



WHEN IS THE TOTAL NOT THE WHOLE

Robert B. Kaplan (University of Southern California)

R e s u m o : É possível que o maior mal-entendido sobre a importância do *nacionalismo* entre os encarregados do planejamento linguístico, especialmente os responsáveis pelo planejamento em língua-na-educação, possa ser uma causa subjacente para fracasso. A questão do *nacionalismo* junta dois domínios distintos – o domínio de questões étnicas e culturais e o domínio da organização política. Além disso, o nacionalismo requer algum conhecimento do que seja língua e que papel ela desempenha. Definir língua começa pela discussão de sua origem – de onde ela veio? A origem da língua é difícil de ser estudada devido à ausência de qualquer evidência direta, de modo que os estudiosos têm tido que tirar inferências de outros tipos de informação. Por exemplo, de registros fósseis, evidências arqueológicas, a grande diversidade de línguas vivas e os vários modos de comunicação dos animais, pássaros e insetos. A língua que usamos é moldada pelos falantes que compõem a sociedade. A diferença entre as línguas não está na gramática e no vocabulário, mas antes no mundo das metáforas.

P a l a v r a s - c h a v e : Nacionalismo; origem da linguagem; aquisição da linguagem; língua e mundo.

A b s t r a c t : It seems possible that a basic misunderstanding of the importance of *nationalism* among those charged with undertaking language planning and especially those responsible for language-in-education planning may actually be an underlying cause for failure. The issue of *nationalism* involves the junction of two distinct domains -- the domain of ethnic and cultural issues and the domain of political organization. In addition, the matter of nationalism requires some understanding of what language is and what role it plays. Defining language starts by discussing the origin of language – where did it come from? The origin of language is difficult to study in the absence of any direct evidence, so scholars have had to draw inferences from other kinds of information; e.g., from fossil records, archeological evidence, the vast diversity of living languages, language acquisition and language learning, as well as comparisons between human languages and the various modes of communication employed by animals, birds, and insects. The language one uses is shaped by the society in which one lives; that society is shaped by the language used by speakers who inhabit the society. The difference between languages lies not in grammar and vocabulary but rather in the world of metaphor.

K e y w o r d s : Nationalism; language origin; language acquisition; language and world.

"Humor is the first of the gifts to perish in a foreign tongue."
Virginia Woolf [AZQuotes.com. Retrieved 24 Jan 2016, from
AZQuotes.com Web site: [http:// www.azquotes.com/quote/320666](http://www.azquotes.com/quote/320666)]

1. Introduction

In 2012, some colleagues and I (KAPLAN, BALDAUF & KAMWANGAMALU, 1-20)

ECO-REBEL

undertook to explore some reasons why educational language plans sometimes fail. We discussed a number of matters that impede successful attempts at educational language planning essentially in polities that are impeded by a general limitation of resources. There is, however, a deeper explanation for the failure of such attempts in a large number of instances. It seems possible that a basic misunderstanding of the importance of *nationalism* among those charged with undertaking language planning and especially those responsible for language-in-education planning may actually be an underlying cause for failure.

The issue of *nationalism*, it appears, normally, involves the junction of two distinct domains -- the domain of ethnic and cultural issues and the domain of political organization. In addition, the matter of nationalism requires some understanding of what language is and, in general, what role it plays. The domains underlying nationalism can be defined in two kinds of questions -- descriptive and normative:

<p>-What is a nation?</p> <p>-What is national? Does it include language?</p> <p>-What does belonging to a nation mean? Does it include fluency in a common language?</p> <p>- What does pro-national attitude mean?</p> <p>-Is belonging to a nation involuntary or voluntary?</p>	<p>-Is caring about the nation appropriate?</p> <p>-What limitation can be placed on caring?</p>
---	--

Table 1: Questions underlying nationalism

2. What is language

However, before such questions can be directly addressed, it seems necessary first to step back a bit in order to address the question “What is language?” It seems that any attempt at defining language ought to start by discussing the origin of language – where did it come from? The origin of language is a difficult matter to study in the absence of any direct evidence. Given the lack of direct sources, scholars have had to draw inferences from other kinds of information; e.g., fossil records, or archeological evidence, or the vast diversity of living languages, or language acquisition and language learning, as well as from comparisons between human languages and the various modes of communication employed by animals, birds, and insects. A large number of different ideas about the origin of language and – consequently – of the nature of language are available; Müller (1861/1996) published a list of speculative theories attempting to explain the origins of spoken language¹:

- The *bow-wow* or *cuckoo* theory saw words as imitations of the cries of animals and birds.
- The *pooh-pooh* theory saw words as emotional interjections triggered by pain, surprise or pleasure.
- The *ding-dong* theory saw words as based on the vibrating natural resonance of all things somehow echoed by human beings.
- The *yo-heave-ho* theory saw words as emerging from collective rhythmic labor.

The *tata* theory did not appear in Müller’s list, having been added later by Paget (1930) who asserted that the "pantomimic action" of the lips and tongue reflected the speaker's senses and emotions, since hand signs and gestures may have been the original form of human communication. Various other scholars have, over time, added other theories.

- the *mama* theory, • the *sing-song* theory,
- the *hey-you!*-theory, • the *hocus-pocus* theory,
- the *eureka!*-theory. (See, e.g., BOEREE, no date; ROMANES, 1897).

Such theories cannot be said to be erroneous -- they do in fact offer peripheral insights; rather, these theories not only have amusing names but they are unsophisticated and

irrelevant. The absence of empirical evidence has resulted in attempts to ban such studies; in 1866, for example, the Linguistic Society of Paris banned discussion of the origin of language at any time in the future. Without reference to that prohibition, there has been virtually no agreement on any pertinent issue over the 150 years since the Paris prohibition. Indeed, political matters have often intervened in explaining (rather than in exploring) how language came to be. In more recent times, as Gal and Irvine (1995) noted, “our conceptual tools for understanding linguistic differences still derive from [the] massive scholarly attempt to create the political differentiation of Europe.” Contemporary disciplines (called *anthropology* and *linguistics* among others) emerged at the end of the nineteenth century, a time when accrediting and sanctioning discrete national states was an intellectual project of vast perceived importance and equally great practical consequences². The objective was to sanction the emergence of the nation-state; as a consequence, that development gave rise to the one-nation/one-language myth (KAPLAN, 2011).

3. Contemporary theory debates

In attempts to explore pertinent matters in some sort of chronological order, it becomes necessary to skip around a bit. In the mid 1950s, Noam Chomsky appeared on the scene. He introduced a radically innovative way of looking at language. Chomsky claimed that a language is “a set (finite or infinite) of sentences, each finite in length and constructed out of a finite set of elements” (CHOMSKY, 2002, 13). He asserted that linguistic competence consists of knowledge of syntactic rules, without reference to semantic meaning. In Chomsky’s view, the grammar of a language “will thus ... be a device that generates all of the grammatical sequences of [the language] and none of the ungrammatical ones” (CHOMSKY, 2002, 13). Plainly, he believed that the concepts of “language as resource” and “language as rule” were incompatible. Messy ordinary language use clearly obstructs the recognition that *universal grammar* [i.e., all human being are born having an innate linguistic ability] is “the inherited genetic endowment that makes it possible for us to speak and learn human languages” (GLIEDMAN & CHOMSKY, 1983). In brief, Chomsky saw language as a set of rules; he asserted that meaning plays no part in understanding what language is. Chomsky’s radical view of language initiated a continuous debate as well as a number of dramatic shifts in conceptions of what language is. Halliday’s view of language as a *social semiotic*, for

ECO-REBEL

example, requires asking functional questions regarding what people do with language (HALLIDAY, 1978; HALLIDAY, Hasan, 1989), necessitating looking at real examples of language in use in a variety of situations. He criticized Chomsky's attempt to make "language as resource" and "language as rule" incompatible. 's view necessitates looking at real examples of language in use in a variety of settings, while Chomsky (1965) explicitly rejected speakers' spontaneous performance as being the proper data for linguistic analysis. Instead, Chomsky proposed relying on the intuitions regarding grammatical "well-formedness" provided by "an ideal speaker-listener, in a completely homogeneous speech community, who knows its language perfectly..." (CHOMSKY, 1965).

Chomsky's search for language universals is a search to discover the abstract underlying properties of human language without reference to context or culture. Trask (1999, p. 96), on the other hand, argues that "providing each speaker with an individual and group identity is one of the most important functions of language." Chomsky's conception of language as innate knowledge of syntactic rules offers very little enlightenment with respect to the uses of language. It is an interesting question whether the innate knowledge of syntactic rules could be based on any possible use; if language IS simply a set of rules, would it ever have come into use? The conception of sociolinguistics, as "the study of variation in language, or more precisely of variation within speech communities," permits consideration of such matters as age, gender, ethnicity, and the various political, social, and educational issues that impact on, and are impacted by, the language usage of groups and individuals (TRASK 1999, p.187). Language is primarily a means of expressing things.

Although the preceding discussion does not lead to a functional solution of the issues, the definitions presently in common use tend to ignore Chomsky's concept. In general, at least among speakers of U.S. English in the second decade of the twenty-first century (in 2016), all readily available definitions include users and uses: e.g., language is:

- "the system of words or signs that people use to express thoughts and feelings to each other; any one of the systems of human language that are used and understood by a particular group of people"(Merriam-Webster).
- "a body of words and the systems for their use common to a people who are of

the same community or nation, the same geographical area, or the same cultural tradition” (Dictionary.com).

4. Language and semantic meaning

More and more research has concluded that the attachment between “language and identity” and “language and semantic meaning” is essential. In this context, one may say that Chomsky’s concept has not been helpful. There is substantial evidence that language both defines a culture and changes as the construct of the culture is altered by modification in speaker behavior. It appears that the individual well-being of the members of a community is modified by the linguistic environment; acceptance or isolation of the individual is determined by that individual’s linguistic behavior (see, e.g., YOUMANS, 2007).

The language one uses is shaped by the society in which one lives; that society is shaped by the language used by the speakers who inhabit the society -- ergo, those who control the language exercise social control by focusing on particular ideas but not on others. Metaphors play an incredibly important role in shaping the worldview (Larson, 2011). To illustrate the ideas being explored at this point, consider the ways that any language structures the world. To illustrate, consider how English structures its world:

1.) English individualizes and permits individualization of mass nouns (e.g., a glass of water, a cup of coffee); in English mass nouns constitute measurable categories (e.g., a liter of water, a gallon of coffee). Such a system fragments the idea that all water (or any other substance) constitutes a unity.

People think of water in the kitchen sink as separate from water in the ocean; consequently, it becomes difficult to understand such notions as water pollution.

2.) English allows two types of countable nouns -- real & imaginary -- even though some occupy space (e.g., rock, car, gun) while others are metaphorical (e.g., beauty, evil, delight). This phenomenon makes experience measurable, even though in reality not everything can (or needs to) be countable.

3.) English relies on a three-tense conception of time, objectifying time and making it linear; each unit is equal to all other comparable units (e.g., seconds, hours, years). This system extends infinitely into the past and into the future. Such

ECO-REBEL

noun units can be counted and can be pluralized, permitting them to become aggregates. Such a structure permits speakers to see things rather than processes. The English-language worldview reinforces scientific realism. As the boundary between the literal and the metaphorical is language-specific, and as access to reality in technologies is achieved mainly by means of metaphor, the result makes it possible to ignore non-Western metaphor systems (MÜHLHÄUSLER, 2003).

Academics have identified a number of problems for which technological solutions are sought because technologists believe that they can manage solutions – provide answers – implying that managerial framing is reliant on technology, and that such managerial framing remains unquestioned. As a result, three limiting constraints appear to be in operation:

- First, this process trivializes or simply omits the public's participation (even though the public may be the first sector to recognize the existence of a problem).
- Second, it inflates the role of technology, assuming that, if all the pieces of a problem can be described, solutions to the problem will emerge.
- Third, managerialism leads to a conflict between competing interests; i.e., management constitutes a metaphor defining a culture that is controlled by experts.

In problem solving, the preferred managerial control consists of mechanistic and reductionist approaches. A dichotomy between technology and society emerges - - technology deals with solid facts; society deals with fuzzy individual and cultural preference. The English language magnifies and reifies this distinction, resulting in the operation of a subject-object framework, while prohibiting the occurrence of a subject-subject framework. Given the metaphors in use, an ethics based on egocentrism and anthropomorphism becomes likely.

Kaplan (2001) argued that, in the political events following World War II, English became the dominant language of science and technology and played a key role in the development of computer technology. That accident has, to a significant extent, made English the language with the greatest role in technological development and in worldwide communication and, consequently, having the greatest value in the marketplace and consequently the most sought-after utility. The role of English was an accident. But the need for English is the result; it is taught to speakers of other languages

around the world, and it's acquisition is the achievement providing greatest access to employment, therefore having the highest value.

Kamwangamalu, in his forthcoming book *Language Policy and Economics: The Language Question in Africa*, argues that, because African languages do not merely constitute an integral element in the socio-political and economic development of the African states, any language policy designed to promote those languages in such higher domains as education must demonstrate that the languages must also produce economic advantages for speakers of those languages. The languages native to populations in African states are marginalized/ minoritized (i.e., treating [persons, or groups] as insignificant or peripheral) by the ruling segment of the population who do in fact enjoy the economic (and social) benefits associated with colonial languages, especially English³. Economic benefits do not often accrue to “minoritized” languages.

As long as science and technology constitute a valued good sold in the market place, only those languages that have the lexicon, the metaphors, the rhetoric to deal with science and technology will be desirable. Only those languages that are common on the web will be sought, learned, coveted, taught.⁴ That is not to say that other languages cannot achieve preference; rather, it is to say that the capacity to be on the web is what must be taught to move toward prestige planning.⁵

5. Nationalism in linguistics

It is now possible to look at *nationalism* and its role in current linguistic issues. During the 19th century and in the early years of the 20th century, liberal (and later Marxist) theorists underestimated the power of nationalism (ANDERSON, 1996). In its general form, the issue of nationalism concerns the identification of both the ethno-cultural domain and the domain of political organization. *Nations* emerged after several generally held beliefs were enfeebled.

Aristocratic languages (one of the enfeebled beliefs) had – generally in the distant past -- offered unique access to truth. However, at present, aristocratic languages have re-emerged in a somewhat different incarnation. Chinese, for example, constitutes an example of a modern aristocratic language; that is, the general practice of designating a “national language” has come to serve, at least to some extent, as the creation of an aristocratic language, especially when a national language serves to limit access to information, requiring all citizens in the state to use only the national language as the means to access

knowledge and to participate in national activities. It has become an instrument for assuring control by a government.

A second enfeebled belief was, generally speaking, the idea that societies were naturally organized around a leader who ruled through divine dispensation; i.e. often a King who was perceived as a male sovereign head holding his authority for life, usually by hereditary right, and consequently being the chief authority over a people and the territory in which they live⁶. A third enfeebled belief assumed that the origin of the world and the origin of human beings in the world co-occurred in time.

Not until economic changes, scientific discoveries, and a new way to understand the unification of power, fraternity, and time came to replace the three dominant assumptions previously constraining human development. In addition, what Anderson (1996) called “the revolutionary vernacularizing thrust of capitalism” also needs to be considered.

6. Post-biological developments

These economic considerations co-occurred with important development among human beings. Over the past four and a half million years, the human species has undergone a long series of biological modifications, among them the modifications that made speech possible. However, since the emergence of language, the human species has undergone a series of post-biological modifications. Deriving from the existence of language as part of human biological development, a number of massive changes made possible by biological changes but independent of them and not part of the biological baggage occurred:

- the invention of writing,
- the invention of printing, and
- the invention of electronic word processing and the World-Wide Web.

The distinction between biological and post-biological modifications is critical; human genetics constitutes the study of inheritance as it occurs among human beings; but those changes co-occurred with changes human beings endured in the way they lived. Biological changes constitute a part of the human genetic baggage, while post-biological changes seem not to include any genetic characteristics. All human offspring within the normative ranges have the capacity to speak and to understand speech. However, it is not

ECO-REBEL

the case that all human children are born with a biologically conditioned predisposition to acquire the skills of reading and writing; on the contrary, reading and writing must be learned anew in each new generation.⁷

The invention and rapid improvement of writing served to extend communication, since literacy is still constrained by enormous linguistic variation. Writing also slowed down changes within languages, making them seem fixed and stable. And it created “languages of power,” like the “King’s English,” which were more prestigious than other vernaculars. From the emergence of language to the emergence of writing, human populations had access to information primarily as it was held in human memory. Retrieval exclusively from memory depended at least:

- on the presence of the owner of memory,
- on the mental condition of the holder of the memory,
- on the audience for whom retrieval was undertaken,
- on the form in which the information is stored, and
- on the circumstances in which retrieval occurs.

Once it became possible to write things down — the first post-biological modification -- the nature of information changed, since it became possible to retrieve information across long time and great space. Whereas memory probably necessitated the use of memory-enhancing stylistic devices, written text requires a different stylistic and rhetorical structure. As the holder of information no longer needs to be present, the mental condition of the holder and the form in which the text is stored become essentially irrelevant. Text could be more widely distributed. Initially the process of manual copying was slow and subject to error, making the production of large numbers of copies unlikely. Indeed, limited production gave rise to texts being perceived as expensive works of art, limiting acquisition to the elite.

While the invention of printing (see, e.g., invention of the Printing Press in 1440 by Johannes Gutenberg [1398-1468] in Mainz) constituted the second post-biological modification, the invention of printing permitted much more rapid production of texts and, gradually, over the next several hundred years, significantly reduced the cost of possessing texts (see, e.g., the diaries [23 February 1633 – 26 May 1703] of Samuel Pepys). The library as a repository became feasible; the earliest great library at Alexandria

ECO-REBEL

possessed some 400,000 to 700,000 parchment scrolls.⁸ Gradual improvements in print technology increased the speed of production and the number of copies available, consequently reducing cost and increasing the reading public.

Electronic word-processing constitutes the third post-biological modification. Electronic document production and distribution increases speed of production, serves to change the role of the library (i.e., the middle-man) in text distribution, and increases exponentially the amount of material available (not merely to the scholar but to anyone with the technical skill to access the World-Wide Web).

Each of these post-biological changes decreased the effort (and the cost) required to produce, store, and distribute information, and each has, in its turn, caused an information explosion.

Increased availability of printed information is reciprocal with increased desire for literacy; given little or nothing to read, literacy becomes a superfluous skill. Each increase in the availability of information complicates the verification of information, making the veracity of information harder to determine. Each leap in the availability of information seems to be associated with the emergence of a fundamentally new form of human society:

- the invention of language and its accompanying genetic changes mark the beginning of what can be designated as ‘human.’
- the post-biological changes are, respectively, associated with the dawn of civilization, with the beginning of modern civilization, with a new orientation not yet possible to describe, define, or perhaps even imagine.

Each change has accompanied an invention that resulted in an information explosion. Limits on the production of information impeded progress in the time preceding each information explosion. As Robertson (1998: 9) suggests, civilization **is** information, and societies may be limited more by lack of information than by lack of physical resources. The results were communities — that is, “nations” — that were limited (all nations had borders) and sovereign (no longer organized by the idea of divinely ordained dynastic rule).

Such communities were “imagined”; any community larger than a village in which people know one another face to face is “imagined.” The “deep horizontal comradeship” that

ECO-REBEL

characterizes a nation is socially constructed, but being also heartfelt and genuine -- a concept that explains why people are willing to kill (and to die) for their nations.

The development of national consciousness began in the Western Hemisphere during the late 18th century — in the United States, in Brazil and in the Spanish colonies, eventually spreading to Europe and then to what were the colonies of European nations in Africa, Asia and South America.

In analyzing nationalism, the importance of the attitudes that citizens of a community have when they care about their communal identity should be a major consideration. If one wants to urge people to struggle on behalf of their communal interests, it is essential to discover what it means to belong to a community. In order to formulate and authenticate their evaluations, claims, and directives for action, pro-nationalist advocates have expounded theories of culture, ethnicity, nation and state. The definition and status of the social group that is likely to benefit from the existence of a nation (i.e., ethnic group/group of speakers of the common language) is essential; there are basically two options – the first option has been put forward by a small but distinguished group of theorists (i.e., RENAN 1887, WEBER 2014, 2006) who argued that a nation is any group of people aspiring to a common political state-like organization. Alternatively, and more typically, nationalist claims are focused on a community consisting of individuals having a common origin, language, tradition and culture.

One cannot choose to be a member of this group; membership depends on the accident of origin and early socialization.⁹

7. Conclusion

Language policy (decision taking) and planning (decision implementation) are complex processes requiring a number of actions to be taken and implemented if they are to be successful. While there is research that suggests the factors that lead to successful outcomes, these outcomes are often either ignored or prove to be too difficult for polities to implement and maintain, given their limited resources. This insufficiency can lead to a waste of resources and a failure to meet language- planning objectives. A number of myths have arisen about such planning, in general, and in particular relating to English being a guarantee of access to economic opportunity and relating to starting non-native language study early leading to better outcomes. Kaplan, Baldauf & Kamwangamalu (2012) examined 12 common fallacies related to educational language planning to

ECO-REBEL

provide some insights into why such plans sometimes fail. This paper reaches behind the superficial and easily identified issues, and attempts to examine some more basic matters. I contend that the problems arise from underlying misunderstanding.

This paper has tried to demonstrate that Anglo-European concepts of the scope of languages and the issues of undertaking to produce multilingual populations through planning rather than through normal processes or by accident arise from very basic concepts – i.e.

- that second-language acquisition is merely a matter of learning some grammar and vocabulary of the intended second language, and
- that measuring success is a matter of successfully passing written tests measuring the knowledge of grammar and vocabulary.

The quotation at the start of this article illustrates a real danger in second-language education by claiming “Humor is the first of the gifts to perish in a foreign tongue.” The difference between languages lies not in grammar and vocabulary but rather in the world of metaphor (KAPLAN, 2015).

A language may be said to be:

- the system of communication used by people in a particular country or in a particular type of work.

Focusing down a bit,

- the characteristics of a group of people or things that set them apart from other people or things; alternatively, people, things, or groups that share particular characteristics.

- a particular group of people or things that share similar characteristics and form a smaller division of a larger set.

- a person who seems to represent a particular group of people, having all the qualities that one usually connects with that group.

- to be the type of person that someone thinks is attractive.

In short, a language is the means of identification of a community of people who speak it (Kaplan, 2014).

ECO-REBEL

Historically, Europe consists of a number of groups identified by the language they speak. Over time, the political boundaries of Europe have shifted; as previously noted, the Congress of Vienna (1815) redrew the map of Europe, but that redrawing only changed the arbitrary lines identifying on a map the borders of countries; it had little or no effect on the languages spoken within, around, across the political borders. The political settlement following World War I again redrew the boundaries, as did the political settlement following World War II. The creation of the Council of Europe (Conseil de l'Europe), founded in 1949, representing another political settlement, is a regional intergovernmental organization whose stated goal is to promote human rights, democracy, and the rule of law among its 47 member states, covering 820 million citizens. The Council did not do anything to the languages spoken in Europe.

In the late 1950s there were four official European Union languages; at present there are 24, but figures provided by the European Commission reveal that 40 million people in the EU speak 60 indigenous regional or minority languages. While language policy is a member-state responsibility, the European Commission "helps fund projects and partnerships designed to raise awareness of minority languages, promote their teaching and learning, and thereby help them survive." The commitment to language and cultural diversity is enshrined in the European treaties and was further enhanced by the Lisbon Treaty (2007) when respect for linguistic minorities became legally binding.

To a certain extent, while the status and protection of languages in Europe is relatively well known, the situations in Asia, Africa and Latin America is neither well known, nor well understood, nor being approached by well-designed programs. On the contrary, because the indigenous languages in Africa and Latin America have become minority languages in states that use the former colonial languages of Europe as their dominant means of communication.

The situation in Asia is somewhat different because of the relatively recent emergence of powerful states (e.g., China, India, Japan) each of which has minoritized hundreds of indigenous languages, suppressed through various attempts to impose a common language of communication intended to find unifying languages in order to solve communication problems.

One such effort is illustrated by the attempt to establish the *Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere*, an imperial Japanese concept promulgated for Japanese-occupied Asian populations promoting the cultural and economic unity of Northeast Asians,

Southeast Asians, and Oceanians¹⁰ through a self-sufficient bloc of Asian nations, led by Japan, and free of the influence of Western powers.

A comparable attempt by the governing powers in the People's Republic of China (a multi-ethnic country containing 55 minority groups, representing approximately 110 million people, among which the Han are the dominant group, comprising about 92 percent of the total population and speaking Mandarin while most minority groups have their own mother tongues.¹¹ The nationwide promotion of Mandarin Chinese as a national language in 1956 (ROHSENOW, 2004; ZHOU, 2004), the provision by means of the educational system of Mandarin Chinese starting from Grade 3 in minority regions (HU, SEIFMAN, 1987; ZHOU, 2004), and the relative popularity of Mandarin Chinese because of the influence of globalization and of China's trade relations with the world at large. These developments have created unfavorable circumstances for minority languages in China.

Similar efforts have taken place in North Korea and in the former Soviet Union (KAPLAN & BALDAUF, 2011) and over a considerably longer period of time in India (KACHRU, et al, 2008). There are several languages in India belonging to different language families, the major ones being the Indo-Aryan languages spoken by 75% of the Indian population, the Dravidian languages spoken by 20% of that population, as well as a few other languages spoken by the remaining 05% of population. More than three millennia of language contact has led to significant mutual influence among the four predominant language families in mainland India and in South Asia. The Constitution of India does not give any language the status of *national language*. The *official language* of the Union Government of the Republic of India is Hindi in the Devanagari script.¹² Unfortunately, the various attempts to create official languages, national languages, *linguae francae* across vast geographic areas and linguistically very mixed populations have not been successful; the "other" languages across those vast areas have essentially been minoritized and at present are significantly threatened with extinction. The efforts by various governments, representing various political orientations, have essentially not been successful. Singapore may represent the perfect mirror of events to install one official language to serve all practical needs. Founded as a British trading colony in 1819, Singapore joined the Malaysian Federation in 1963, was ousted two years later, and became independent in 1965. It has an urban population consisting of Chinese (74.2%), Malay (13.3%), Indian (9.2%), other (3.3%) (according to the 2013 census). The

ECO-REBEL

Singapore government recognizes four official languages: English, Malay, Mandarin, and Tamil. The national language is Malay, while English is mainly used as the business and working language. Actually, there are many languages spoken in Singapore:

Mandarin 36.3%,	English 29.8%,
Malay 11.9%,	Hokkien 8.1%,
Tamil 4.4%,	Cantonese 4.1%,
Teochew 3.2%,	other Indian languages 1.2%,
other Chinese	other languages 1.1%
dialects 1.1%,	(as per the 2010 census).

In 1979 the government launched the “Speak Good English” campaign, and in another campaign, launched in 2000, the government encouraged Chinese to speak Mandarin, one of its four official languages.

The “Speak Mandarin” campaign has come under criticism from several points of view. Chinese dialect speakers have complained that their children have to study two foreign languages — English and Mandarin – as opposed to a possible alternative policy of English and their native language. It was acknowledged that, for many Chinese Singaporeans, Mandarin is not a mother tongue because "dialect is the real mother tongue." In 2009, in spite of the ongoing movement, the government admitted that the teaching of Mandarin Chinese in schools had gone wrong, so that successive generations of students were seriously disadvantaged by the new policy. In 2010, the government admitted that, while Mandarin is important, it remains a second language in Singapore. Some critics have noted that the Mandarin education system's goal of promoting cultural identity has left many younger generations of Mandarin speakers unable to communicate with their dialect-speaking grandparents. The policy has also been compared to the policy of Russification in the Soviet Union resulting in intentional language elimination. The reduction in numbers of speakers of Chinese dialects has raised concerns about the preservation of those dialects. Despite the government's stance concerning the importance of English and Mandarin over dialects, since speaking dialects ultimately interferes with the learning of Mandarin and English. Non-Chinese language communities (principally Malays and Tamils) have argued that the effort placed into promoting Mandarin weakens the role of English as Singapore's *lingua franca* and

ECO-REBEL

threatens to marginalize Singapore's minorities. Some have expressed concern that Mandarin fluency or literacy could be used to discriminate against non-Chinese minorities.

Given the confusion, the ambiguity in official positions, and the effect on various language communities of unclear language requirements have all worked to invalidate the efforts to achieve a common language in Singapore, and that state of affairs serves as a microcosm of the efforts to achieve linguistic homogeneity in various polities in other parts of the world. In short, the identification of a common language as the official language in polities in which multilingualism is the norm has, so far, not succeeded; on the contrary, it has often increased the pressure on minoritized languages (as it has in South Africa [Kamwangamalu, 1997] and has increased the danger of their disappearance. The problem is not that governments have failed; the problem is that language decision-taking and decision-serving as implementation is complex. Most actors are neither trained nor free of political intent to be able to do the job properly.

References

- AMMON, U. English(es) and Academic Publishing. In C. Chapelle (Ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. (10 Vols.) Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley, 2013.
- ANDERSON, B. *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso, 1996.
- BRUBAKER, R. *Ethnicity without Groups*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006.
- CHOMSKY, N. *Syntactic Structures*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2002.
- CHOMSKY, N. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1965.
- GAL, S. & IRVINE, J. T. The boundaries of languages and disciplines: How ideologies construct difference. *Social Research* 62, 1995, p. 967-1001.
- GLIEDMAN, J & CHOMSKY, N. Things No Amount of Learning Can Teach. Chomsky interview with John Gliedman. November 1983. Retrieved December 27, 2015, *Omni*, 6:11. <https://chomsky.info/198311>, 1983.
- GORDON, R. G., Jr. (ed.). *Ethnologue: Languages of the World* (Fifteenth edition). Dallas, Texas: SIL International, 2005.
- HALLIDAY, M. A. K. *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold, 1978.
- _____. & R. Hasan. *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- KACHRU, B. B., KACHRU, Y. & SRIDHAD, S. N. (eds). *Language in South Asia*. New York; Cambridge University Press, 2008.

ECO-REBEL

KAMWANGAMALU, N. *Language Policy and Economics: The Language Question in Africa*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, (forthcoming).

_____. Multilingualism and education policy in post-apartheid South Africa. *Language Problems & Language Planning* 21, 1997, p. 234–253.

KAPLAN, R. B. A Metaphor is a many-splendored thing. In D. HOLLÓ, & K. KÁROLY (eds.). *Inspirations in Foreign Language Teaching: Studies in Language Pedagogy and Applied Linguistics in Honour of Péter Medgyes*. Harlow: Pearson Education, 2015, p. 222-242.

_____. I never metaphor I didn't like. *Applied Linguistics Interest Section of TESOL AL Forum*, 2014, (5 pp. unnumbered.)

_____. Language management theory: From The Prague Circle to the present. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 32 (1), 2011, p. 85-93.

_____. English--the Accidental Language of Science? In U. Ammon (Ed.) *The Dominance of English as a Language of Science: Effects on Other Language Communities*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2001, p. 3-26.

_____; BALDAUF, R. B. North Korea's Language Revision and Some Unforeseen Consequences. In O. Garcia and J.A. Fishman (eds.). *Handbook of Language and Ethnic-Identity: The Success-Failure Continuum in Language and Ethnic Identity Efforts*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

KAPLAN, R.B., R. B. BALDAUF, JR., & N. M. KAMWANGAMALU. Why educational language plans sometime fail. In R. B. BALDAUF, Jr., R. B. KAPLAN, N. M. KAMWANGAMALU & P. BRYANT (eds.). *Language Planning in Primary Schools in Asia*. New York & London: Routledge, 2012, p. 1-20.

LARSON, B. *Metaphors for environmental sustainability: Redefining our relationship with nature*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011.

MÜHLHÄUSLER, P. *Language of Environment, Environment of Language: A Course in Ecolinguistics*. London: Battlebridge, 2003.

MÜLLER, F. M. The theoretical stage, and the origin of language. Lecture 9 from Lectures on the Science of Language. Reprinted in R. HARRIS (ed.). *The Origin of Language* (p. 7-41). 1996 [1861] Bristol: Thoemmes Press.

RENAN, E. Qu'est-ce qu'une nation? [What is a Nation?] *Discours et Conférences*. Paris: Caiman-Levy, 1887.

ROBERTSON, D. S. *The new Renaissance: Computers and the next level of civilization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

TRASK, R. L. *Key Concepts in Language and Linguistics*. Routledge: London and New York, 1999.

WEBER, M. *La ville*. Paris, La Découverte, 2014.

Youmans, M. *Chicano-Anglo Conversations: Truth, Honesty and Politeness*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2007.

ZHOU, M. L. (ed.). *Language Policy in the People's Republic of China: Theory and Practice since 1949*. Dordrecht & Boston: Kluwer Academic, 2004.

NOTES:

ECO-REBEL

¹This discussion concerns spoken language; written language and gestural language and other means of conveying information are not discussed here since their origins were differently conceived.

²Interest in establishing new national identities was widespread throughout the 19th century, having an

impact on the European map, and highlighting the failure of a 'European order' that ultimately led to the First World War. The victors in the Napoleonic Wars (Austria, France, Russia and the United Kingdom) redrew the map of Europe. While Europe was marked by significant growth in discussion of nationalism, the redrawn map did not in fact pay any attention to ethnic and linguistic nationalism. The objective of the Congress of Vienna (1815) was not to restore old boundaries; it was to resize the main powers so they could balance each other off and remain at peace. Congress leaders were conservatives with little use for republicanism or revolution. Following the destruction of the French Empire in the Napoleon Wars, the growing influence of the emerging British, Russian and German empires, and the United States, became the world's leading powers, and consequently had a drastic impact on the map of Europe. The Congress of Vienna redrew the map of Europe, putting an end to the period initiated by the French Revolution. Although the period was marked by significant growth in discussions of nationalism, the redrawn map did not in fact demonstrate any concern with ethnic and linguistic nationalism; the Congress of Vienna induced changes which ultimately led to World War I, and the aftermath of that added to the lack of understanding of ethnic and linguistic conflicts (e.g., *Czechoslovakia* was a sovereign state in Central Europe from October 1918, until 1 January 1993); Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Kosovo, Macedonia, and Montenegro combined in 1918 as the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes and federated in 1929 as Yugoslavia).

³Other colonial languages – French, German, Italian, Spanish as well as Arabic -- must be shown to participate equally and productively in the polity's educational, political and economic development to produce outcomes favorable to the development of genuine benefits to citizens educationally, economically and politically.

⁴The official language of Myanmar as recognized by its constitution is Burmese, although 108 other languages are spoken in Myanmar (see *Ethnologue* i.e., Gordon 2005). *The New York Times* (July 19, 2015) published an article, entitled "Those Who Would Remake Myanmar Find That Words Fail Them," about the problems Myanmar is having because of its official language.

For half a century, Myanmar was so cut off from the outside world that people were jailed for owning an unauthorized fax machine. As the rest of the world was hurtling into the information age, the strict censorship of publications, limited access to global media and creaking connections to the Internet stunted the evolution of the Burmese language, leaving it without many words that are elsewhere deemed essential parts of the modern political and technical vocabulary.

⁵"Prestige planning has received little attention from language planners and, to the extent that it has, it has been impeded by lack of clarity, even on basic concepts"(Ammon, 2013).

⁶For example, the Kings and queens of England, some 48 individuals, drawn from seventeen "families," ruling between 871 CE and the present (1145 years) — the House of Wessex, the House of Denmark, the House of Normandy, the House of Blois, the House of Anjou, the House of Plantagenet, the House of Lancaster, the House of York, the House of Tudor, and the House of Stuart.

ECO-REBEL

⁷Reading and writing must be acquired *de novo*; speech too must be acquired, but the acquisition of the capacity to speak is genetically conditioned -- it is socialization to the community norms of spoken language that must be taught anew in each generation.

⁸See, e.g., the great library at Alexandria, founded in 283 BCE and continuing to function until at least the Roman conquest of Egypt in 30 BCE. [Later causes for the partial or complete destruction of the Library at Alexandria are attributed: (i.) to a fire set by Julius Caesar in 48 BCE, (ii.) to an attack by Aurelian in the CE 270s, and (iii.) to the decree of Coptic Pope Theophilus in CE 391 – but the library's actual destruction remains a mystery.

⁹Commonality of origin has become mythic for most contemporary candidate groups; ethnic groups have been mixing for millennia (Brubaker, 2006).

¹⁰Inhabitants of the islands of the southern, western, and central Pacific Ocean, including Melanesia, Micronesia, and Polynesia, as well as of Australia, New Zealand, and the Malay Archipelago.

¹¹There are about 120 mother tongues in minority regions in China among which only 30 minority languages have written scripts and 20 languages have less than 1,000 speakers.

¹²The Eighth Schedule of the Indian Constitution lists 22 languages that have been referred to as *scheduled* languages and hence have been given recognition, status and official encouragement. According to the 2001 census, India has 122 major languages and 1599 other languages. That census recorded 30 languages that were spoken by more than a million native speakers and 122 languages that were spoken by more than 10,000 people. Two languages have played an important role in the history of India: Persian and English. Persian was the court language during the Mughal period (1526-1858) and as an administrative language for several centuries up to British colonization (1858-1947). In the present, English continues to be an important language in India, used in higher education and in some functions of the government. Hindi, presently the most widely spoken language, serves as lingua franca across much of North and Central India. There have been some anti-Hindi agitations in South India as well as some opposition in non-Hindi speaking states towards any perceived imposition of Hindi in those areas.

ECOLINGÜÍSTICA: REVISTA BRASILEIRA DE
ECOLOGIA E LINGUAGEM (ECO-REBEL), v. 2, n. 1, 2016.