*Introduction to International and Global Studies*

**Shawn Smallman and Kimberley Brown**

## Chapter 14: Language

Language is the vehicle that carries and mediates communication in an increasingly globalized world, but in the discipline of international studies, it is often forgotten. To become global citizens, students of international studies must deal consciously with the vehicle that carries our communication. Language competence plays a critical role in the ability to move successfully between cultures and thrive within another culture. Success in global citizenship is always enhanced by fluency in a relevant second language. Research indicates that business ventures are more effective when there is an attempt to learn the host language and vastly more effective when fluency in that language has been achieved. Scholars and teachers routinely use languages other than their own to conduct research and synthesize material relevant for their classes. Foreign Service officers have little hope of becoming ambassadors without basic communication skills in at least one other language. Questions concerning language are a key aspect of cultural globalization. At the broadest level, a student of international studies needs to know something about the history and demographics of language, how many languages there are in the world, critical issues related to language, which peoples are about to lose their language, the extent to which English has become a killer language, and how interest groups use and abuse language. They also need to master at least one other language.

In the future, global languages like English will carry more and more communication to the point of becoming commodities in and of themselves. English has acquired economic significance; it allows economic, political, and cultural transactions to occur through enhanced communication. Less positively, when English exists in relationship to another language, typically English is the valued language, while the other language becomes less visible and is eventually devalued. In order to engage as a global player, it often seems necessary to agree to lose one's local language. In this chapter, we will first examine the role of language within the nation-state and then the role of English internationally, contrasting it with other languages of power, such as Hindi and Chinese, before exploring the links between language and security, language and sustainability, and language and individual identity.

### Language and the Nation-State

Linguists frequently joke that the difference between a dialect and a language is that dialects have no armies while languages do. In fact, a historical examination of the relationship between language, nationalism, and the formation of states reveals the ambiguity of these terms. Language and variations of languages known as dialects can be defined as:

[T]he system of human communication by means of a structured arrangement of sounds (or their written representations) to form larger units, e.g. morphemes, words, sentences .

. . [as well as] any particular system of human communication, for example, the French language, the Hindi language. Sometimes a language is spoken by only part of the population of a country, for example, Tamil in India, French in Canada. . . . Languages are usually not spoken in exactly the same way from one part of a country to the other. Differences in the way a language is spoken by different people are described in terms of regional and social variation. Dialect A of Language X on one side of the border may be very similar to Dialect B of Language Y on the other side of the border if language X and Y are related. This is the case between Sweden and Norway and between Germany and the Netherlands (Richards, Platt, and Weber 1985).

We see in this definition that there is nothing inherently privileging in the more general term "language" over the term "dialect." Yet by calling something a dialect as opposed to a language, we diminish power. Dialects are often seen as something smaller or less important than a language. In Iran, after the revolution, the new constitution called a number of languages "dialects" (Weryho 1983). This automatically gave them less status than if they had been called languages. According to the Iranian constitution, speakers of "dialects" could use these languages for private purposes but had no access to government resources to support them.

Many nations have constitutions that identify particular languages as national languages, symbolizing and linking their use to the nation-state. These languages may or may not be the most widely spoken; they are sometimes chosen simply because the ruling class speaks a particular language. Sometimes national languages change as boundaries change. In the former state of Yugoslavia, the national language was Serbo-Croatian. Now there are two separate nations with two separate languages, Serbian and Croatian, even though the U.S. State Department still refers to the language in both nations as Serbo-Croatian (see the NSEP list of languages in this chapter).

Often, newly independent states shift their language policies to promote local languages. This phenomenon can be seen throughout the former Soviet Union, where the newly independent states (NIS) shifted from Russian to Uzbek, Kyrgyz, Tajik, Ukrainian, and other languages. As these areas are of critical geopolitical interest to the United States, there is developing interest in funding students who wish to learn these languages.

Newly independent states sometimes choose to retain the language of their colonizers because this external language has less baggage than any internal language. In former colonies of Great Britain, English is frequently one of the national languages. On the other hand, sometimes external languages become languages of resistance. In Namibia, for example, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) conducted their work in English in order to avoid supporting the regime in power in the early 1980s (Brock-Utne and Holmarsdottir 2001).

A *national* language is not the same as an *official* language. An official language is used for official purposes—for example, in legal proceedings. Most often, national languages are also official languages, but frequently official languages are not national languages. Cobarrubias (1983) refers to three additional language statuses: promoted, tolerated, and

proscribed. A language that is promoted is one that a government invests in via development of materials or support for institutions offering teacher education in the language. A language that is tolerated is one where no investment is made on the part of the government or education ministry, and a language that is proscribed is one where individuals are actually punished for using it in speech, education, radio, and other media.

It is difficult to find settings where languages are completely proscribed. Turkey provides a good example in that Kurdish is legally restricted in public settings in spite of a 1991 massive annulment of laws limiting use of languages other than Turkish (see Skutnabb-Kangas and Bucak 1995). Turkish law limits the contexts in which Kurdish can be used. Law 3713, the law to Fight Terrorism, effective April 12, 1991, relates Kurdish to terrorism, terrorist criminals, terrorist crimes, and crimes committed for terrorist purposes. Skutnabb-Kangas and Bucak (1995, p. 357) present the text of Article 8, Propaganda against the Indivisible Unity of the State. This article stipulates: "Written and oral propaganda and assemblies aiming at damaging the indivisible unity of the State of the Turkish Republic with its territory and nation are forbidden, regardless of the method, intention and ideas behind it." In 2006 a group of more than sixty-four mayors of Kurdish-speaking communities in Turkey signed a petition asking that the Turkish government not close down a Kurdish television broadcast from Denmark that the Turkish government suggested was sponsored by the PKK, a terrorist organization. All sixty-four mayors were arrested and charged with violation of Law 3713. In April 2008, they were convicted. According to a Kurdish-rights website, an appeal will be filed. If this fails, the case will perhaps be taken to the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg, France. The decision that the court makes is one that Turkey will have to abide by (Kurdish Rights 2009).

In some settings, Cobarrubias argues, governments actually try to kill off languages that are perceived as somehow threatening to the stability of the nation-state. Sometimes, governments simply let languages die; there is no infusion of resources, and the languages wither. This can be seen in many of the Native American communities in the United States. Governments may "tolerate" the existence of a language by allowing it to exist but not support its maintenance. But Cobarrubias also suggests that a government can partially support a specific language. An example would be allowing it to be used at a regional level, as with numerous languages in Nigeria, or actually by adopting it as an official language.

After the Iranian revolution in 1979, the new government rewrote the constitution and its policies on national and official languages, as well as what they termed "dialects"; the official and common language and script of the people of Iran is Persian.

All official correspondence, documents, texts, as well as textbooks must be in this language and script; however, the use of local or tribal dialects is allowed along with the Persian language in publications and mass media and in the instruction of their literature in schools. (Official translation of the Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran as cited in Weryho 1983, p. 11)

Even while Iran was at war with Iraq, high school textbooks described Arabic as the unifying language of the region because the Holy Quran is written in Arabic. At the same time, the constitution of Iran clearly states that the only official language is Persian—even though there are thousands of speakers of other languages within the country, including Arabic, Turkish, Rashti, Luri, and Kurdish. Individuals are allowed to use other languages for social purposes and even broadcast them by radio as long as there is no intent for them to compete with Persian (Brown 1981).

When governments write aspects of language policy into government documents, the policies are termed de jure. When countries have unofficial policies, they are termed de facto. In Canada, both French and English are official languages as decreed in the constitution. In contrast, the United States has no official language and no national language, although English is clearly the language of power and everyday life. De facto English is both the official and the national language. There have been consistent attempts to write an amendment to the Constitution declaring English to be the official language, but they have failed. At the state and community level, however, numerous statutes have been passed declaring English the official language, perhaps the most notable of which is the state of California. Only two states, New Mexico and Hawaii, have more than one official language. In the case of New Mexico, the second official language is Spanish, and in the case of Hawaii, the second official language is Hawaiian.

Historically in the United States, the use of languages other than English has been seen as threatening. In the workplaces of the early 1900s, individuals speaking foreign languages were often seen as promoting unionism through the secrecy of a foreign code (Ruiz 1984; Tyak 1974). Children were rewarded for speaking only English. On the Minnesota Iron Range, students actually wore buttons stating "I speak English." A director of a University of Minnesota Americanization institute in the mid-1900s reminded social workers and language educators that "it takes three full generations to eradicate all traces of ethnicity." The idea of a multilingual nation is seen as positive in Canada, while in the United States, multilingualism is still often viewed with suspicion, drawing attention as something "alien" and problematic as opposed to simply a difference. During World War II, numerous states passed legislation supported by Public Safety Commissions declaring the use of foreign languages in public settings to be against the law, resulting in a drastic drop in the study of German between 1916 and 1918 (Ovando 2003; Wiley 1998).

Statehood and nationalism can be reinforced or resisted through language use. Over the next fifty years, it is expected that the current count of 195 nations will increase to about 220 (http://geography.about.com/cs/countries/a/numbercountries.htm). These nation-states will undoubtedly establish policies regarding national and official languages. As smaller languages die out or (depending on your political perspective) are killed off, other languages may become stronger because of their sociopolitical associations.

The degree of government control of electronic communication also affects language. Iran currently has one of the highest numbers of bloggers in the world. Alavi (2005) indicates that "Farsi is the fourth most frequently used language for keeping online journals. There are more Iranian blogs than there are Spanish, German, Italian, Chinese, or Russian" (p. 1). Yet Iranian bloggers cannot count on being able to access their sites in a reliable manner. Many bloggers

have had to leave the country due to persecution. Others have had their sites closed and have had to set them up over and over with new names and URLs. This has become such a problem that Western political pressure is being used to protect bloggers throughout the Middle East via a project known as the Voice Initiative (Ephron 2007). Ephron reports on the difficulties endured by the Syrian blogger Ammar Abdulhamid. In spite of being the son of a famous musician, he cannot escape governmental scrutiny when he blogs about negative aspects of his homeland. Michael Totten and others decry the travails of an Egyptian blogger with the moniker "Sandmonkey" who was actually forced to close down his blog in a situation similar to that of the Iranians discussed by Alavi (Totten 2009). Language is a major concern of states.

**Language and International Communication**

In 1997 the British Council, a language policy arm of the British Government, hired linguist David Graddol to generate demographic predictions for global language use in the year 2050. For purposes of strategic planning, their goal was to identify what would happen to English and, by extension, English-language teaching as promoted around the world through the British Council. Although Graddol found that English is not likely to lose its power in the next fifty years, he also predicted that it will not simply be native speakers of English from Inner Circle countries (United States, Canada, Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand) that will wield this power but also fluent, intelligible, multilingual users of English living around the globe whose first language is not English. Graddol suggests that in transactions around the world, there are numerous examples of native speakers (NSs) using English with nonnative speakers (NNSs) as well as nonnative speakers using English with each other. We could find, for example, a Saudi businessperson conducting business in Japan in English or two European IBM executives using English with each other in a meeting in Brussels.

By most accounts, English is the most powerful global language. Academic journals such as *English Worldwide, English Today, and World Englishes* examine English around the world. In terms of business and culture diffusion (for example, through music and films), English is powerful and necessary. An entire industry has sprung up to support short-term English-language training. At international sporting events such as the Pan Asian American Games, the Commonwealth Games, and the Olympics, massive training programs are established to develop guides able to speak English with international tourists. In Malaysia and elsewhere, some companies have rating scales to determine whose English is good enough to use in a business setting within the country and who could be sent out of country to conduct company business using English (Gill 2001, 1996). Linguist Jennifer Jenkins has studied and refined descriptions of what she terms ELF—English as a lingua franca (2007, p. 4):

ELF is the preferred term for a relatively new manifestation of English which is very different in concept from both English as a Second Language (ESL)—the label frequently given to outer circle Englishes—and English as the Foreign Language (EFLL)—the traditional, if to a great extreme anachronistic, label for English in the expanding circle. Unlike ESL varieties, it is not primarily a local or contact language within national groups but *between* them. And unlike EFL, whose goal is in reality ENL (English as a Native Language), it is not primarily a language of communication between its NSs and NNSs, but among its NNSs.

Jenkins's conceptualization of English can be contrasted with that of more traditional thinkers (for example, Crystal 1997) in that context and users are charged with determining what the rules are: if the speakers can understand each other in an academic or businesslike setting, it does not matter if they are following all the rules of British, American, or some other native-speaker variety of English. It is also assumed that the closer the English is to a native-speaker variety, the more internationally comprehensible it will be. Among scholars there is disagreement over how English should be taught and what models should be promoted—a monomodel that sees only native-speakerlike English as acceptable or a polymodel that makes room for variation depending on the situation.

For our purposes, these disagreements are important for several reasons. First, like the examples we have seen in the chapters on environment and globalization, what seems to be an objective truth may instead be a well-supported hypothesis. Second, you may choose to travel using English, live for a time in an Outer Circle country (countries colonized by the United States or Great Britain using English for internal purposes), or travel to an Expanding Circle country (a country where English has been imported and taught as a foreign language) to teach English. You need to be aware that in some settings, English is seen as a tool of hegemony and colonization, while in others it is seen as a language of wider communication.

Other languages that Graddol suggests will come to hold a similar position to English internationally and/or regionally include Chinese, Spanish, Arabic, Bahasa Malaysia, and Hindi/Urdu. Graddol uses the term "Big" languages, while Cobarrubias (1983) names them "Killer" languages. Both authors recognize the power of these languages; one chooses a somewhat neutral term to characterize this power, while the other draws on negative associations. Is one correct and the other simply an ideological marker? Probably not. The two terms reflect distinct ideologies that scholars can draw upon as they investigate the state of the world's languages. It is important for you to identify which perspective most closely matches your own. Just as health officials watch diseases jumping from species to species and global pandemics cross national borders, it is important to understand that languages can also sometimes be viewed as destructive.

**Language and Security**

After September 11, 2001, the United States began to approach language fluency from a security standpoint. Since the Cold War, there have been efforts to build up foreign language fluency in the U.S. population, but with minimal success. For example, the Foreign Language and Area Studies awards were available in the late seventies and early eighties. In 1991 the David L. Boren National Security Education Act was passed by Congress, authorizing the creation of the National Security Education Program (NSEP). The goal of the program has been to support the development of language proficiency in what are termed critical languages for individuals contemplating any type of government position. In return for fellowships ranging from three months to one year, both graduate and undergraduate students have been required to commit to some type of government service linked to national security.

The Institute for International Education (IIE), which manages the Boren graduate, undergraduate, and flagship programs, published the following list of languages and countries deemed critical to national security for the year 2007. Examine the tables below to identify patterns. What languages and what regions are prominent? Based on your knowledge of global issues, why might these languages and regions be highlighted at the expense of others?

**Table 1. 2007 NSEP Countries Critical to U.S. National Security**

**Africa**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Angola | Democratic Republic of the Congo | Republic of the Congo | Cote d'Ivoire |
| Eritrea | Ethiopia | Kenya | Liberia |
| Nigeria | Rwanda | Sierra Leone | South Africa |
| Sudan | Tanzania | Uganda | Zimbabwe |

**East Asia and the Pacific**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Burma | Cambodia | China | Indonesia |
| Japan | North Korea | South Korea | Malaysia |
| Philippines | Taiwan | Thailand | Vietnam |

**Europe/Eurasia**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Albania | Armenia | Azerbaijan | Belarus |
| Bosnia & Herzegovina | Bulgaria | Croatia | Czech Republic |
| Georgia | Hungary | Kazakhstan | Kyrgyzstan |
| Macedonia | Moldova | Poland | Romania |
| Russia | Serbia & Montenegro | Slovakia | Slovenia |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Tajikistan | Turkey | Ukraine | Uzbekistan |

**Latin America and the Caribbean**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Argentina | Brazil | Chile | Colombia |
| Cuba | El Salvador | Guatemala | Haiti |
| Honduras | Mexico | Nicaragua | Panama |
| Venezuela | | | |

**Middle East**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Algeria | Bahrain | Egypt | Iran |
| Iraq | Israel | Jordan | Kuwait |
| Lebanon | Libya | Morocco | Oman |
| Qatar | Saudi Arabia | Syria | Tunisia |
| United Arab Emirates | Yemen | | |

**South Asia**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Afghanistan | India | Pakistan |

**Table 2. Forty-Eight Languages of Critical National Interest to the United States in 2007**

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Albanian | Hindi | Mandarin | Swahili |
| Amharic | Hungarian | Mongolian | Tagalog |
| Arabic (& dialects) | Indonesian | Pashto | Tajik |
| Armenian | Japanese | Persian | Tamil |
| Azerbaijan | Kazakh | Polish | Thai |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Belarusian | Khmer | Portuguese | Turkmen |
| Bulgarian | Korean | Romanian | Turkish |
| Burmese | Kurdish | Russian | Uighur |
| Cantonese | Kyrgyz | Serbo-Croatian | Ukrainian |
| Czech | Lingala | Sinhala | Urdu |
| Georgian | Macedonian | Slovak | Uzbek |
| Hebrew | Malay | Swahili | Vietnamese |

These languages are only a subset of the 150 languages listed in the appendices of the 2004 Civilian Linguist Reserve Corps Feasibility Study (electronic citation, p. 33 retrieved online on December 17). In 2003 the U.S. Congress requested a feasibility study on a Civilian Linguist Reserve Corps (Section 325 of Public Law 107-306). By January 2005, the study had been completed by NSEP. Roughly one year after September 11th, the U.S. Department of Defense asked the military to review its policies and procedures regarding language professionals. Over the next two years more than six more study/assessment activities were completed. By January 2005, the U.S. Department of Defense had actually crafted what they termed the "Defense Language Transformation Roadmap" (www.defenselink.mil/news/Mar2005/d20050330roadmap.pdf).

This road map has the goals of creating foundational language and regional area expertise; creating the capacity to surge (that is, to establish cadres of language professionals possessing functional proficiency for a variety of job specifications); and establishing a process to track the accession, separation, and promotion rates of military personnel with language skills and foreign area officers. Details of the road map are available at (www.nsep.gov/support/CivilianLinguistReserveCorpsFeasibilityStudy.pdf).

Of particular note are the assumptions that underlie the goals, reproduced in total below for their clarity in identifying how the U.S. government perceives the links between language proficiency and national capacity Defense Language Transformation Road Map, p. 3):

> 1. Conflict against enemies speaking less commonly taught languages and thus the need for foreign language capability will not abate. Robust foreign language and foreign area expertise are critical to sustaining coalitions, pursuing regional stability, and conducting multinational missions, especially in post-conflict and other than combat, security, humanitarian, nation-building, and stability operations.
>
> 2. Changes in the international security environment and in the nature of threats to U.S. national security have increased the range of potential conflict zones and expanded the number of likely coalition partners with whom U.S. forces will work.

3. Establishing a new "global footprint" for DoD (Department of Defense) and transitioning to a more expeditionary force will bring increased requirements for language and regional knowledge to work with new coalition partners in a wide variety of activities, often with little or no notice. This new approach to war fighting in the 21st century will require forces that have foreign language capabilities beyond those generally available in today's force.

4. Adversaries will attempt to manipulate the media and leverage sympathetic elements of the population and "opposition" politicians to divide international coalitions.

These documents demonstrate that the United States has begun to make investments in and connections between language and national security that have existed for some time in other countries. It is anticipated that these investments are likely to continue. For example, research that helps the government identify accents as real or unreal (is someone presenting themselves as a speaker of a particular language from a particular nation when in fact he or she is from another country that also uses that language?) will likely be funded as security-clearance-type research. Perhaps in the future, the role of Native American languages in national security will reemerge, as in the situation in World War II where speakers of Navajo (Dine) were employed in classified positions as code talkers. Unfortunately, if this happens, we may never know because it will be classified information.

The U.S. military now actively promotes linguistic and cultural competence in a local language for soldiers on the ground as well as for those in training in the military academies. For example, all active enlisted army soldiers can download copies of Rosetta Stone™ language learning programs to their computers at no cost. A powerful example of the use of multilingual soldiers occurred in the former Yugoslavia, where joint NATO forces were stationed. A Dutch colonel there broke up the Romanian platoon in his unit in order to place two of them in each American division because, unlike the U.S. monolingual soldiers, the Romanians were able to find effective ways to communicate with the villagers around them and could translate for the Americans even though the Romanians could not speak the local language either. The multilingual soldiers were able to be edge walkers, mediating between two cultures. This emphasizes why the U.S. military places a great emphasis on the importance of language acquisition.

In another case, a young man of Irish descent who was a first lieutenant in the U.S. Army was majoring in international studies and had completed two years of Arabic when he was called up to serve in Afghanistan. In preparation, he studied Dari, a variety of Persian spoken in Afghanistan, at Fort Riley, Kansas; upon deployment, he left with a pocket-sized Dari phrase book. He was the only member of his company to have studied a Middle Eastern language in a formal academic setting. His language and leadership skills, coupled with a commitment to communication across cultures, allowed him to work closely with village elders and mullahs (religious leaders) on the reconstruction of the Pushto region of Afghanistan, an area where, to his dismay, Dari was not particularly helpful. Even though his Arabic was primarily Modern Standard Arabic (otherwise known as Fussha, a classical rather than spoken Arabic), he was

amazed to discover that it was Arabic that helped him communicate across cultures, so much so that when he departed, a local mosque was named in his honor.

**Language, Sustainability, and Biodiversity**

As physical scientists and social scientists work collaboratively to investigate the intersection of biology, culture, and language, research and activist agendas have focused on biological diversity and ecosystemic sustainability. Language is a critical pillar. As the table below indicates (UNESCO 2003, p. 39), there is roughly a 64% overlap between areas with the highest numbers of endemic vertebrates and endemic languages; in other words, the belted area around the equator, along with several other areas evident in the table, are a storehouse of biological and linguistic diversity.

**Table 3: Endemism in Languages Compared with Rankings of Biodiversity**

| Country | Endemic Languages Rank | Endemic Languages Number | Endemic Vertebrates Rank | Endemic Vertebrates Number | Flowering Plants | Endemic Bird Areas | On Megadiversity List? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Papua New Guinea | 1 | 847 | 13 | 203 | 18 | 6 | yes |
| Indonesia | 2 | 655 | 4 | 673 | 7 | 1 | yes |
| Nigeria | 3 | 376 | | | | | |
| India | 4 | 309 | 7 | 373 | 12 | 11 | yes |
| Australia | 5 | 261 | 1 | 1346 | 11 | 9 | yes |
| Mexico | 6 | 230 | 2 | 761 | 4 | 2 | yes |
| Cameroon | 7 | 201 | 23 | 105 | 24 | | |
| Brazil | 8 | 185 | 3 | 725 | 1 | 4 | yes |
| Democratic Republic of the Congo | 9 | 158 | 18 | 134 | 17 | | yes |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Philippines | 10 | 153 | 6 | 437 | 25 | 11 | yes |
| USA | 11 | 143 | 11 | 284 | 9 | 15 | yes |
| Vanuatu | 12 | 105 | | | | | |
| Tanzania | 13 | 101 | 21 | 113 | 19 | 14 | |
| Sudan | 14 | 97 | | | | | |
| Malaysia | 15 | 92 | | | 14 | | |
| Ethiopia | 16 | 90 | 25 | 88 | | | |
| China | 17 | 77 | 12 | 256 | 3 | 6 | yes |
| Peru | 18 | 75 | 8 | 332 | 13 | 3 | yes |
| Chad | 19 | 74 | | | | | |
| Russia | 20 | 71 | | | 6 | | |
| Solomon Islands | 21 | 69 | 24 | 101 | | | |
| Nepal | 22 | 68 | | | 22 | | |
| Colombia | 23 | 55 | 9 | 330 | 2 | 5 | yes |
| Ivory Coast | 24 | 51 | | | | | |
| Canada | 25 | 47 | | | | | |

While the numbers of speakers of languages in these areas are relatively small, numerous authors have presented compelling rationales for preserving our linguistic and cultural biodiversity for the sake of humanity's future (Skutnabb-Kangas 2000; MacPherson 2003; Mulhauser 2001).

Linguistic diversity is, then, our treasury of historically developed knowledge—including knowledge about how to maintain and use sustainably some of the most vulnerable and biologically diverse environments in the world. If during the next century we lose more than half of our languages, we also seriously undermine our chances for life on earth (UNESCO 2003, p. 42).

The connection between language loss and preservation, and the link with biological diversity, remains an important one for students of international studies.

Globalization affects the sociological and biological balance described above. Whether planned or unplanned, world languages like English can control the fate of smaller languages within nation-states. Consider the U.S. island protectorate of Guam. Prior to U.S. positioning in the Pacific Basin during World War II, Chamorro was the primary language of Guam. The economic capitol of English has gradually begun to edge out Chamorro as the U.S. military continues to remain the largest employer on the island. At present, most middle- and upper-class Guam families use English as their primary language. While the edging out of Chamorro is not as drastic as the eradication of all but two species of birds on Guam (Jaffe 1994) beginning in the 1950s (due to the arrival of the brown tree snake inside a cargo plane), the devastation caused by Chamorro's ultimate demise has and will no doubt continue to affect the balance of the ecosystem in the future. Language loss leads to culture and community change. This change has irrevocable consequences, frequently leading to a domino effect in terms of loss. The ecosystemic price is high.

Paul Boevers (2006, p. 4) provides a second example of the consequences of language loss with his summary of the fate of the Sami in Lapland:

> The Sami languages reflect the ecology of the arctic tundra and are essential for the survival of Sami culture, especially reindeer herding. . . . The Sami languages have adapted to fit the need of the herders' way of living. The relationship between the Sami languages and reindeer herding is so intertwined that non-herding Sami have more difficulty maintaining the language, as shown by Henning Johansson's study of Swedish non-herding Sami: 20% could not understand Sami, 40% could not speak Sami, 65% could not read Sami, and 85% could not write Sami. (Beech 1994)

A factor of critical importance to the relationship between language and the ecosystem is that the health and power of languages within a particular community (endogenous languages) and languages from outside a particular community (exogenous languages) can affect the health and well-being of the community as a whole. While some scholars would argue that there are natural and imposed dimensions of the life cycles of languages (Moag 1982; Schmied 1991), these cycles are intricately entwined in other dimensions of their communities.

**Language and Human Rights**

Skutnabb-Kangas (2000) distinguishes between language rights and linguistic human rights. Until the mid-1990s, there were few if any provisions made for "binding human rights instruments" at the international level. Skutnabb-Kangas suggests that language rights are broader than linguistic human rights: while they are important, they are sometimes "extra"' and include things such as the right to learn a foreign language in school. In contrast, linguistic human rights having to do with "language related identity [and] access to mother tongues" are central to people's lives. Other collective dimensions of linguistic human rights include "the right for minorities and indigenous peoples to exist and reproduce themselves as distinct groups, with their own languages and cultures" (2000, p. 499).

Why should these rights matter to those of us studying in our mother tongues in comfortable and safe classrooms? Intentionally or unintentionally, we may be contributing to how our governments approach linguistic human rights by not understanding and affirming that these rights exist. Furthermore, we may demonstrate insensitivity to immigrant colleagues and their children even as we promote dimensions of global understanding. Thus it is imperative for us to see connections around us between language and global patterns of settlement, security, and protection.

As an example, Quechua, an indigenous language, is spoken in a variety of Latin American countries. There are roughly 9.6 million Quechua speakers throughout Ecuador, Bolivia, Chile, Argentina, Colombia, and Peru (Hornberger 2001, p. 169). Spanish was introduced when these nation-states were colonized. In Peru, although Quechua is a national language, most individuals know that to succeed, it is necessary to be a fluent Spanish speaker. If Quechua holds no linguistic capitol in spite of being a national language, parents will continue to push their children to lose Quechua as quickly as possible and to use only Spanish. Is it possible for students to do both? Clearly it is—but only with a governmental investment in increasing the capitol value of Quechua.

In Hawaii, individuals made choices to learn English in order to get coveted jobs in the sugarcane and pineapple industries. While there were no overt government policies preventing the use of Hawaiian, there was an economic expediency to being an English user. As has often happened with other indigenous populations of the world, teachers punished children for using Hawaiian in school by putting tape over their mouths, washing their mouths out with soap, or physically beating them. Through these practices, students internalized the dominant attitudes toward their own languages (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000).

It is of paramount importance for languages and cultures in positions of power to recognize how they affect communities around them with less power. In Burma, for example, members of the indigenous Karen group have found it more effective for local nongovernmental organizations to provide educational assistance to the Karen than for international NGOs to do this. Van Dan Acker (2006, p. 9) suggests:

> Now more than ever there is an increased need for Karen people to be educated. However, they cannot be properly educated with the resources they have presently. A new need to learn Burmese has arisen. Humanrightswtach.org illustrates people who cannot communicate effectively with Burmese solders and are thus forced into labor.

Van Dan Acker highlights the Karen Teacher Working Group website (http://kktwg.org/home.html) as a further illustration of local solutions to problems in the area of indigenous education.

Another example of the complexity of linguistic human rights can be found in India, where exiled Tibetans flock to the northern border and Buddhist nurses maintain traditional perspectives on health even as they struggle to become fluent users of English. MacPherson

(2003) reports that English-language educators working with these nurses were forbidden to teach Western medical English. Why? Because of the recognition that the language carries culture; with Western medical language come attitudes and beliefs toward healing that frequently contrast with Buddhist traditional views of healing.

**Language and Individual Identity**

Richard Ruiz (1984) suggests that there are three possible perspectives on language: language as problem, language as resource, and language as right. Language as a problem is a perspective that sees threats in use of a nondominant language. In the U.S. school system, the historical attitude has been that any use of a language other than English causes difficulties for schools, individuals, and ultimately society. Students who come to school with fluent oral use of a language other than English are typically not supported in using and maintaining this language; the ultimate school goal is for learners to be strong users of English only. From a national security perspective, this becomes a strategic dilemma. It is easier to develop strong working fluency in a second language like Korean, Vietnamese, Russian, and Arabic as young adults if there has been early exposure to the language.

Skutnabb-Kangas (2000) promotes the perspective of language as a right in that individuals have the right to use their mother tongue in public settings, to go to court in such a language, and to name their children with traditional names from their home language, no matter what country they are living in. This perspective contrasts directly with a bumper sticker found on a vehicle in the Pacific Northwest in the fall of 2010: "No hablemos espagnol. This is the United States." In both the United States and Canada, there are records of native/aboriginal children in boarding schools being punished for using their language even on the playground. In France, certain first names have been prohibited, and the same is true in Iran, where postrevolution names deemed too "royal" or too Western were forbidden.

Language as a resource is the most positive perspective. Ruiz suggests that if we see use of an additional language besides English as a resource, this resource can be supported and ultimately used to the benefit of all. To return to the Quechua example, if use of Quechua in Peru is seen as a resource rather than simply a national language in name only, government funding can be invested through the college level in maintaining teachers, developing materials, and creating media programming to reach more individuals.

Public documents from the European Union (http://www.europa.edu) and from the Council of Europe (http://www.coe.int) indicate the time and effort government officials have invested in protecting the languages of the EU, given that some languages possess more linguistic capitol than others. Preservation of linguistic human rights is paramount in the planning conducted by the EU.

Some scholars argue that one can lose one's mother tongue but still be actively connected to the cultural community of that language. Jerzy Smolicz (1979) contrasts Greek immigrants to Australia with Dutch immigrants to Australia. The Greek immigrants maintain their "Greekness" while actively promoting maintenance of the Greek language—not unlike the parents in the film *My Big Fat Greek Wedding*, who insist their American-born children attend Greek school on a

weekly basis. The Dutch immigrants maintain their "Dutchness" even though they do not insist their children learn their parents' home language. On the other hand, Thomas Paikeday (1985) looks at how multilingual children in places like India and Africa may lose their mother tongues if their elementary schooling is in a regional language that is different from their home languages. In addition, their regional language may be replaced by a language like English or French in secondary school and at a university.

The Kurds are one of only two indigenous groups recognized by the UN that do not have a nation-state (Palestinians are the other). Scattered among Russia, Syria, Iran, Iraq, and Turkey, the Kurds have three different alphabets, even though language is a unifier among all Kurds. In Iran, Iraq, and Syria, the alphabet is the Arabic alphabet, written from right to left. In Russia the alphabet is Cyrillic, and in Turkey the alphabet is the Roman alphabet—both of which are written from left to right. If the Kurdish language as a marker of Kurdish identity vanishes, it will become even more difficult to maintain an ethnic profile, particularly since the Kurds do not have a homeland.

The final example takes place in Oaxaca, Mexico. Read through this case study to identify further examples of language rights issues. Oaxaca is a poor southern state in Mexico, a nation-state offering one of the most linguistically rich ecosystems in Latin America. Approximately 40% of the population of Oaxaca is indigenous (Ríos Morales 2001) if the main criterion is language, but 70% of the population is indigenous if another criterion is used (Anderson 2003; see also INEGI 1993). Within the sixteen different languages spoken in Oaxaca, there is an immense diversity, from dying languages such as Ixacetec, with 200 speakers, to thriving languages such as Zapotec, which may have 400,000 speakers (Whipperman 2006). Even these figures can be deceptive, because the languages are fractured into separate and mutually unintelligible groups within each family. The Zapotec family, for example, has more than twenty different languages, each of which has its own name, such as Lhej, Xan, Xhon, and Xidza (Ríos Morales 2001). Locally, these languages are referred to by associating them with the regions in which they are spoken, so that within Oaxaca, specific groups of speakers are called the Zapotec of "the Mountains," of "the Valley," or of "the Isthmus." (To listen to examples of each, go to the website of Frente Comun Contra El SIDA: www.frentecomunoaxaca.org/en015.htm.)

The linguistic differences with other language families are immense. Some languages, such as Zapotec and Mazatec, are tonal; that is, the meaning of a word changes depending upon whether the tone is "low, high, rising, or falling" (Whipperman 2006). This characteristic permits Mazatec speakers to have an unusual whistled form of their language, so that they can whistle messages from one high mountain ridge to another, as the sound carries great distances:

> Detailed messages, extended conversations, and urgent requests with substantive information could be expressed simply by whistling. It was possible, for example, for two men to meet on a trail, discuss the weather, argue about the worth of a commodity, settle on a price, and continue on their way without a single word having been exchanged. Travelers separated by a quarter mile or field hands working on opposite sides of a valley could communicate across distances that would muffle ordinary voices. The secret lay in an ability to replicate the tonal and

> rhythmic features of the spoken language, but in a manner that few outsiders, however fluent in Mazatec, could understand. (Davis 1996, pp. 101–2)

This structure is fundamentally different from Nahuatl, the ancient language of the Aztecs, whose colonies in Oaxaca implanted their language in the region. This cultural richness presents both great opportunities and challenges. How does a government conceive of a state when the region is so linguistically fractured that neighboring villages may not be able to communicate across a field?

The social context also affects the politics of language. Bordered by Chiapas in the south, Oaxaca is one of the most impoverished states in Mexico, although it is true that in the city of Oaxaca (Ciudad de Oaxaca), there is a thriving service sector, which has fostered the development of a handicrafts trade directed to the tourist market. Villages specialize in particular crafts—Zapotec rugs, Mixtec pottery—for Europeans and North Americans. But at short distances from the urban center, one can find communities that are isolated by language and neglect and experiencing great social misery.

As Paula Anderson wrote in her master's thesis, this reality can be seen in mortality statistics:

> The principal causes of death reported in Oaxaca in 2002 [were] in order of occurrence: infectious intestinal illnesses, malignant tumors, pneumonia, homicides, accidents, cirrhosis and other liver diseases, and measles. According to a 1992 report, 23.9 percent of Oaxaca's households lacked electricity, 41.9 percent lacked running water, and 61.1 percent had no sewers. The infant mortality rate in Oaxaca is the highest in Mexico: 33 deaths for every 1,000 live births. By comparison, the rest of Mexico is 27 for every 1000 live births." (Anderson 2003, pp.14-15)

Anderson's work emphasizes that women are particularly impacted by this poverty. Most women in rural areas marry young (fifteen is a common age), begin having children early, and spend lengthy periods alone with their children as their husbands are abroad. Many women lack enough food, do not have adequate prenatal care, and endure violence (Anderson 2003).

These social facts shape the context in which language must be understood, as many linguistic communities have survived because of their isolation and marginalization; at the same time, poverty has driven high rates of labor migration to the United States. As Lourdes de León Pasquel has argued, this means that one needs to consider language policies in both Mexico and the United States in order to frame the experience of minority language speakers in Oaxaca (León Pasquel, 2001b). In many countries, having an official language is seen as an essential part of creating a nation. For this reason, in Mexico during the nineteenth century, Spanish was the official language, even though the country had a multiplicity of languages. After the Mexican Revolution began in 1910, the state realized that it had to recognize the demands of the indigenous peoples. But it did so by trying to educate indigenous peoples in the majority language. It was not until the 1960s that the state began to truly recognize linguistic diversity, while the 1990s saw a plethora of laws to defend linguistic rights, in large part because of political organization within indigenous communities (León Pasquel 2001b). The government

has also encouraged the publication of works in indigenous languages, even for small language groups, such as the 15,000 Triques of Oaxaca (CONACULTA 2002).

Mexico's policy contrasts sharply with the language policy in Mexico's northern neighbor, at least on paper. In the United States, León Pasquel points to the increasing pressure for an English-only policy by both local and state governments. The passage of measure 187 in California reflected widespread resentment of undocumented workers (see the cultural valence of the terms "illegal alien" versus "undocumented worker"), which can be seen in a wide range of policies and court rulings. For example, the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that bilingual Latinos may be excluded from juries that are trying other Latinos because their bond of language may not make them neutral (León Pasquel 2001b).

On the surface, it would seem that Mexico's policy is much more supportive of linguistic minorities. But in reality, León Pasquel argues, both countries place immense pressure on language communities to adopt the dominant language. She points to a number of tragic cases that support this perspective. Many young men leave their home communities, which may only have thousands of speakers, and enter a world of Spanish or English in order to make a living. They face a number of risks, not the least of which is that of being diagnosed as mentally ill. For example, in 1986 a Trique man was confined in Oregon for a year in a mental hospital because he "smiled inappropriately" and did not interact every time a Spanish speaker was sent to speak with him. It wasn't until contact was made with a Mixtec translator that it was found that the "patient" was a Trique. When communicating in his language after a year in isolation, he said that he believed that he had been imprisoned, although he thought it strange that "they inject you daily" (León Pasquel 2001b). There are similar examples in Mexico, where large numbers of migrants also travel to work as agricultural laborers in coffee and sugar plantations as well as in industry (León Pasquel 2001b).

Another famous case that León Pasquel points to is that of a Mixtec man, Santiago Ventura Morales, who was accused of murder in Oregon. During his trial, he had a Spanish translator from Cuba, who also served as the translator for his accusers. How this could have functioned, since the translator spoke no Mixtec, is unclear. But the judge told the jury that in rendering a judgment they could not consider the quality of translation in the court (León Pasquel 2001b). Evidence later emerged that Ventura Morales was innocent, and he later went on to graduate from the University of Portland. Such cases are not isolated. León Pasquel cites similar cases in Mexico (León Pasquel 2001b), one of which involved a young man who finally learned enough Spanish while in prison to be able to explain his version of the crime (León Pasquel 2001b).

While these cases are disturbing, they illustrate the fact that the social marginalization of linguistic minorities makes them vulnerable to exploitation since they do not have the ability to claim their rights before the state (León Pasquel 2001b). Another problem is that the children of many migrants return to Mexico having spent years in the United States, where they have learned to speak English, only to find it very challenging to learn their traditional language, such as Zapotec. Despite the scale of these problems, they can be overcome with creativity.

The success of HIV/AIDS education in Oaxaca provides an example of the difficulties posed by linguistic diversity in rural areas. Mexico's HIV prevalence is lower than that of the United

States, but it is growing—especially in rural areas—where there is large out-migration to the United States. Young men travel from small, traditional centers to the United States, where they spend time without their families, endure situations of great stress, and enjoy more disposable income than they have ever known. Some of them experiment with drugs or new sexual practices, and a small fraction of them come back to Oaxaca or other states with HIV. When they return to Mexico, they may engage in sexual activity with awaiting wives or girlfriends who are deeply enlaced in traditional gender roles and who find it very difficult to negotiate condom usage (Smallman 2007). Far more Oaxacan housewives are being diagnosed with HIV than sex workers (by a factor of at least ten), even though the sex workers are much more likely to be tested (Smallman 2007).

AIDS educators from many different backgrounds in Oaxaca have recognized this challenge, but it is very difficult to resolve. In many communities, all of the young men are gone, leaving villages filled with women, children, and older folks. Many nurses and outreach workers employed by the state government have adopted the belief that the entire community must be educated about HIV/AIDS and that one cannot focus on the migrants alone (Smallman 2007). This is a wise approach, but there is a second major challenge. How can one prepare culturally appropriate materials in the proper language for that community? One important NGO, Frente Común Contra el SIDA, has worked hard to address this challenge. The NGO successfully applied for a grant from the Mexican agency SEDESOL, which funded two years of work. The Frente Común partnered with a federal government program (CONAFE) that provides students with funds for their university education, in return for which they provide one year of service in remote rural communities, where they may teach Spanish, math, or hygiene. With these funds, Frente Común paid to translate educational materials into an indigenous language, with nine languages or dialects translated each year for two years. The end product was to be an audiocassette rather than a written document (Wolf 1995).

The work itself was demanding. To be certain that the translations were done correctly, two students who spoke the same language were paired, with each serving as a check on the other's work. In many cases, it was difficult to find the correct terms for phrases such as "vaginal fluids," which might be referred to in the language with euphemisms such as "honey from the mountains" (Wolf 1995). Balancing the need to be clear with materials that the elders would accept proved difficult. But in the end, Frente Común accomplished its goal with materials now available on their website. One might expect that in poor rural areas, no one would have access to the Web. But local educators and some young people still find opportunities to explore the online world. Bill Wolf of Frente Común gets reports from the server company that indicates the search terms that bring visitors to his site, which often resemble "Trique language AIDS information." Local communities accept AIDS education materials as something that belongs to them when they come with an audiocassette in their language (Personal communication, Bill Wolf, August 13, 2007). Moreover, these materials are also available on request both to local communities and migrant communities in the United States.

Such examples show what is possible with both the will and the funding. But language should not only be thought of as a barrier. The Zapotec writing system stretches at least as far back as the Roman Empire and perhaps earlier. The Mixtecs preserved their codices, which tell their history and myths going back over a thousand years. Each linguistic culture has a rich oral

tradition, from folktales to epic poetry, myth cycles, and ethnobotanical knowledge. In other words, language in Oaxaca is not only a wall that isolates communities but also a link to traditions that unite and define the state's peoples. Linguistic rights remain an important political issue in Mexico, as the Chiapas uprising illustrated. Many of these communities are not only surviving but in some cases may even be expanding, and some languages will be here for centuries to come.

**Language and You**

Throughout this chapter, we have looked at links between language and the nation-state, security, identity, and the environment. In an extended case study and numerous smaller examples, we have introduced you to the poignant issues of loss that speakers of smaller indigenous languages encounter every day. We have looked at urban and rural settings and seen that language issues have no boundaries. There is a very direct link between knowledge of other languages and connections to the world around us. English is a clear player in terms of globalization, but it is not the only major language of communication.

As the rest of this chapter has demonstrated, there are intricate relationships between languages of power and heritage languages. As a speaker of English, one of the power languages, if your interest in international studies carries the intent to participate in government service of any type, it is imperative for you to be a fluent user of at least one other language. If you have grown up using a language in addition to English, consider this a resource base to build from. Reexamine the list of critical languages in Table 2 of this chapter. Identify where and how you can complete a level of study in one or more of these languages that will be truly functional.

If your future work takes you into the private sector, recognize that competency in information technology combined with competency in a critical language makes you invaluable to your work team. Your knowledge of how powerful languages affect less-powerful languages may allow you to serve as a community resource and to diffuse tensions between users of particular languages. Your own personal fluency in another language may be the single skill that allows you to experience another culture while others simply pass through it.

Language competence is only one piece of the communication puzzle. Cultural competence—the knowledge of cultural norms, beliefs, and attitudes of a particular culture—coupled with interactional competence and intercultural competence are all necessary to be a global player. Interactional competence involves the knowledge of another culture's tacit communication rules. In Persian culture, for example, the term *taarof* (pronounced tah-rowf) refers to the fact that there are certain types of politeness rules that have language attached to them. For example, if you are sitting in front of someone in a movie theater, you are expected to turn around and say: "Excuse me for blocking your view." The expected response is: "Don't worry. Flowers have no fronts or backs." Intercultural competence is widely seen to incorporate knowledge of how two or more specific cultures interact. While we will not be exploring these dimensions further in this chapter, becoming interculturally competent is a goal you should add to your list of competencies to be able to move successfully across cultures.

If you continue your education in international studies, you will be expected to develop fluency in at least one language other than English. For example, in order to become a diplomat, you will need a "two-plus" level out of four on the U.S. State Department scale of proficiency in a second language. An effective international studies program will have a strong language component in which students read articles in second languages in their areas of specialization. This requirement is proficiency-based language learning, emphasizing functional skills in listening, speaking, reading, and writing. It will be important to think carefully in choosing a language to study by considering which languages are of strategic importance, which will remain alive over the next century, and which will retain their importance for purposes of national security or regional communication.

It is also important to learn a language of strategic or national importance—one that will remain alive and retain its importance for national security and maintain a regional value for commerce or government within a specific world region for the next fifty years. Receptive skills are more important than productive skills; listening and reading are equally important. Speaking is more important than writing. It could be sufficient to speak and write in your own language but be able to read and listen in the second language.

Throughout this chapter, we have explored language issues around the globe, both past and present. You have seen how language connects back to security, health, the environment, human rights, and our daily interactions with individuals whose levels of bilingualism contrast with our own. Try as we might, it is impossible to ignore these connections. As you continue your work in international studies, try to identify which of the sections of this chapter relate most specifically to situations you have been in or may find yourselves in.

**Vocabulary**

de facto

de jure

dialect

national language

official language

hegemony

Inner Circle, Outer Circle, Expanding Circle

intercultural competence

interactional competence

killer language

language rights

language as problem

language as right

language as resource

linguistic human rights

National Security Education Program (NSEP)

**Comprehension and Discussion Questions**

1. What language(s) are you now studying and why?

2. What is the difference between a language and a dialect?

3. What is the difference between a national language and an official language?

4. What are the five statuses that a language can hold? Can you think of examples you are familiar with for each of the categories?

5. What is the difference between a de jure policy and a de facto policy?

6. Why is multilingualism seen as something positive in Canada and viewed as problematic in the United States?

7. How does language use relate to technology regulation? What aspects of communication are more severely monitored and regulated in other areas of the world than in North America?

8. What do the terms Inner Circle, Outer Circle, and Expanding Circle English refer to (remember that you were introduced to these terms in the early chapters of the text as well)?

9. What is English as a lingua franca?

10. What elements of colonialism and hegemony may be reflected in David Crystal's conceptualization of English as a global language? Whose English is global English?

11. What languages other than English will increase in global status over the next fifty years?

12. What is the difference between a "big" language and a "killer" language?

13. How can a language sometimes serve as a gatekeeping device?

14. What is problematic with the term "native speaker"?

15. What seem to be the patterns of choices on the part of the U.S. government regarding languages and nation-states determined to be critical to national security?

16. The U.S. Department of Defense has determined that it is important to link language and language study more directly to U.S. security. How might your own personal language expertise relate to the four goals that they have outlined?

17. What does it mean that there is a high overlap between areas with large numbers of endemic vertebrates and areas with large numbers of endemic languages?

18. Why should linguistic diversity be considered important to humanity's future?

19. Look at the following statement: "The health and power of languages from within a particular community and languages from outside a particular community can affect the health and well-being of the community as a whole." Can you think of any examples from your own experiences that support or refute this point?

20. Why might some scholars say that the life cycles of languages are intricately entwined in the other dimensions of life cycles of their communities?

21. What is the difference between a "language right" and "linguistic human rights"?

22. There are five examples of linguistic human rights provided in this chapter. Make sure you are familiar with at least one of them.

23. What is the difference between the following perspectives: "language as right," "language as problem," and "language as resource"?

24. How could a person lose their mother tongue but still remain connected to their ethnic and cultural community?

25. Who are the two indigenous groups recognized by the UN who do not have a nation-state?

26. Identify at least two language issues profiled in the Oaxaca case study that related to issues discussed in earlier portions of the chapter.

27. What languages do you currently speak other than English? What is your level of fluency? What would you need to do to use this other language in a work-based setting?

**Activities**

Think about how you would frame the following language issues within international studies.

1. If you are a Sami in Lapland, the rap music you write in your own language and distribute over the Internet may be enjoyed by many music lovers, but within a short span of years, no one will be able to understand it (Boevers 2006; http://foreigndispatches.typepad.com/dispatches/2005/02/rapping_in_sami.html; http://home.earthlink.net/~arran4/siida/sami-yoik.htm). A nondominant dialect of Sami is not likely to be used by very many people in the future and thus will likely die out. By recording rap music on the Internet in this language, it is possible to maintain not only a living record of the language but also to afford a creative outlet for its author to maintain his Sami identity even as his language is dying.

2. The U.S. government is currently researching how to identify whether individuals speaking particular dialects of Arabic are speaking in their first language as a means of determining whether they are attempting to disguise their national origin. How might the results of this research affect human rights and impact issues of national security?

3. Would you be willing to leave your job to serve for two months in a national civilian linguistic corps? How could you improve your fluency in a foreign language to a point where you could help diffuse a diplomatic crisis?

4. Language skills can have implications for domestic policies. When Hurricane Katrina hit the United States in 2005, there was no national registry of foreign-language speakers to call upon to provide assistance to thousands of speakers of Vietnamese, Spanish, and other languages needing complicated disaster relief assistance. What domestic language polices would be helpful during future national disasters?

5. Our national security is dependent upon changing our attitudes toward foreign-language proficiency. Being able to use a language in addition to English is clearly a resource rather than a problem. Providing service by using your bilingualism or multilingualism is a gift to your country. How have your thoughts changed about learning a second language after considering the issues in this chapter?

6. There can be consequences when nation-states choose one language or one variety of a language over others to symbolize and unify their countries. What would it be like to be a Kurd living in one of five contiguous countries that considers his/her language to be a vibrant and dynamic symbol of identity and a means of contact with fellow Kurds?

7. New Zealand requires all senior-level government employees to be able to manage three functions in Maori: greetings, toast, and introductory remarks. At an event at Simon Fraser University in Vancouver, British Columbia, a speaker of a northwest Pacific language began her remarks in her first language. What do these ceremonial uses of language have to say about the importance of global citizens being able to honor the languages of the people with whom they interact?

8. In what ways are you privileged by being able to speak English? What responsibilities does your fluency in English require of you in relation to speakers of other languages? In what

ways does the English language belong to those who speak it as a second language as well as those who speak it as a first language?

**References**


Abdullah, A., S. Singh, and S. K. Gill. 2001. Communicating with Malaysians. In *Understanding the Malaysian workforce: Guidelines for managers,* ed. A. Abdullah and A. Low. Rev. ed. MIM: Kuala Lumpur.

Alavi, N. 2005. *We are Iran*. London: Portobello Books.

Anderson, P. J. 2003. AIDS as an opportunity for compassion and growth through dialogue. Unpublished master's thesis, Portland State University.

Beach, H. 1994. The Sami of Lapland. In *Polar people: Self-determination and development.* London: Minority Rights Group.

Boevers, P. 2006. *The Sami languages: Surviving the odds*. Unpublished manuscript submitted in fulfillment of course requirement, International Studies Senior Seminar, Fall 2006, Portland State University.

Brock-Utne, B., and H. Holmarsdottir. 2001. The Choice of English as medium of instruction and its effects on the African languages in Namibia. *International Review of Education* 47 (3/4): 293–322.

Brown, K. 1983. Language loss in Iran. Paper presented at the International Conference on Language and Social Problems, Curacao, Netherlands Antilles. December.

------. 2005. World Englishes: Pedagogical practices in the TESOL preparatory sequence. In *Teaching English from a global perspective*, ed. A. Burns, 19–34. Alexandria, Va.: TESOL.

Burma: They came and destroyed our village. Retrieved December 15, 2006, from http://hrw.org.

Cobarrubias, J. 1983. Ethical issues in status planning. In *Progress in language planning: International perspectives*, ed. J. Cobarrubias and J. Fishman, 41–86. New York: Mouton Publishers.

CONACULTA. 2002. *Relatos triquis: Nato one güendo yio, lenguas de Mexico, 20*. 2nd printing. Mexico City: CONACULTA.

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

Davis, W. 1996. *One river: Explorations and discoveries in the Amazon rain forest*. New York: Touchstone Press.

Defense Language Transformation Road Map. 2005. Retrieved January 26, 2009, from www.defenselink.mil/news/Mar2005/d20050330roadmap.pdf.

Ephron, D. 2007. Arab bloggers face unwanted attention: Government clampdown. *Newsweek*. June 11.

Europa: Gateway to the European Union. Retrieved December 15, 2006, from http://www.europa.edu.

Europeans. Retrieved December 15, 2006, from http://www.coe.int.

Fill, A., and P. Muhlhausler, eds. 2001. *The ecolinguistics reader: Language, ecology, and environment*. New York: Continuum, 286–90.

Foreign Dispatches website. Retrieved September 7, 2007, from foreigndispatches.typepad.com/dispatches/2005/02/rapping_in_sami.html.
Frente Comun Contra el SIDA. Retrieved September 7, 2007, from www.frentecomunoaxaca.org/en015.htm.
Gill, S. K. 1996. Stand up and deliver effectively as a Malaysian. *Journal of Language Teaching, Linguistics and Literature*. Jilid 3. Fakulti Pengajian Bahasa, UKM, 49–81.
------. 2001. Managing conflict. In *Understanding the Malaysian workforce: Guidelines for managers,* ed. A. Abdullah and A. Low. Rev. ed. MIM: Kuala Lumpur.
Graddol, D. 1997. *The future of English*? The British Council. Digital copy created by the English Company Ltd. (UK) and available in pdf format from: www.officiallanguages.gc.ca/.
Hornberger, N., and K. King. 2001. Reversing Quechua language shift in South America. In *Can threatened languages be saved?*, ed. J. Fishman, pp. 166–94. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Instituto Nacional de Estadistica Geografica e Informatica (INEGI). 1993. *Oaxaca, hablantes del Lingua indígena*. Aguascalientes, Mexico: INEGI.
Jaffe, M. 1994. *And no birds sing: The story of an ecological disaster in a tropical paradise.* New York: Simon and Schuster.
Jenkins, J. 2000. *The phonology of English as an international language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
------. 2007. *English as a lingua franca: Attitude and identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Karen Teacher Working Group. Retrieved December 13, 2007, from http:ktwg.org/home.html.
Kurdish Rights. Retrieved January 26, 2009, from http://www.kurdishrights.org/2008/04/15/36.
León Pasquel, L. de, ed. 2001a. *Costumbres, leyes y movimiento indio en Oaxaca y Chiapas*. Mexico City: CIESAS.
------. 2001b. Lenguas minorizadas, justicia y legislación en México y en Estados Unidos. In *Costumbres, leyes y movimiento indio en Oaxaca y Chiapas,* 203–28.
MacPherson, S. 2003. TESOL for biolinguistic sustainability: The ecology of English as a lingua mundi. *TESL Canada Journal* 20 (2): 1–22.
Minority Rights Group, ed. 1994. *Polar peoples: Self-determination and development*. London, UK: Minority Rights Group.
Moag, R. 1982. The life cycle of non-native Englishes: A case study. In *The other tongue: English across cultures,* ed. B. B. Kachru, 270–88. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
Morris, W. 1981. *The American heritage dictionary.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
Mulhauser, P. 2001. Babel revisited. In *The ecolinguistics reader: Language, ecology, and environment,* ed. A. Fill and P. Muhlhausler, 159–64. New York: Continuum.
Outline for Civilian Linguist Reserve Corps. 2004. Retrieved December 17, 2007, from www.nsep.gov/support/CivilianLinguistReserveCorpsFeasibilityStudy.pdf.
Ovando, C. 2003. Bilingual education in the U.S.: Historical development and current issues. *Bilingual Research Journal* 27 (1): 1–24.
Paikeday, T. 1985. *The native speaker is dead!* New York: Paikeday Publishing, Inc.
Richards, J., J. Platt, and H. Weber. 1985. *Longman dictionary of applied linguistics*. London: Longman Group Limited.
Ríos Morales, M. 2001. Usos, costumbres e identidad entre los Zapotecos de la Sierra de Oaxaca. In *Costumbres, leyes y movimiento indio en Oaxaca y Chiapas,* ed. L. de León Pasquel, 71–90. Mexico City: CIESAS.

Ruiz, R. 1984. Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal* 8 (2): 15–34.
Sami Yoik (Saami Joik) and Music. Complete Guide to MP3 and Video. Retrieved September 14, 2007, at home.earthlink.net/~arran4/siida/sami-yoik.htm .
Schmied, J. 1991. *English in Africa*. New York: Longman.
Skutnabb-Kangas, T. 2000. *Linguistic genocide in education—Or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
Skutnabb-Kangas, T., and R. Phillipson. 1995. *Linguistic human rights: Overcoming linguistic discrimination.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Skutnabb-Kangas, T., and S. Bucak. 1995. Killing a mother tongue: How the Kurds are deprived of linguistic human rights. In *Linguistic Human Rights: Overcoming Linguistic Discrimination*, ed. S. Skutnabb-Kangas and R. Phillipson, 347–70. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Smallman, S. 2007. *The AIDS pandemic in Latin America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
Smolicz, J. 1979. *Culture and education in a plural society*. Canberra: Curriculum Development Center.
Totten, M. 2009. Sandmonkey shut down. Retrieved January 26, 2009, from www.michaeltotten.com/archives/001420.html.
Tyack, D. 1974. *The one best system: A history of American urban education*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
UNESCO. 2003. *Sharing a world of difference: The earth's linguistic, cultural and biological diversity*, by Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Luisa Maffi, and David Harmon. Paris: UNESCO.
U.S. Department of Defense News Release no. 300-05. Retrieved February 20, 2007, from http://www.defenselink.mil/Releases/Release.aspx?ReleaseID=834. Road Map available at http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Mar2005/d20050330roadmap.pdf.3.
Van Dan Acker, S. Fall 2006. Unpublished manuscript submitted in fulfillment of course requirement for International Studies Senior Seminar, Portland State University.
Weryho, J. 1983. Paper presented at the International Conference on Language and Social Problems, Curacao, Netherlands Antilles. December.
Whipperman, B. 2006. *Moon handbooks: Oaxaca*. 3rd ed. Emeryville, Calif.: Avalon Travel Publishing.
Wiley, T. 1998. The imposition of World War I–era English-only policies and the fate of German in North America. In *Language and politics in the U.S. and Canada: Myths and realities*, ed. T. Ricento and B. Burnaby, 211–41. Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Wolf, B. 1995. *The Memoirs,* vol. 2. Unpublished excerpt from memoirs, 161–62. October.

***