were annulled, the Turkish government has attempted to persuade world opinion that the oppression of the Kurdish language has ended. Study of the Turkish constitution (1982) tells a different story - and the constitution is still valid. The language of Turkey is still Turkish. "The state of Turkey is in its state territory and state citizens an indivisible whole. Its language is Turkish." (Constitution, Article 3). Other formulations that prohibit the use of languages other than Turkish, are also still valid: "No language prohibited by law may be used for disclosure or publication of ideas and opinions. Written or printed materials, records, tapes, videotapes as well as other means of expression that are in violation of this prohibition will be confiscated..." (Constitution, Article 26/3). Both the constitution and the anti-terrorist law passed 12th April 1991, still prohibit Kurdish.- The use of a language can also be prohibited not with the help of physical force, but structurally and ideologically, indirectly, in much more sophisticated ways. 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 they are not taught by minority teachers who are legally allowed to use the language of the minority children as the main medium 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, in the US, Canada and Australia (See e.g. Apple 1993, Beykont 1994, Churchill 1985, Cummins 1984, 1988, 1989a,b, 1991, 1992,

1994, Cummins & Danesi 1990, Cummins & Swain 1986, García 1992, Hakuta 1986, Hernández-Chávez 1994, Lambert 1975, Leontiev 1994, Ogoa 1994, Padilla A. et al. 1991, Padilla R. et al. 1992, Pattanayak 1986, Ramirez et al. 1991, Skutnabb-Kangas & Toukomaa 1976, Wong Fillmore 1991). Immigrant minority education in these European or Europeanised countries is thus guilty of linguistic genocide, according to the UN definition. It is also the situation for most indigenous peoples in the world. - The UN Draft Universal Declaration on Rights of Indigenous Peoples formulates language rights strongly and explicitly and with the state required to allocate resources. But the fate of the Draft is still unsure - the latest version was completed 25-29 July 1994 and forwarded to the UN Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, which in its turn has submitted it to the UN Commission on Human Rights for discussion in February 1995. Major changes can still be expected (Morris 1995) and there is some suspicion that indigenous peoples themselves may be left without adequate influence on them (Daes 1995). - At the same time, the minorities whose languages are being killed, are being made to believe that it is not only necessary but beneficial for them, and often that they leave their languages behind them voluntarily because they want to modernise or join the so called mainstream. Ethnocide is a concomitant to linguicide (see Stavenhagen 1995 on ethnocide).

The difference between the way that such countries as Turkey on the one hand and, for instance, Sweden, the United States or Australia on the other hand, commit linguicide is that the **covert** linguicide (the type that most Western states use in their educational systems) is more efficient, as compared with the **overt** version (as in Turkey). Within 2-4 generations, there are fewer speakers of most minority languages in these European/ised countries than in more openly linguicidal countries. Kurds in the Turkish part of Kurdistan where the Kurdish language has been forbidden by law since 1924, still know Kurdish well and resist linguistic oppression, whereas many former Spanish-speakers in the USA, Italian- or German-speakers in Australia and Finnish-speakers in Sweden have assimilated and no longer know the language, at least not well. 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. The Western educational system is more efficient in committing linguistic genocide than countries which imprison and torture people for the crime of speaking their own language.

xvii   "Underdeveloped" is here used in Walter Rodney's sense (in his book **How Europe underdeveloped Africa**), i.e. countries that the rich "North"/"industrialized" countries have (consciously) underdeveloped and continue to underdevelop.

xviii   See e.g. Obura 1986, Rubagumya 1991, Rubagumya (Ed.) 1990, for some examples. See also the references to Akinnaso and Brock-Utne in the bibliography. See e.g. Brock-Utne 1993a,b, Akinnaso 1993 (which also reviews the exceptions in Africa).

xix   See Sachs (Ed.) 1992 for a multidisciplinary criticism of the concept of development.

xx   Recently (6 April 1994, Doc. CCPR/C/21/Rev.1/Add.5) The UN Human Rights Committee adopted a General comment on Article 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights which interprets it in a substantially more positive way than earlier. The Committee sees it as recognizing the existence of a "right"; imposing positive obligations on the States; seeing the Article as protecting all individuals on the State's territory or under its jurisdiction (i.e. also immigrants and refugees), irrespective of whether they belong to the minorities specified in the Article or not; stating that the existence of a minority does not depend on a decision by the State but requires to be established by objective criteria. It remains to be seen to what extent this General comment will influence the State parties. If the Committee's interpretation ("soft law") becomes the general norm, then the whole assessment in this article needs to be revised.

xxi   See Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson 1994, Skutnabb-Kangas 1995. There is a substantial literature on contemporary European language policy. See, for instance, the yearbook **Sociolinguistica** for 1992, 1993 and 1994.