

263. MLE concepts, goals, needs and expense: English for all or achieving justice?

Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Robert Phillipson, Minati Panda, Ajit Mohanty

In Mohanty, Ajit, Panda, Minati, Phillipson, Robert, Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (eds) (2009). *Multilingual Education for Social Justice: Globalising the Local*. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan, 313-334. Also in Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove, Phillipson, Robert, Mohanty, Ajit and Panda, Minati (eds). *Social Justice through Multilingual Education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 320-344

This volume has critiqued some practices and theories in multilingual education and presented studies of successful innovation and empowerment. The concluding chapter states that Education For All is a mantra, not reality. It stresses the need for stringency in the concepts or labels used in the area of multilingual education. It draws together some of the significant insights from earlier chapters and other research evidence, including critical Indigenous pedagogy, and relates educational policy to broader social processes. One of them is the role of English worldwide, especially as a medium of education, the issue of popular demand for English, the language that is seen as a panacea. We also provide one possible model for analysing the extent to which multilingual education facilitates structural incorporation without cultural assimilation. Some basic issues around the right to education and Linguistic Human Rights are touched upon. Finally the chapter considers MLE in relation to meeting basic needs and combating poverty, including issues of cost.

Education for all: a long way from mantra to reality

Many millions of people in China and India have succeeded in hoisting themselves out of poverty while hundreds of millions remain there. However the globalising economies have failed to deliver successfully the 'Education For All' that political leaders in theory are committed to. The current global economy has in no way bridged the substantial gap between global haves and have-nots. One third of the world's population still live below subsistence levels - the 'wretched of the earth', in Franz Fanon's words in a pioneer study of colonialism - and how a more just world order might be established (1963).

Some of the main causes of educational failure in multilingual societies were correctly diagnosed a century ago in British India (see Curzon as quoted in Skutnabb-Kangas 2009, this volume). UNESCO's 1953 book *The use of the vernacular languages in education* included firm recommendations, written by experts, on how multilingual education can best be organized. Similar informed consultations went into drafting UNESCO's Education position paper in 2003, *Education in a multilingual world*. Alas, a review of achievements in Africa concludes that '[W]e are not making any progress at all' (Alexander 2006: 9); 'most conference resolutions were no more than a recycling exercise' (Bamgbose 2001, quoted in Alexander 2006: 10); 'these propositions had been enunciated in one conference after another since the early 1980s' (2006: 11); 'since the adoption of the OAU [Organisation for African Unity] Charter in 1963, every major conference of African cultural experts and political leaders had solemnly intoned the commitment of the political leadership of

the continent to the development and powerful use of the African languages without any serious attempt at implementing the relevant resolutions' (2006: 11). This has led to 'the palpable failure of virtually all post-colonial educational systems on the continent' (2006: 16).

Is this book, then, yet another academic 'recycling exercise' of the kind that some African scholars deplore? Not so. It is not merely a set of authorised language policy statements that may or may not be implemented. It brings together critical scholarly evidence of theories and activities in a range of contexts worldwide that are of general, even universal relevance. The critique of much of what has been done, both theories and practices, is also self-criticism; the book represents theoretical innovation but also description of theoretically founded and positive new practices.

MLE and other concepts: use, misuse, mislabelling

One step in developing MLE further in a more glocalised direction (enriching more general 'global' theories through local contexts) must be to compare how various central concepts are used in different parts of the world and in different disciplines. When stressing the need to clarify concepts in the area of bilingual education, Skutnabb-Kangas and McCarty wrote (2008: 3):

The concepts we use are almost never neutral. In contested arenas such as bilingual education, words and concepts frame and construct the phenomena under discussion, making some persons and groups visible, others invisible; some the unmarked norm, others marked and negative. Choice of language can minoritise or distort some individuals, groups, phenomena, and relations while majoritising and glorifying others. Concepts also can be defined in ways that hide, expose, rationalize, or question power relations.

Because concepts and terms develop historically, the same concept may have several definitions. For example, 'language immersion' has historically been associated with French-Canadian immersion for middle-class Anglophones (Cummins and Swain 1986; Lambert and Tucker 1986). The term was misleadingly appropriated by U.S. policymakers to describe submersion programmes (called "structured immersion"), despite protest from the concept's originator (Lambert 1984: 26-27). Recently the term has taken on new meaning in Indigenous-language immersion programmes to revitalize endangered Indigenous languages (Bear Nicholas 2005; Hinton and Hale 2001; Hinton et al. 2002). The ideological, historical, epistemic, and empirical bases for these varied uses of "immersion" are distinct, as are program practices.

Skutnabb-Kangas and McCarty also give other reasons for the need to 'unpack and define key concepts' (3-4):

A further reason for interrogating concepts is the presence of multiple paradigms. For example, literacy can be defined as the ability to read and write. Yet this definition masks two different paradigms informing literacy research and practice. *Autonomous* views characterize literacy as abstract, neutral, and independent from the social context and language users (Ong 1982). *Ideological* views characterize literacy as "socially and historically situated, fluid, multiple, and power-linked"

(McCarty 2005: xvii-xviii; Street 1984, 2001). Educationally, an autonomous view emphasizes discrete language skills, often taught through direct instruction and scripted phonics programs. An ideological view binds reading and writing to oracy, emphasizing the development of different literacies (and multiliteracies) for different purposes through meaningful social interaction and critical examination of authentic texts.

It is noteworthy that ‘literacy’ is officially defined in Zambia as the ability ‘to read and write in English’ (Williams 2006: 17). In Malawi it is defined as the ability ‘to read and write’ (25).

Theoretical concepts and categories are temporally embedded to begin with; they continue to evolve through the flow of knowledge, practices, and analytical processes. Those in the field of MLE are no exceptions. The models and concepts in the field of bilingualism/multilingualism and BE/MLE (such as ‘balanced’/additive/subtractive bilingualism) which proved to be extremely powerful explanatory tools are now becoming inadequate for dealing with linguistic heterogeneity and complexity around the globe. Even the common categorical labels such as monolingualism, bilingualism, multilingualism are being increasingly problematised. Pittman (2008) summarises some of the literature on trilingualism where many researchers experience a need for new theories to explain multilingualism because they see it as fundamentally different from bilingualism. Some of the chapters in this volume point to the fluidity of linguistic boundaries, questioning the concept of ‘a language’ and the psycholinguistic reality of notions like monolingualism (e.g. Agnihotri 2009, this volume).

As the field of BE/MLE research gets enriched by fresh inputs from multilingual societies, in Asia and Africa in particular, it becomes quite clear that monolingualism as a set of codified rules abstracted from the diversity of how a language is actually used is probably rare in oral forms of communication. Heugh (2009, this volume) describes the ‘multilayered and partially connected language chains’ (Fardon and Furniss 1994: 4) used among the communities for communication as the *de facto* lingua franca in the African situation. Garcia (2009a, this volume) describes dynamic classroom multilingual discourse as ‘translanguaging’ with potential implications for pedagogical practices in what is ostensibly monolingual education.

However, while applications of such ideas to the oral practices of children, people and communities in multilingual settings may be less problematic, written text in schools still remains mostly monolingual all over the world regardless of societal multilingualism. Thus, the notion of dynamic multilingualism gets blurred as one moves from oral to written classroom practices. Since the written form must necessarily be a major focus in the classroom, the notion of dynamic multilingualism remains problematic as a pedagogical concept. As long as ‘imposed normativity is a feature of most institutions, and the education system is generally a case in point ... a system of ideological reproduction’ (Blommaert 2008: 428), children who translanguage in writing in official situations lose their voice because [i]nstitutions have the tendency to “freeze” the conditions for voice: unless you speak or write *in this particular way*, you will not be heard or read’ (2008: 428; emphasis in the original).

Even within *one* language, schools need to make children aware of when they engage in what Blommaert (2008: 432) calls ‘cross-register transfer’ (for instance, using a low-status expression in formal speech, or vice versa). In multilingual situations, children need to be aware of which parts of their multilingual resources to use in which situations. This metalinguistic awareness may develop in more complex ways when a greater number of languages is added. This also increases the potential for adding more benefits that high-level metalinguistic awareness can enhance (e.g. Mohanty 1995), provided teachers know how to support this awareness. As the discussion of the development of scientific concepts below also makes clear, translanguaging can not in any way substitute for good mother-tongue-based MLE where the teachers know and use the children’s first language(s).

Furthermore, language labels are themselves monolingual not just as linguistic categories but also as psychological categories, which means that many people and communities like to think of their language as ‘a language’ and, in the case of multilinguals, their languages as several such forms of ‘a language’. Thus, any attempt to de-emphasize that reality may be problematic, particularly when such labels are also very significant identity tags, as in the case of dominated linguistic minorities all over the world.

Thus it is necessary to remind ourselves that when dealing with the real world of languages, the theoretical concepts and categories are prone to be constantly challenged in light of more and more complex linguistic contexts, especially in urban areas. The field of bilingualism itself evolved with the arrival of ‘new’ concepts like multilingualism, multilinguality, and plurilingualism. When moving to bilingual and, especially, multilingual education, as contrasted with monolingual education, one also notices a comparable fuzziness and tentativeness of the concepts. This is very true in the endorsement of multilingualism and plurilingualism by the European Union. Concepts/categories in BE/MLE have very different implications for classroom practices. Garcia (2009a, this volume) claims that prestigious programmes of bilingual education (immersion/maintenance) tend to compartmentalize the languages as very distinct and autonomous entities that cannot meet the requirements of heteroglossic multilingual societies. BE/MLE must go beyond just using multiple languages in education. Benson (2009, this volume) sees many early models and categories of BE/MLE as misleading when they are extended to contexts where they do not fit and shows how strongly entrenched notions like immersion are used and abused. In view of the problems encountered, Benson offers the practical suggestion to flexibly adapt context-sensitive learning principles rather than blindly adhering to ‘Models’.

It is also important to see our concepts in broader and literally more ‘global’ historical perspective. For instance democracy is often thought of in purely western terms, as though patented in ancient Greece, and the idea that democracy is a reality in all western countries is simply untrue. Contact between China, India and Arabia flourished for two millennia, with translations between Chinese, Arabic and Sanskrit in many scholarly fields (science, mathematics, literature, linguistics, architecture, medicine and music), as explained by Amartya Sen, a winner of the Nobel Prize for Economics, with a distinguished career at Cambridge and Harvard, and passionately committed to his mother tongue, Bengali:

In so far as public reasoning is central to democracy . . . , parts of the global roots of democracy can indeed be traced back to the tradition of public discussion that received much encouragement in both India and China (and also in Japan, Korea and elsewhere), from the dialogic commitment to Buddhist organization. . . . The first printed book in the world with a date (corresponding to 868 CE), which was the Chinese translation of a Sanskrit treatise, the so-called “Diamond Sutra” (Kumārajīva had translated it in 402 CE), carried the remarkable motivational explanation: “for universal free distribution” (Sen 2005: 164, 182-3).

The pre-eminence of Western science, in our unstable, inequitable, militarised world, is recent, and legitimated as though ‘knowledge societies’ are a late capitalist invention:

Different cultures are thus interpreted in ways that reinforce the political conviction that Western civilization is somehow the main, perhaps the only, source of rationalistic and liberal ideas – among them analytical scrutiny, open debate, political tolerance and agreement to differ. . . . science and evidence, liberty and tolerance, and of course rights and justice. [. . .] Once we recognize that many ideas that are taken to be quintessentially Western have also flourished in other civilizations, we also see that these ideas are not as culture-specific as is sometimes claimed (Sen, 2005: 285, 287).

With the relativity of concepts in mind, we now move to some of the broader prerequisites for working towards the kind of MLE Plus education advocated in this volume. We start with a discussion about the role of English worldwide, English as the big bad wolf/tiger.

English as the big bad wolf

The prevalent use of European languages worldwide, and especially English, in high-prestige domains has major implications, for democracy, a well-informed public sphere and population, and social cohesion. The prominence given to English is problematical wherever local languages are not *also* used, especially in education. This applies in Europeanised settler countries worldwide (like Canada and Peru, Bear Nicholas 2009, Perez 2009, both this volume). It also holds for former colonies, which as independent countries have generally maintained English as the language of power and privilege. It increasingly also holds in continental Europe, where English is used not only in international links but also within countries in several key domains (Phillipson 2009a, this volume). Many factors contribute to the glamorous pull of English, not least the ubiquitous presence of Hollywood, the massively influential global advertising industry, and the space accorded to English on school time-tables.

It is true that people wish to learn English, and that governments can see pragmatic and economic reasons for facilitating this in education. However, we would claim that whenever English is not the mother tongue, its learning should be promoted through linguistically and culturally appropriate education, meaning MLE for minority groups, and as a foreign language elsewhere. In both cases this represents the addition of English to one’s repertoire of language competence. High levels of competence in English can be achieved without sacrificing competence in other languages. In fact

this is precisely what is achieved in some continental European countries, especially the Nordic countries and the Netherlands, where the learning of English as a foreign language succeeds without English being a medium of instruction at any level of basic education. It is therefore false to assume that education systems ought to introduce English ever earlier as the medium of instruction or even as a foreign language.

The age variable is merely one among several relevant factors. European scholars from five countries have summarised the criteria that need to be met for any early foreign language learning to succeed: adequate funding and infrastructure, parental involvement, continuity through the various levels of schooling, adequate time, teacher training, sensitivity to learners with different degrees of success, appropriate pedagogy for each age group (summarised in Phillipson 2003: 98). The recommendations stress that all these conditions need to be addressed before innovation is attempted.

Introducing English as a medium of instruction ever earlier in primary education worldwide

- may well be subtractive in multilingual settings, leading to the marginalisation, neglect and dispossession of national languages;
- is an elite project that has overt agendas (the myth of ‘development’, the demands of globalisation, World Bank strategies) and covert agendas (economic interests, dependency on western norms and expertise);
- contributes to historical amnesia in postcolonial education, obliterating awareness of the evolution and use of local languages, for instance African languages (Heugh 2009, this volume, who refers to this as revisionism) or Indian languages when children attend exclusively English-medium schools;
- reflects misunderstanding of the nature of learning in several languages, and often misuse of western bilingual education principles, terms and models;
- an excessive focus on English leads to a false focus and structure in higher education, as in many former colonies, and to an absence of good teacher training for marginalised languages (cf. Bear Nicholas 2009, this volume);
- misleads parents into believing that formal education means education in English, a pernicious backwash effect (Benson 2009, Heugh 2009, both this volume).

There is therefore a major challenge to ensure that parents are better informed about multilingual learning, and what will lead to the best educational results. The faith that an early start in English means good education and ensures success in life is a pernicious myth.

Warnings against an excessive use of English are not new. Rabindranath Tagore, winner of the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1913, and equally proficient in English and Bengali, stressed the importance of good MLE. It is a refrain in the writings of Gandhi and Nehru, who articulated the case for Indian independence and a viable modern state. In Africa the case for MLE has been made most strongly by creative writers like Ngũgĩ and by sociolinguists and educators (references in Benson 2009, and Heugh 2009, both this volume). It is a leitmotiv in the work of scholars who see the maintenance of the dominance of English as serving western imperialist interests (Phillipson 1992, Skutnabb-Kangas 2000). The European Union is in principle committed to strengthening multilingualism at all levels of European education systems, but the reality is that English is being strengthened at the expense of other

languages by the policies that the EU endorses in higher education (Phillipson 2006), by the working practices of the EU institutions, and education systems in member states that are not geared to creating viable MLE. There is in virtually all education systems worldwide an absence of explicit language policies for ensuring multilingualism.

Seeking to constrain English should not be understood as meaning that people have anything 'against' the language English, which, of course, provides access to an infinite range of information, positions of influence, and material well-being. What needs to be resisted and counteracted is policies that privilege English at the expense of other languages. English opens doors, yes, but it closes others. English is an open sesame for some people and some purposes, but it serves to condemn others to poverty and oblivion. A lot of the advocacy in favour of English is one-sided misrepresentation. This is clearly visible in Gordon Brown's plan, announced on the occasion of his first visit as Prime Minister of the UK to China and India in February 2008, to make British English (and not American English or any other form of English) the global language of 'choice', with the para-statal British Council charged with spearheading this operation, a logical continuation of their activities since the 1950s. A key constituent of the new British policy is a plan for the British to train literally millions of English language teachers in India and China. Implementing Brown's plan (which appears to have been announced without prior consultation with the Chinese or the Indians!) has, as the British press noted, billion pound implications for Britain because of the importance for the British economy of the English language industry (reference works, textbooks, university degrees for 'international' students, teacher training expertise, private language schools, educational know-how et al, Phillipson 1992, <<http://www.britishcouncil.org>>). The rhetoric of 'choice' is pure spin in a world in which 'choice' is as free as the 'free' market. English is the leading language of the unfree neoliberal market, and the new imperialism (Harvey 2005). Linguistic neoimperialism, and whether English functions as a *lingua franca* or *lingua frankensteinia*, are explored in Phillipson 2006, 2008a, 2008b, and 2009b.

Solid analysis but little change

A diagnosis similar to the African scepticism of Alexander (2006) and others can be made for many Asian contexts. The failures and challenges in India are laid bare in several contributions to this volume. The complexity of language education issues is explored insightfully in Lin and Martin's *Decolonisation, globalisation: Language-in-education policy and practice* (2005, reviewed in Phillipson 2007b) and in Tsui and Tollefson's *Language policy, culture, and identity in Asian contexts* (2007), with exemplification from many countries. The integration of language with cultural and economic globalisation is revealingly explored in Rassool's *Global issues in language, education and development* (2007). The case study of Pakistan in the book (Rassool and Mansoor 2007: 218-241) confirms Tariq Rahman's analyses (1998) and shows that the use of English as the sole medium of higher education (for only 2.63% of the population) ensures the cultural alienation of the elite from the rest of the population. 'The global cultural economy is interdependent and, despite the dominant position occupied by English, in practice, it has an organically interactive multilingual base. A narrow monolingual nationalism [a reference to Urdu], an under-resourced

educational system as well as unequal access to English as international lingua franca, therefore, is counter-productive to national growth.’ (ibid., 240).

Thiru Kandiah of Sri Lanka sees countries in the postcolonial world as trapped in a major contradiction. On the one hand, postcolonial countries need the ‘indispensable global medium’ for pragmatic purposes, even for survival in the global economy: it is a *panacea* for the privileged. On the other there is the fact that the medium – English – is not culturally or ideologically neutral, far from it, so that its users run the ‘apparently unavoidable risk of co-option, of acquiescing in the negation of their own understandings of reality and in the accompanying denial or even subversion of their own interests’ (Kandiah 2001: 112): a *pandemic* (Phillipson in press). Kandiah (ibid.) sees the need in relation to English for ‘interrogating its formulations of reality, intervening in its modes of understanding, holding off its normalising tendencies, challenging its hegemonic designs and divesting it of the co-optive power which would render it a reproducing discourse’. His concern related exclusively to English, but his worries about hegemonic designs and co-option apply to any dominant language. What he advocates is authentic local projections of reality, and emancipatory action, as in the projects in India and Nepal presented in this volume.

Angel Lin from Hong Kong (2005) makes the methodological point that a ‘Periphery’ scholar should not merely take over ‘Centre’ epistemologies, and argues that our research approaches risk being self-referential - purely ‘academic’ - and lack self-reflection. She demonstrates the value of critical discourse analysis in unmasking the legitimization of an inequitable social structure: proficiency in English remains an elusive goal for the many in postcolonial contexts, but the current education system is functional for the local elite and for global commerce. Lin’s worry about choice of appropriate methodology in education holds for all scholars, whether from Centre or Periphery (Heugh 2009, Skutnabb-Kangas 2009, both this volume). Her analysis of the limitations of much ‘research’ echoes the denunciation of unreflective positivism and academic exhibitionism by one of the key founders of social science research, Max Weber, a century ago (see Kim 2007: 130-131).

We need to relate these major cultural and epistemological considerations to societal goals, those of dominant and dominated groups. How is the place of dominated groups in society seen by both, and how has education been used to achieve these societal goals?

Agreement versus disagreement about future goals for Indigenous and tribal peoples and minorities

Schermerhorn (1970: 80-) has a useful typology of the collective goals of minoritiesⁱ and the extent to which a majority (or dominant group) in a countryⁱⁱ agrees or disagrees with them. In describing these goals, he distinguishes between two aspects of assimilation, the economic-structural (the alternatives being structural incorporation or autonomy) and the cultural (assimilation or pluralism). Social structure refers to ‘the set of crystallized social relationships which [the society’s] members have with each other which place them in groups, large or small, permanent or temporary, formally organized or unorganized, and which relate them to the major institutional activities of the society, such as economic and occupational life, marriage

and the family, education, government, and recreation' (Schermerhorn 1970: 80). The majority (dominant group) and the minority (subordinated group) can agree or disagree, partially or totally, with the collective goals for the subordinated group. If both groups want the same for the subordinated group in terms of both structure and culture, for instance structural incorporation (SI+) and cultural assimilation (CA+), meaning INCORPORATION at the structural level and ASSIMILATION at the cultural level, there is total agreement. If on the other hand the dominant group wants these two goals (SI+, CA+) for the subordinated group while the group itself does *not* want structural incorporation but wants structural AUTONOMY (SI-), and does *not* want cultural assimilation but cultural PLURALISM (CA-), there is a total disagreement. Partial agreement and disagreement are also possible. There are thus 16 possible outcomes (see Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukoma 1976: 3-4). Several of them are highly unlikely while some are very realistic. Before relating this typology to situations described in this volume, we present some examples.

US 'melting pot' ideology expects all citizens to adopt the American way of life and ideals, in order to become 'good Americans'. On the other hand, the democratic ideal demands that everyone should be given equal educational and economic opportunities. The official ideology of the majority thus represents cultural assimilation but structural incorporation. This mythical American Dream has always been about granting everybody a chance of structural incorporation into an economically and politically just democratic society (see below). But the price to be paid has also, despite some early tolerance of official multilingualism, been extremely clear: total cultural assimilation. Theodore Roosevelt (the USA president 1901-1909) wrote:

We must have but one flag. We must also have but one language. ... We *cannot tolerate any attempt to oppose or supplant the language and culture that has come down to us* from the builders of this Republic ... We call upon all loyal and unadulterated Americans to man the trenches against the enemy within our gates' (Roosevelt 1968; emphasis added).

Roosevelt also wrote in 1919, in a letter to the next president:

In the first place, we should insist that if the immigrant who comes here in good faith *becomes an American and assimilates himself* to us, he shall *be treated on an exact equality with everyone else*, for it is an outrage to discriminate against any such man because of creed, or birthplace, or origin. But this is predicated upon the person's becoming in every facet an American, and nothing but an American ... There can be no divided allegiance here. Any man who says he is an American, but something else also, isn't an American at all. We have room for but one flag, the American flag ... We have room for but one language here, and that is the English language ... and we have room for but one sole loyalty and that is a loyalty to the American people (quoted in Skutnabb-Kangas and Fernandes 2008: 55-56; emphasis added).

Some Indigenous/tribal peoples and minority groups in the USA may want to assimilate culturally, to give up their distinctive cultural features, including their languages and religions, but in general most do not want cultural assimilation. On the other hand, most do want access to goods and services and the institutional benefits of the "mainstream" society. This would be a case of agreement on structural

incorporation but disagreement on the need for cultural assimilation. In particular, if stress is laid on economic and occupational life, political participation and opportunities for a good education for the children, most Indigenous/tribal peoples and minorities globally want structural incorporation, but as the 25-year negotiations preceding the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples 2007 show, most do NOT want linguistic and cultural assimilation. If the dominant group agrees to this, it would be a case of consensus on the goals. This is unusual in today's world. An example would be Swedish-speakers in Finland, with one of the best minority protections in the world and full agreement, with both the (Finnish-speaking) majority and the minority agreeing on the goals: full incorporation politically, economically, and socially and on the labour market, but no cultural and linguistic assimilation:

In Finland the constitution guarantees the Swedish-speaking minority [5.8% of the population] the right to satisfy its linguistic and cultural needs on the same principles as Finnish-speakers. Both the majority and the minority agree about this, and the principle finds expression in, for instance, the large number of cultural institutions in the minority's own language. For example, Finland-Swedish children can be taught through the medium of their own language right through from Kindergarten to university degree level (Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa 1976: 4)ⁱⁱⁱ.

This total agreement might be an ideal situation for most Indigenous/tribal peoples and minorities. It thus involves two aspects. In cultural pluralism/integration the minority (or, as often is the case, subordinated group), can choose what and how much of its own languages and cultural traits it wants to maintain and develop in the integration process where it also learns and uses as much of the dominant group's language(s) and culture(s) as it chooses, and merges and develops further the resultant evolving hybridities. In full structural incorporation there is agreement that the minority/subordinated group has the same political rights to participate as the dominant group, the same educational opportunities (not only on paper but also in terms of outcomes – and this is where MLE is required), the same chances economically, e.g. on the labour market, and where there is social justice. This might also be the ideal situation in a more just world for all peoples, also in countries which in a numerical sense consist of linguistic 'minorities' only, with no group representing over 50% of the population. Of course, political and economic hierarchies make some of the peoples minorised, regardless of the numbers they represent. Some of the hierarchies are language-based and/or have linguistic consequences.

Trends, processes and variation in reaching consensus about multilingual just societies – possible futures

In reality, a long, dynamic, historical process, with continuing power struggles, usually precedes a consensus model like the Finnish one. The trends in different subordinated and dominant group situations vary considerably and may include a wide range of stages. Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa suggested^{iv} (1976: 6) that a 'typical' course of development might well be as follows (Table 19.1):

Insert Table 19.1 here

Now we can relate the typology and the stages to situations described in this volume. All statistics from the USA tell us that Indigenous peoples, African Americans and Spanish-speaking (immigrant) minority groups (e.g. García 2009b) suffer from the results of discrimination socially and economically (see Dunbar and Skutnabb-Kangas 2008 on these results). Indicators of the results of social injustice, including low levels of formal education among these groups, show that the promises of structural incorporation have not materialised for many groups. At the same time, the linguistic and cultural assimilation demands are still as harsh as in Roosevelt's formulations. Most Indigenous peoples in North America have lost their languages (see McCarty 2009, Bear Nicholas 2009, Taylor 2009, all this volume) and recent immigrants are more or less monolingual in English by the third generation. Many groups have paid the price (i.e. tried to assimilate) but have not, at the group level, got what was promised, even if many individuals and even some groups, especially from South Asia, have "succeeded" economically. There is revealing research by Eddie Williams (1998, 2006) that shows how education fails African children when there is an excessive concentration on English. This reinforces the analyses of Benson and Heugh (2009, this volume).

Williams studied basic education in Malawi (education in an African language, with English as a subject, for the first four years, then English-medium, with an African language as a subject) and Zambia (English-medium from day one; no African languages studied). He documents that the Malawi children in grade 5 do as well in tests of the English language, after one year of English-medium studies, as the Zambian children after 5 years of English-medium. None of them have the competence in English needed for using it as the teaching-learning language, but the Malawi children have a better chance of reaching the required competence. In addition, they are biliterate, and have learned some of the content in their own languages whereas the Zambian children cannot read or write any language well and have therefore missed most of the content teaching. Williams (2006) also reminds us that the medium of education is NOT a panacea – systemic political, economic and societal changes need to accompany changes of teaching language. In addition, teaching methods, teacher training and the entire organisation of schools has to be changed. These results echo results from immigrant minority education in many parts of the world.

Debate about whether the economic success that some groups may have achieved at the cost of being forced to assimilate has been worth it and whether there are alternatives, have not been widespread in the USA or Canada, or, for that matter, Africa, and has not led to large-scale minority organising around linguistic and cultural demands. This may still happen when people realise what the price that they have paid or are in the process of paying might mean.

Some groups/peoples in other countries have mobilised differently, starting with linguistic and cultural demands, as in Table 19.1 above. It is possible that some of them have achieved or are in the process of achieving more rights also in terms of structural incorporation than those who initially strove towards incorporation only, at the cost of language and culture (see. e.g. Aikio-Puoskari 2009, this volume, on the

Saami – see also the comparison of the relative success of strategies used by, respectively, the Deaf and the Saami in Skutnabb-Kangas and Aikio-Puoskari 2003). In many – but by no means all - Asian countries cultural and linguistic pluralism have been much more widely accepted and, in some of them (such as India and Nepal, see Agnihotri 2009, Jhingran 2009, Panda and Mohanty 2009, Hough et al. 2009, Yonjan-Tamang et al. 2009, all in this volume, Awasthi 2006) codified in constitutions and other legal texts. Here we can also see that Indigenous/tribal peoples and even many national linguistic minorities are excluded from social justice in the sense of structural incorporation. The structural inequalities are often discussed in addition to linguistic, ethnic and cultural characteristics or even only in terms of class/caste hierarchies which are often language-based or coincide with language-related characteristics, as the following example shows.

For many tribals in India, the formative foundations of social identity are their language, culture and ethnicity, which are often seen as one and the same thing. In a few languages like Saora, the same word is used for land, language and ethnicity. The conceptual distinction between these concepts was less sharp and sometimes non-existent among small tribal communities. Looking back at the history of small and large tribal protests and movements in India, one finds that more often than not, the tribals began their protest essentially for land. They did not want to lose their language, but language was definitely not an issue, since they did not collectively perceive it as a resource or a marker of identity or, at least, did not consider it at risk. Their collective protests were sporadically organised in time and space, and in small groups. Only when these led to big movements, as in the case of Bodos and Santhalis, were these three bases of identity conceptually distinguished by the leaders. But for the common people they were one and the same. Non-use of tribal languages in formal/official spaces like school was not construed by the speakers of that language as a process that may lead to loss of their own language and, therefore, their culture and some day their ethnicity, except where collective processes were strong. Therefore the demand for mother tongue based MLE is still weak among tribal parents. In a few states like Andhra Pradesh and Orissa, MLE was implemented in a few pilot schools because of decisions taken at the state bureaucratic level and not because the parents of the tribal children demanded it. However, one can say that many tribal parents have started noticing the benefits of MLE for their children in Orissa and Andhra and therefore have started lending emotional and moral support to these initiatives. They also started seeing language as a resource, a cultural capital. However, an offshoot of the kind of silence mentioned above was strengthening a popular view of the bureaucrats, researchers and educationists that the tribals do not want their children to be taught in their mother tongues in the early years of schooling. This is without doubt a wilful interpretation that is wrong, misleading and dangerous. It is damaging because it delays any kind of collective awareness among tribals of language, education and ethnicity through falsely signifying a mutually exclusive status for each of these three domains of (tribal) life.

Thus in many contexts worldwide Indigenous/tribal peoples and minorities live in societies which are organised so as to exclude them both from structural incorporation that might lead to more just societies socially, economically and politically, and from the right not to be discriminated against on the basis of their languages and cultures and to maintain and develop these, in addition to having access to additional languages and cultures, including the dominant ones. If we take this situation as reflecting the intentions of the dominant groups, regardless of the extent to which the

intention is overtly expressed (or even when the opposite is expressed in declarations and laws), what requires analysis is to what extent Indigenous/tribal peoples and minorities agree with these goals. One might safely assume that none of them agree with the goal of *not* having the right and opportunity to achieve full structural incorporation. The three main questions relating to this topic that the authors in our volume grapple with in various ways have to do with the following:

- 1) do Indigenous/tribal peoples want linguistic and cultural assimilation or not?
- 2) what is the role of MLE in reaching *both* goals (structural incorporation and linguistic and cultural pluralism) and how can this be achieved in various contexts?
- 3) to what extent do those who ‘want’ linguistic and cultural assimilation think that this is a necessary price to pay for structural incorporation? Do they believe that they have to choose between the two goals? Are they made to believe that it is a zero-sum game? To what extent do they know what the long-term consequences of their choices are, and is there in reality any choice?

One wonders what the future prospects are for the coming generations of Indigenous/tribal peoples, and of both national and immigrated minorities. How are elite parents in the United Arab Emirates and elsewhere in middle eastern oil states going to react when their children, brought up by Philippine nannies and attending English-medium schools, end up with ‘neither good Arabic nor good English’ (a worry expressed to one of us by a senior educationalist at an English-medium university)? What are those ‘second generation’ South Asians in the USA going to do who wish to pass on their language and culture to their children but who know too little of their language? Are Internetworks going to support the language use of those youngsters who do not have any speakers of their language in the neighbourhood? Will some of the Indigenous/tribal peoples in Africa, Asia and even Latin America follow the path of Indigenous peoples in other parts of the world who have been deprived of their languages and are now recreating (Amery 2000) or revitalising them (e.g. Huss and Lindgren, in press; Aikio-Puoskari 2009, Bear Nicholas 2009, McCarty 2009, Perez 2009, all this volume) at the same time as they are fighting both assimilation and economic and political exclusion? Or will they be able to maintain and develop their languages and cultures as resources while (successfully?) striving for economic and political self-determination? Is Europe, already the world’s linguistically poorest continent (under 3% of the world’s languages), succeeding in killing off all immigrant minority languages by the third generation, or will some of the rhetoric about the worth of multilingualism be extended to these languages too? And what is the role of MLE in all of this? We start with what critical MLE should do and move then to human rights, basic needs, and cost.

Critical Indigenous pedagogy: From everyday concepts to scientific discourse, continuing to build on Indigenous/tribal knowledge

There are absolutely no two opinions on the need to ground MLE in children’s everyday knowledge, experiences and perspectives. Without these it is simply futile to talk about MLE practices. Indigenous peoples’ knowledge cannot be separated from their epistemological and metaphysical roots, since cultural concepts and meanings are negotiated within epistemological boundaries and metaphysical realities.

However, just bringing in a couple or a sample of cultural practices and language uncritically to the classroom may not make the pedagogical practices relevant, innovative and transformative for the young children, though the whole process may superficially appear to be culturally rooted. Experience in India shows that more often than not, we either romanticized the centrality of the children's culture in teaching them or we made our claims and philosophical moorings rhetorical, and therefore only paid lip service to culture when we designed MLE for indigenous and tribal children (Panda 2004; 2006).

What we need is a pedagogical perspective for MLE which goes well beyond Indigenous pedagogy and the pedagogy of mainstream schools in today's world. Hough, Magar and Yonjan-Tamang, and Panda and Mohanty (2009, both this volume) provide a compelling case for this. They extend the case for critical pedagogy of Vygotsky, Freire and Bourdieu to MLE. Hough et al call this *critical indigenous pedagogy* and draw our attention to a need for not only rooting MLE pedagogy in indigenous epistemologies and values, but also to allow space for a dialectical tension between one's own Indigenous knowledge systems and Western knowledge systems. Panda and Mohanty present the perspective of CHAT (cultural historical activity theory) that locates Western knowledge (so-called rational discourse in science, mathematics and knowledge of art, literature, history etc.) as yet another cultural artefact added to the sum of artefacts that define the discursive context of the young learners from these language-disadvantaged communities. A pedagogical perspective that allows constant dialogues between these knowledge systems, privileging children's everyday knowledge only in the initial years of formal schooling, serves to awaken a critical consciousness among the learners. Subsequently, a dialectical interplay between different knowledge systems without privileging any one would help the learners rise to a level of critical consciousness in Vygotskian terms. This would help them to participate optimally in democratic processes and to position themselves vis-à-vis more macro-level discourses, such as the neoliberal economy, patenting, privatization, and globalisation, since these determine the quality of the political, economic and social lives even of people living in tiny remote villages (Skutnabb-Kangas 2000, Chapter 3).

MLE experts also need to reflect on strategies for building on children's everyday concepts and facilitating their progressive engagement with scientific discourse. They gradually develop the capacity to engage in meta-discursive practices in all areas of school learning such as mathematics, history, science, literature, and human ecology, firstly in their mother tongue and subsequently in the second and other languages. This is, in fact, a precursor to development of CALP (Cummins 1989, 2000, 2009, this volume). And this is possible when children begin with everyday concepts embedded in the mother tongues and rooted in cultural activities like agriculture, food, dance, music, literature, art, religion, knowledge of science, environment and history, and gradually move to scientific concepts and scientific discourse. This, however, does not mean that one form of discourse gets completely replaced by another form of discourse; rather it is more appropriate to state that one form of discourse (i.e. everyday discourse of Indigenous peoples) gets recontextualised into another form of discourse^v. Panda and Mohanty (2009, this volume) demonstrate that this challenge is met by using the children's cultural knowledge and concepts to develop innovative classroom activities that create multiple contact points between everyday and scientific discourse. Sound, innovative and culturally rooted pedagogic

practices based on theories of critical pedagogy and carried out in the children's mother tongue for at least eight years of schooling can enable children to participate in meta-discursive practices, as the Indian and Nepali evidence shows. We strongly feel that this is what the transfer from BICS to CALP is all about. Such transfer empowers all the more when MLE practices are firmly rooted, also in Linguistic Human Rights.

MLE and Linguistic Human Rights

Good empowering MLE respects children's educational Linguistic Human Rights (LHRs), including the Indigenous and minority children's right to mainly mother tongue medium education for the first many years (of course with competent teaching of a dominant language as a second language). Today there is no such right in *binding* international human rights conventions (see Varennes 1996). LHRs (including the right not be discriminated against on grounds of language) are in their turn a precondition for enjoying many other human rights, in addition to facilitating access to these other human rights. The international human rights (HRs) system should also be used to protect diversities in a globalised, 'free market' world. Instead of granting market forces free range, HRs, especially economic and social rights, are to act as correctives to the free market, according to human rights lawyer Katarina Tomaševski (1996: 104).

The first international HRs treaty abolished slavery. Prohibiting slavery implied that *people* were not supposed to be treated as market commodities - something that is increasingly happening again today, even if the 1989 International Labour Organisation (ILO) Convention stipulates that *labour* should not be treated as a commodity (see Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson 1994 (eds), Appendix: 395). Tomaševski states that the 'purpose of international HRs law is ... to overrule the law of supply and demand and remove price-tags from people and from necessities for their survival' (1996: 104). These necessities for survival, minimal prerequisites for social justice, include not only basic food and housing (which come under economic and social rights), but also basics for the sustenance of a dignified life. These have been formulated as basic civil, political and cultural rights, and they include LHRs. These genuinely universal *non-market-values-based* parts of the universal common heritage of humanity include these latter human rights (see Mireille Delmas-Marty's 2003 article 'Justice for sale. International law favours market values', where she shows that the legal protection of market values is incommensurably stronger than the protection of non-market values).

At the moment, many states are denying the HR of access to free and compulsory education by putting price-tags on it, meaning treating *education* as a commodity. More than half of the world's states have introduced school fees for basic primary education in the last decade or two, often prompted by the World Bank and International Monetary Fund's structural adjustment demands^{vi}. This fact has been strongly criticized by the United Nations former Special Rapporteur on the right to education, Katarina Tomaševski (2000)^{vii}.

Even in other ways, these necessary rights are not being respected nor implemented by governments today. As we see in most papers in this volume, education through the medium of the mother tongue for Indigenous and tribal peoples and minorities is not today a human right, even in countries where it may be legally mandated or at least

permitted. When Indigenous and tribal languages are being ‘reduced to writing’, ostensibly for mother tongue medium education purposes, by missionary organisations like the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL), their often covert goals are evangelical as well as linguistic (and ultimately political and economic ones). The version of the Bible, the Living Bible, which is used worldwide for evangelical purposes is considered to be a paraphrase rather than a literal translation. Words with warlike connotations are changed ‘in order to pacify those tribes that would otherwise oppose their new masters’, a guiding principle for the work of the SIL and the Wycliffe Bible Translators, which have been connected with funding from the CIA and Rockefeller Foundation (see <http://www.watch.pair.com/cnp2.html>, <http://www.wayoflife.org/articles/living.htm>). Thus good MLE, for social justice, and good MLE for dominant-language children, to benefit and enrich both them and the whole society, are a long way off.

Can good MLE help in solving problems in meeting basic needs?

For hungry people, empowerment through LHRs and MLE can sometimes sound like empty words. We have heard many people say: most Indigenous peoples and minorities are struggling to meet even their basic physical needs (for food, housing, health services, jobs, land); languages and cultures are a luxury that they can start thinking of only after their basic physical needs have been met. These are false alternatives: it is not a zero-sum game. We claim that MLE is one of the necessary but not sufficient prerequisites for solving some of the basic needs problems outlined below.

When assessing basic needs, Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, Managing Director at the World Bank states (2008: 14) that some 550 million people in sub-Saharan Africa (almost 75% of the population) and some 700 million (50%) in South Asia cannot turn on a lamp or have a fridge for the food they might have, because they have no access to electricity. Nearly 2.5 billion people worldwide use traditional biomass fuels for cooking and heating. Simply getting electricity and heating services to them and other deprived people would require an annual investment of \$165 billion, and an additional \$40 billion for the energy to be green (Okonjo-Iweala 2008: 14). By comparison, the military expenditure of the USA in 2007 was \$547 billion, 45% of the world’s military expenditure, according to SIPRI, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (http://www.sipri.org/contents/milap/milex/mex_data_index.html, accessed 23 August 2008; see Fernandes 2008 for some of the military activities).

The first of the eight United Nations Millennium Development Goals of halving extreme poverty by the year 2015 (see <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/>, accessed 20 July 2008) is to reduce by half the proportion of people living on less than a dollar a day, to achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all, including women and young people, and to reduce by half the proportion of people who suffer from hunger. It is clear by now that this first goal will not be met.

‘As has been confirmed by research worldwide since the last century... investment in education spurs economic growth’ (Ogutu 2008: 552). If economic growth in the multilingual countries worst hit by poverty is one of the answers, then this education has to support multilingual children through MLE. This is now becoming accepted wisdom even within UNESCO – all their Fact Sheets (called Languages matter!) to celebrate the International Year of Languages takes, for the first time, this for granted.

After UNESCO's big question^{viii} that we have discussed above ('how can MLE be done?'), the next question is the cost. Can states afford MLE?

MLE is too expensive?

A further argument that we often hear is: MLE is too expensive. But multilingualism for all does represent both linguistic and cultural capital and added value. The dispossession (in the sense of Harvey 2005) of the mother tongues which is an inevitable consequence of non-MLE programmes for Indigenous/tribal and minority children leaves them without what is generally the only capital that their parents would be able to pass on to them (Skutnabb-Kangas 2000: 404-408). False economic arguments about cost serve as an excuse for lack of support for many languages. The United Nation's 2004 *Human Development Report* links cultural liberty to language rights and human development (<http://hdr.undp.org/en/reports/global/hdr2004/>) and argues that there is

no more powerful means of "encouraging" individuals to assimilate to a dominant culture than having the economic, social and political returns stacked against their mother tongue. Such assimilation is not freely chosen if the choice is between one's mother tongue and one's future.

As Kathleen Heugh (2009, this volume, and references in it) shows, even in one of the world's economically poorest countries, Ethiopia, MLE is possible, and the results show how worthwhile it is. Papua New Guinea, a country with a very small population (under 5 million), with the largest number of languages in the world, (over 700) is a relatively poor country economically. Still their elementary education (admittedly of an early-exit transitional model, so far) is being conducted in over 400 languages (Klaus 2003).

What would, then, be reasonable costs for maintaining Indigenous/tribal languages, respecting children's LHRs, and thus for MLE, and should it be the state that pays them? Grin offers through his discussion of 'market failure' (2003) excellent arguments for resisting market dominance for public or common assets/goods like cultural products:

Even mainstream economics acknowledges that there are some cases where the market is not enough. These cases are called "market failure". When there is "market failure", the unregulated interplay of supply and demand results in an inappropriate level of production of some commodity (Grin 2003: 35).

In Grin's view, many public goods, including minority language protection, 'are typically under-supplied by market forces' (ibid.). The level becomes inappropriately low. Therefore it is the duty of the state(s) to take extra measures to increase it.

Grin (e.g. 2003: 24-27) differentiates between *moral considerations arguments* and *welfare considerations arguments* in answering the question why anybody, including society as a whole, should bother about maintaining IM languages, and pay for maintaining them. Most of the legal discourse, including the LHRs considerations, refers to moral norms about the right to live in one's own language, even if the extent of the ensuing rights is debated (2003: 24-25). In contrast,

the emphasis of the welfare-based argument is not on whether something is morally “good” or “bad”, but on whether resources are appropriately allocated. The test of an “appropriate” allocation of resources is whether society is better off as a result of a policy (ibid., 25).

In a moral discourse, in most cases the question of what kind of rights, if any, should be granted to speakers of indigenous and minority languages, and at what cost, seems to depend on how ‘nice’ states are. This is a shaky foundation for human rights, as Fernand de Varennes rightly observes (1999: 117):

Moral or political principles, even if they are sometimes described as “human rights”, are not necessarily part of international law. They are things that governments “should” do, if they are “nice”, not something they “must” do. Being nice is not a very convincing argument and is less persuasive than rights and freedoms that have the weight of the law behind them.

In addition to new codified LHRs (which might be coming through UNESCO’s latest plans?), we need implementation of the existing good laws and intentions – and the political will for that is mostly lacking. Neville Alexander’s analysis of reasons for it (2006: 16) states:

The problem of generating the essential political will to translate these insights into implementable policy ... needs to be addressed in realistic terms. Language planners have to realize that costing of policy interventions is an essential aspect of the planning process itself and that no political leadership will be content to consider favourably a plan that amounts to no more than a wish list, even if it is based on the most accurate quantitative and qualitative research evidence.

What Alexander advocates necessitates the type of multidisciplinary approach that Grin represents.

In a welfare-oriented discourse one can calculate in much more hard-core terms (often but not necessarily always involving cash) who the winners and losers are. Here ‘the question is whether the winners, who stand to gain from a policy, can compensate the losers and still be better off’ [than without the policy] (Grin 2003: 25). This is an empirical question, not a moral question. If what decides the fate of research-based suggestions for the education of indigenous peoples and minorities is decided by market-value-based laws, both formalised and non-formalised, then the human rights, including linguistic human rights, of these people, do not stand a chance - unless the rights are formulated in terms of cost-benefit analyses that show the economic market value of both granting these rights and of mother-tongue medium education. If even human rights law is a ‘marketable commodity’, we as researchers have to discuss whether and how it is possible to market ‘our commodity’ more effectively and efficiently, while maintaining our integrity.

When assessing the empirical question of why one should maintain minority languages, Grin uses both ‘positive’ and ‘defensive’ or ‘negative’ arguments, but both within a welfare-considerations based paradigm. He asks both what the costs and benefits are if minority languages ARE maintained and promoted, and what the costs (and benefits) are if they are neither maintained nor promoted.

Some of Grin's promising conclusions are as follows:

- ‘diversity seems to be positively, rather than negatively, correlated with welfare’
- ‘available evidence indicates that the monetary costs of maintaining diversity are remarkably modest’
- devoting resources to the protection and promotion of minority cultures [and this includes languages] may help to stave off political crises whose costs would be considerably higher than that of the policies considered’ [the peace-and-security argument].
- ‘therefore, there are strong grounds to suppose that protecting and promoting regional and minority languages is a sound idea from a welfare standpoint, not even taking into consideration any moral argument.

We agree. The question whether states can afford MLE should rather be: can states afford *not* to implement MLE?

Notes:

ⁱ If we use ‘minorities’ alone, it includes Indigenous and tribal peoples whereas the opposite is not true. In a legal sense, Indigenous and tribal peoples are NOT minorities. Indigenous and tribal peoples should minimally have all the rights that minorities have. In addition, they have other rights as Indigenous and tribal peoples – see the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007) at <http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/en/drip.html>

ⁱⁱ We are fully aware that there are no numerical linguistic majorities in many countries; we use “the dominant group” and will qualify this later.

ⁱⁱⁱ In terms of Finnish and Swedish, the two official languages, a municipality is officially bilingual if the minority (Finnish- or Swedish-speaking) comes up to 8 percent of the population. If the municipality has been bilingual and the number of the minority population decreases, as long as the population is at least 3000 people, or, alternatively, does not go down to under 6 percent, the municipality remains officially bilingual. For language groups in Finland, see http://www.tilastokeskus.fi/tk/tp/tasku/suomilukuina_en.html; for details of the latest Language Act (number 423, from 2003), see <http://www.finlex.fi/en/laki/kaannokset/2003/en20030423>, for some background for the Act, see <http://www.om.fi/uploads/i0qyauw gw18ziqq.pdf>, for the Sámi Language Act (number 424), see <http://www.finlex.fi/en/laki/kaannokset/2003/en20031086> and the references in Aikio-Puoskari 2009, this volume. For a general presentation, see Latomaa and Nuolijärvi 2002.

^{iv} The Table is very slightly modified from the original.

^v Here scientific discourse does not mean “modern science knowledge” alone, rather to the manner in which network of concepts exist, interact and make possible furthering of knowledge and discourse beyond the physical limits of everyday knowledge and practices in the cognitive academic language.

^{vi} Laws based on market values are being spread by more or less global organisations such as the WTO (World Trade Organisation) and, it seems to us,

even more dangerously, WIPO (World Intellectual Property Organisation). This happens mainly through the 1994 agreement on TRIPS (trade-related aspects of intellectual property rights) which should be concerned with both market values and non-market values such as languages or Traditional Indigenous Knowledge. These laws are being developed extremely rapidly, with harsh sanctions for violations. Since even primary education is now being treated as a commodity, it can come in under TRIPS. A future nightmare scenario might see states taken to court for offering free education – this could be seen as a trade barrier by private schools.

^{vii} See www.tomasevski.net/ and <http://www.katarinatomasevski.com/>.

^{viii} See, e.g. UNESCO's *Concept Paper Protecting indigenous and endangered languages and the role of languages in promoting EFA [Education For All] in the context of sustainable development*, 24 June 2008. An early version of this is on the web at <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0016/001614/161495e.pdf>.