

\*181 Phillipson, Robert & Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (1999). Englishisation: one dimension of globalisation. In Graddol, David & Meinhof, Ulrike H. (eds). **English in a changing world. AILA Review 13** Oxford: The English Book Centre, 19-36.

This article suggests how Englishization can be approached, and considers some of the types of data that would facilitate more informed analysis of globalizing English. It contains a description of some factors influencing the expansion of English in Europe and some of the central language policy questions, and a presentation of a pilot empirical study of attitudes to an increased use of English by academics in one continental European country, Denmark. The final section reverts to some broader aspects of Englishization and resistance to it, including the question of whether there is any prospect of "reducing English to equality", to adapt a term first used in South Africa by Neville Alexander in relation to Afrikaans.

English is deeply involved in ongoing processes of globalization and localization. If the role of English globally and locally is to be addressed adequately, scholarship within this branch of applied linguistics needs to be informed by current work in economics, political science and political sociology, communications, cultural studies, history, discourse analysis, and sign languages<sup>1</sup>. As the institutional structures that applied linguists operate within entail influence on decisions on language policy at national, sub- and supranational levels, particularly in educational reproduction and change, we ought also to be familiar with work in peace and conflict studies, development studies, multilingual education, ideology, human rights, and the relationship between biodiversity and linguistic and cultural diversity<sup>2</sup>.

A useful umbrella term for addressing the language dimension of such concerns is language ecology, launched by a pioneer in language planning and bilingualism studies, Einar Haugen, in 1972 (Dil 1972) and increasingly visible in the literature on language policy and its multiple features and ramifications (Fill 1993, Mühlhäusler 1996, Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas 1996). A major multi-disciplinary effort is needed if we are to understand the roles played by English and other languages in the contemporary global linguistic ecology.

Just as policy-makers and specialists in the natural sciences are concerned about the consequences globally of ecological imperialism, reduced bio-diversity, dwindling resources, and the death of species (Crosby 1986, Groombridge 1992), it would seem to us that language professionals have a special responsibility to address the linguistic and cultural dimensions of diversity (Maffi 1996, Maffi, Skutnabb-Kangas & Andrianarivo, in press), including solid descriptive work (for an example, see Hallamaa, in press) and the causal factors working on language ecologies, global and local. We would also need to assess in what ways the "triumph" of English and other major dominant languages is linked to the predicted demise of 90% of the world's languages within a century from now (Krauss 1992, 1995, Posey 1997, World Commission on Culture and Development 1995).

The privileged position of English has been established in processes of linguistic hierarchisation in a world that is manifestly and monstrously skewed in favour of a minority of haves and a vast majority of have-nots. Current UN figures (the Human Development Index)

**Erreur ! Argument de commutateur inconnu.**

report that 1.3 billion of our fellow human beings do not have enough to eat, and an increasing proportion of the world's children in countries in both North and South grow up in abject conditions. Inequalities are on the increase: the 358 richest individuals in the world control assets which correspond to more than the earnings of 45% of the world's population, the proportion of the global gross national product of the richest 20% of the world's population increased from 70 to 85% in the 30-year period between 1960-1991 while the proportion of the poorest 20% went down from 2,3% to 1,4% (data from Vilby 1997). We are urgently in need of fresh thinking if we are to tease out how English is involved in complex processes affecting so many aspects of the lives of billions of people. Globalisation is multi-faceted, and can, as the scientific approaches named earlier suggest, be approached from many angles. We are not suggesting that there is a simple correlation between haves, many of whom speak English as an L1 or L2, and have-nots, many of whom do not, but it must be a responsibility of "experts" on language to investigate what correlational or even causal links there might be, and how command of English relates to contemporary power structures. Likewise, we have to investigate how the manifestly false promises to have-nots about the acquisition of (some) competence in English leading them towards economic prosperity are produced and marketed, and why this marketing is so effective.

Addressing these issues represents a challenge of monumental proportions. The scientific and journalistic literature in many of these areas is immense. Yet language matters do not figure very prominently in much political discourse, nor much social or political science. If applied linguists fail in even provisional efforts to situate the study of the language that is currently perceived as being globally triumphant (the "worldliness" of English, Pennycook 1994) within wider perspectives, intellectual and material, theoretical and practical, our scholarly discourses may remain a form of intellectual escapism and therapy fitting snugly and smugly within the mould of much post-modernist writing in increasingly neoliberalist and consumerist times.

We would claim that ethical dimensions and accountability are central to work in this area. Ethical codes of conduct are being elaborated, and key moral issues confronted, in the "development aid" business (see Hamelink 1997), which language policy permeates. The donor policies of the North have in recent years often been ostensibly committed to the promotion of human rights but are being subjected to critical scrutiny (Tomaševski 1997). Language is the medium for most North-South links, whether in the field of finance, technology, or entertainment. Global flows, from North to South, and from South to North, are predominantly in the languages of the North, and quintessentially in English.

Value judgements influence the behaviour of all of us, as scholars as well as as people, whether we choose to acknowledge this or not. Neither Englishization itself nor the study of Englishization is a neutral activity. Scholarship that purports to rise above politics when analysing language policy and global English (e.g. Crystal 1997) suffers from a high degree of self-deception, particularly when a spurious "neutrality" seems to reveal myopia about the way power is approached in social or political science and in the humanities, and the epistemological roots of scholarship in this area. One can always hope for a changed awareness; for instance TESOL has taken socio-political concerns on board as the columns of *TESOL Matters* and statements of policy, for instance on "English Only" show. And one luminary has disarmingly admitted that he wished applied linguistics had been more aware of socio-political constraints much earlier (Kaplan 1995).

**Erreur ! Argument de commutateur inconnu.**

The complexity of the topic would require book-length treatment rather than a brief article. What can be attempted here is a glimpse into some features of the globalization of English through focussing on some of the agents who seem to be facilitating the spread of English. The micro level examples have strong connections to macro level structures and processes. Agency is a key dimension to pursue, and important if samples of the discourse of global English are to be anchored contextually in identifiable types of social reproduction. Languages do not "spread", just as "countries" do not talk to each other (which Crystal writes, 1997, 11): it is users of English who influence processes of globalization and localization, who are involved in structures of power that frequently reflect linguisticism (Skutnabb-Kangas 1988) through unequal resource allocation, and legitimation processes that validate "big" languages at the expense of "small" ones. Whether linguistic imperialism is involved in any given context is an empirical question (Phillipson 1992). Granted the decisive role of human agency, and responsibility, change in a more equitable direction is in principle always possible, which gives grounds for challenging the current hegemonic ordering.

### **English in the brave new Europe**

In March 1997 the American ambassador to Denmark, Mr Elton, at an informal lunch at our university (Roskilde), stated that the most serious problem for the European Union (EU) was that it had so many languages, this preventing real integration and development of the Union. His comments appear to reflect ignorance of the commitment of the member states of the EU, confirmed in EU treaties and European Parliament resolutions, to maintaining Europe's cultural and linguistic diversity. Likewise one might be forgiven for thinking that it is the EU member states themselves that will decide how European language policy will evolve, and whether a single dominant language should be accorded a special status. But to assume that European leaders are in a sovereign position to dictate policy would be disingenuous: there are many extra-European, "global" players and influences. One of these is the US government, which the ambassador represents. The Clinton administration is frank about its geo-political agenda:

The first grand objective, of course, is to keep America as a European power, not just for today but for the indefinite future. What the European Union and Nato are trying to do in central Europe is nothing less than to complete the promise of the Marshall Plan, which was thwarted by Joseph Stalin some 50 years ago, and bounded at the Iron Curtain. We finally have a chance now to take that grand effort to completion (Martin Walker, *The Guardian Weekly*, January 12, 1997 reporting on what the US Ambassador to NATO, Robert Hunter, said in an address to the European Institute in Washington DC).

The Marshall plan tends to be portrayed as US charity altruistically kick-starting post-war European economies. The injection of US capital did indeed have this effect, but it simultaneously served to integrate European economies into patterns determined by US global economic interests, with major consequences for agriculture, transport, industry, culture, and language. US government policy is determined by US commercial and military interests, then as

**Erreur ! Argument de commutateur inconnu.**

now. This is what the US being "a European power" involves.

Then as now it is probable that politicians and ambassadors are much weaker players than transnational corporation directors. It is likely that what Mr Elton or even Mr Clinton **says** is much less important than what Ted Turner, Richard Murdoch or Bill Gates **does**. Relatively speaking, a higher degree of globalization has been achieved in the world of communications (in such domains as air transport or satellite TV) than in politics, economics or military affairs. Increasingly the various interests coincide and coarticulate. For instance, the dominant transnational media concerns are part of the military-industrial complex: General Electric, recently merged with the computer giant Microsoft, also owns the giant American media network NBC; Disney owns the other large American media network, ABC. These examples show the importance for economic and military interests of infotainment, its content and form/language, something that peace researchers are increasingly concerned with. In many fields (the environment, trade, etc), global integration is potential, fluid and in a constant flux of negotiation. This is the case in "global" organizations such as the UN and the World Trade Organization. Regional organizations such as the EU involve policy-making in multiple areas of collaboration, and these are of major significance locally and globally (Richardson 1996).

Elites in each field are serviced by a limited set of dominant languages, among them English above all. Language policy in the European Union is such a political hot potato that few concerted high-level initiatives have been taken, and language policy does not have a high profile. Most language policies are covert rather than overt. The "national interest" may well be construed differently in larger as opposed to smaller countries, post-imperial vs non-empire countries, and largely monolingual vs more multilingual countries. The use of certain languages at the supra-national level may serve particular national interests (e.g. those of France or the UK), but the relationship between the "national interest" and supra-national interests (e.g. European "integration") is by no means clear. Most of the explicit language policy agendas (on language use in EU institutions, on promoting the learning of foreign languages) are minimalist, aiming at some kind of equity among the 11 **official** languages. In theory the architects of Europeanization proclaim that cultural and linguistic diversity are to be maintained. However, the reality is otherwise. There is incontrovertible evidence that English is expanding at the expense of other potential lingua francas (French and German in particular, though the picture is far from uniform, Schlossmacher 1996, Labrie & Quell 1997, Quell 1997, Hagen 1993). Official policies play some lip service to national minority languages and disregard immigrated minority languages<sup>3</sup>. As the editor of an issue of the *International Political Science Review* on "The emergent world language system" notes, in an article devoted to the EU:

The subject of languages has been the great *non-dit* of European integration. There was much talk of milk pools and butter mountains, of a unitary currency, of liberalizing movements for EC citizens and restricting access for outsiders, but the language in which these issues were dealt with remained itself a non-issue. (de Swaan 1993, 244)

There is a growing literature in the area of EU language policy (Ammon 1996, Labrie 1993, many contributions to the annual *Sociolinguistica*, Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas 1997, Phillipson 1998), but the number of empirical studies is relatively small. There are still many

**Erreur ! Argument de commutateur inconnu.**

unanswered questions: is the EU moving towards diglossia, with English as a second language for elites other than the Brits and the Irish, who will remain mostly monolingual? Or can a more substantial degree of multi-directional and reciprocal multilingualism be established? Will EU institutions continue with a cumbersome system of translation and interpretation, or will they re-think their policy for working languages and the drafting of texts, particularly if the EU expands to take in new members<sup>4</sup>? Are current schemes that fund student mobility (ERASMUS, SOCRATES etc) achieving their declared goal of strengthening the less widely used EU languages, or are they in fact boosting English? Is there any informed discussion of the viability of other alternatives, e.g. an increased use of Esperanto, as proposed by The Working Group on the Language Problems of the European Union<sup>5</sup>? Which constituencies exercise most influence on language policy formation, national or supra-national elites, professional bodies, or mythology generated in the media world and political discourse? Is it fair to assume that the political sensitivity of the issues, coupled with the fragility of the infrastructure, nationally and supra-nationally, for guaranteeing informed public debate about the issues, means that market forces will progressively strengthen English? And if this happens, will it necessarily be at the expense of (speakers of) other languages?

What is clear is that the issues involved are not simple, and that they have hitherto been subjected to little systematic scrutiny within any disciplinary tradition, let alone in an informed multi-disciplinary way. What is currently available is fragmentary, and largely impressionistic, though some trends are clear. Much is at stake, at multiple levels (individual, regional, societal, global) and in many domains (cultural, economic, political, etc). Englishization needs to be studied in specific local linguistic ecologies as well as at a macro level. Something of the complexity of the topic can be seen from our small empirical study, that is summarized in the following section.

### **Englishization in academic discourse in Denmark**

In order to shed light on how Englishization is perceived in a "marginal" North country, we conducted a pilot study of the use our colleagues at the University of Roskilde make of languages of scientific communication, of their experience of Englishization, and the possible consequences for Danish as a language of scientific communication (Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas 1996 a & b).

A few words initially about the context. Though spoken by only 5½ million people, Danish is among the world's 100 biggest languages. Danish is one of the official languages of the EU. It has a rich cultural tradition and is widely used in all domains in Denmark. For the past century Denmark has been projected as an essentially monocultural and monolingual country. It thus fits into the classic mould of western European states attempting to impose cultural and linguistic uniformity on a diverse, heteroglossic and multilingual reality, reflected in the use of languages other than Danish in the German border area, Greenland, the Faroes, elite bilingualism, immigration, strong external links, Danish as a hybrid language substantially influenced by borrowing, etc.

English is increasingly used in higher education in Denmark. Students of virtually all

**Erreur ! Argument de commutateur inconnu.**

subjects are expected to read books and journals in English, and their school English largely equips them to do so (ESP is unknown). Scandinavian scholarly journals aiming at the international public use English. Many doctoral dissertations are written in English. Some departments with many students from abroad are shifting to using English as the medium of education, at least partially and mostly at post-graduate levels. Policy is decided on by the institution in question, and is not guided by any explicit national policy. The funds provided by the European Union for increased student and staff mobility have accelerated the trend towards a greater use of English, even when some of the funds are nominally intended to support the "smaller" European languages such as Danish.

In our empirical study, we preyed on the goodwill of all tenured professors and lecturers in the humanities, social and natural sciences at the university, and received 83 completed questionnaires, a very reasonable response rate (over 50 per cent). Our colleagues are of diverse origins, nationalities and mother tongues, but the majority are Danes.

The questionnaire covered

- assessments of their **competence** in Danish, English, French and German, and other languages,
- perceptions of **difficulty** in writing in a foreign language, and whether they are assisted (translation, native speaker checking a text, etc),
- the languages in which they **publish**, and whether there is any change as compared with 10 years ago,
- the language(s) used in **conferences** in their field,
- **attitudes** to language policy, and whether such matters are discussed,
- whether any research has remained "**unnoticed**" because it was written up in a Nordic language,
- how far the obligation to write in a foreign language has influenced their **scientific approach**,
- whether the increased use of English represents a **threat** to Danish,

The responses show that there is a wide range of perceptions of what is happening in the ongoing Englishization of higher education in Denmark, of what is at stake, and what the implications are. Some Danes admit to **difficulties** in functioning in English:

To me writing and speaking English represents a reduction in accuracy - and an extra workload.

Many scholars claim the opposite, and are happy to operate in English.

There is also a diverse picture when it comes to the actual use made of English and Danish.

At Nordic conferences, English is spreading as the medium of written papers, although many speakers present them in Danish, Norwegian, Swedish.

Most regard contact with scientific English as beneficial for Danish research, but some feel that conforming to the dominant language and its scientific norms involves sacrifice. Some feel that the obligation to function in a second language, in their written work and at conferences, puts them at a disadvantage vis-a-vis native speakers. Some write exclusively in English, and feel Danish is not at risk, boldly reporting that "Danish is not a scientific language" and "one language

**Erreur ! Argument de commutateur inconnu.**

is enough for science". Others feel that some research is undervalued simply because it is written in Danish.

The most important thing to do is to abolish the snobbery of international publications, ratings, etc. Assessment should be by quality rather than status etc.

Although few comment in detail on the link between the medium and scientific paradigms, this concern is also felt:

I don't see writing in English as the problem. The problem is the strength of US research on the market, i.e. as scientific commodities (not necessarily the same as excellency in theoretical level etc.). Nobody in Scandinavia can publish without discussing on American premisses - or in relation to them. The reverse does not hold.

Some of these colleagues operate in other languages in addition, and feel Anglo-Americans are handicapped if they are restricted to input from and in one language.

I really think that it is an advantage to come from a small country where one has been forced to learn languages - especially compared to the Anglosaxons.

There is no antagonism between maintaining one's cultural identity (as a Dane), and working/living in foreign cultures, speaking/writing in 2-4 languages. Rather, it enriches your life.

The majority experience that there is no threat or only a minor threat to Danish, for a small number the threat is moderate, and only for 10%, nearly all of them language specialists, is the threat major. However, a substantial number are convinced that research not available in English has gone unnoticed.

There is very little discussion in professional circles of language policy, in most subject areas none at all, and it is exclusively scholars with a professional interest in languages who are hooked on this topic (!).

Our results suggest that our informants can be grouped into three broad categories, which we label the **English-only**, the **Danish-mostly**, and the **Multilingual**.

The **English-only** group seems to consist predominantly of natural scientists and to have the following characteristics:

1. they publish in English only;
2. they often rate their linguistic competence in English as very good or excellent;
3. they feel that they have no problems whatsoever in writing in English - though to judge from some responses, competence is far from optimal, and writing in English may be "moderately" demanding;
4. they generally feel that English is the "natural" and self-evident language of science, and that Danish is not a scientific language or a language for scientific work/publication;

**Erreur ! Argument de commutateur inconnu.**

5. they mostly feel that Danish researchers are not at a disadvantage as compared to native speakers of English;
6. they think that there is no change in their use of languages as compared with 10 years ago, and if there is any change, it is towards more use of English - and for the good;
7. they have their English checked by native speakers only seldom, the reason being that they claim there is mostly no need;
8. they think that there is little or no need to assist researchers to become functionally multilingual, though some endorse residence abroad and special course work;
9. they see no threat from English to Danish;
10. there is no discussion about language policy in their field;
11. their conferences, including Nordic ones, are generally exclusively in English; some are multilingual;
12. they are mostly not familiar with research which has gone "unnoticed" because it was written up in a Scandinavian language, and often such work is available in English after a time-lag;
13. they feel that their scientific approach has not been influenced by needing to write in English, and generally contact with English represents enrichment;
14. they are more often male than female.

The **Danish-mostly** group seems to have the following characteristics:

1. they are mainly scholars in such fields as history, Danish, education, and topics which are by their nature concerned with Danish conditions or texts, or which are seen as of little interest to outsiders for other reasons, or where the researcher is oriented towards communicating results to a Danish audience (e.g. environmental studies);
2. they share few of the characteristics attributed to the English-only group, though there is a tendency towards needing to be able to operate in English in publications and at conferences;
3. they generally sense that the Danish language is in some ways threatened by English but tend to be resigned or pessimistic about whether this trend can be influenced or resisted, so that often there is an implicit acceptance of this "modernisation" paradigm;
4. some protest against publications in Danish not being seen as of equal value as those in English, i.e. that language tends to be more important than quality in evaluations and appointments;
5. there is a somewhat higher percentage of females than in the other groups.

The **Multilingual** group seems to have the following characteristics:

1. they are individuals from a wide range of subjects;
2. they have developed their command of several languages through marriage, or emigration, or a variety of circumstances;
3. though they are keenly aware of what one loses when not functioning through one's mother tongue (with its nuances, accuracy, irony, etc), they are convinced of the benefits of not being a monolingual, unlike speakers of English with no access to other cultures and scientific traditions;
4. they express more appreciation of multilingualism in many contexts, e.g. at conferences;
5. they often have ideas on how to manage change, in practices and attitudes, but often only at the level of the individual;

**Erreur ! Argument de commutateur inconnu.**



6. they are aware of shifts of paradigm in their scientific approach through an increased use of English, and some are critical of native English speakers at conferences, and American dominance in general.

The results of our modest pilot study demonstrate that multilingualism is entrenched in Danish higher education, but that the general, but by no means sole, trend is towards a strengthening of English. Anxieties are increasingly expressed in the media and professional fora about the invasion of English: the editor-in-chief of a major Danish national encyclopedia has written that some contributors who are natural scientists are unable to communicate their scholarship in Danish for a Danish audience (Lund 1995). Worries have been expressed that in economics the choice of topics taken up reflects the preferences of the international scientific community rather than local needs.

The only official Danish language policy body interprets its mandate as being restricted to corpus planning and excluding status and acquisition planning. Some anxiety has been expressed by linguists about excessive lexical borrowing from English into Danish, about the potential loss of certain professional domains to English, and Danish in reality having few rights in EU institutions (Haberland & Henriksen 1991, Haberland 1993).

If the position of Danish is not to be marginalized further, and if competence in a variety of languages in the EU is to be nurtured, there is a need for academic policy-makers and gate-keepers to pursue more active and more explicit and equitable language policies. These should logically also include more support for immigrated minority languages, which are more effectively marginalised in Denmark, both in the educational system and generally, than in most other EU countries. To guide this, more research would also be needed. Although there are very few signs that language policy is of broad concern, a move in the direction of making multilingual policies more explicit would be in tune with recent changes towards more managed control of higher education and research. In parallel, and of perhaps greater importance, would be the need to intensify dialogue between language professionals and decision-makers in a wide range of fields, particularly politicians.

### **Charting and countering Englishization**

Englishization processes in Denmark are occurring in academic life in parallel with comparable developments in many other domains and discourses, in which the picture is also fluid and dynamic:

- when Danish transnational corporations such as Carlsberg and Novo Nordisk increasingly shift to English as the in-house company language, is there mutual reinforcement of English and Danish, or is the process subtractive, with English replacing Danish?
- what is the impact on domestic film production of internationally successful film directors such as Bille August and Lars von Trier making English-medium films?
- if pop music is increasingly English-only, what consequences are there for music in local languages? (Denmark has not yet experienced what Finland, Iceland and Norway have, important popular singers proudly and intentionally switching over from English to singing in their own

**Erreur ! Argument de commutateur inconnu.**

languages and even using old folklore - e.g. the Finnish national epic *Kalevala* - as inspiration);  
- if cultural change is largely asymmetrical, following agendas set by Hollywood, McDonalds and Microsoft, does it make any difference whether English or a local language is used, provided the products, processes and values are adopted (Danish television shows huge amounts of American films with the original sound-track whereas "Wheel of fortune" and quiz programmes use Danish but follow American models)?

- what is the significance of senior Danish politicians, who use English with moderate proficiency, inevitably creating false and unintended impressions when talking impromptu to the "world" press? (The four Danish exceptions to the Maastricht Treaty were hammered out at a summit in Edinburgh in 1991, at the close of which the Danish Foreign Minister referred to the "so-called Edinburgh agreement", implying that no real obligations had been entered into. When Salman Rushdie came to Denmark in 1996 to receive a EU literature prize, an event that was postponed because of a security scare, the Danish Prime Minister was asked by Rushdie whether the death threat was real or hypothetical, to which he replied that he did not have the "ability" to answer the question, a revelation that many Danish citizens might agree with, as the whole affair was mishandled. Both errors are due to mother tongue transfer).<sup>6</sup>

Danes have grown up with Grundtvig (the father of the folk high schools) and his "Modersmålets sang" (the paean of the mother tongue) and with feeling sentimentally positive about and proud of descendants of Danes in the USA who as immigrants have maintained their Danish language and culture in addition to having learned American ways and English. Why is it that they have no understanding of the importance of the maintenance of the mother tongue, and additive rather than subtractive learning of Danish, when it comes to immigrated minorities in Denmark?<sup>7</sup>

There are clearly problems in making sense of such processes, at several levels: what data, how much and of what type, is needed for generalizations to be valid? Can one specify structural and causal factors, so that exemplification is unambiguously linked to the role performed by English in a given context and the consequences for other languages? Are our theoretical concepts and analytical frameworks sufficiently sensitive and powerful to permit scholarly study to go beyond personal impressions and assessments, and trigger productive professional dialogue and analysis?

We would claim that it is possible to take informed analysis further with the help of the disciplines referred to initially in this paper. A great deal of stimulating and informed work is appearing, for instance on Englishization in east Africa (Mazrui 1997) and in Asia (Baumgardner 1996). There is a wealth of description of the forms and functions of English in contributions to such journals as *English Today*, *English Worldwide* and *World Englishes*. There is evidence from several countries of domains, genres and rhetorical traditions succumbing to the force of Anglo-American dominance (for example in scientific writing in Sweden, in Sweden, Gunnarsson & Öhmann 1997, and in Finland, Mauranen 1993). Braj Kachru is calling for a paradigm shift in the study of the diffusion and impact of English, one that would be less ethnocentric and that does justice to linguistic and cultural pluralism (e.g. Kachru 1996a, 1997). There are some attempts to tackle causal factors and underlying patterns, for instance the anthology edited by Fishman, Conrad & Rubal-Lopez (1996), to which a reply and rejoinder is needed (Phillipson forthcoming). There are analyses of whether agendas in "English Studies" are local or global, meaning, in this

case, British (Kayman 1997). The sociology of language is lop-sided, as Kachru has noted in a review of a book on Indian language policy by a Canadian: "This is a typical specimen of Indian and Western collaboration: superficial and patronizing... By ignoring scholarship in India's regional languages on India's language issues, we are missing vital insights. The English language provides us just one dimension, one perspective and one window " (Kachru 1996b, 138, 140). In parallel there are lively debates in Hungarian social science journals about the unequal relationship between North American researchers and their Hungarian "partners" (see the special issue of *replika* "Colonisation or partnership? Eastern Europe and western social sciences", 1996; we are grateful to Miklos Kontra for drawing our attention to this). Throughout eastern and central Europe linguistic imperialism interlocks with academic imperialism in ways that are much cruder and more visible than in Denmark, and that are rooted in unequal access to resources, asymmetrical relations in academic discourse that the status of English consolidates, and a hierarchy of research paradigms that is often legitimated and internalized unquestioningly.

It is significant that even though most of the exemplification in *Linguistic imperialism* (Phillipson 1992) relates to the postcolonial world, the book is evidently regarded as of direct relevance in post-communist contexts. There is an awareness here and in such "periphery" contexts as southern Europe of the need to counteract linguistic imperialism in the area of language teaching, enshrined in structures and ideologies and educational discourses also analysed in Pennycook's *The cultural politics of English as an international language* (see Dendrinos 1996 and 1997, and for debate on linguistic imperialism, see Bisong 1995, Phillipson 1996, Davies 1996, Phillipson 1997). Native speaker authority is under impressive non-native-speaker challenge (Medgyes 1994). An increasing number of applied linguists and language teachers are attempting to situate their work in broader socio-political frameworks.

Not all commentators are willing to do so. Thus Widdowson (1997) focusses on the relative strength and authenticity of the roots of English in different parts of the world, so as to be able to characterize English as a potential of infinite variability rather than an instrument of power. This line of argument is supposed then to exonerate the North from responsibility for what happens in the South, even in relation to an assumed global community of users of English for specific purposes (science, commerce etc). This permits Widdowson to ignore the social stratificational purposes that English de facto performs in postcolonial and postcommunist contexts and the role of language professionals in its promotion.

The same is true of a recent article examining "rivalry" between French and English in Tunisia (Battenburg 1997). The article is candid about the American, British and French governments competing for influence, but regards modernization as unproblematical and apparently accepts that the "development" agenda, with key roles assigned to European languages, is appropriate. It is perhaps not surprising to find such beliefs still prevalent among western scholars (for critique, see Escobar 1995, Galtung 1995 and contributions to Sachs (ed.) 1992). Linguistic hierarchies reminiscent of the colonial period still underpin World Bank and IMF education policies (Samoff 1996, Brock-Utne 1993), which currently set the tone for "aid" alongside notoriously anti-social, poverty-inducing structural adjustment policies:

the World Bank's real position ... encourages the consolidation of the imperial languages in Africa... the World Bank does not seem to regard the linguistic Africanisation of the

**Erreur ! Argument de commutateur inconnu.**

whole of primary education and beyond as an effort that is worth its consideration. Its publication on strategies for stabilising and revitalising universities, for example makes absolutely no mention of the place of language at this tertiary level of African education". (Mazrui 1997, 39)

Earlier agenda-setting World Bank reports on basic education in eastern African countries barely refer to local languages (see Phillipson 1992b). The ensuing educational "aid" reflects the linguisticist belief that only European languages are suited to the task of developing African economies and minds, the falsity of which many African scholars have documented, Ansre, Bamgbose, Kashoki, Mateene, Ng\_g\_ (references in Phillipson 1992, see also Akinnaso 1994, Djité 1993). An early World Bank report which drew conclusions for policy from research findings on education leading to multilingualism (Dutcher 1982) had little impact. Dutcher's new impressive report (1997) may hopefully get a fairer hearing.

It is precisely this legacy that current South African language planning is attempting to counteract, the "blatant hegemony" of English that is in conflict with linguistic equity and democracy. The policy document published in August 1996 *Towards a national language plan for South Africa* attempts to set out policies for how all South Africans can learn languages other than their mother tongue (i.e. it is not an either/or, monolingual or subtractive policy but an additive, both-and-and, multilingual one) and has, in the words of the then Minister of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology, Dr. B.S.Ngubane, the goal that "the African languages which have been marginalised by the linguisticist policies of the past should be elaborated and maintained" (iii). It appears that in neighbouring Namibia, like in much of Sub-Saharan Africa, language policy has served to consolidate English as the language of power at the expense of those "only" competent in Namibian languages<sup>8</sup>.

As we understand South African policy-makers, they have nothing against English, any more than we do. What is being criticized is the way English is **used** and **legitimated** in a range of contexts. English linguistic imperialism serves particular interests, some local (elites), some global (North-South transactions, which use the North language as the medium of exchange, this hegemonic choice being rationalized as "natural" or "functional" or an equivalent legitimising argument). Just as Gandhiji used English in the struggle against colonialism, and Ng\_g\_ currently does (1993) in the struggle against neocolonialism, language policy in a globalizing world needs to address how more equity can be achieved through ensuring that power is shared between speakers of a wide range of languages. What counts is not only the medium *per se* - all languages can in principle be used for all purposes - but the message that choosing one medium rather than another in specific situations carries, the question of differential and hierarchising access to and use of these languages, and the issue of whether access to them is additive or subtractive.

Linguistic imperialism is unthinkable without decision-makers in both North and South according a privileged position to a particular language, such as English. The issue for applied linguists who are involved in such processes is one of professional and ethical choices. There is not a simplistic choice between English and other languages, but a more complex set of choices in the management of the linguistic ecology along equitable, humane lines. Only if this is done will Englishization serve democratic purposes and may cease functioning as a Tyrannosaurus Rex in particular scientific domains (Swales 1997) and flourishing "on the graveyard of other peoples'

**Erreur ! Argument de commutateur inconnu.**

languages" (Ng\_g\_ 1993, 35).

## References:

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

Ammon, Ulrich 1996 The European Union (EU - formerly European Community): Status change of English during the last 50 years, in Fishman, Conrad & Rubal-Lopez (eds.), 241-267.

Bakmand, Bente, Robert Phillipson & Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (eds.) 1996 **Papers in language policy**. Papers from the language policy conference, 29 January 1996, Roskilde: Roskilde University, ROLIG-papir 56.

Battenburg, John 1997 English versus French: language rivalry in Tunisia **World Englishes** 16/2, 281-290.

Baumgardner, Robert J. 1996 **South Asian English. Structure, use, and users**. Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Bisong, Joseph 1995 Language choice and cultural imperialism: a Nigerian perspective, **English Language Teaching Journal** 49/2, 122-132.

Branson, Jan E. & Don B. Miller 1993 Sign language, the Deaf and the epistemic violence of mainstreaming. **Language and Education** 7/1, 21-41.

Branson, Jan E. & Don B. Miller 1995 Sign language and the discursive construction of power over the Deaf through education. In **Discourse and Power in Educational Settings**, ed. David Corson. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 167-189.

Brock-Utne, Birgit 1993 **Education in Africa**, Oslo: University of Oslo Department of Educational Research.

Brock-Utne, Birgit 1997 The language question in Namibian schools, **International Review of Education**, 43/2-3, 241-260.

Churchill, Stacy 1996 The decline of the nation-state and the education of national minorities. In Labrie, Normand & Churchill, Stacey (eds.). Special Issue: The Education of Minorities. **International Review of Education/ Internationale Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft/Revue Internationale de l'education** 42/4, 265-290.

Crosby, Alfred W. 1986 **Ecological imperialism. The biological expansion of Europe, 900-**

1900, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, David 1997 **English as a global language**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Curtis, M. 1995 **The ambiguities of power. British foreign policy since 1945**, London: Zed Books.

Davies, Alan 1996 We cannot escape history: ironising the myth of 'Linguistic imperialism', **Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development** 17/6, 485-496.

Dendrinos, Bessie 1992 **The EFL textbook and ideology**, Athens: Grivas.

Dendrinos, Bessie 1996 A politicized view of foreign language education planning in the European Union, Paper at the 5th Annual Workshop on Critical Discourse Analysis, Universidad Autonoma de Madrid, 11-13 December 1996.

Dendrinos, Bessie 1997 Homophony in ELT discourse and the construction of the teaching practitioner, Paper at the conference 'Strong' and 'weak' languages in the EU. Aspects of linguistic hegemonism, Thessaloniki, 26-28 March 1997.

de Swaan, Abram 1993 The evolving European language system: a theory of communication potential and language competition, **International Political Science Review** 14/3, 241-256.

de Varennes, Fernand 1996 **Language, Minorities and Human Rights**. The Hague, Boston, London: Martinus Nijhoff.

Dil, Anwar S. (ed.) 1972 **The ecology of language. Essays by Einar Haugen**, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

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

Dutcher, Nadine 1982 **The Use of First and Second Languages in Primary Education: Selected Case Studies**. World Bank Staff Working Paper No. 504, January 1982. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank, Education Department.

Dutcher, Nadine, with the collaboration of G.Richard Tucker (1997 - undated). **The Use of First and Second Languages in Education: A Review of International Experience**. Pacific Islands Discussion Paper Series, 1. East Asia and Pacific Region, Country Department III. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

Eide, Asbjørn, Catarina Krause & Allan Rosas (eds.) 1995 **Economic, social and cultural rights, a textbook**, Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff.

Escobar, Arturo 1995 **Encountering Development. The Making and Unmaking of the Third World**. Princeton Studies in Culture/Power/History. Princeton, NJ.: Princeton University Press.

Fairclough, Norman 1991 **Discourse and Social Change**. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Featherstone, Mike (ed.) 1990 **Global culture: nationalism, globalization and modernity**, London: Sage.

Fill, Alwin 1993 **Ökologuistik. Eine Einführung**. Tübingen: Gunther Narr.

Fishman, Joshua A., Andrew W. Conrad & Alma Rubal-Lopez eds. 1996 **Post-imperial English: Status change in former British and American colonies, 1940-1990**, Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Galtung, Johan 1996 **Peace by peaceful means. Peace and conflict, development and civilization**, London: Sage.

Golding, Peter & Phil Harris (eds.) 1997 **Beyond cultural imperialism: globalization, communication and the new international order**, London: Sage.

Grin, François (ed.) 1996 The economics of language. **International Journal of the Sociology of Language** 121.

Groombridge, B. (ed.) 1992 **Global Biodiversity: Status of the Earth's Living Resources**. World Conservation Monitoring Centre. Chapman & Hall, London.

Gunnarsson, Britt-Louise & Öhmann, Katarina 1997 **Det internationaliserade universitet. En studie av bruket av engelska och andra främmande språk vid Uppsala universitet**, Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet.

Haberland, Hartmut 1993 Probleme der kleinen Sprachen in der EG: Beispiel Dänisch, **heteroglossia** 5: 83-131.

Haberland, Hartmut & Carol Henriksen 1991 Dänisch - eine kleine Sprache in der EG, **Sociolinguistica** 5: 85-98.

Hagen, Stephen (ed.) 1993 **Languages in European business. A regional survey of small and medium-sized companies**, London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research (CILT).

Hallamaa, Panu 1997 Scales for evaluating language proficiency and language viability (in press). In **Northern Minority Languages: Problems of Survival**. Senri Ethnological Studies, 44, eds. Shoji, H. & J.Janhunen. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.

**Erreur ! Argument de commutateur inconnu.**

Hamelink, Cees 1994 **Trends in world communication: on disempowerment and self-empowerment**, Southbound, and Third World Network, Penang.

Hamelink, Cees (ed.) 1997 **Ethics and development: On making moral choices in development cooperation**, Kampen: Kok.

Harlech-Jones, Brian 1997 Looking at means and ends in language policy in Namibia, in Pütz (ed.) 223-249.

Kachru, Braj B. 1996a English as lingua franca, **Kontaktlinguistik/Contact Linguistics/Linguistique de contact: An international handbook of contemporary research**, ed. Hans Goebel, Peter H. Nelde, Zdeněk Starý & Wolfgang Wölck, Berlin & New York: de Gruyter, 906-913.

Kachru Braj B. 1996b Review of Grant D. McConnell 'A macro-sociolinguistic analysis of language vitality: geolinguistic profiles and scenarios of language contact in India', **Language in Society** 25/1, 137-140.

Kachru, Braj B. 1997 World Englishes and English-using communities, **Annual Review of Applied Linguistics**, 17, 66-87.

Kaplan, Robert B. 1995 Iceberg tips and first steps: A call to action, **TESOL Matters**, 5/2, 16.

Kayman, Martin A. 1997 On difference and difficulty: theorizing English in Europe. **European Journal of English Studies** 1/1, 10-32.

Krauss, Michael 1992 The world's languages in crisis. **Language** 68, 4-10.

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.

Labrie, Normand 1993 **La construction linguistique de la Communauté européenne**, Paris: Henri Champion.

Labrie, Norman & Carsten Quell 1997 Your language, my language or English? The potential language choice in communication among nationals of the European Union, **World Englishes** 16/1, Special issue on English in Europe, ed. Marc G.Deneire & Miachaël Goethals, 3-26.

Lund, Jørgen (1995). Plan, program og perspektiv. **Magisterbladet** 19, 21.

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

**Erreur ! Argument de commutateur inconnu.**



Maffi, Luisa, Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Andrianarivo, Jonah (in press). Language diversity. In Posey, Darrell and Dutfield, Graham (eds.). **Cultural and Spiritual Values of Biodiversity**. New York: United Nations Environmental Programme & Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mauranen, Anna 1993 **Cultural differences in academic rhetoric**, Frankfurt-am-Main: Lang.

Mazrui, Alamin 1997 The World Bank, the language question and the future of African education. **Race & Class** 38/3, 35-48.

Medgyes, Peter 1994 **The non-native teacher**, London: Macmillan.

Mühlhäusler, Peter 1996 **Linguistic ecology. Language change and linguistic imperialism in the Pacific region**. Routledge, London.

Ng\_g\_wa Thiong'o 1993 **Moving the centre. The struggle for cultural freedoms**, London: James Currey, Nairobi: EAEP, Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

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

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

Phillipson, Robert 1996 Linguistic imperialism - African perspectives. **English Language Teaching Journal** 50/2, 160-167.

Phillipson, Robert 1997 Realities and myths of linguistic imperialism, **Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development**, 51.

Phillipson, Robert 1998 Globalizing English: are linguistic human rights an alternative to linguistic imperialism? **Language Sciences**, 19/1.

Phillipson, Robert forthcoming Review of Fishman, Conrad & Rubal-Lopez (eds.) 1996.

Phillipson, Robert & Tove Skutnabb-Kangas 1996a Facteurs sociopolitiques et langues de la communication scientifique, in Actes du colloque **Le français et les langues scientifiques de demain**, Montréal, 19-21 mars 1996, Available on internet: <http://www.acfas.ca>.

Phillipson, Robert & Tove Skutnabb-Kangas 1996b Danish scholars and languages of scientific communication, in Bakmand, Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas (eds.), 33-42.

Phillipson, Robert & Tove Skutnabb-Kangas 1996 English only worldwide, or language ecology,

**TESOL Quarterly**, Special-topic issue: Language Planning and Policy, ed. Nancy H. Hornberger & Thomas K. Ricento, 30/3, 429-452.

Phillipson, Robert & Tove Skutnabb-Kangas 1997 Lessons for Europe from language policy in Australia, in Pütz (ed.), 115-159.

Posey, Darrell 1997 Conclusion of Darrell Posey's 'Biological and Cultural Diversity - the Inextricable Linked by Language and Politics', **Iatiku. Newsletter of the Foundation for Endangered Languages** 4, 7-8.

Pütz, Martin (ed.) 1995 **Discrimination through language in Africa? Perspectives on the Namibian experience**, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Pütz, Martin (ed.) 1997 **Language choices: Conditions, constraints and consequences**, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Quell, Carsten 1997 Language choice in multilingual institutions: A case study at the European Commission with particular reference to the role of English, French and German as working languages, **Multilingua** 16/1, 57-76.

Richardson, Jeremy (ed.) 1996 **European Union: power and policy-making**, London: Routledge.

Robinson, William I. 1996 Globalisation: nine theses on our epoch, **Race and Class** 38/2, 13-31.

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

Samoff, Joel 1996 Aid and education - transforming the policy making process. In **The role of aid in the development of education for all**, ed. Birgit Brock-Utme & Tove Nagel, Oslo: Pedagogisk forskningsinstitut (Rapport 8).

Schlossmacher, Michael 1996 **Die Amtssprachen in den Organen der Europäischen Gemeinschaft**, Peter Lang, Frankfurt am Main.

Skutnabb-Kangas Tove 1988 Multilingualism and the education of minority children. In Skutnabb-Kangas & Cummins (eds.) 9-44.

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

Skutnabb-Kangas Tove 1998 Human rights and language wrongs - a future for diversity. **Language Sciences**, 20/1, 5-27, Special issue on Language Rights, ed. Phil Benson, Peter Grundy, & Tove Skutnabb-Kangas.

**Erreur ! Argument de commutateur inconnu.**

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Jim Cummins (eds.) 1988 **Minority education: from shame to struggle**, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove & Robert Phillipson (eds.) 1994 **Linguistic human rights: overcoming linguistic discrimination**, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter (paperback version 1995).

Swales, John 1997 English as Tyrannosaurus Rex, **World Englishes**, 16/3, 373-382.

Thornberry, Patrick 1991 **International Law and the Rights of Minorities**, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Tomaševski, Katarina 1996 International prospects for the future of the welfare state. In **Reconceptualizing the welfare state**. 100-117. Copenhagen: The Danish Centre for Human Rights.

Tomaševski, Katarina 1997 **Between sanctions and elections. Aid donors and their human rights performance**, London: Pinter.

van Dijk, Teun (ed.) 1997 **Discourse as social interaction. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction**, volume 2, London: Sage.

Vilby, Knud 1997 **Den globale reisen**. (The global journey). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Widdowson, Henry G. 1997 EIL, ESL, EFL: global issues and local interests **World Englishes** 16/1, 134-146.

Wodak, Ruth (ed.) 1989 **Language, Power and Ideology**, Amsterdam: Benjamins.

World Commission on Culture and Development 1995 **Our creative diversity**. Paris: UNESCO.

#### **Notes:**

1. See, for instance, for economics, Robinson 1996, Grin (ed.) 1996; political science and political sociology, Churchill 1996, Richardson 1996, de Swaan 1993; communications, Hamelink 1994, Golding & Harris 1997; cultural studies, Featherstone 1990; history, Curtis 1995; discourse analysis, van Dijk 1997, Wodak 1989; and sign languages, Branson & Miller 1993, 1995.

2. See, for instance, for peace and conflict studies, Galtung 1996; development studies, Escobar 1995, Sachs 1992; multilingual education, Skutnabb-Kangas (ed.) 1995; ideology, Dendrinos 1992, Fairclough 1991; human rights, Eide, Krause & Rosas 1995, de Varennes 1996, Thornberry 1991,

Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson 1994, and the relationship between biodiversity and linguistic and cultural diversity, Maffi, Skutnabb-Kangas & Andrianarivo, in press.

3. There are interesting inconsistencies here. For instance Finnish in Sweden has 2 representatives in the supranational European Bureau for Lesser Used Languages, one for an ancient border minority, one for the immigrated minority. However, at state level Sweden has so far refused to grant the immigrated minority the national minority status that would enable the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages to be applied to it, while the Bureau treats them as such.

4. The cost of the interpretation and translation services is often brought in as an argument against official multilingualism. There are substantial costs, but they are very minor as a proportion of the overall EU budget: 0.1% for interpretation and 0.4% for translation, figures quoted in 1997 by the director of EU language services. In addition, the costs for this type of mental communication have to be compared with the costs for physical communication: roads, bridges, tunnels, railways, aeroplanes, cars, etc (Labrie 1993, Skutnabb-Kangas 1998). The common agricultural policy absorbs nearly half of the EU budget.

5. This organisation (with its headed note-paper in 6 languages) is lobbying for greater awareness among members of the European Parliament about a range of language policy issues.

6. The Danes are of course not alone in having problems with English. In the latest communication, in 4 languages, from the follow-up group preparing the revision of the Draft Universal Declaration on Language Rights, the Catalan secretariat states that this key document is "in the way of" being translated (= in the course of) and that the scientific council is "pretending" to provide a forum for debate (= "aiming at"). It is unreasonable to expect that Danes, Catalans or other users of English as a second language use English supremely well. The dice are loaded against them, the conditions for communication are not symmetrical, and native speakers often seem to be unaware of this.

7. A recent brilliant Social Democrat proposal was to completely exclude from attending school those minority children who could not cope with Danish as the medium of education in first grade, until they had succeeded in learning Danish. Luckily, the Danish Centre for Human Rights pointed out that the proposal violated human rights principles and the Danish Constitution. If a similar proposal were made as a requirement for election to the European Parliament ("Unless you know English and French you are not allowed to stand"), it would be seen as scandalous, even if the consequences for the individual are not as serious and even if MEPs *de facto* need to know these languages.

8. The Englishization of Namibia has been well documented, both during the liberation struggle and since independence. Little English was used before the 1990s, except in UN-funded efforts to equip the SWAPO liberation movement with qualified personnel for the time when the South Africans would be forced out of the country. See Pütz (ed.) 1995, Brock-Utne 1997, Harlech-Jones 1997, Phillipson, Skutnabb-Kangas & Africa 1985, chapter 9 of Phillipson 1992. The foreign "aid" effort

**Erreur ! Argument de commutateur inconnu.**

dovetails with the interests of those in power. We recently met some highly articulate student leaders from Namibia (see the interview with Isaiah Kavendjii in *Zig-Zag*, the journal of the Danish NGO Ibis, 51, April 1997, 3-5), who are alarmed about how the reliance of the elites on English is effectively excluding the vast majority of the population, i.e. people with no or little competence in English, from participation in democratic processes in civil society in this new post-apartheid state.