201. Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (2001). Bilingual Education. General Rapporteur's Position Paper. In Fleiner, Thomas, Nelde, Peter H. & Turi, Joseph-G. (eds.) **Droit et langue(s) d'enseignement / Law and Language(s) of Education**. Fribourg: Publications of the Institute of Federalism Fribourg Switzerland, 381-422.

Bilingual education. General Rapporteur's Position Paper[1]

Tove Skutnabb-Kangas

INTRODUCTION

This General Rapporteur's introduction will structure the field of bilingual education in some of the many possible ways. It starts with the challenges facing bilingual or multilingual education in the future. This part finishes with a few quotations about the role of language in education in general and in bilingual or multilingual education in particular. These are a sort of credo: I agree with the sentiment expressed in the quotations. Then some of the diverse meanings will be mentioned which are implied when people have discussed what they call "bilingual education" - everybody certainly does not mean the same thing. Next a few prototypes or models of bilingual education will be outlined, both strong and weak ones, together with the reasons which parents/authorities/groups have for choosing them. On the basis of evaluated experiments, tentative conclusions will be drawn about principles which might be generalizable across varied contexts, if one wants a school system to support high levels of bilingualism. And finally, I will say a few words about the societal contexts within which I see bilingual education.

THE CHALLENGES

The first challenge of multilingual education in the 21st Century will in my view be how to **combine the two trends** that have dominated bi/multilingual education in the past, one for the rich or majorities or dominant groups, with an emphasis on increased knowledge, scholastic achievement and benefits, and one for the poor or minorities or dominated/subordinated groups, with a focus on increased educational access, linguistic human rights, and self-determination. More and more, as the world becomes increasingly interdependent, it is important for **all** its citizens, not just privileged elites or poor minorities, to be fluent **and literate** in at least two languages, preferably more. The second challenge will thus be to be able to offer **all** citizens of the 21st century a multilingual education that would increase the global knowledge and scholastic achievement of all, while providing greater social equity (between different regions of the world, between classes/social groups, racial, religious and age groups, the genders and between different linguistic groups) and participating in the elimination of prejudice, racism and antagonism labelled "ethnic". Professor Fleiner said in his introduction to this Seminar that "language has become a major cause for conflict". I disagree. It is "simplistic and dangerous to give too much currency to the phrase 'ethnic conflict'", says Alan Phillips (1994, 5), in his introduction to Asbjørn Eide's report **New approaches to minority protection** (1994). Eide, a member of the UN Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities, summarizes in the report his 3-year study for the Sub-Commission. Eide and Phillips (1994, 5-6) quote the NGO World Congress on Human Rights, New Delhi, 1991, where the phrase 'ethnic conflict' is labelled a misnomer which leads to false perception. Other prominent peace and conflict researchers, including Björn Hettne (e.g. 1987, 1990) and Rodolfo Stavenhagen (e.g. 1988, 1990), have also criticized the labelling of conflicts and antagonisms as 'ethnic' as soon as ethnic or linguistic lines happen to coincide with class lines, economic, geographical, religious or other power-related lines in a conflict. There may in some cases be a **correlational** relationship between conflict and language/ethnicity, but this should not be interpreted as a **causal** relationship (see Phillipson, Rannut & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1994; see also Fishman, 1989 and Pattanayak, 1988).
For bilingual education to become this integrated alternative for the education of all citizens, it has to move beyond

---

Skutnabb-Kangas

its focus on only **two** languages. Multilingualism and multiculturalism must rest on bilingualism and biculturalism, as a first step but move beyond this, to recognize the linguistic human rights of all groups.[i] In order to take the first step, two opposite types of understandable but still irrational fear have to be overcome - this is the third challenge. The **first** fear, typical of many Western countries could be labelled the "majority group misperception of bilingualism". It sees bilingualism as dangerous for national unity, as a factor which can lead to "ethnic unrest/conflict" (as described above) or "ghettoization" or "separatism", and in the last end to the disintegration of the "nation state".[ii] United States is one of the "best" representatives for this fear, e.g. through organizations like U.S.English, but also others. In U.K., it takes the form of accepting multiculturalism but not multilingualism in the education of immigrated minorities. This fear in its most classic form is the state ideology in Turkey and is being upheld through laws, imprisonment, torture and physical, linguistic and cultural genocide on the Kurds (see note 26 for references). The **second** fear, which we could label the "minority group misperception of bilingualism", sees bilingualism as something that a powerful majority forces on an unwilling powerless minority in order to be able to assimilate them. A recognition of this fear (which apparently was real under the Soviet rule) can be seen in many contributions from ex-Soviet Union countries (see e.g. Hint 1991 for the fear and Rannut 1994, Rannut & Rannut 1995, and Leontiev 1995 for a recognition of its existence), but also in Western countries (see e.g. Rosenberg 1994). Overcoming the fear of bilingualism is inextricably mingled with the larger societal power issues which form a basis for any educational policy. I will come back to some of them in my concluding remarks. But first the quotations which exemplify some of the conclusions reached by people with extensive experience of bilingual education or lack of it:

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

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

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

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

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

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

"I am really worried about those children who do not have a strong mother tongue. Of course, as a parent, you do not need to ensure that the children learn their mother tongue up to a really high level, if you can be hundred percent sure of a few things. If you KNOW that you are never going to move house or school or country, that the parents' relationship is VERY stable, and that the child is NEVER going to have ANY emotional or learning problems in her

life, then you can take risks with your child and not send them to mother tongue classes." (Joanna Sancha, teacher in the English subsection in The European School of Brussels, in an interview 8 June 1994).

DIVERSE MEANINGS OF "BILINGUAL EDUCATION"

As the practice of multilingual education has expanded, different models have been developed to respond to the different purposes outlined below. All of them do not belong to the domain of bilingual education, though. The classic definition of bilingual education requires that the educational system uses two languages as media of instruction, in subjects other than the languages themselves (Andersson & Boyer 1978).

I divide the types of education which have been labelled as bilingual education, into three different groups: **non-forms, weak forms and strong forms of bilingual education**.[iii] Some of them do **not** properly belong to the domain of bilingual education according to the classic definition even if they are so called.

The **non-forms** are types of education where saying "bilingual" is pure phraseology. The school may have some teachers or teacher's aids who are present part of the time and who are unofficially allowed to use some minority languages as auxiliary languages if the children do not understand the language of instruction. But these minority languages are not time-tabled as subjects or officially accepted as media of instruction, neither does the composition of a class reflect a proper plan of trying to collect children with the same mother tongue to separate classes.

Some school systems may use the term bilingual education even in cases where minority languages are not used by any members of the school staff (meaning they are only used by students) if there is some kind of a reception class or pull-out system for L2-instruction for minority children.

The term has also been used by some school systems which have made efforts to include something of minority children's cultures (in some of the most colourful, superficial forms: dances, food, costumes, etc. - see the cultural deficiency phase described in e.g. Skutnabb-Kangas 1988, 32-36). This type of celebration of multiculturalism (e.g. during specific days/weeks) often excludes multilingualism, except, again, in its most superficial forms (how to say 'hello' in fifteen languages; to learn a song in each of the languages of one's classmates).

The **weak forms** of bilingual education have monolingualism, strong dominance in the majority language or limited bilingualism as their linguistic aim rather than multilingualism and multiliteracy.

Some use one language only as a medium but teach foreign languages as subjects, i.e. they are not properly to be considered "bilingual education". International Schools usually belong to this type (for an overview of these, see Carder 1995 and the articles in Jonietz & Harris (Eds.) 1991).

Others do belong to the category of **bilingual education** in the classic sense of the term, though, because they use two languages as media of instruction, e.g. all transitional models. These can again be subdivided according to the timing of and the criteria used for transition; they can be early-exit, medium-term-exit or late-exit models (see e.g. Hornberger 1991, Ramirez et al. 1991b). But none of these are **strong** forms of bilingual education.

The **strong forms** of bilingual/multilingual education have as their linguistic aim to promote multilingualism (or, minimally, bilingualism) and multiliteracy for all participants in the programme. Some of the most important strong forms will be outlined below.

PROTOTYPES OR MODELS OF BILINGUAL/MULTILINGUAL EDUCATION

Strong models of multilingual education

Among the strong models, I will identify the following four, which will be described very briefly:

1. **Plural multilingual model** (also called mainstream bilingual/multilingual);
2. **Immersion model**;
3. **Two-way dual language model** (also called two-way bilingual immersion;
4. **Maintenance model** (also called language shelter or heritage language model).

1. Plural Multilingual model: The European Union Schools are a prototype for this model.[iv] There are presently (1997) 11 schools of this type in 6 European Union countries, with around 15,000 students. They encompass grades 1-12 and lead to the European Baccalaureate. The schools have subsections for most of the official languages of the

Skutnabb-Kangas

member states and these are initially used as media of instruction. In that sense, then, all children are considered "language majority students" and all languages are "majority" ones. The students are of different nationality and language background - therefore "plural". Several languages are used as media for instruction, according to a carefully planned progression, and teachers are minimally bilingual. The goal is that all students become not only bilingual but multilingual - therefore "multilingual".

The societal aim[v] is clearly one of enrichment and pluralism, while the linguistic aim is to make students high level multilinguals and multiliterates, able to function in the European Union and beyond.

2. Immersion model: This originally Canadian model has spread to many countries[vi]. Immersion programmes typically involve ethnolinguistic majority children, although there are some exceptions.[vii] Two languages are used as media of instruction, initially the students' second language[viii] and the teachers are bilingual, even if they only speak the students' L2. Early, partial and late immersion models aim to make students bilingual (or, in Europe, multilingual) and biliterate so that they can function in (and draw benefit from) pluralistic societies.

The societal goals have so far to a large extent been more about maintaining old or gaining new benefits or privileges for middle class populations than general equity.

3. Two-way Dual Language model: The bilingual immersion schools in California and elsewhere in the United States are the prototype.[ix] There are both majority and minority students in the same class, and both languages (in most cases English and Spanish) are used as media of instruction with both groups, with the minority language dominating initially. Again, the objective of this type of bilingual education model is enrichment and pluralism, and bilingualism and biliteracy, for both the majority and the minority group. Alternate days programmes can be seen as a sub-category under two-way programmes.[x]

4. Maintenance model: These classes/schools are often organized and/or demanded by an ethnolinguistic minority community. Most typically they educate minority children using both the minority and the majority language. Initially, the students' native language is used for most of the content matter education, especially in cognitively demanding, decontextualised subjects, while the majority language is taught as a subject only. Later on, some (but by no means all) maintenance programmes use the majority language as a medium of education for part of the time, but in proper maintenance programmes the minority language continues as a medium of education in several subjects throughout the school.

For a few national minorities, maintenance programmes are a self-evident, "normal" way of educating their children, a natural human right. It is indicative that most minorities of this type, e.g. the Swedish-speakers in Finland, Afrikaans- and English-speakers in South Africa, or Russian-speakers in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, are either former power minorities or in a transitional phase where they have to accept the fact that they no longer have the power to impose their will on a numerical majority but where they still do have the power to organize their own children's education through the medium of their own language.

Of course, it should be a fundamental, self-evident linguistic and educational human right for **any** ethnolinguistic minority to use its own language as the main medium of education.[xi] But in fact most minorities in the world do not have this basic right.[xii] A few indigenous peoples (who are numerically a minority in most of their own countries) have maintenance programmes (see e.g. Black 1990, Harris 1990, Kāretu 1994, Magga 1994, McLaughlin 1992, McLaughlin & Tierney (Eds.) 1993, Stairs 1988, Vorih & Rosier 1978. for examples); most of them do not (see e.g. Hamel 1994a, b). Most immigrant and refugee minority children do not have access to maintenance programmes either, even if it can be shown that they result in high levels of bi/multilingualism, enhanced school achievement and more societal equity.[xiii]

The purpose of this type of multilingual programme is to ensure that language minority children continue to maintain and develop their mother tongue up to either a native (national minorities, indigenous peoples) or at least near-native (immigrant minorities) level, learn the majority language at a native level, become biliterate and achieve academically. In a European context, they typically also learn further foreign languages. This type of multilingual programme enriches society at large by ensuring that minorities gain access to linguistic and educational prerequisites for social, economic and political integration.

Although the strong forms of multilingual education have different sociolinguistic realities with regard to the linguistic background of the students and the language(s) of the classroom, and different sociopolitical realities with regard to the power relations between the groups attending and the rest of society, they **all** share an aim of cultural and linguistic pluralism, with the multilingualism and multiliteracy of students as an avowed minimum aim.

Skutnabb-Kangas

Weak models of multilingual education

For purposes of comparison, I will also mention one other model of education which is classified as "weak" in Colin Baker's typology (1993). The **Transitional Model** uses two languages as media of instruction. It is strictly for minority students who do not know the dominant majority language well enough for using it initially as a medium of instruction (mostly immigrant or refugee minorities in Europe and the U.S., national minorities in e.g. India). It is thus based on defining the students negatively, as deficient, in relation to their (lack of) knowledge of the dominant language (see Skutnabb-Kangas 1990a, 1991b). Initially, the minority language is used as a medium of instruction until the child becomes orally fluent in the dominant majority language, at which time instruction continues first mainly and very soon only through the medium of the dominant language. There may (often in Europe) or may not (mostly in the USA) be a mother-tongue-as-a-subject component after the transition. Sometimes there is some auxiliary teaching through the medium of the mother tongue even after the transition, but only during a limited, often rigidly specified time. Most educational models for minor or minority language speakers in India are also of this type (see e.g. Annamalai 1986, 1995, Mohanty 1994).

Teaching through the medium of the mother tongue is not seen as a right that the child is entitled to[xiv]; the mother tongue is seen as useful only so far as its auxiliary use enhances the knowledge of the dominant language (see e.g. Baker & de Kanter for clear statements on this; in the U.S.A. context even reports like Ramirez et al (1991a, b), seen from a "European" point of view, clearly embody this type of principles in their design and presentation where prominence is given to minority children's knowledge of the dominant language while the knowledge of their mother tongue is not even reported). It is often, especially in the higher grades, more the attitude towards the minority mother tongue, the rationale legitimating its use (a self-evident right, or an instrument to better proficiency in the dominant language) than the number of hours, devoted to the minority language that is decisive for how a model should be classified.

This model is, after ordinary submersion models (where minority children are instructed through the medium of the dominant language only), the most prevalent education type in most European and Europeanized countries[xv] for immigrant minorities (and indigenous peoples) and certainly the most prevalent type using more than one language as media of education. Transitional bilingual education encourages shift to monolingualism in the dominant language.[xvi]

REASONS FOR CHOOSING THE DIFFERENT TYPES

The **reasons** for choosing bilingual or multilingual education are often different for diverse groups. Some have recognized multilingual education as a means to make their own children bilingual, thereby improving opportunities of doing business, getting ahead and maintaining privileges. Immersion programmes, the European Schools and International Schools[xvii] are examples of this approach of enrichment and extra benefits.

For others, multilingual education represents a means to better understanding of other ethnolinguistic groups with which they are in contact. Both immersion programmes and two-way programmes may have an element of this "integrative" motivation.

Still others, often threatened ethnolinguistic groups have adopted multilingual education as a means of linguistic survival. Maintenance/language shelter programmes or revitalization programmes for minorities, e.g. the Frisian schools in the Netherlands or the Finnish schools in Sweden or Kōhanga Reo programmes in New Zealand, are of this type.

And yet another use of bilingual education has been to educate in the mother tongue ethnolinguistic groups which had previously been excluded from equal educational opportunity. Again, both maintenance and two-way programmes may belong to this group. Likewise, many educational programmes in African countries could be counted under maintenance programmes.[xviii]

The reasons and goals in using two languages in the educational system thus vary greatly, ranging then from increased knowledge and economic gain, to increased mutual understanding, to ethnolinguistic survival, to improved educational opportunity. Many programmes are multipurpose and combine several of the goals.[xix]

GENERALIZABLE PRINCIPLES IF A SCHOOL SYSTEM IS TO SUPPORT HIGH LEVELS

Skutnabb-Kangas

OF BILINGUALISM

A sound multilingual educational policy is in several ways not too different from a sound educational policy in general. Despite the fact that both teachers and students develop high levels of metalinguistic awareness, the focus is often not on language per se, but rather the education of students, with multilingualism and multiliteracy being both a means to enhance good schooling[xx], and one more product of good schooling.

Informed parents, enlightened politicians and school administrators, and well-educated and committed teachers are important for the education of any child. Likewise, well-structured schools, progressive and inclusive educational policies and teaching strategies, rich and diverse materials, and fair educational assessment are principles of effective education for all. All this is most important in multilingual education too.

But to achieve the full multilingualism and multiliteracy of students, certain additional principles have to be followed by the **agents** involved, developed by the **educational context** in which the action takes place, and supported by the surrounding **society**.

It is, of course, impossible and would be pretentious to come with a list of principles for multilingual education which is claimed to be exhaustive. Many of my points could be deleted and others added.[xxi] Still, with many reservations, I venture to suggest that there are important characteristics, desirable or required of the educational agents and the educational culture which can be seen as guiding principles for multilingual education. It seems to me that the principles which have to a large extent been followed in most of those experiments which have reached the best results (i.e. high levels of bi- or multilingualism, a fair chance of success in school achievement, and positive intercultural attitudes), could be formulated as 8 recommendations. I have applied the principles to some of the strong models discussed in this article (immersion, two-way bilingual and European Schools models and language maintenance (or language shelter as it is also called) and one which is not discussed (the alternate days model). I have also included a "utopian" model which would get a plus-rating on all the principles. Alternatives and additions to and further developments of and discussions about both the principles and, especially, concrete experience, are vital. Here are the principles:

1. Support (= use as the main medium of education, at least during the first 8 years) the language (of the 2 that the child is supposed to become bilingual in initially) which is least likely to develop up to a high formal level. This is for all minority children their own mother tongue. For majority children, it should be a minority language. Numerical majority languages may also be the languages to be supported if they are politically weak, for instance the official languages in the Baltic countries, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, or native African languages.

2. In most experiments, **the children are initially grouped together with children with the same L1**. Mixed groups are not positive initially, and certainly not in cognitively demanding decontextualised subjects. (Spanish-English two-way programmes in the U.S.A. are an exception: they have mixed in the same class 50% minority, 50% majority children. All are initially taught through the medium of the minority language, later through both. This may be a relevant factor in accounting for the Spanish-speaking children's sometimes relatively less impressive gains in both languages, compared to English-speaking children in the same programmes. The mere presence of majority or power language children in the same classroom may be too overwhelming for minority children, despite the minority language being the medium of education).

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

4. **All children have to be equalized vis-a-vis the status of their mother tongues and their knowledge of the language of instruction**. Nice phrases about the worth of everybody's mother tongue, the value of interculturalism, etc, serve little purpose, unless they are followed up in how the schools are organized.

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

There has to be equality in the role that the languages are accorded on the schedules and in higher education, in testing and evaluation, in marks given for the languages, in the physical environment (signs, forms, letters, the school's languages of administration, the languages of meetings, assemblies, etc), in the status and salaries of the teachers, in their working conditions, career patterns, etc.

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

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

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

Skutnabb-Kangas

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- transfer from the known to the unknown;
- transfer from teaching in a language to teaching through the medium of that language;
- transfer from teaching through the medium of L2 in cognitively less demanding, context-embedded subjects, to teaching through the medium of L2 in cognitively demanding decontextualized subjects.

The progression used for all children in the European Schools seems close to ideal for minority children:

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

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

2. **All cognitively demanding decontextualized core subjects** are taught **through the medium of the mother tongue** during the first 7 years.

3. There is **less** teaching **through the medium of the mother tongue** in grades 8-10, and again **more** teaching **through the medium of the mother tongue** in grades 11-12, especially in the most demanding subjects, in order to ensure that the students have understood them thoroughly.

4. **The mother tongue** is taught **as a subject throughout schooling**, from 1-12.

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

1. **The second language** is taught as a **subject throughout schooling**, from 1-12.

2. **The second language** becomes **a medium of education** already in grade 3, but only in **cognitively less demanding context-embedded subjects**. The teaching can be given in mixed groups, but ideally together with other children for whom the language is also an L2.

3. Teaching in **cognitively demanding decontextualized subjects** only starts **through the medium of L2** when the children have been taught that language **as a subject for 7 years** (grades 1-7) and have been taught **through the medium of that language in cognitively less demanding context-embedded subjects for 5 years** (grades 3-7). Children should not be taught demanding decontextualized subjects through L2 with other children for whom the language of instruction is their L1 before grade 8. In European Schools this is mostly not done even in grades 9-12

Skutnabb-Kangas

in compulsory subjects, only in elective courses.

RATING THE MODELS

In Table 1 the models have been "rated" in terms of pluses and minuses which show whether they generally follow the principle or not. In some cases, a differential rating has been given in relation to majority and minority children in the same programme.

Table 1 **Principles for multilingualism through education**

1. Support (= use as the main medium of education, at least during the first 8 years) the language which is least likely to develop up to a high formal level.

LANGUAGE SHELTER	IMMER-SION	ALTERN. DAYS	EUROPEAN SCHOOLS	TWO-WAY	UTO-PIAN
+	+	+/-	MI+ MA-	+	+

2. **Group the children initially together with children with the same L1**. No mixed groups initially, and especially not in cognitively demanding decontextualised subjects.

LANGUAGE SHELTER	IMMER-SION	ALTERN. DAYS	EUROPEAN SCHOOLS	TWO-WAY	UTO-PIAN
+	+	-	+	-	+

3. **ALL children are to become high level bilinguals**, not only minority children. (Monolingualism is a curable illness. Bilingualism is to be a goal and a positive model for all)

LANGUAGE SHELTER	IMMER-SION	ALTERN. DAYS	EUROPEAN SCHOOLS	TWO-WAY	UTO-PIAN
+	+	+	+	+	+

4. **All children have to be equalized vis-a-vis their knowledge of the language of instruction and the status of their mother tongues**:
A **All children know the language of instruction**
B **No children know the language of instruction**
C **All children alternate between "knowing" and "not knowing" the language of instruction**

LANGUAGE SHELTER	IMMER-SION	ALTERN. DAYS	EUROPEAN SCHOOLS	TWO-WAY	UTO-PIAN
+ A	+ B	+ C	+ A, C	-	+

5. **All teachers have to be bi- or multilingual**

LANGUAGE SHELTER	IMMER-SION	ALTERN. DAYS	EUROPEAN SCHOOLS	TWO-WAY	UTO-PIAN
+ (ma ?)	+	+	+	+	+

6. **Foreign languages should be taught through the medium of the children's mother tongue and/or by teachers who know the children's mother tongue**
Skutnabb-Kangas

LANGUAGE SHELTER	IMMER-SION	ALTERN. DAYS	EUROPEAN SCHOOLS	TWO-WAY	UTO-PIAN
varies	+?	?	varies	?	+

7. **All children must study both L1 and L2 as compulsory subjects through 1-12**

LANGUAGE SHELTER	IMMER-SION	ALTERN. DAYS	EUROPEAN SCHOOLS	TWO-WAY	UTO-PIAN
+?	-	+?	+	-	+

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

LANGUAGE SHELTER	IMMER-SION	ALTERN. DAYS	EUROPEAN SCHOOLS	TWO-WAY	UTO-PIAN
+	+	+?	+	+?	+

(Skutnabb-Kangas)

It seems clear that none of the models follows **all** the principles. The Plural Multilingual European Schools model does it to a higher extent, though, than any of the other models.

Jo Lo Bianco, the architect behind the Australian National Languages Plan, sums up the social goals in the Australian language policy under the four És: EQUALITY, ECONOMICS, ENRICHMENT and EXTERNAL.[xxii] Equality refers to the correlation between language on the one hand and social and economic equality or lack of it on the other hand. Language policy must correct any systematic injustice. The economic goal has to do with the economic value of multilingualism. The enrichment goal uses arguments about the cognitive and cultural benefits deriving from multilingualism. And the external goals have to do with the geopolitical situation of the country, development cooperation, transfer of technology and supporting bi- and multilateral relations with other countries. If we transfer the four És to the educational models discussed here, we could characterize them, admittedly a bit squarely, as follows.

Maintenance or language shelter programmes for minorities support the equality goal and the enrichment goal for the minorities themselves, and help them economically, but do not do anything for the majorities directly. Indirectly the majorities benefit because maintenance models aid a better integration of minorities in the rest of the society, as Mohanty (1994) shows. **Immersion** programmes work against the equality goal. They support the enrichment goal and the economic goal for the participants in the programmes but not for the rest of the society.

Two-way programmes and the **European Schools** models can function as the answers of the educational system vis-a-vis all four goals, but certain preconditions have to be fulfilled first. Multilingualism has to be seen as something enriching, good, normal, indeed necessary, for all, not only minorities or majority elites - and it has to encompass more than English, French and German. The schools have to become accessible to all, not just elites. And the equality goals, both economic and political, must become more than nice catchwords, and be extended to the whole world, not only the small western European/North American/Japanese club.[xxiii]

CONCLUDING REMARKS: THE SOCIETAL CONTEXTS FOR BILINGUAL EDUCATION

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

By contrast, the attempts of **dominated/subordinated linguistic minority groups** to become **high level** multilinguals have in most parts of the world met with considerable difficulty and often direct or indirect resistance

Skutnabb-Kangas

and sabotage from the educational systems. For them, becoming at least bilingual has been and is in most cases (except when some kind of isolation is possible) necessary for survival, economically, culturally, psychologically, even politically. For them, high levels of multilingualism or at least bilingualism is a question of basic human rights. In a civilized state, there should be no need to debate the right to maintain and develop one's mother tongue. It is a self-evident, fundamental, basic linguistic human right.

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

Observing LHRs implies at a **collective** level the right of minority groups to exist (i.e. the right to be "different"). It implies the right to enjoy and develop their languages and the right for minorities to establish and maintain schools and other training and educational institutions, with control of curricula and teaching in their own languages. It also involves guarantees of representation in the political affairs of the state, and the granting of autonomy to administer matters internal to the groups, at least in the fields of culture, education, religion, information, and social affairs, with the financial means, through taxation or grants, to fulfil these functions. Many of these principles have been endorsed and codified in a wide range of human rights covenants and charters.[xxv]

Many ethnolinguistic majorities enjoy most LHRs, and élites them all. It would be perfectly feasible to grant many of these rights to ethnolinguistic minorities, without infringing the rights of majorities. It is urgent to grant them if we are interested in avoiding conflicts where ethnicity coincides with other cleavages in society (as it does in many of the most violent conflicts in today's world).

Observing the principles for multilingual education outlined in previous sections of this article in my view also respects linguistic human rights in education. If all education were to follow principles honouring LHRs, high levels of multilingualism would be likely to follow for both minorities and majorities. But today the education of both majorities and minorities in most European and Europeanized countries in my view functions in conflict with most scientifically sound principles about how education leading to high levels of multilingualism should be organized. Education participates in attempting and committing linguistic genocide[xxvi] in relation to minorities. In relation to linguistic majorities, education today in most cases deprives them of the possibility of gaining the benefits associated with high levels of multilingualism. Present reductionist educational language choices (monolingual reductionism) do not support the diversity which is necessary for the planet to have a future.

When global control to an increasing degree happens via language, instead of more brutal means (despite some of the signs of the opposite today), the relativity which comes with the multihorizons of multilingual and multicultural awareness, must be enhanced on a global scale too, if our planet and our humanity are to have a chance of survival (Skutnabb-Kangas 1996a). It is not only biodiversity which is a necessity for the planet. Maintaining, developing and sharing the knowledge and potential embedded in all our languages and cultures, supporting linguistic and cultural human diversity, is at least equally important for our survival as a species on this planet. Many cultures, and the languages through which their representatives have expressed them, contain more peaceful alternatives for humans to coexist with each other, with nature and with the cosmos[xxvii] than the languages and cultures which dominate today.

If laws, domestic and international, are to support human rights and linguodiversity, it is necessary for lawyers, linguists and educators to sit together and discuss not only the technicalities of how best to make children high level multilinguals, but also the context within which it happens and the goals we have when planning educational systems and legal measures to support them.

Ole Wæver and his colleagues (1993) analyze the political forces which have been decisive in forming Europe during the preceding decade, as follows (Table 2):

Table 2 **The four political forces of the Europe of the past decade**

(1) the political stagnation and economic banktruptcy of the Soviet Union;
(2) the revitalisation of Western European integration, initially under the banner of '1992', and latterly, and with much more trouble, under 'Maastricht';

Skutnabb-Kangas

(3) the widening acceptance that pluralism and markets were essential ingredients for any successful modern society; and
(4) the releasing and/or revival of nationalism and xenophobia.

from Wæver et al. 1993)

In the last two, there is an inbuilt conflict which they do not discuss: an acceptance of pluralism on the one hand and a new flourishing of nationalism and racism (what they call "xenophobia") on the other hand. It is important to note that the pluralism that is meant here is a pluralism of market forces, not the linguistic and cultural pluralism which I see as one of the goals in the strong forms of bilingual or multilingual education. When supporters/representatives of the European Union speak of the European "integration", the second force in Wæver et aĺs list, this often refers to an integration among the élites in the self-selected little Western European Club which has monopolized the label "Europe" for themselves. Neither Eastern and Central Europe nor ordinary people or minorities in Western Europe are seen as agents in this "European integration".
As I mentioned earlier, one of the big challenges for multilingual and multicultural education is to organize education in a way which helps to solve the conflict between models which make élites multilingual and models which prevent minorities or powerless groups from reaching high levels of multilingualism. Linguistic plurality has to be seen as something enriching: positive, normal and necessary (instead of a deficiency: negative, abnormal, avoidable); it has to encompass more than English, French and German[xxviii]; the equality goal, both economic and political, has to become more than phrases or a posture, be global rather than restricted to the small western European club. If we do not counteract the linguistic and cultural imperialism that Western Europe, through its élites, is a formidable representative of, multilingualism will result in the integration of élites with other élites, in order to be able to maintain and recreate their global hegemony and to be better able to prevent any kind of a more equitable global integration.
When we in European educational language planning fora talk about the necessity of everybody learning English well as a part of the multilingualism goal, we must choose to what extent we want to, unwittingly or willingly, be agents for the advancement of English linguistic imperialism (see Phillipson 1992), or agents for supporting linguistic diversity and plurality of languages and cultures in a authentic, human ecological spirit. Yukio Tsuda discusses both alternatives in terms of a "diffusion of English" paradigm and a "language ecology" paradigm. He sees them as characterized by the following epiteths (Table 3):

Table 3 **The diffusion of English and the ecology of language paradigms**
1. The diffusion of English paradigm
- capitalism
- science and technology
- modernization
- monolingualism
- ideological globalization and internationalization
- transnationalization
- Americanization and homogenization of world culture
- linguistic, cultural and media imperialism
2. Ecology of language paradigm
- human rights perspective
- equality in communication
- multilingualism
- maintenance of languages and cultures
- protection of national sovereignties
- promotion of foreign language education
(from Tsuda 1994)

I see multilingual education models which work within the language ecology paradigm, i.e. advanced versions of the strong models above, as better alternatives for those who do not want to reproduce the present unequal power structures. But the strategies for accomplishing the spreading of these morally more acceptable and scientifically

Skutnabb-Kangas

sound models have to be thought through much more carefully than so far. Racism, classism, sexism, imperialism, etc. are **not** information problems (if we as researchers inform the politicians about problems and scientifically sound solutions, they will make laws and regulations accordingly, and everybody will live happily ever after). It is clear that, for instance, both the complexity of situations worldwide, the fact that there is no **one** model for every situation but a range of possibilities, and the lack of proper definitions of central concepts (e.g. "minority" or "language") have been used by power holders both to legitimate lack of rights and to prevent changes which might grant rights to groups which so far have been excluded from those rights. The difficulties faced by the Deaf Communities ("do they really have a language?")[xxix] and the resistance of all European countries (e.g. Sweden vis-a-vis the Finnish labour migrant minority[xxx]) to allowing immigrated minorities to develop into new national ethnic minorities or to accept that there are minorities in the country in the first place (e.g. France, Turkey) or to let groups/communities/peoples name themselves and their languages[xxxi] (Macedonians) are just some examples of the problems we have to face. Rather than "differentiating between research and politics", a plea heard in some discussions during this seminar, we should minimally acknowledge that the plea is part of a certain paradigm of philosophy of science, i.e. an ideological claim, or, rather, tackle the question of the necessary interlocking of questions of language and bilingual education with politics in a scientific way, acknowledging the biases that are an inevitable part of the study. Or, as Constance Beutel, the former director of Pacific Bell's Self-directed Education Unit, so succinctly put it in the title of an article (1990), we should, in our research and otherwise, be "Transforming the world - everything else is commentary".

References:

ABBI, Anvita (Ed.) (1986). **Studies in bilingualism**. Delhi: Bahri Publications.

AHLGREN, Inger & HYLTENSTAM, Kenneth (Eds.) (1994). **Bilingualism in Deaf Education**, International Studies on Sign Language and Communication of the Deaf, Vol. 27, Hamburg: Signum.

ALFREDSSON, Gudmundur (1991). Minority Rights: Equality and Non-Discrimination. In Krag & Yukhneva (Eds.) 19-41.

AMMON, Ulrich (1994). The Present Dominance of English in Europe. With an Outlook on Possible Solutions to the European Language Problem, **Sociolinguistic** 8, 1994, 1-14.

ANDERSSON, Theodore & BOYER, Mildred (1978). **Bilingual Schooling in the United States**. Austin, Texas: National Educational Laboratory Publishers, 2nd edition.

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

ANNAMALAI, E. (1986). Bilingualism through schooling in India. In Abbi (Ed.).

ANNAMALAI, E. (1995). Multilingualism for all - an Indian perspective. In Skutnabb-Kangas (Ed.), 215-220.

ARTIGAL, Josep Maria (1993). Catalan and Basque Immersion programmes. In Baetens Beardsmore (Ed.), 30-53.

ARTIGAL, Josep Maria (1995). Multilingualism for all - a Catalan Perspective. In Skutnabb-Kangas (Ed.), 169-182.

BAETENS BEARDSMORE, Hugo (1990a). The Multilingual School for Mixed Populations: A Case Study, in Baetens Beardsmore 1990b, 1-51.

BAETENS BEARDSMORE, Hugo (1990b). **Bilingualism in Education: Theory and Practice**, Brussel/Bruxelles: Linguistic Circle of the Vrije Universiteit Brussel and the Université Libre de Bruxelles.

BAETENS-BEARDSMORE, Hugo (1993). **The European School Experience in Multilingual Education**. Brussels: Vrije Universiteit Brussel and Université Libre de Bruxelles.

BAETENS BEARDSMORE, Hugo (1995). The European School Experience in Multilingual Education, in Skutnabb-Kangas (ed.), 21-68.

BAETENS BEARDSMORE, Hugo & ANSELMI, Gulia (1991). Code-Switching in a Heterogeneous, Unstable, Multilingual Speech Community. In **Papers for the Symposium on Code-Switching in Bilingual Studies; Theory, Significance and Perspectives**, Strasbourg, European Science Foundation, vol. II, 405-436.

BAETENS BEARDSMORE, Hugo & KOHLS, J. (1988). Immediate Pertinence in the Acquisition of Multilingual Proficiency: the European Schools, **The Canadian Modern Language Review** 44:2, 240-260.

BAETENS BEARDSMORE, Hugo & LEBRUN, Nathalie (1991). Trilingual Education in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg. In García (Ed.), 107-122.

Skutnabb-Kangas

BAETENS BEARDSMORE, Hugo & SWAIN, Merrill (1985). Designing Bilingual Education: aspects og Immersion and "European School Models", **Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development** 6:1, 1-15.

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

BAKER, Keith & de KANTER, Adriane (1981). **Effectiveness of Bilingual Education: A Review of the Literature**, Final Draft. Washington, D.C.: U.S.Department of Education.

BALDAUF, Jr., Richard & LUKE, Allan (Eds.) (1990). **Language Planning and Education in Australasia and the South Pacific, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.**

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

BEUTEL, Constance (1990). To transform the world: all the rest is commentary. **CABE Newsletter**, 12(6), 3-13.

BHAT, P.Ishwara (1993). **A comparative study of the language provisions in the constitutions of Canada and India from the perspectives of equal liberty of all**. Mysore: Department of Studies in Law, University of Mysore.

BLACK, Paul (1990). Some Competing Goals in Aboriginal Language Planning. In Baldauf & Luke (Eds.), 80-88.

BRANSON, Janet E. & MILLER, Don B.(1993). Sign Language, the Deaf and the Epistemic Violence of Mainstreaming. **Language and Education**, 7(1).

BRANSON, Janet E. & MILLER, Don B. (1994). Sign Language and the Discursive Construction of Power over the Deaf through Education. In Corson (Ed.).

BROCK-UTNE, Birgit (1993). **Education in Africa**, Rapport Nr. 3, Oslo: University of Oslo, Institute for Educational Research.

CAPOTORTI, Francesco (1979). **Study of the Rights of Persons Belonging to Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities**. New York: United Nations.

CARDER, Maurice (1995). Language(s) in international education: a review of language issues in International Schools. In Skutnabb-Kangas (Ed.), 113-158.

CDE 1981 = California State Department of Education (1981). **Schooling and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework**. Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University.

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

CHRISTIAN, Donna (1994). Students learning through two languages, Paper presented at 28th Annual TESOL Convention, Baltimore, Maryland, March 12 1994.

CHRISTIAN, Donna & MAHRER, Cindy (1992). **Two-way Bilingual Programs in the United States 1991-1992**, Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, The National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.

CHRISTIAN, Donna & MAHRER, Cindy (1993). **Two-way Bilingual Programs in the United States, 1992-1992** Supplement, Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, The National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.

CHRISTIAN, Donna & MONTONE, Chris (1994). **Two-way Bilingual Programs in the United States, 1993-1992** Supplement, Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, The National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.

CLYNE, Michael (Ed.) (1986). **An Early Start Second Language at Primary School**. Melbourne: River Seine.

CORSON, David (1993). **Lamguage, Minority Education and Gender. Linking Social Justice and Power**. Clevedon/Philadelphia/Adelaide: Multilingual Matters.

CORSON, Davis (Ed.) (1994). **Discourse and Power in Educational Settings**. New Jersey: Hampton Press.

CUMMINS, Jim (1980). The Cross Lingual Dimensions of Language Proficiency: Implications for Bilingual Education and the Optimal Age Issue. **Tesol Quarterly**, 14(2), 175-187.

CUMMINS, Jim (1981). The Role of Primary Language Development in Promoting Educational Success for Language Minority Students. In CDE 1981, 3-49.

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

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

CUMMINS, Jim (1994a). From Coercive to Collaborative Relations of Power in the Teaching of Literacy. In Ferdman, Weber & Ramirez (Eds.), 295-331.

CUMMINS, Jim (1994b). The socioacademic achievement model in the context of coercive and collaborative

Skutnabb-Kangas

relations of power. In De Villar, Faltis & Cummins (Eds.), 363-390.

CUMMINS, Jim (1995). Reflections on the European Schools Model in relation to French Immersion Programs in Canada, in Skutnabb-Kangas (ed.), 159-168.

CURTIS, Jan (1988). Parents, schools and racism: Bilingual education in a Northern California town, in Skutnabb-Kangas & Cummins (eds), 278-298.

de VARENNES, Fernand (1996). **Language, minorities and human rights**. Dortrecht: Martinus Nijhoff.

De VILLAR, Robert A., FALTIS, Christian, J. & CUMMINS, James P. (Eds.) (1994). **Cultural diversity in schools: From rhetoric to practice**. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

DOLSON, David & LINDHOLM, Kathryn (1995). World Class Education for Children in California: A Comparison of the Bilingual/Immersion and European School Model, i Skutnabb-Kangas (Ed.), 69-102.

DUFF, Patricia A. (1991). Innovations in Foreign Language Education: an Evaluation of Three Hungarian-English Dual-Language Schools, **Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development** 12(6), 459-476.

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

ERIKSSON, Riitta (1994). **Biculturalism in Upper Secondary Education. The Long Term Effects of Finnish Language Programs on Students' Educational and Occupational Careers - A Swedish Case Study**, Stockholm: Stockholm University, Institute of International Education.

FERDMAN, Bernardo, WEBER, Rose-Marie & RAMIREZ, Arnulfo G. (Eds.) (1994). **Literacy Across Languages and Cultures**. Albany: State University of New York Press.

FERGUSON, Charles A., HOUGHTON, Catherine & WELLS, Marie H. (1977). Bilingual Education: An International Perspective. In Spolsky & Cooper (Eds.), 159-174.

FISHMAN, Joshua A. (1976). **Bilingual Education: An International Sociological Perspective,** Rowley, Mass., Newbury House.

FISHMAN, Joshua A. (1980). Minority language maintenance and the ethnic mother-tongue school. **Modern Language Journal**, 64, 167-172.

FISHMAN, Joshua A. (1989). **Language & Ethnicity In Minority Sociolinguistic Perspective**, Clevedon/Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

FISHMAN, Joshua A. (1994). "English only" in Europe? Some suggestions from an American Perspective, **Sociolinguistica** 8, 1994, 65-42.

GARCÍA, Ofelia (1988). The education of biliterate and bicultural children in ethnic schools in the United States. In **Essays by the Spencer Fellows of the National Academy of Education**, Vol. IV, 19-78.

GARCÍA, Ofelia (1993). Understanding the societal role of the teacher in transitional bilingual education classrooms: Lessons from Sociology of Language. In Zondag (Ed.), 25-37.

GARCÍA, Ofelia (Ed.) (1991). **Bilingual Education: Focusschrift in Honor of Joshua A. Fishman**. Volume I. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

GARCÍA, Ofelia & OTHEGUY, Ricardo (1988). The bilingual education of Cuban American children in Dade County's ethnic schools. **Language and Education** 1, 83-95.

GENESEE, Fred (1976). The Suitability of Immersion Programs for All Children, Canadian Modern Language Review, 32:5, 494-515.

GENESEE, Fred (1985). Second language learning through immersion: A review of U.S. programs, **Review of Educational Research** 55:4, 541-561.

GENESEE, Fred (1987). **Learning Through Two Languages: Studies of Immersion and Bilingual Education**, Cambridge, MS: Newbury House.

GORTER, Durk, HOEKSTRA, Jarich F., JANSMA, Lammert G. and YTSMA, Jehannes (Eds.) (1991). **Fourth International Conference on Minority Languages**, Vol. 1: General Papers. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

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

HAMEL, Rainer Enrique (1994a). Indigenous education in Latin America: policies and legal frameworks. In Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson (Eds.), 271-287.

HAMEL, Rainer Enrique (1994b). Linguistic rights for Amerindian people in Latin America. In Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson (Eds.), 289-303.

HARRIS, Stephen (1990). **Two-way Aboriginal Schooling. Education and Cultural Survival**. Canberra: Aboriginal Studies Press.

HELLE, Tuija (1994). Directions in bilingual education: Finnish comprehensive schools in perspective, **International Journal of Applied Linguistics** 4:2, 197-220.

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

Skutnabb-Kangas

HETTNE, Björn (1987). **Etniska konflikter och internationella relationer**, Rapport 6 från DEIFO. Stockholm: DEIFO (Delegationen för invandrarforskning).

HETTNE, Björn (1990). **Development Theory and the Three Worlds**. Harlow: Longman.

HINT, Mati (1991). Kaksikielisyys sosiaalisena ja poliittisena ongelmana (Bilingualism as a social and political problem). In Mustakallio, Marja & Tuula Uusi-Hallila (toim **Joka puulla juurensa** (Every tree has its roots). Äidinkielen Opettajain Liiton Vuosikirja XXXVIII, Helsinki: Äidinkielen Opettajain Liitto, 43-55.

HORNBERGER, Nancy H. (1991). Extending enrichment bilingual education: Revisiting typologies and redirecting policy. In García (Ed.), 215-234.

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

JONIETZ, Patricia L. & HARRIS, D. (Eds.) (1991). **World Yearbook of Education 1991: International Schools and International Education**. London: Kogan Page.

JORDAN, Deirdre (1988). Rights and claims of indigenous people: Education and the reclaiming of identity. In Skutnabb-Kangas & Cummins (Eds.), 189-222.

KĀRETU, Timoti (1994). Māori language rights in New Zealand. In Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson (Eds.), 209-218.

KRAG, Helen & YUKHNEVA, Natalia (Eds.) (1991). **The Leningrad Minority Rights Conference. Papers**. Copenhagen: The Minority Rights Group in Denmark.

LAMBERT, Wallace E. & TUCKER, Richard G. (1972). **Bilingual Education of Children. The St.Lambert Experiment**, Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

LEONTIEV, Alexei A. (1995). Multilingualism for all - Russians? In Skutnabb-Kangas (Ed.), 199-214.

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

LINDHOLM, Kathryn J. (1992b). Relationship Between Language Proficiency, Academic Achievement and Cognition: Outcomes from Bilingual/Immersion Programs, Paper presented at the National Association for Bilingual Education Conference, Albuquerque, New Mexico, January 1992.

LINDHOLM, Kathryn J. & FAIRCHILD, Halford H. (1989). **Evaluation of an "exemplary" Bilingual Immersion Program**, Technical Report No 13, Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Center for Language Education and Research.

LO BIANCO, Joseph (1990). Making Language policy: Australia's Experience, in Baldauf & Luke (eds.), 47-79.

MAGGA, Ole Henrik (1994). The Sámi Language Act. In Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson (Eds.), 219-233.

McLAUGHLIN, Daniel (1992). **When literacy empowers. Navajo language in print**. Albuquerque; University of New Mexico Press.

McLAUGHLIN, Daniel & TIERNEY, William G. (Eds.) (1993). **Naming silenced lives: personal narratives and the process of educational change**. New York: Routledge.

Minority Rights Group (Ed.) (1994). **Education Rights and Minorities**. London: Minority Rights Group.

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

MOHANTY, Ajit K. (1987). Social psychological aspects of assimilation/integration in a language contact situation. Paper presented in the thematic panel on Language and National Integration, XII Indian Social Science Congress, Mysore, India.

MOHANTY, Ajit K. (1994). **Bilingualism in a Multilingual Society**. Psychosocial and Pedagogical Implications. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.

NIETO, Sonia (1992). **Affirming diversity. The sociopolitical context of multicultural education**. New York & London: Longman.

NGŨGĨ, wa Thiong'o (1987). **Decolonising the mind. The politics of language in African literature**. London: James Currey.

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

PADILLA, Raymond V. & BENAVIDES, Alfredo H. (1992). **Critical Perspectives on Bilingual Education Research**, Tempe, Arizona: Bilingual Press/Editorial Bilingüe.

PATTANAYAK, Debi Prasanna (1984). Language policies in multilingual states. In Gonzales, A. (Ed.) **Panagani. Language planning, implementation and evaluation**. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines. (quoted in Mohanty 1994, 166).

PATTANAYAK, Debi Prasanna (1988). Monolingual myopia and the petals of the Indian lotus: do many languages

divide or unite a nation? In Skutnabb-Kangas & Cummins (Eds), 379-389.

PATTANAYAK, Debi Prasanna (1992). Mothertongue awareness. Lecture given at Cambridge University, U.K., September 1992, manuscript.

PEURA, Markku & SKUTNABB-KANGAS, Tove (Eds.) (1994). "**Man kan vara tvåländare också." Om sverigefinnarnas väg från tystnad till kamp**, ("You can be bicountrial too". The road of the Sweden Finnish minority from silence to struggle), Stockholm: Sverigefinländarnas arkiv.

PHILLIPS, Alan (1994). Introduction. In Eide (1994), 5-8.

PHILLIPSON, Robert (1992). **Linguistic Imperialism**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

PHILLIPSON, Robert (1994). English language spread policy. **International Journal of the Sociology of Language**, 107, 7-24.

PHILLIPSON, Robert, KELLERMAN, Eric, SELINKER, Larry, SHARWOOD SMITH, Mike & SWAIN, Merrill (Eds.) (1991). **Foreign/Second Language Pedagogy Research: a commemorative volume for Claus Faerch**. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

PHILLIPSON, Robert, RANNUT, Mart & SKUTNABB-KANGAS, Tove (1994). Introduction. In Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson (Eds.), 1-22.

PHILLIPSON, Robert & SKUTNABB-KANGAS, Tove (1994). English, panacea or pandemic. **English only? in Europe/in Europa/en Europe, Sociolinguistica** 9, International Yearbook of European Sociolinguistics, 73-87.

RAMIREZ, J.D., YUEN, S.D. & RAMEY, D.R. (1991a). **Executive Summary: Final report: Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs for language-minority children, Submitted to the U.S.Department of Education**, San Mateo: Aguirre International.

RAMIREZ, J. David, PASTA, David J., YUEN, Sandra D., BILLINGS, David K. & RAMEY, Dena R. (1991b). **Longitudinal study of structured immersion strategy, early-exit, and late-exit bilingual education programs for language minority children (Vols. 1-2)**. San Mateo, CA: Aguirre International.

RANNUT, Ülle (1992). **Keelekümblus**, Tallinn: Keeleameti toimetised nr 3.

RANNUT, Mart (1994). Beyond linguistic policy: the Soviet Union versus Estonia, in Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson (Eds.), 179-208.

RANNUT, Mart & RANNUT, Ülle (1995). Bilingualism - a step towards monolingualism or multilingualism? In Skutnabb-Kangas (Ed.), 183-198.

ROSENBERG, Thomas (1994). **Svenskfinlands sönderfall. Texter till minnet av ett folk**. (The disintegration of Swedish Finland. Texts in rememberance of a people). Vasa: Institutet för finlandssvensk samhällsforskning.

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

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

Silence is killing them. Annual report 1993, "On the Situation of Human Rights in Northern Kurdistan and the Kurds in Turkey" (1994). Bremen: International Association for Human Rights in Kurdistan.

SKUTNABB-KANGAS, Tove (1987). **Are the Finns in Sweden an Ethnic Minority? Finnish Parents Talk about Finland and Sweden**, Working Paper 1, Research Project The Education of The Finnish Minority in Sweden, Roskilde: Roskilde Universitetscenter.

SKUTNABB-KANGAS, Tove (1988). Multilingualism and the education of minority children, in Skutnabb-Kangas and Cummins (Eds.), 9-44.

SKUTNABB-KANGAS, Tove (1990a). **Language, literacy and minorities**, London: Minority Rights Group.

SKUTNABB-KANGAS, Tove (1990b). Legitimating or delegitimating new forms of racism - the role of researchers. In Gorter et al. (Eds.), 77-100.

SKUTNABB-KANGAS, Tove (1991a). Bicultural Competence and Strategies for Negotiating Ethnic Identity. In Phillipson et al. (Eds.), 307-332.

SKUTNABB-KANGAS, Tove (1991b). Swedish strategies to prevent integration and national ethnic minorities. In García (Ed.), 25-42.

SKUTNABB-KANGAS, Tove (1995). Introduction, i Skutnabb-Kangas (Ed.), 7-20.

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

SKUTNABB-KANGAS, Tove (1996b). The colonial legacy in educational language planning in Scandinavia - from

Skutnabb-Kangas

migrant labour to a national ethnic minority? **International Journal of the Sociology of Language**. 1996. vol. 118. Dua, Hans (Ed.). Language Planning and Political Theory, 81-106.

SKUTNABB-KANGAS, Tove (1996c). Language and Self-Determination. In Clark, Donald & Williamson, Robert (eds.). **Self-Determination: International Perspectives**. London: The Macmillan Press and New York: St.Martin's Press, 124-140.

SKUTNABB-KANGAS, Tove (Ed.) (1995). **Multilingualism for All**. Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger.

SKUTNABB-KANGAS, Tove & BUCAK, Sertaç (1994). Killing a mother tongue - how the Kurds are deprived of linguistic human rights, in Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson (Eds.), 347-370.

SKUTNABB-KANGAS, Tove & GARCÍA, Ofelia (1995). Multilingualism for All - General Principles?, i Skutnabb-Kangas (Ed.), 221-256.

SKUTNABB-KANGAS, Tove & PHILLIPSON, Robert (1989). **Wanted! Linguistic Human Rights**, Roskilde: Roskilde University, ROLIG-papir 44.

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

SKUTNABB-KANGAS, Tove & CUMMINS, Jim (Eds.) (1988). **Minority Education: from Shame to Struggle**, Cledecon: Multilingual Matters.

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.

SMOLICZ, J.J. (1986). National Language Policy in the Philippines. In Spolsky (Ed.), 96-116.

SPOLSKY, Bernard (Ed.) (1986). **Language and education in multilingual settings**, Clevedon/Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

SPOLSKY, Bernard & COOPER, Robert (Eds.) (1977). **Frontiers of Bilingual Education**. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

STAIRS, Arlene (1988). Beyond cultural inclusion. An Inuit example of indigenous education development, in Skutnabb-Kangas and Cummins (Eds.), 308-327.

STAVENHAGEN, Rodolfo (1988). Old and New Racism in Europe. In **New Expressions of Racism. Growing Areas of Conflict in Europe**, SIM Special No. 7, Utrecht: Netherlands Institute of Human Rights, 23-30.

STAVENHAGEN, Rodolfo (1990). **The Ethnic Question. Conflicts, Development, and Human Rights**, Tokyo: United Nations University Press.

SWAIN, Merrill and LAPKIN, Sharon (1982). **Evaluating Bilingual Education: A Canadian Case Study**, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

SWAIN, Merrill, LAPKIN, Sharon, ROWEN, Norman, HART, Doug (1990). The Role of Mother Tongue Literacy in Third Language Learning, **VOX, The Journal of the Australian Advisory Council on Languages and Multicultural Education**, 4, 111-121.

TAYLOR, Shelley K. (1993). Trilingualism by design?: Contextual factors in the educational experience of Mi'kmaq pupils in French Immersion. Invited Paper presented at **Lancaster University Conference on Bilingual Classroom Discourse, July 1993,** Lancaster: Lancaster University, Centre for Language in Social Life.

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

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

TRUCHOT, Claude (1994). La France, l'anglais, le français et l'Europe, **Sociolinguistica** 8, 15-25.

TSUDA, Yukio (1994). The Diffusion of English: Its Impact on Culture and Communication. **Keio Communication Review** 16, 49-61.

TUCKER, Richard G., OTANES, Fe T. & SIBANES, B.P. (1970). An Alternate Days Appro

---

i   For more on linguistic human rights, see especially Skutnabb-Kangas (in press), Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson 1989, 1994 and de Varennes 1996.

ii   Related to this is also the belief that bilingualism is causally connected to (other) psychological, educational or economic deficiencies and disasters. For refuting this type of claim, see, e.g. references to Corson, Cummins, Fishman, García, Hakuta, Nieto, Pattanayak, Skutnabb-Kangas, in the bibliography.

iii   I am here building further on Colin Baker's distinction between weak and strong models of multilingual education - for these and typologies of bilingual education, see especially Baker 1993, 153ff). See also the typologies in Skutnabb-Kangas 1984, chapter 6, which, in turn, Baker has developed further.

iv   See references to Baetens Beardsmore (especially 1995) in the bibliography for descriptions and

Skutnabb-Kangas

evaluations of these schools.

v   For the concepts of linguistic & societal goals, especially when these do not tally with the officially expressed goals which sometimes function as a smokescreen, in the best doubletalk way, see Skutnabb-Kangas 1988, 1991b, 1996b, and the introduction and final comments by the editors in Skutnabb-Kangas & Cummins (eds.) 1988.

vi   Early, late or partial immersion programmes which have been studied and reported exist in many countries, e.g. Australia (e.g. Clyne (Ed.) 1986), Canada (e.g. Genesee 1976, 1985, 1987, Lambert & Tucker 1972, Swain & Lapkin 1982), Catalunya (e.g. Artigal 1995), Finland (e.g. Helle 1995), Hungary (e.g. Duff, 1991), USA. Many countries are trying them out but without much research follow-up, others are planning them (e.g. Estonia, see (Ülle) Rannut 1992). For studies on immersion programmes in other countries, see the references in Artigal 1995, Cummins 1995 and Genesee 1987.

vii   See e.g. Taylor 1993, on indigenous Mi'kmaq children in Canadian French immersion. See also Swain et al. 1990.

viii   Unless something else is clearly indicated, I use "L2" or "**second** language" to mean the language which is the second in the order of learning for the student (**as opposed to** the **first** language or a third or fourth language). A second language in this sense may or may not be a language which is not the student's mother tongue but which the student can hear and use in the immediate environment outside the home, one of the other common ways of defining a second language. Here the second language is posited **as opposed to** a **foreign** language which one does not use daily in the environment.

ix   See Dolson & Lindholm 1995 for an excellent overview of the goals, set-up and preliminary results of these programmes, and Christian 1994, Christian & Mahrer 1992, 1993 and Christian & Montone 1994 for detailed yearly overviews and some comparisons of existing programmes. See also references to Lindholm in the bibliography for some of the evaluations.

x   See Curtis 1988 for a description of an alternate days programme, from its inception to its preliminary but temporary death - it functions in Calistoga again. See also Tucker et al. 1970 for an early description of this type of programme, in the Philippines.

xi   This is recognized by e.g. the Estonian regulations on education where the Russian-speakers can even in the future have all of their education, including secondary schools, through the medium of Russian if they so wish, and study Estonian as a second language - see e.g. Rannut & Rannut 1995. It is important to note this because of the misinformation about the Baltic countries, common in some Russian propaganda, even at the highest level.

xii   See articles in Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson (Eds.) 1994, for analyses and examples; see also Minority Rights Group (Ed.) 1994.

xiii   See e.g. Skutnabb-Kangas 1987 and articles in Peura & Skutnabb-Kangas (Eds.) 1994, for examples of Finnish migrant minority children in maintenance programmes in Sweden where the Finnish working class migrant minority children, after 9 years of Finnish-medium classes, score somewhat better than Swedish middle class children in parallel classes in the same schools in a Swedish language test and almost as well as Finnish children in Finland in a Finnish language test; see also Eriksson 1994. Ethnic mother-tongue schools in the United States are of this type; see Fishman 1980, García 1988, García and Otheguy 1988.

xiv   This is true in Australia and in the U.S. and, in most cases, European contexts. In India, the right to use the mother tongue as a medium of education is enshrined in the constitution and school regulations, but the formulations are vague enough to allow for the right to be sidestepped (see Bhat 1993 for an excellent legal overview and comparison with Canada).

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

xvi   For more on how this is done, see García 1993; for a thorough criticism of the model and the ideologies behind it, see Mohanty 1994. This model fits the United Nation's old definition of linguistic genocide - see Skutnabb-Kangas 1996a, b, forthcoming.

xvii   Most International Schools are not part of bilingual/multilingual education in the classical sense of the term, though, because they only use one language of instruction.

xviii   See e.g. Obura 1986, Rubagumya 1991, Rubagumya (Ed.) 1990, for some examples. As Birgit Brock-Utne observes, "[I]n many of the African countries the majority language is treated in a way that minority languages are

treated in the industrialized world" (1993, 39).

xix   For more on different aims of multilingual education, see, e.g. Baker 1993; Ferguson, Houghton and Wells 1977; Fishman 1976; Hornberger 1991; Lo Bianco 1990; Mohanty 1994.

xx   Ajit K. Mohanty summarizes his extensive empirical studies in India, studies where many of the methodological shortcomings of much of Western research into the relationship between bilingualism and cognition have been corrected for, as follows: "... bilingualism or the ability to communicate in two linguistic codes fosters metalinguistic and metacognitive development which makes them [the Kond children studied] cognitively more flexible, endows them with a capacity to control their own cognitive processes more effectively, gives them a better analytic and objective orientation and enhances their sensitivity to communicative input." (Mohanty 1994, 81).

xxi   See also Skutnabb-Kangas & García 1995 for a more elaborated version.

xxii   See e.g. Lo Bianco 1990.

xxiii   See also the reflections on and criticisms of the European Schools model in the articles in Skutnabb-Kangas (Ed.) 1995.

xxiv   I define "minorities" and "minority languages" in terms of power not numbers. See Andrýsek 1989, Capotorti 1979 and Thornberry 1991 on legal human rights definitions, and Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson 1994 on their specific applicability to linguistic minorities.

xxv   See Alfredsson 1991; Phillipson, Rannut & Skutnabb-Kangas 1994; Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson 1994; de Varennes 1996, for these rights and Skutnabb-Kangas, in press, for criticism.

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

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

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

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

xxvii   This is the threefold relationship within which we exist, as Debi Pattanayak so beautifully shows in relation to our mother tongues (1992).

xxviii   See e.g. nr. 8, 1994, of the journal **Sociolinguistica**, a thematic number called **English only? in Europe/in Europe/en Europe**, and especially the articles by Ammon, Fishman, Truchot and Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas.

xxix   See e.g. Branson & Miller 1993, 1994, the Newsletter of the World Federation of the Deaf and articles in Ahlgren & Hyltenstam (Eds.) 1994.

xxx   See e.g. Skutnabb-Kangas 1996b.

xxxi   See Skutnabb-Kangas 1996c.

Skutnabb-Kangas