

180. Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (1999). The Globalisation of Language Rights. In Brock-Utne, Birgit & Garbo, Gunnar (eds.) **Globalization - on whose terms?** Oslo: Institute of Educational Research, University of Oslo, 168-199.

Keynote paper for the conference "Globalization - on whose terms?", Oslo, May 7-10.1998, organised by Institute of Educational Research, University of Oslo, 'Education in Africa' seminar series.

1. Introduction

Our environment consists of at least the following three parts, in addition to the **spiritual** environment: our **biological** environment, our **linguistic** environment and our **cultural** environment. The present diversity in all three areas is very seriously threatened by globalisation and by what is falsely called the 'free' market.

All conference participants know about the threat to biodiversity and most could probably mention at least one big international conference about it or an international organisation working to maintain biodiversity. But if I were to ask: how many can mention at least one international organisation working to maintain linguistic diversity, and at least one big international meeting concerned with linguistic diversity, I suspect that not many hands would be up.

But today linguistic and cultural diversity are disappearing relatively **much much faster** than biological diversity. And languages are today being killed at a much faster pace than ever before in human history.

Still, linguistic and cultural diversity are as necessary for the existence of our planet as biodiversity, and the three are correlated (Maffi, Skutnabb-Kangas & Andrianarivo, 1998). There may even be a causal link between them - a coevolution of all three kinds of diversity.

The paper starts with a short exposé about the present health situation of the world's languages and the prospects for them during the next few generations. The conclusion is that the future looks dim - if things continue, we may kill over 90 percent of the world's oral languages in the next hundred years.

Some of the direct main agents for this linguistic (and cultural) genocide are parts of what we call the **consciousness industry: formal education** and the **mass media** (including television, 'cultural nerve gas' as Michael Krauss (1992: 6) has called it.

One necessary tool in the remedies is linguistic human rights (LHRs). Linguistic human rights are a necessary (but not sufficient) prerequisite for the maintenance of linguistic diversity.

Violations of linguistic human rights, especially in education, may lead to reduction of linguistic and cultural diversity on our planet. Globalisation of formal education and mass media is a killing agent.

Linguistic human rights in education, will then be described, with a very quick run-through of what happens to educational language rights in international human rights law, regionally and globally. My assessment is that the present linguistic human rights in education, are completely insufficient to protect and maintain linguistic diversity on our globe.

The catastrophe is that the so called 'free' market destroys our biological environment and our linguistic and cultural environment at an accelerating pace. I shall only discuss one aspect of this,

the relationship between the 'free market' and human rights. Human rights are supposed to be a corrective to the 'free' market. They are supposed to overrule the law of supply and demand and remove price-tags from people and from necessities for their survival. But they are powerless unless two unlikely changes happen. Firstly, a radical redistribution of the world's material resources is a prerequisite for **implementation** of human rights. Secondly, for this to happen, civil society needs to take back the control of economy which has been given away to the transnational companies and the financial giants in the globalisation process. The losers, if this does not happen, are not only the 80 percent of the world's population at present consuming only 20 percent of the resources. The losers are humanity and the planet. I will quote Edward Goldsmith (1996, 91), and want to remind you that 'environment' means biological, linguistic and cultural environment. In his words (1996, 91),

'there is no evidence that trade or economic development are of any great value to humanity ... The environment, on the other hand, is our greatest wealth, and to kill it, as the TNCs [transnational companies] are methodically doing, is an act of unparalleled criminality.' The only hope today seems to be that the TNC leaders might realise that it is not in the interest of their grandchildren either because 'there can be no trade and no economic development on a dead planet' (ibid., 91).

In the age of industrialisation and modernism, those who had material and financial resources, capital, did well. In the age of information, those who are depositories for the knowledge capital needed for creating, storing and exchanging information, those with linguistic and cultural capital, will do well. The more linguistic and cultural diversity, the more knowledge capital. If the elites, in the name of supposed efficiency, homogenise the world, they are also killing this mental capital. Unless we, instead of globalising financial capital, start truly globalising language rights, including a right to a diverse environment, there is no future.

Additive English for everyone is OK. Globalizing **subtractive** English (where English is learned **at the cost** of the mother tongues, not in addition to them) kills other languages.

2. The world's languages: number of languages and number of speakers

2.1. The number of languages

If we want to preserve the world's linguistic diversity, we have to know what to preserve. The first questions then are: What are the languages of the world, how many of them are there and where are they?

The short defensive answer is that we do not really know exactly. The number of 'languages' in the world is not known - and cannot be known. Partly this is because we don't even properly know what 'a language' is. Why? There are some good reasons and some bad ones. The main reason is that the difference between a language and dialects/sociolects is political and arbitrary - it is neither similarity or dissimilarity of structure nor mutual intelligibility or lack of it.

Norwegian and Swedish show close structural similarity and many speakers understand each other but still they are seen as separate languages. Many variants of Black English, cockney, RP, Indian, Nigerian, or Appalachian Englishes are supposed to represent one language, English, even their native speakers may not understand each other and there are big systematic structural

differences. Political definitions of a language would be: 'A language is a dialect with an army (and a navy), or 'A language is a dialect with state borders', or 'A language is a dialect promoted by the elites'.

Having said that, we can claim that there probably are something between 6.500 and 10.000 spoken (oral) languages in the world, and a number of **sign languages** which can be equally large. I will leave sign languages outside this paper, partly because the type of data I present is lacking about themⁱ. Even if many different statistics on the number of languages have been presented, they change all the time, and the principles behind each set of statistics can be discussed and questioned on many counts, I will in the following use the **Ethnologue** estimate or some 6.700 oral languagesⁱⁱ. Of the **Ethnologue** estimate of over 6.700 languages, Europe and the Middle East together have only 4% and all the Americas (North, South and Central) together around 15%. The rest, 81% of the world's oral language, are in Africa and the Pacificⁱⁱⁱ.

There are nine countries in the world with more than 200 languages each. They account for more than half the world's oral languages (around 3.500). These are the two megadiversity countries, Papua New Guinea and Indonesia (850 and 670 respectively, according to Krauss' 1992 figures) and seven others (Nigeria, India, Cameroon, Australia, Mexico, Zaire, Brazil). Another 13 countries have more than 100 languages each (Phillippines, Russia, USA, Malaysia, China, Sudan, Tanzania, Ethiopia, Chad, Vanuatu, Central African Republic, Myanmar, Nepal). These top 22 countries, just over 10 percent of the world's countries, probably account for some 75 percent (over 5.000) of the world's oral languages.

2.2. The number of speakers of each language

From the number of languages in various countries we move to number of speakers of each language. Even here the figures can be discussed from several angles, starting from the question of what a language is (see, e.g. Mühlhäusler 1996) and how it can be defined. Is it advisable to bunch together all the Chinese languages, including Mandarin and Cantonese? The numbers are extremely unsure anyway. It shows something about the finance behind various research disciplines that we count in nanounits, nanoseconds, nanomillimeters, etc, in going to Mars or splitting sheep genes or soya bean genes but even our millions are questionable in counting depositories of the world's most precious resources, human linguistic and cultural diversity units, people. In Denmark, a bacon-exporting country, there are at any one time exact figures for how many pigs of different kinds, ages and weight classes there are, but no idea of how many or which languages people speak as their mother tongues or what linguistic competencies people have.

The **top 10 oral languages** in the world, in terms of number of mother tongue speakers are Chinese, English, Hindi/Urdu, Spanish, Arabic, Portuguese, Russian, Bengali, Japanese, German. All have more than or very close to 100 million speakers. They take half the pie: they comprise only 0,10 - 0,15% of the world's oral languages but account for close to 50% of the speakers, i.e. the world's oral^{iv} population. There is much more disagreement about numbers for the following group of languages, those with between 35 and 100 million speakers each: Punjabi, Javanese, Korean, French, Tamil, Telugu, Vietnamese, Marathi, Italian, Turkish, Persian, Urdu, Thai, Ukrainian, Polish, Bhojpuri and Gujarati.

The top languages in terms of number of speakers are the **big killer languages**, and English is the foremost among them. These are the languages whose speakers have allocated to themselves

and to their languages more structural power and (material) resources than their numbers would justify, at the cost of speakers of other languages.

A very small group of the world's languages, numbering **less than 300** (Harmon 1995; between 200 and 250, Krauss 1992), are spoken by communities of **1 million speakers and above**.

Demographically these **less than 300 languages** (the Really Very Big, Big and the Middle-sized languages) account for a total of over 5 billion speakers or close to **95% of the world's population**. But the 95% of the world's population accounts for much less than 5% of the world's languages, probably only 3 percent. This means that some 95-97% of the world's languages have fewer than 1 million speakers each. Probably around **45% of the world's languages are spoken by between 1 million and 10,000 speakers each** (the **smallish, small and very small** languages).

Somewhat **over half of the world's (oral) languages** and most of the sign languages are spoken by communities of **10,000 speakers or less**. Most languages are spoken in one country only:

84% of all the world's oral languages are endemic to the country. These languages which are

spoken by less than 10,000 each are the **Really small and threatened languages**. The **median** number of speakers for oral languages is probably some 5-6,000 people (Krauss 1992, 7).

But half of these, in turn, meaning around **a quarter of the world's languages**, are spoken by communities of **1,000 speakers or less**, according to Dave Harmon (1995). These **Minimal-sized and therefore endangered languages** are the most vulnerable oral languages of the world (and all sign languages are threatened).

3. The state of the languages: the moribund, the endangered and the safe

Linguists agree that many languages face extinction. Michael Krauss from Alaska divides the (oral) languages into three groups, the **moribund**, the **endangered** and the **safe** languages (ibid., 5-7).

The **moribund** languages, between 20 and 50 percent of the world's oral languages, are the ones which are no longer being learned by children, meaning they are 'beyond endangerment, they are living dead and will disappear in the next century' (Krauss 1995).

The **endangered** languages are the ones 'which, though now still being learned by children, will - if the present conditions continue - cease to be learned by children during the coming century' (Krauss 1992, 6).

The **safe** languages are the ones which are neither moribund nor endangered.

Krauss sees the number of speakers as the second of the three important criteria for safeness (the first being 'learning by children'). Starting with seeing languages with more than one million speakers as 'safe' (200-250 languages), Krauss first goes down to half a million (which raises the numbers with some 50 languages) and then all the way down to 100,000. This gives around 600 'safe' languages.

But the degree of threat cannot be directly predicted from 'learning by children' or numbers.

Krauss uses as his third criterion official state support (1992, 7). The majority of the world's around 200 states are not officially multilingual. In addition, English has official status in 75 countries, French in 26, Arabic in 19, Spanish in 18, Portuguese and German in 6 each, and Chinese, Malay and Tamil in 3 each. This means that at least one of the 9 big languages above has official status in 141 countries in the world. Admittedly some countries have several official languages, notably South-Africa with 11 official languages, and India, with 18 plus 1. Still,

probably the number of official languages in the world is no higher than the number of states. To me it is scary. **UNESCO Statistical Yearbook 1997** lists a total of 176 countries. If in 141, around 80% of these, one of the 9 languages (out of the 6,760 in the **Ethnologue**) has official status, that means that 80% of the world's countries give official status to 0,133% of the world's oral languages. This does not leave much room for other languages.

In many if not most of the countries the native speaker population of this language with official status is minimal. Linguistic and cultural colonialism have replaced physical colonialism. What is needed is not only the decolonisation of the mind (as Ngũgĩ puts it) but the **decolonisation of the linguistic mind**. Even if some additional languages have partial official status, regionally or for specific purposes, e.g. education, their numbers are probably maximally some hundreds. This leaves over 95 percent of the world's oral languages without any official support. As we said, Krauss estimates (1992, 1995) the number of oral languages that are assured of still being around in 2100 to only around 600, much less than 10 percent of the present oral languages. Again, this count does not consider sign languages. According to this prognosis, then, not only are most of the languages with less than 10,000 speakers, over half of today's languages, going to disappear, but also most of the ones which have between 10,000 and 1 million speakers. We kill more than 90 percent of our linguistic resources in the next 100 years.

4. Linguistic and cultural diversity are correlationally and may be causally connected to biodiversity

Linguistic diversity is disappearing at a much faster pace than ever before in human history. Now we could just say: so what? Is it not a natural development? Will it not be easier when all of us speak the same language, or only a few big languages?

No. I shall only present one reason here of the many - probably the least well known one.

Linguistic and cultural diversity are as necessary for the existence of our planet as biodiversity. They are correlated: where one type is high, the other one is too. Mark Pagel points out that in North America

languages, like all biological species, get thicker on the ground as you approach the equator (Pagel, as reported by Nicholas Ostler in **Iatiku: Newsletter of the Foundation for Endangered Languages** 1, 1995, p. 6).

Luisa Maffi, President of Terralingua^v, also says (1996) that there are

'remarkable overlaps between global mappings of the world's areas of biological megadiversity and areas of high linguistic diversity', and likewise a 'correlation between low-diversity cultural systems and low biodiversity' (Maffi 1996)^{vi}.

In Table 1, showing this correlation, conservationist David Harmon compares **endemism** in language and in higher vertebrates (mammals, birds, reptiles and amphibians), taking the top 25 countries for both. Harmon has derived the figures for endemic languages from Grimes **Ethnologue** 1992 and for species from WCMC 1992: 139-141.

Table 1

Endemism in language and higher vertebrates: comparison of the top 25 countries

Endemic languages	Number	Endemic higher vertebrates species	Number
1. PAPUA NEW GUINEA	847	1. AUSTRALIA	1,346
2. INDONESIA	655	2. MEXICO	761
3. Nigeria	376	3. BRAZIL	725
4. INDIA	309	4. INDONESIA	673
5. AUSTRALIA	261	5. Madagascar	537
6. MEXICO	230	6. PHILIPPINES	437
7. CAMEROON	201	7. INDIA	373
8. BRAZIL	185	8. PERU	332
9. ZAIRE	158	9. COLOMBIA	330
10. PHILIPPINES	153	10. Ecuador	294
11. USA	143	11. USA	284
12. Vanuatu	105	12. CHINA	256
13. TANZANIA	101	13. PAPUA NEW GUINEA	203
14. Sudan	97	14. Venezuela	186
15. Malaysia	92	15. Argentina	168
16. ETHIOPIA	90	16. Cuba	152
17. CHINA	77	17. South Africa	146
18. PERU	75	18. ZAIRE	134
19. Chad	74	19. Sri Lanka	126
20. Russia	71	20. New Zealand	120
21. SOLOMON ISLANDS	69	21. TANZANIA	113
22. Nepal	68	22. Japan	112
23. COLOMBIA	55	23. CAMEROON	105
24. Côte d'Ivoire	51	24. SOLOMON ISLANDS	101
25. Canada	47	25. ETHIOPIA	88
		26. Somalia	88

Source: Harmon 1995a, 14. Figures for Ethiopia include Eritrea. Reptiles are not included for USA, China and Papua New Guinea. The countries which are on both lists are **BOLDED AND CAPITALISED**.

16 of the 25 countries are on both lists, a concurrence of 64%. According to Harmon, it is highly

unlikely to be accidental, and he gives factors accounting for it which I do not have time to go into.

But the relationship between linguistic and cultural diversity on the one hand and biodiversity on the other hand is not only correlational. There seems to be mounting evidence that it might be causal. According to Maffi, ethnobiologists, human-ecologists and others have proposed 'theories of "human-environment coevolution"', including the assumption that 'cultural diversity might enhance biodiversity or vice versa.' (ibid.).

In this perspective, the first conference investigating this relationship, called 'Endangered Languages, Endangered Knowledge, Endangered Environments' (at the University of California, Berkeley, October 1996, organised by Maffi) stressed 'the need to address the foreseeable consequences of massive disruption of such long-standing interactions' (ibid.).

The processes of language loss also 'affect the maintenance of traditional environmental knowledge - from loss of biosystematic lexicon to loss of traditional stories' (ibid.).

The United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP), one of the organisations behind the 1992 Rio Biodiversity conference, produced a massive book on global biodiversity assessment that summarizes current knowledge about biodiversity (Groombridge 1992). Now UNEP also acknowledges the connection between biological resources and human resources. It has just produced a companion volume to the biodiversity book, on **Cultural and Spiritual Values of Biodiversity** (Posey (ed.) 1998). In the chapter on Linguistic Diversity, Luisa Maffi and I argue that

the preservation of the world's linguistic diversity must be incorporated as an essential goal in any bioculturally-oriented diversity conservation program (from Executive Summary).

We can compare the loss of languages to some aspects of loss of biodiversity. The total **number of species** is not known, and estimates vary much more than for languages, from five million to thirty million or more, i.e. the highest estimates are more than six times the lowest. Therefore, also **extinction rates** are difficult to determine.

Conservative estimates put the [extinction] rate at more than 5,000 species each year. This is about ten thousand times as fast as prehuman extinction rates. Less conservative estimates put the rate at 150,000 species per year (Goodland 1996, 214).

If we take the most conservative ('optimistic') estimate of extinction (5,000/year) and the 'optimistic' (least conservative) estimate about numbers (30 million), we get a 0,017% rate per year. With reverse estimates, 'pessimistic' (least conservative) for extinction (150,000/year and most 'pessimistic' (most conservative) for species (5 million), the yearly extinction rate would be 3%. As we can see, the difference is huge, mainly because the highest extinction rate estimate is 300 times the lower one. On the other hand, those researchers who use the higher rates, usually also use the higher estimates of numbers. For instance, an extinction rate of 150,000/year, with the numbers set at 30 million, would give a yearly extinction percentage of 0.5%. The most often used figures seem to be somewhere between 0.2% ('pessimistic realistic') and 0.02 ('optimistic realistic').

'**Endangered**' species are defined as 'species that are in imminent danger of extinction' (Krauss 1992, 7) and '**threatened**' as 'species that in the foreseeable future will be in imminent danger of extinction' (ibid.). Of the 4.400 mammal species, 326 or 7.4% are on either the 'endangered' or

the 'threatened lists, and the corresponding figures for birds are 231 (2.7%) of 8,600. The 1997 **Threatened Plants Report**, compiled by the World Conservation Monitoring Centre in Cambridge, UK, is the first comprehensive international study of the world's threatened plants, drawing on data from more than 200 countries from some 2,000 data sources. Still, as for animals too, scientific data is seriously lacking from parts of Asia, South America and Africa, i.e. those parts of the world which are rich in biodiversity. The Report estimates that out of the global total of some 270,000 plants more than 34,000 must be put on the Red List of plants facing extinction.

As compared to the threat of languages (90% moribund, endangered, or threatened), the threat to biodiversity is 'relatively mild', according to Krauss (1992, 7). Of course a comparison is problematic because the definitions used are different. If we make a very simple calculation, estimating the rate of extinction with today's situation as the starting point, 90% of today's languages would according to Krauss be extinct in 100 years' time, whereas 20% of today's species would, according to the 'pessimistic realistic' estimate above, and 2% according to the 'optimistic realistic' estimate, and 12,6% of today's plants are on the Red List. This shows that there is a very large difference. Still, there are thousands of organisations fighting loss of biodiversity.

It is interesting, then, that loss of biodiversity has had massive attention all over the world - many people are worried about it. But few people talk of loss of linguistic diversity. Still, linguistic diversity is today disappearing relatively much much faster than biological diversity, in the sense that the percentage of languages that will perish/be killed in the next century is larger than the percentage of all biological species that will be killed during the same time.

'Preservation of the linguistic and cultural heritage of humankind' (one of Unesco's declared goals) has been seen by many researchers and politicians as a nostalgic primordialist dream (creating employment for the world's linguists). The perpetuation of linguistic diversity is, however, not at all romantic. It is a necessity for the survival of the planet, in a similar way to biodiversity (Maffi, Skutnabb-Kangas & Andrianarivo 1998).

(Educational) linguistic human rights in international human rights law

But what does this have to do with linguistic human rights? **Language rights in education** are central for the maintenance of languages and for prevention of linguistic and cultural genocide, regardless of whether this education happens in schools, formally, or in the homes and communities, informally, and regardless of whether and to what extent literacy is involved. Transmission of languages from the parent generation to children is **the** most vital factor for the maintenance of languages. Children must have the opportunity of learning their parents' idiom fully and properly so that they become (at least) as proficient as the parents. Language learning in this sense has to continue at least into young adulthood, for many functions throughout life. When more and more children get access to formal education, much of their more formal language learning which earlier happened in the community, happens in schools. If an alien language is used in schools, i.e. if children do not have the right to learn and use their language in schools for learning content, i.e. use it as the main medium of education, the language is not going to survive because children educated through the medium of an alien language are not likely to pass their own language on to their children and grandchildren. "Modernization" has accelerated the death/murder of languages which without formal education had survived for

centuries or millennia. One of the main agents in killing languages is thus the linguistic genocide which happens in formal education, every time indigenous or minority children or dominated group children even if they are a majority in terms of numbers are educated in a dominant language. Linguistic genocide sounds drastic. We need to define it. When the United Nations worked on the final draft of what was to become The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (E 794, 1948), a definition of **linguistic genocide** was included in Article III.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.

In the final vote in General Assembly, Art. III was voted down, and is NOT part of the final Convention. Still, the definition can be used. If we accept the claim that "prohibition" can be direct or indirect, it follows that if the minority language is not used as the main medium of education in the preschool/school and if there are no minority teachers in the school, the use of the language is **indirectly** prohibited in daily intercourse/in schools, i.e. it is a question of linguistic genocide.

I would not hesitate in calling **educational language rights the most important linguistic human rights** if we are interested in maintaining linguistic and cultural diversity on our planet, most importantly the right to mother tongue medium education. But is mother tongue medium education in fact a human right? In the following section I sum up the situation today.

In many of the post-WW2 human rights instruments^{vii}, language is mentioned in the preambles and in general clauses, as one of the characteristics on the basis of which individuals are not to be discriminated against in their enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Many other characteristics are listed too but the original basic four (in the United Nations Charter, Art.13) are "**race, sex, language, or religion**", i.e. language has been seen as one of the most important characteristics of humans in terms of their human rights.

When we move from the non-duty-inducing phrases in the preambles, to the binding clauses, and especially to the educational clauses, something very strange happens. Often **language disappears completely**. This happens in **The Universal Declaration of Human Rights** (1948): the paragraph on education (26), does not refer to language at all. Often there is still a list which has all or most of the others - but language is no longer there. **The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights** (adopted in 1966 and in force since 1976) mentions language on a par with race, colour, sex, religion etc in its **general** article (2.2), but then omits any reference to language in the **educational** Article 13, even if the Article does explicitly refer to "racial, ethnic or religious groups" - but not "linguistic" groups.

Several new Declarations and Conventions to protect minorities and/or minority languages have been passed in the 1990s. But even in the new instruments, language rights in education are treated differently as compared to other rights.

If language indeed **is** included, the Article with language-related rights is so weak and unsatisfactory that it is virtually meaningless. All or many of the other human characteristics are still there and get proper treatment and detailed, positive rights. The clauses about them create obligations and contain demanding formulations, where the states are firm dutyholders and '**shall**' do something positive in order to ensure the rights; there are few modifications, few opt-out clauses and few alternatives on a gliding scale. Many of the other characteristics get their own specific conventions (e.g. conventions to prevent racism or sexism, or to guarantee freedom

of religion). But not so for language, especially in education.

Compare the *demanding formulations* relating to other characteristics (1.1, 1.2), with the treatment, with the many opt-outs, modifications and alternatives, that language in education (4.3) gets in The **UN Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities**, adopted by the General Assembly in December 1992 (my emphases):

1.1. States *shall protect* the existence and the national or ethnic, cultural, religious and linguistic identity of minorities within their respective territories, and *shall encourage* conditions for the *promotion* of that identity.

1.2. States *shall* adopt appropriate legislative and other measures to achieve those ends.

4.3. States should take appropriate measures so that, wherever possible, persons belonging to minorities have adequate opportunities to learn their mother tongue or to have instruction in their mother tongue.

Clearly such a formulation as in Art. 4.3 raises many questions. What constitute "appropriate measures" or "adequate opportunities", and who is to decide what is "possible"? Does "instruction in" the mother tongue mean "through the medium of the mother tongue" or does it only mean instruction in the mother tongue as a subject?

We can see the same phenomenon in the **European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages** (22 June 1992). A state can choose which paragraphs or subparagraphs it wants to apply (a minimum of 35 is required). The formulations in the education Article 8 include a range of modifications like "as far as possible", "relevant", "appropriate", "where necessary", "pupils who so wish in a number considered sufficient", "if the number of users of a regional or minority language justifies it", and a number of alternatives as in "to allow, encourage or provide teaching in or of the regional or minority language at all the appropriate stages of education".

While the Charter demonstrates how difficult it is to write binding formulations which are sensitive to local conditions (and this is, we certainly have to admit, a real problem), just like in the UN Declaration above, its opt-outs and alternatives permit a reluctant state to meet the requirements in a minimalist way which it can legitimate by claiming that a provision was not "possible" or "appropriate", numbers were not "sufficient" or did not "justify" a provision, and that it "allowed" the minority to organise teaching of their language as a subject, outside school, at their own cost.

Also in a new Council of Europe **Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities** (adopted by the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe on 10 November 1994), again the Article (14.2) covering the medium of education is more heavily qualified than anything else in the Framework Convention:

In areas inhabited by persons belonging to national minorities traditionally or in substantial numbers, if there is sufficient demand, the parties shall endeavour to ensure, as far as possible and within the framework of their education systems, that persons belonging to those minorities have adequate opportunities for being taught in the minority language or for receiving instruction in this language (my emphases).

There is a hierarchy, with different rights, between different groups whose languages are not

main official languages in the state where they live (see Human Rights Fact Sheets from the UN Centre for Human Rights in Geneva for these). Traditional/territorial/autochthonous/national minorities have more language rights than other groups and most human rights instruments pertain to them. **Immigrant/guest worker/refugee minorities** have practically no language rights in education in relation to their own language, and only few in relation to learning the official language. The UN International Convention on the Protection of the rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, from December 1990 but not yet in force because of lack of signatures, in its assimilation-oriented educational language Article (45) accords minimal rights to the mother tongues and is even more vague than the instruments mentioned before.

Indigenous peoples have on paper some rights and more are suggested in the UN **Draft Universal Declaration on Rights of Indigenous Peoples**, but many of them may disappear in the revision process (see below).

A still more recent attempt to promote language rights, a Universal Declaration of Linguistic Rights, accepted in Barcelona in June 1996 and handed over to UNESCO, also suffers from similar shortcomings even if it for several beneficiaries (**language communities** and, to some extent, **language groups**) represents great progress in relation to the other instruments described. Still, indirectly its education section forces all others except those defined as members of **language communities** (which roughly correspond to national territorially based minorities) to assimilate. For all others, only education in the language of the territory is a right, i.e. not education in their own language (see below). There are many states which claim that they do not have minority language communities, or which do not want to give these communities any rights. Since **self-determination** is not an unconditional right in international law, neither internally (autonomy of some kind) nor externally (secession, independence), a Declaration which gives most of the rights to linguistic **communities**, without firm dutyholders, makes these communities completely dependent on the acceptance of their existence by states, an acceptance that many states are not willing to grant. This makes individual rights enormously important in the Declaration. But these individual rights are the weakest part of the Declaration.

The new Universal Declaration does not give any positive **educational** language rights to **all** individuals, regardless of which category they belong to - and this is exactly what individual human rights are supposed to do. If something is to be seen as an individual **human right**, it means, per definition, a right which **every individual** in the world has, simply because that individual is a human being. It means an unconditional, fundamental right that no state is allowed to take away. In addition, the new Declaration seems to be in many ways completely unrealistic - few if any states in the world would be willing to accept it in its present form. This will probably be the fate of the UN **Draft Universal Declaration on Rights of Indigenous Peoples** also, according to its chair, Erica Irene Daes (1995). Despite the careful negotiations over a decade, several countries, most importantly the United States, are probably going to demand substantial changes which undermine the progress achieved in the Declaration (Morris 1995).

The conclusion is that we are still to see the right to education through the medium of the mother tongue become a human right. We are still living with basic language wrongs in human rights law, especially in education policy. Denial of linguistic human rights, linguistic and cultural genocide and forced assimilation through education are still characteristic of many states, notably in Europe and Neo-Europes.

There are some positive recent developments, though.

Recent positive developments

In 1992 OSCE created the position of a High Commissioner on National Minorities 'as an instrument of conflict prevention in situations of ethnic tension' (Rothenberger 1997, 3). In order to prevent ethnic conflict, the High Commissioner, Max van der Stoep, recently published authoritative guidelines for minority education for the 55 member states (which include Canada and the United States). These guidelines, The Hague Recommendations, were worked out by a small group of experts on human rights and education (including the author of the abstract). The guidelines (worked out by a small group of experts on human rights and education, including TSK) are an interpretation and concretisation of what international human rights law says about minority education. Even if the term used is "national minority", the guidelines also apply to immigrated minorities, and one does NOT need to be a citizen in order to be protected by the guidelines.

In the section 'The spirit of international instruments', bilingualism is seen as a right and responsibility for persons belonging to national minorities (Art. 1), and states are reminded not to interpret their obligations in a restrictive manner (Art. 3). In the section on "Minority education at primary and secondary levels", mother tongue medium education is recommended at all levels, including bilingual teachers in the dominant language as a second language (Articles 11-13). Teacher training is made a duty on the state (Art. 14).

11) The first years of education are of pivotal importance in a child's development. Educational research suggests that the medium of teaching at pre-school and kindergarten levels should ideally be the child's language. Wherever possible, States should create conditions enabling parents to avail themselves of this option.

12) Research also indicates that in primary school the curriculum should ideally be taught in the minority language. The minority language should be taught as a subject on a regular basis. The State language should also be taught as a subject on a regular basis preferably by bilingual teachers who have a good understanding of the children's cultural and linguistic background. Towards the end of this period, a few practical or non-theoretical subjects should be taught through the medium of the State language. Wherever possible, States should create conditions enabling parents to avail themselves of this option.

13) In secondary school a substantial part of the curriculum should be taught through the medium of the minority language. The minority language should be taught as a subject on a regular basis. The State language should also be taught as a subject on a regular basis preferably by bilingual teachers who have a good understanding of the children's cultural and linguistic background. Throughout this period, the number of subjects taught in the State language, should gradually be increased. Research findings suggest that the more gradual the increase, the better for the child.

14) The maintenance of the primary and secondary levels of minority education depends a great deal on the availability of teachers trained in all disciplines in the mother tongue. Therefore, ensuing from the obligation to provide adequate opportunities for minority language education, States should provide adequate facilities for the appropriate training of teachers and should facilitate access to such training.

Finally, the Explanatory Note states that

[S]ubmersion-type approaches whereby the curriculum is taught exclusively through the medium of the State language and minority children are entirely integrated into classes with children of the majority are not in line with international standards (p. 5).

Human rights as a corrective to the 'free' market

Using the metaphor of the languages themselves as killer languages as I did about the top 13 languages may be vivid. However, it is the market forces behind the languages, behind the relative validation or invalidation, that are important to analyse. What I loosely call 'the "free" market response' is centralisation, homogenisation, monocultural efficiency; and the consequences of the 'free market' for linguistic diversity are disastrous. Another response could be through diversity, including implementing linguistic human rights. These two responses will be discussed below.

But first I want to ask what the response of the human rights system is to giving market forces free range? Human rights, especially economic and social rights, are, according to human rights lawyer Katarina Tomaševski (1996, p. 104), to act as **correctives to the free market**.

The first international human rights treaty abolished slavery. Prohibiting slavery implied that **people** were not supposed to be treated as market commodities. ILO (The International Labour Organisation) has added that **labour** should not be treated as commodity. But price-tags are to be removed from other areas too. Tomaševski claims (ibid., p. 104) that

The purpose of international human rights law is ... to overrule the law of supply and demand and remove price-tags from people and from necessities for their survival.

These necessities for survival include not only basic food and housing (which would come under economic and social rights), but also basics for the sustenance of a dignified life, including basic civil, political **and cultural** rights. In Johan Galtung's terms, it is not only material, somatic needs that are necessities for survival, but also non-material, mental needs (see Table 2):

Table 2
Types of basic needs and basic problems

TYPES OF BASIC NEEDS

vs

Impediments to their satisfaction

	<i>DIRECT</i> (intended)	<i>STRUCTURAL</i> (built-in)
<i>Material needs</i> (SOMATIC)	SECURITY vs <u>violence</u>	WELL-BEING vs <u>misery</u>
<i>Non-material needs</i>	FREEDOM	IDENTITY

<i>(MENTAL)</i>	vs <u>repression</u>	vs <u>alienation</u>
-----------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------

(based on Galtung 1988, p. 147)

Education is part of 'well-being' and 'identity', and a prerequisite for 'security' and 'freedom'. Education, including basic educational linguistic rights, is one of the necessities from which price-tags should be removed by the human rights system.

This means that it is the duty of each government to create conditions under which people are able to provide these necessities for themselves. If this really happened, we would not need to worry about the fate of the world's languages. But it does not. Most states are either unwilling or unable to deliver - or both^{viii}. Western countries would be capable of respecting educational linguistic human rights but many are peculiarly unwilling to do so. The capacity of states to deliver is partially eroded by the "free" market, by the restrictions on state sovereignty in the age of post-modernist globalisation which has replaced the **universalism** of the modernisation period (Bauman 1997). **Universalisation**, seen by some idealists as positive (civilisation was spread to more and more countries, differences were going to be levelled out), in fact had to do with westernisation and homogenisation. In Zygmunt Bauman's analysis (1997), the difference between the two is that **universalisation** was seen as something with active agents (we made it happen) whereas **globalisation** is (constructed as) something that happens to us, a natural process that moves by itself. The actions by states are negative: to remove hurdles and obstacles for transnational corporations: to drop constraints to 'free' market, to make capital flexible, to make workers replaceable, movable and controllable, i.e. **not** take any positive action but only remove constraints to capitalism (see articles in Mander & Goldsmith (eds.) 1996). According to representatives of transnational corporations (TNCs), the key task for states in the world today is to secure the confidence and trust of investors. The state must remove any obstacles to this confidence. In this world, the investors are the only volatile element/force. Behind this lies the collapse of institutions of political control of trade and capital.

The earlier tests of the sovereignty of a state had to do with to what extent the state had political control over the economy, the military, the culture; was self-sufficient and sovereign and could provide for its citizens (see also Hassanpour, in press). The post-modernist state has no control over the traditional markers of sovereignty; sovereignty has disappeared or is shaky beyond repair. **Glocalisation** has replaced globalisation. There is a globalisation of finance & capital; they are extraterritorial. Everybody can buy the same tanks, i.e. military control has disappeared. And American culture is everywhere. Preservation of local law and order (the only area where states are 'sovereign') represents localisation. States use their power to control those who might want to prevent the removal of the obstacles to globalisation^{ix}. TNC investors are in Bauman's view interested in **weak but sovereign states**: states have to be weak in order not to be able to prevent the globalisation which multi- and transnationals need; on the other hand they have to be capable of securing the safety of international businessmen on the streets everywhere and to control workers, i.e. to have control over the state apparatuses for violence for internal purposes. Most wars today are intra-state wars, not wars between states.

The often quoted fact of the top 358 multimillionaires (who have as much liquid cash as the poorest 45% of the population of the world together) is just one example of increasing inequality, one of the consequences of structural changes in globalisation (one of the 'stress on people' factors in Figure 1). But instead of analysing the structural poverty, resulting from, among other factors, the structural unemployment inherent in the 'free markets', as a result of globalisation,

the poor are constructed as being poor because of inherent deficiencies (among these lack of competence in dominant languages)^x. It is their own fault.

Now the poor are seen as structurally poor and unemployed, hence bad consumers, and under the 'free' market that is a crime. Criminalisation of poverty leads to the poor being legitimately controlled by the state (in the welfare state by social workers, and increasingly the police) and not 'helped'. Not ethnic cleansing but economic cleansing, townships, bantustans for the poor of the world. Thus the local state removes the obstacles for the globalising free market. Signing the half-secretly negotiated MAI (Multilateral Agreement on Investment) will further accelerate this development.

This is the answer of market forces to the post-modern problems of their own making. A human rights oriented answer could be different. According to our earlier analysis, one of the important tasks for states would be to guarantee the satisfaction of basic human needs for everybody. This could be done if human rights and economic rights came together, controlled by a democratic political process.

But in global **human rights policies** there is a conspicuous silence about economic and social (or welfare) rights, coupled with very vocal anti-welfare approaches. In global and Western **economic policies**, human rights are hardly mentioned, except when legitimating economic benefits for the industrialised countries by referring to alleged (and often real) human rights violations in underdeveloped countries. Also, in renegotiating **political, military and economic alliances**, Western countries skilfully play the card of alleged human rights violations^{xi}.

Tomaševski sums it all up (1996, p. 100):

the ideology of the free market has exempted economy from public control (sometimes even influence) and thus eliminated the basis for human rights, when these are understood as an exercise of political rights to achieve economic, social and cultural rights.

Globalising access to information **has** enabled counterhegemonic forces to ensure that there is growing sensitivity to human rights. But at the same time there is also a growing inability to secure them by progressive forces in civil society. The gap between rhetoric and implementation is growing, with all the growing inequalities.

The message from both sociologists like Zygmunt Bauman and human rights lawyers like Katarina Tomaševski is that unless there is a redistribution of **resources** for implementing human rights, nothing is going to happen. It is no use spreading **knowledge of human rights** unless the resources for implementation follow, and that can **only** happen through a radical redistribution of the world's material resources.

Language shift can be 'voluntary' at an individual level: a result of more benefits accruing to the individual who agrees to shift than to someone who maintains her mother tongue. But in most cases of language shift it seems that either sticks, punishment, or carrots, economic or other benefits, have been at work - or, increasingly, ideological persuasion, hegemonic mind-mastering, meaning linguistic agents. Likewise, the choice of which languages are granted support, and of what kind, in the education system as mother tongues and foreign or second languages often follows linguistic 'free' market principles, with more benefits accruing to those who support the killer languages as both media of education and as first foreign languages in education.

If people are forced to shift their languages in order to gain economic benefits of the kind which in fact are bare necessities for basic survival, this is a violation of not only their economic human

rights but also their linguistic human rights.

Violations of linguistic human rights, especially in education, may lead and have led to both ethnically articulated conflict and to reduction of linguistic and cultural diversity on our planet. But granting human rights **on paper**, even linguistic human rights, even in education, something that is hardly done today, does not help much. For human rights to be implemented, a radical redistribution of material resources on the earth is needed. With a 'free' market this is not likely to happen.

Summing up, market economy, and the creation of larger and more centralized economic, administrative and political units has, despite a rhetoric of democracy and local participation, been the order of the day, in the 'first' and 'third' worlds. It also seems to be re-emerging in the former 'second' world. The socio-economic, techno-military and political, structural changes inevitably connected with the 'modernization' process cause stress on both **nature** and on **people**, their socio-economic conditions of life, and their languages and cultures (Figure 1). These processes have resulted in an accelerated **environmental degradation** (= nature under stress), and **growing gaps** between the Haves and the Have-nots (or Never-to-haves as many of our Indian colleagues say) and in **linguistic and cultural genocide** (= people under stress). Education systems, as currently run, contribute to committing this linguistic and cultural genocide.

Figure 1. Alternative responses to socio-economic, techno-military and political structural changes

Alternative responses to changes

BACKGROUND REASONS

Socio-economic, techno-military and political structural changes

RESULTS in

Environmental degradation	Linguistic and cultural genocide	Growing gaps between haves and have-nots
----------------------------------	---	---

CREATES STRESS UPON

NATURE	P E O P	L E
	Languages and cultures	Socio-economic conditions of life

THESE RESPOND, ALTERNATIVELY,

THROUGH MARKETS & MONOCULTURAL EFFICIENCY: Economic efficiency first priority; larger and more centralized economic and political units; OR	THROUGH DIVERSITY: Sustainability through diversity first priority: flexible, resilient and democratic economic and political units
--	--

WHICH RESULTS, ALTERNATIVELY, in

biodiver-sity	linguistic and cultural diversity	living conditions	biodiver-sity	linguistic and cultural diversity	living condi-tions
disappears	disap-pears; homogeni-zation	deterio-rate; polariza-tion	mainte-nance	mainte-nance, de-velopment	sustain-able; democra-tization

(This figure is partially inspired by the flow chart in Jussila & Segerståhl 1988, p. 18).

An important priority for research would be to define policies for preservation and development of environmental, linguistic and cultural, economic and political diversity^{xii}. This would also include studying the role of human rights in the different responses.

Some hard-core researchers claim that wanting to preserve small languages and cultures is working against nature. It is "natural" for languages to come and go, natural in the same way as for biological organisms. Trying to maintain languages, trying to prevent what might be seen as a "natural" development, is "working against nature" and should not be done. Languages like biological species "naturally" have a life-span, including death. If everything living in nature has a life-span, everything is born, blossoms, withers away, is replaced by the next candidate - then why not languages? Let a natural order prevail! Besides, the weak (individuals and species which cannot adapt to changing circumstances, "modernization") die and the strong (those who can adapt) survive in nature.

In fact, the killing of diversity is not at all in pact with nature, as some researchers would like us to believe. Bioregionalists who try to extract basic tenets for a sustainable life both from nature and from earlier, more balanced ways of interacting with (the rest of) nature, are sure that, in order to have a chance of saving the planet, we have to 'abandon the notion of controlling and remaking the world in the name of global monoculture' (Sale 1996, 472).

They advocate self-reliance at the level of bioregions. Sale (1996, 475) summarizes the basic tenets of the bioregional and industrio-scientific paradigms as follows (Table 3):

Table 3
Basic tenets of the bioregional and industrio-scientific paradigms

	BIOREGIONAL PARADIGM	INDUSTRIO-SCIENTIFIC PARADIGM
Scale	Region Community	State Nation/World
Economy	Conservation Stability Self-Sufficiency Cooperation	Exploitation Change/Progress Global Economy Competition
Polity	Decentralization Complementarity Diversity	Centralization Hierarchy Uniformity
Society	Symbiosis Evolution	Polarization Growth/Violence

adopted from Sale (1996, 475)

In terms of language, we can see the parallels, using our (Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas 1996) adaptation of Yukio Tsuda's (1994) paradigms. The first of these, The Diffusion of English Paradigm, is connected to capitalism, science and technology, modernization, monolingualism, ideological globalization and internationalization, transnationalization, Americanization and homogenization of world culture and linguistic, cultural and media imperialism. The second one, The Ecology of Language Paradigm, is connected to a human rights perspective, equality in communication, multilingualism, maintenance of languages and cultures, protection of national sovereignties and promotion of foreign language education. Most English as a Second Language teaching today, internally and globally, is a reflection of the Diffusion of English Paradigm. For linguistic and cultural diversity to be maintained, for the planet to have a future, an Ecology of Languages Paradigm (which also respects linguistic human rights) is a necessary (but not sufficient) prerequisite.

One of the richest men in the world, George Soros, who has made a fortune in the financial markets, thinks that "the untrammelled intensification of laissez-faire capitalism and the spread of market values into all areas of life is endangering our open and democratic society. The main enemy of the open society ... is no longer the communist but the capitalist threat" (1997, 45). Soros (1998, p. 27) also says: "Markets reduce everything, including human beings (labor) and nature (land), to commodities. We can have a market economy but we cannot have a market society."

We have the knowledge needed to choose intelligently. Information technology could be used for spreading this knowledge, instead of mass media spurting out the mental nerve gas of consumerism and Macdonaldization.

At present, though, while we can **hope** that some of the positive developments might have **some** effect, overall there is not much cause for optimism. My conclusion is that we still have to work for education through the medium of the mother tongue to be recognized by states as a human right. And if this right is not granted, and implemented, it seems likely that the present pessimistic prognoses of over 90% of the world's oral languages not being around anymore in the year 2100, **are too optimistic**.

Conclusions

My country is and will for ever be Finland, despite the fact that I do not live in Finland. But my country is not necessarily a concrete space - it is a mental community of solidarity. My country is also the planet. A prerequisite for world citizenship is in my view that you are firmly anchored in one or some localities and landscapes, and one or some languages and cultures which you really feel are yours. That you know who you are, where you come from, where your ancestors came from. You have to have a mental centre from which your solidarities can then start radiating outwards, towards larger and larger circles, until you may embrace the whole world, the planet, and the universe, first selectively, then fully. There is also supposed to be another type of global citizenship, that of the mobile free-floating post-modernist nomads. In my view these nomads are a fiction, created to hide the enforced rootlessness that is promoted by the capitalist, neoliberalist, consumerist life-style, the Macdonaldization, that is glorified in the media.

Indigenous peoples, representatives of those most threatened languages, have always formulated the connections between our manifold environments very aptly, strongly and beautifully:

The Okanagan word for "our place on the land" and "our language" is the same. We think of our language as the language of the land. This means that the land has taught us our language. The way we survived is to speak the language that the land offered us as its teachings. To know all the plants, animals, seasons, and geography is to construct language for them. We also refer to the land and our bodies with the same root syllable. This means that the flesh that is our body is pieces of the land that came to us through the things that this land is. The soil, the water, the air, and all the other life forms contributed parts to be our flesh. We are our land/place. Not to know and to celebrate this is to be without language and without land. It is to be dis-placed ... I know what it feels like to be an endangered species on my land, to see the land dying with us. It is my body that is being torn, deforested, and poisoned by "development". Every fish, plant, insect, bird, and animal that disappears is part of me dying. I know all their names, and I touch them with my spirit (Armstrong 1996, 465-466, 470).

In our times, unity is achieved through diversity. Pluricultural, multiethnic, and multilingual societies rise. The states that don't accept this trend are opting for conflict (1993 Annual Report of the Chilean Commission on Indigenous Peoples (CEPI), quoted in Ekern 1998, 4).

Summing up, then: linguistic (and cultural) diversity are as necessary for the existence of our planet as biodiversity, and all three are related. We as humans are just one part of the planet and the planet's diverse inhabitants as Jeannette Armstrong so beautifully describes it in the quote. Linguaging the planet, using, maintaining, developing further, and cherishing the languages which have, after all, developed to describe **specific** lands and environments and peoples and their cultures, necessarily has to be done in **localised** ways, in addition to studying the universal aspects of each language and global human experience. Acknowledging this should make people work against those aspects of globalisation which are killing **all** aspects of diversity, including linguistic diversity. Human rights could be part of that work, but they are at present powerless as a corrective to the market forces and to growthism. Governments which do not only accept but indeed support diversity and localisation are going to be in trouble very soon.

References:

- Armstrong, Jeannette (1996). "Sharing One Skin": Okanagan Community. In Mander, Jerry & Goldsmith, Edward (eds.). **The case against the global economy and for a turn toward the local**. San Francisco: Sierra Club, 460-470.
- Bauman, Zygmunt (1997). Universalism and Relativism - Reaching an Impossible Compromise. Keynote lecture presented at the conference Development and Rights, Roskilde University, 8-10 October 1997.
- Branson, Jan & Miller, Don (1989). Beyond integration policy - the deconstruction of disability. In L. Barton, ed. **Integration: Myth or reality**. Brighton: Falmer Press, 144-167.
- Branson, Jan & Miller, Don (1993). Sign Language, the Deaf and the Epistemic Violence of Mainstreaming. **Language and Education**, 7(1), 21-41.
- Branson, Jan & Miller, Don (1995). Sign Language and the Discursive Construction of Power

over the Deaf through Education. In David Corson (ed.) **Discourse and Power in Educational Settings**. Creskill, New Jersey: Hampton Press, 167-189.

Branson, Jan & Miller, Don (1996). Writing Deaf subaltern history: is it a myth, is it history, is it genealogy? is it all, or is it none? In T.Vollhaber & R.Fischer, eds. **Collage. Works on international Deaf history**. Hamburg: Signum Press, 185-194.

Branson, Jan & Miller, Don (1998). National Sign Languages and Language Policies. In **The Encyclopedia of Language and Education**. Volume 1. Language Policies and Political Issues in Education. Wodak, Ruth & Corson, David (eds). Dordrecht: Kluwer, 89-98.

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

Ekern, Stener (1998). Development Aid to Indigenous Peoples is an exercise in Crossing Boundaries. In Stokke, Hugo, Suhrke, Astri & Tostensen, Arne (eds.), in cooperation with Haanæs, Øystein Rygg. **Human Rights in Developing Countries. Yearbook 1997**. The Hague/London/Boston & Oslo: Kluwer Law International & Nordic Human rights Publications, 3-34.

Galtung, Johan (1988). Methodology and Development. Essays in Methodology, Volume III, Copenhagen: Christian Ejlers.

Goldsmith, Edward (1996). Global trade and the environment. In Mander & Goldsmith (eds.), 78-91.

Goodland, Robert (1996). Growth has reached its limit. In Mander & Goldsmith (eds.), 207-217.

Grin, François (in press). Market forces, language spread and linguistic diversity. In Kontra et al. (eds.).

Gronemeyer, Marianne (1992). Helping, in Sachs, Wolfgang (Ed) (1992). **Development Dictionary. A Guide to Knowledge as Power**, London & New Jersey: Zed Books, 53-69.

Harmon, David (1995). The Status of the World's Languages as Reported in Ethnologue. **Southwest Journal of Linguistics** 14: 1/2, 1-28.

Harmon, David (in press). Losing Species, Losing Languages: Connections Between Biological and Linguistic Diversity. **Southwest Journal of Linguistics** 15.

Hassanpour, Amir (in press). Language rights in the emerging world linguistic order: The state, the market and communication technologies. In Kontra et al. (eds.).

Jussila, Heikki & Segerståhl, Boris (1988). **Cultural and societal change in the North - the role of innovation in development**. Oulu: Research Institute of Northern Finland, Working Papers 56, October 1988.

Kontra, Miklós, Phillipson, Robert, Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Várady, Tibor (eds.) (in press). **Approaches to Linguistic Human Rights**. Budapest: Central European University Press.

Krauss, Michael (1992). The world's languages in crisis. **Language** 68, 14-10.

Krauss, Michael (1995). Paper at a conference of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, reported in **The Philadelphia Inquirer** 19.2.1995, p. A15.

Maffi, Luisa (1996). Language, Knowledge and the Environment: Threats to the World's Biocultural Diversity. **Terralingua Newsletter** 2, December 1996.

Maffi, Luisa, Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Andrianarivo, Jonah (1998). Language diversity. In Posey (ed.), xx.

Mander, Jerry & Goldsmith, Edward (eds.) (1996). **The case against the global economy and for a turn toward the local**. San Francisco: Sierra Club

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.
- Muzsnai, István (in press). Recognition of sign language: a threat or a way to solution? In Kontra et al. (eds.).
- Mühlhäusler, Peter (1996). **Linguistic ecology. Language change and linguistic imperialism in the Pacific region.** London: Routledge.
- Phillipson, Robert & Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (1996). English Only Worldwide, or Language Ecology. **TESOL Quarterly**, Special-Topic Issue: Language Planning and Policy, eds. Thomas Ricento & Nancy Hornberger, 429-452.
- Posey, Darrell (ed.) (1998). **Cultural and Spiritual Values of Biodiversity.** Leiden & New York: Leiden university/Intermediate Technology Press/United Nations Environmental Programme.
- Rothenberger, Alexandra (compiler) 1997. **Bibliography on the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities: Documents, Speeches and Related Publications.** The Hague: The Foundation on Inter-Ethnic Relations.
- Sale, Kirkpatrick (1996). Principles of Bioregionalism. In Mander & Goldsmith (eds.), 471-484.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (1996). Promotion of Linguistic Tolerance and Development. In Legér, Sylvie (Ed.) **Vers un agenda linguistique: regard futuriste sur les Nations Unies / Towards a Language Agenda: Futurist Outlook on the United Nations.** Ottawa: Canadian Center of Language Rights, 579-629.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (1998a). Human rights and language wrongs - a future for diversity. In Phil Benson, Peter Grundy & Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (eds.). **Language rights.** Special issue, **Language Sciences**, Special issue, 20:1, 1998, 5-27.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (1998b). Human rights and language policy in education. In Wodak, Ruth & Corson, David (eds) **The Encyclopedia of Language and Education.** Volume **Language Policy and Political Issues in Education.** Dordrecht: Kluwer, 55-65.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (in press a). Linguistic diversity, human rights and the "free" market'. In Kontra et al (eds.).
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (in press b). **Linguistic genocide in education: does linguistic diversity have a future?** New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Phillipson, Robert (1997). Linguistic Human Rights and Development. In Hamelink, C.J. (Ed.). **Ethics and Development. On making moral choices in development co-operation.** Kampen, The Netherlands: Kok, 56-69.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Phillipson, Robert (1998). Language in human rights. **Gazette. The International Journal for Communication Studies**, Special volume on Human Rights, 60:1, 1998, ed. Cees Hamelink, 27-46.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Phillipson, Robert (Eds.), in collaboration with Mart Rannut. 1994. **Linguistic Human Rights. Overcoming linguistic discrimination.** Contributions to the Sociology of Language 67, Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. Paperback 1995.
- Soros, George (1997). The Capitalist Threat. **The Atlantic Monthly** February 1997, Volume 279:2, 45-58.
- Soros, George (1998). Toward a Global Open Society. **The Atlantic Monthly.** January 1998, Volume 281:1, 20-32.
- Tomaševski, Katarina (1996). International prospects for the future of the welfare state. In **Reconceptualizing the welfare state.** Copenhagen: The Danish Centre for Human Rights, 100-117.
- Tomaševski, Katarina (1997). Development Aid and Human Rights. Keynote lecture presented at

the conference Development and Rights, Roskilde University, 8-10 October 1997.

z

-
- i For important analyses of the invalidation of sign languages, see Branson & Miller 1989, 1993, 1995, 1996, 1998; for a concrete example from Hungary, see Muzsnai, in press.
- ii The so far most reliable listing of the world's oral languages are to be found in the **Ethnologue** (by Barbara Grimes, from the Summer Institute of linguistics, a missionary body); the latest estimates can be found in the revised 13th edition on the Web: <http://www.sil.org/ethnologue/>).
- iii My handout and most of the tables with details about the world's languages have been left out from this written version of the paper for reasons of space. I refer the reader to the first 4 chapters in Skutnabb-Kangas, in press.
- iv From now on I will drop 'oral': every time I say 'languages' or 'population', I mean 'oral languages' and 'oral population' unless otherwise stated - I hope I have made the point about invisibilising sign languages.
- v Terralingua is a nonprofit international organisation devoted to preserving the world's linguistic diversity and to investigating links between biological and cultural diversity (President: Luisa Maffi, Vice-President: Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Secretary-General: David Harmon; Web-site: <http://cougar.ucdavis.edu/nas/terralin/home.html>).
- vi For empirical evidence and an excellent discussion of the complexities of assessing these correlations, see Harmon 1995.
- vii For historical accounts, see Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson 1994; for summaries, see Skutnabb-Kangas 1996, 1998a,b, in press a,b, Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson 1997, 1998.
- viii One reason not discussed here is of course that even basic human rights do not apply to all humans, and very clearly not to most of those who are speakers of the most threatened languages.
- When the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights was accepted, UN consisted of only 51 states, as compared to the present number of close to 200 states. But only a minority of the individuals living in those states were deemed "human" in the sense that the Universal Declaration should apply to them - the human beings in colonies and dependent territories were not "human", according to the vote in UN. In the same sense, migrants are not human today, according to Katarina Tomaševski (1997) - they have very few human rights and certainly no binding linguistic rights.
- ix Bauman claims (1997) that if the globalisation of information levels out cultural differences and cultures in general, a policy of fragmentation implied in localisation on the other hand may favour differentiation. You can have whatever cultural values but still get Western tanks, computers, etc. There is a lack of cohesion, illogicality, in the policy.
- x The images of the poor have also undergone change historically (see Gronemeyer's excellent analysis of this, 1992). They were poor temporarily, it was not their fault, and they helped the rich camels to get through the needle's eye. They were there to be spiritually salvaged. They suffered of temporal unemployment or illness, and were just in need of short-term help to become useful and self-sufficient again.
- xi The concept "human rights" is often used in international relations arbitrarily and selectively by "donor" governments so as to attempt to trigger "democratic" elections or to sanction states that commit gross human rights abuses; in effect it is used as a political tool rather than a rigorous concept rooted in international law (Tomaševski 1997).

xii There are caveats, though. There are no longer any 'bad' or 'good' solutions, only relatively better or worse solutions. Both the bipolar possibilities (either **universality** (universal ideas, ideologies, solutions) or **tolerance of diversity and pluralism**) have certain benefits and certain dangers, according to Baumann (1997). Believing in 'universal truths' (like 'communism' or 'capitalism' or 'free market') can in the worst case lead (and has led) to genocides. 'Tolerance' can also lead to tolerating genocide without doing anything (e.g. Bosnia, Nigeria). 'Tolerance' can also be expressed in demands for autonomy of choice, in an individualistic neo-liberal way, in consumer societies, where any kind of restrictions or limits are seen as negative. This might also include the prevention of any kind of positive intervention to achieve the 'regulated context' which Grin (in press) sees as necessary for harnessing market forces for preservation of at least some linguistic diversity.