

Mart Rannut

Threats to national languages in Europe

Abstract

The article discusses the linguistic consequences of the new, postmodern world order focusing on national languages. Changes in the context are usually explained by introducing two different periods of development. The first period, beginning with the times immemorial, introduces the fluctuating rise in the number of languages, the size of which was limited in time and space due to oral means of communication. In the second period of civilization, development in three stages is monitored.

Language shift is analyzed through quantitative data on functional representation; languages are monitored based on their functions. As the agent in the language shift (and murder) is always present though often hidden, various activities used for language murder are presented.

Special emphasis is on European languages that have entered the stage of globalization, with the distribution between national and minority languages almost complete. If national languages in Europe can maintain control over multilingual environments unaffected by the new “second languages” and keep the already lost (e.g. science and technology) or shifting domains marginal and resist takeover of functional domains important to the majority population, the new multilingual environment in Europe will be enjoying sustainable development in the diglossic framework.

1. Some remarks on development of languages

The number of languages in the world has never been constant with its changes usually explained by introducing two different periods of development. In the first period, beginning with the times immemorial, the development of languages has traditionally been depicted using the equilibrium and recently the punctuated equilibrium model (Dixon 1997) that assumes the existence of a permanent number of languages (with insignificant fluctuations). For example, Nettle/Romaine (2000) consider that “for most of the many millennia of human history, the world was close to linguistic equilibrium, i.e., the number of languages lost roughly equalled the new ones created.” They explain the balance by the fact that there were no massive, enduring differences in the expansionary potential of different peoples that might cause the sustained expansion of a single, dominant language. This balance lasted until the beginning of the next period, the wake of civilization in about 8,000 B.C., when the number of languages started to diminish at an alarming speed.

However, there are no hard facts to support the equilibrium theory supposing a stable number of languages in the past. Quite to the contrary, the picture seems to have been much more sophisticated: the geographical expansion of the population over the globe has been gradual while the last inhabitable places (e.g. the islands in the Pacific) were occupied by mankind just some centuries ago. Together with the growth of the human population, the number of languages increased. The process has been affected by a vast number of various challenges and fallbacks, related to the (negative) changes in the physical and other homeostatic conditions: longer and shorter periods of climate change (drought, cold) and natural catastrophes (volcano eruptions, floods, earthquakes, etc.) resulting in famine and diseases, and consequently in the sharp drop of

population. Alongside with the population decrease, the number of languages reduced considerably due to extinction and language shift. In longer periods such as Ice Ages varieties of lingua franca might have evolved, conditioned by life in refugia (Wiik 2002). In these conditions the bio-diversity and the linguistic diversity underpin and reinforce one another, as noted in ecolinguistic theories (Mühlhäusler 1995; Skutnabb-Kangas 2000).

The firm connection between the number of languages and the size of the world population may be explained by the limitations imposed on the speech communities relying exclusively on the oral communication with all its constraints as there was no technology available to extend languages and their form over time and space. Therefore, new linguistic forms inevitably evolved in time, and the rare contacts under limited communication and transport sooner or later led to the differentiation of geographically dispersed languages. The restricted area of a language community provided for hunters-gatherers only limited resources (max 2-3 ps per sq.km). Thus, there developed limited oral communication systems, based socially on the tribal structure, reaching the size of a band or a clan (though due to the language continuum phenomena neighbouring language varieties may have been similar, while several languages may have been used in the clan, cf. Fried 1972).

The following period, the era of civilization lasting over the past 10,000 years, is characterized by evergrowing speed of language extinction. However, this should rather be regarded as a result of the advancement of technology and the consequent numerical growth of speakers in speech communities. Development in agriculture and of tools, transportation (horse) and technology (e.g. metal processing) enabled to support qualitatively more people on the same limited territory. Technological advances expanded the boundaries of a speech community, resulting in the rise of language contacts (and conflicts, leading to the contraction of some languages and finally, their extinction). Writing as a memorizing technology and literacy enabled to maintain the same language variety over time and space constraints and expanded the number of its users. While the speech community of oral communication used to include up to 1,000 speakers in a band (depending on the geographical constraints and a way of life), the adoption of literacy (starting from the 4th millennium B.C. in Mesopotamia) provided the basis of communication that could unite tens of thousands and in some cases, millions of speakers under the literacy-ruled political governance (using the technological achievements of clay tablets, papyrus, parchment, etc.) that in the case of the mainstream literacy (based on paper and printing technology, the 15th century) provided instruments for shared communication for tens of millions. In the global society with electronic tools of communication creating virtual realities largely independent of time and space, a handful of languages may reach most of the world population, providing basis for one's communication needs and making other languages useless, not to say obsolete in several functions.

New technologies have enabled to establish new functional domains (science, media, etc) and upgrade the old ones (administration, education, etc.). As the reach outside the original speech community expands, several languages are brought into contact, launching their competition (or war) where only the fittest languages survive.

The outcome of these wars has been duly noted, the situation of languages in the world has been mapped in a multitude of articles (e.g. Krauss 1992; Crystal 2000; Nettle/Romaine 2000). Together with the expansion of language communities the number of languages in the world is diminishing. Nettle/Romaine (2000: 2) estimate that about half of the known languages in the world have disappeared over the past 500 years. Crystal (2000: 19) suggests that an average of one language every 2 weeks may vanish over the next 100 years. Estimates of the number of threatened languages vary a great deal from 50 to 90% depending on the criteria used to assess risk (Romaine 2008). UNESCO's *World Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger of Disappearing* (2001) estimates that 50% of languages may be in various degrees of endangerment. Krauss (1992) considers languages under 100,000 speakers unsafe, which means that up to 90% of the world's languages may be at risk.

Based on this statistics, gloomy forecasts predict an alarming decline in the number of languages. Some linguists think that as many as 60 to 90% of the world's approximately 6,900 languages may be at risk of extinction within the next 100 years. Krauss (1992) believes that only about 600 languages with a large number of speakers (i.e., more than 100,000) may survive. Romaine (2008) concludes from this that only a few of the approximately 6,000 remaining languages will have a secure future, while the speakers of probably half of the world's languages are the last ones still alive. Most of these estimations suppose a functional similarity of languages and regard the size as the decisive indicator of the fate of every language.

According to Waever (1993) from the Copenhagen security school, in the postmodern world it is the size that makes difference, but only under actual threat. This means that even multimillion-speaker languages may be under threat, while there might be no immediate threat on, for example, Icelandic with its 270,000 speakers. Predicting the fate for languages in Europe and in Africa just on the numeral basis of their speakers seems therefore to be arguable. More significant seems to be the functional load (and status) of the language concerned. Based on this idea, Rannut (2003) has estimated that by the end of the century from the current wealth of languages only 2-3% will be on the safe side (i.e. used by its population in significant communication), as the role of the Human Language Technology seems to be on the increase, making it a must in the contemporary life, and the number of languages enjoying HLT support in various solutions has not exceeded 100 yet.

2. Functional model of language shift

Due to differing technological levels large or technologically advanced speech communities expand, others contract. This happens usually through language shift that enhances functionally significant domains of the greater part of the speakers of the language concerned. Together with the language shift, attitudinal shift progresses, making the adoption of the new language a matter of common sense.

Romaine (2008) characterizes language shift as a loss of speakers and domains of use, both of which are critical to the survival of a language. This is usually preceded and accompanied by widespread bilingualism of the shifting group, while the language

once used throughout a community becomes restricted in use as another language intrudes on its functions. In the final phase usage declines at home, as growing numbers of parents fail to transmit the language to their children. This may be witnessed through the phenomenon when fluency in the language is higher among older speakers, as younger generations prefer to speak another (usually the dominant societal) language. However, when in the community the domains of functional language shift are limited (e.g. religious domain only), insignificant or affect a minor part of the community concerned, the shift will not succeed and some sort of diglossic solution will be worked out.

According to Fishman (2001) language shifts and in some instances, the resulting language deaths are often a “late order” indicator of cultural assimilation, following crucial changes in language attitudes and status. This phenomenon is largely witnessed today, when speakers of languages are to an ever-extending degree exposed to the influence of other languages that are used in functions of higher status (administration, media, education, etc.) and abandoning, thus, their former first language. It concerns especially those, about 90% of the world languages that are or were until recently almost entirely used as oral vernaculars. This was possible due to the absence of or constrained contacts with other languages represented by speakers using more advanced technology. Now, with enlarging communication networks, new domains are involved and through those, other languages acquired.

Most of the languages today suffer from the already well advanced shift, and the measures required to stop the process mean institutional structures and intimate community centered processes that can be perceived as turning away from the wider society and encapsulating one's community from the outside world (Lo Bianco 2004).

There are numerous reasons for language shift. UNESCO (2006) has pointed at six major factors of language vitality: intergenerational language transmission, absolute number of speakers, proportion of speakers within the total population, trends in the existing language domains, response to new domains and media, and materials for language education and literacy. From these six four are connected to the language shift in various functional domains and only two are connected to demographic patterns. This represents a clear trend of moving away from the size of the language to the functional data.

3. Three stages of language wars

During the last 10,000 years developments in the social structure and communication needs deriving from that have led to the adoption of new technologies enabling to increase the size of speakers within speech communities, increasing thus language contacts and conflicts. As an outcome, more competitive languages have been selected that could offer various solutions for communicative technology and increase this way their value and status expanding as a result at the cost of the other languages concerned.

Language wars may be divided into three different stages, characterizing different language communities with their communicative constraints involved. While at the first prehistoric stage it was oral communication that was exclusively used, at the second

stage, with the introduction of script, though initially extremely limited in its spread, the language varieties became more stable and permanent enabling them to expand in time and space. These were necessary to establish and maintain various fiefdoms and kingdoms, to develop towns. Languages of wider communication emerged (spread of Greek and Latin).

Together with the invention of printing in the 15th century and the following rise in literacy, literary standards were adopted that enabled to establish nation-states that controlled education, administration, compulsory army service, transportation and communication networks, etc., first in Europe and later in other parts of the world. National languages are mostly used by the elite controlling urban centers, hierarchical network between the urban centers. Other languages in the reach of the administrative system of the state, with its literary standard or not, became minority languages with their functions redistributed, and were pushed to the power periphery with scarce resources at their disposal. As a rule, the speakers of these languages were economically comparatively less well off and the status was adhered to their language also. Thus, minority languages emerged. In contemporary urban environment their number is gradually decreasing, though a *modus vivendi* in the form of a diglossic balance, provides basis for securing the domains left, challenging higher domains and steps (cf. Fishman's GIDS, 1991). Currently one may count more than 600 languages that qualify for the minority language status.

The war of languages did not stop at the stage of nation-states, but expanded into the next stage with the goal of global reach, which seems to be the guarantee for sustainable development in the future. According to Lo Bianco (2002) the new technologies are fashioning changes of various identities, bringing virtual multiculturalism to the fore and threatening a huge number of world languages not having adequate technological support for new life systems and constraining thus the accumulation of human capital. There is a vast increase in the investment in science and technology with the resources, however, allocated disproportionately between languages, with its main bulk going to big languages (135 MEUR in FP6). According to Danzin report (1998), languages with fewer than 10 million speakers were regarded incapable of the HLT development. Together with the limitation of the sovereignty of states through their membership in various political, economic and security international organizations access to the global media and the Internet have made the services and goods in various languages competitive on one's linguistic home-ground. Also several legitimate methods to interfere in the matters of another state are used, for example, in the case of human rights (e.g. supporting some language group) or, through public relations campaigns, upgrading the value of some language. Under globalization, competitive advantage rests with those languages able to cater for various consumer needs and preferences, and provide for extensive communication network (Lo Bianco). Therefore, in this borderless domain various institutions make use of options to raise the status of their national culture and language, such as the British Council, the USIA, Goethe Institut, etc., representing states with larger language communities. As a result, in the new global war the economic and social globalization affects two language categories: small national languages and sub-national languages. This is one of the reasons why

language policy has become one of the most extensively developing disciplines in linguistics and why several smaller, though linguistically quite homogenous nation-states are drafting their language laws by now (cf. Sweden 2008).

There seems to be a difference in order of magnitude in the number of languages involved: linguistic biodiversity model is valid and applicable in the case of ca. 6,000 languages (with less than 100,000 speakers) from the almost 7,000 listed in *Ethnologue* (Gordon 2005). These languages are to a major extent unwritten, not recognized officially, restricted to local community and home functions, and spoken by very small groups of people. It is virtually impossible for these languages to get grip in an urban environment. This reflects the balance of power in the global linguistic market place.

Hundreds of languages with minority status (ca. 600) still sort out functions with less than 100 national and official languages, trying to find sustainable diglossia, however in most cases gradually losing their speakers to major ones. The status of the global language is challenged by languages with biggest number of speakers. The first dozen of bigger languages with more than hundred million speakers have been gradually increasing in the number of their speakers (except Russian). Among these English is gradually taking over various functions beginning with research and technology, tertiary education and gradually secondary, business and trade, entertainment, politics, media, resulting in the highest number of second or foreign language speakers of it (see Boyd 2007 for Sweden).

4. Languages in various functions

In spite of the impressing total number of languages in the world, the number of languages tied to various functions within the speech community varies greatly. Let us consider languages in various functions and the share of European languages among those.

According to *Ethnologue* (2005) there are 6,912 spoken languages in the world, cf. www.ethnologue.com, and more than a hundred widely spread sign languages and several thousands used in more limited communication. The number of autochthonous languages in Europe differs from 63 (EBLUL) to 90 (FUEN), constituting a mere percent of the total.

Bible or a section of it has been translated roughly into one third of those, i.e. there is a literary standard for 2,453 languages. All languages in Europe belong to this category, including even Liv with less than 50 speakers. This means no more than a potential for further written communication, as the market for literary language, i.e. the commercial language market with books written, sold and bought in it, operates only in some 800 languages (1997 Frankfurt Book Fair data).

The number of languages used in education is even smaller. UNESCO has been compiling the data for the last decades but the work is still in progress. Though most of the data is available, in many cases the comparison and systematic arrangement of the figures is impossible due to their varying content and interpretation (Bamgbose 2005). Here differentiation should be made of languages as means of instruction and those taught as a subject. Like in the case of literary standard, various thresholds play an im-

portant role here. One is the number of languages used for (obtaining) structural literacy and possibly, elementary education, whereat the number of languages involved may easily exceed a thousand. The challenge here seems to be the exclusion of more vulnerable groups (like girls, disabled persons, etc.). According to the UNESCO data, 72 million children are out-of-school, one out of three children never enters a classroom, and one in five adults is still not literate (two-thirds of them women).

When analyzing higher, more formalized levels of education requiring printed studyware and formalized teacher training, the situation for intergenerational language transmission is less promising. Thus, in Africa with more than 2,000 languages listed (ca. 30% of the total), slightly over 200 of these are used in education. However, the number comes down to 60 plus when counting the languages used as means of instruction, and the number is smaller still, when counting the languages used within the whole period of primary education, as most of them are only a basis of transfer to some other, usually an European language (English, French) that is the medium of further education. Only a handful of African languages are used in instruction at secondary level.

When compared to Europe (without Russia) with its 90 autochthonous languages, the number of languages used as the media of instruction at primary level is less than 50 (UNESCO), the majority of which are used also in secondary education and further. It seems that the primary level education already proves to be an obstacle for many speech communities to provide education in the mother-tongue, as teaching materials, testing, teacher training and other components need financial resources that most of the speech communities cannot afford themselves. Only in Asia the number of languages used throughout the primary education exceeds 100. All in all approximately 250-400 languages are used in the primary education as the main media of instruction.

The number of languages used in tertiary education seems to be less than 100 for the whole world, with Europe covering one third of the figure. The language loss at higher levels of education seems to be the main indicator of sustainability and an indicator of the final war between languages for the global scope, with English being the most successful one introducing its PhD, MA and also BA programs in an ever-increasing extent.

A small minority of dominant languages prevail as languages of government and education. The total number of official languages, i.e. the languages used in administration and in financial services is quite small in the world – probably no more than 100. Simultaneously, several languages are official in more than one country, such as English in more than 53 countries (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/English_language). French has the official status in 30 countries (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/French_language). Arabic is official in 25 countries (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arabic_language). Spanish in 21 (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Spanish_language), and Portuguese in 11 states (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Portuguese_language).

Even less languages are used in Human Language Technology (HLT): computer software for mass consumer is available and in use in 70+ languages, in Nokia products (such as menus of mobile phones) info is installed in 44 languages (2004 data), machine translation (based on Systran, c.f. EUROTRA) functions in ca. 30 languages. To

a large extent the languages that have technological support, coincide. This means that HLT support and tools are developed for the same languages, due to their users' consumer power, thus constituting "elite club" of languages. Those "elite club" languages dominate in this domain (and benefit financially) also in the areas where other languages are spoken, as speakers of non-elite languages (without HLT support) consume the same HLT services and products, e.g. computer programs, speech recognition, information retrieval systems, etc., using for this purpose some foreign, elite club language.

Most languages are unwritten, not recognized officially, restricted to local community and home functions, and spoken by very small groups of people. This reflects the balance of power in the global linguistic market place.

5. Language killing methods

Language death is unfortunately much more common than success in language revitalization or the emergence of a new language that would be sustained intergenerationally. However, this has its own virtues, as the murder cases of a language enable us to monitor and make explicit also several covert processes, providing valuable data in planning sustainable development for other, more lucky languages.

Language murder may be presented both as a closed model (language shift takes place due to changes inside the language environment) or an open model (interaction with other environments, e.g. demographic, economic, physical, social identity issues). The closed model option implies language policy developments in various language planning dimensions (status, corpus, education, technology), providing data on the transfer of functional domains from an ousted language (X) to the other, the ousting one (Y). Together with the language shift, the speakers adopt new attitudes and beliefs popular among the ousting language.

Language killing techniques are diverse. In the following, we have grouped them into language planning dimensions (closed model), revealing language shift through various activities. The most important dimension to language survival and also vice versa, to language death, is the status planning dimension. Here traditionally three interwoven domains may be viewed: legislation, management and language marketing (or prestige planning, cf. Haarmann and Holman 1997). In the case of language murder, legislation is often left untouched, as leaving a language without protection is the easiest way to implement *laissez-faire* policy. Non-existence of language acts or forms of regulation automatically means non-recognition of the (minority) language concerned and its rights. Even more, abundant are the examples (e.g. in the former Soviet Union) when any discussion of the subject was labelled as nationalism and xenophobia, and harshly punished. Even more, *laissez-faire* in legislation places no obligations on immigrant population, who could avoid from learning the local low-status language and culture and thus, maintain usually negative attitudes about these.

The absence of language legislation has never constrained different activities of language management. Local X-language is substituted by Y-language in public and official functions, bringing along language shift from X to Y in various language domains

(administration, court, media, military service, police, etc.). Together with this, the non-speakers of the X-language concerned are promoted to leading positions, establishing thus non-X speaking and simultaneously Y-speaking elite. In the language marketing domain the Y-language is usually depicted as a gateway to great opportunities. The Y-language documentation, information space and media require extensive proficiency in Y for employment and also for daily survival. Marginal representation of X with no functional load turns the language useless.

These steps raise the status of the ousting Y-language at the cost of X, resulting in the rise of the number of YSL and later YFL speakers. Other languages, X included, are left to die with marginal number of speakers.

Acquisition planning dimension provides also significant impact on (reducing) the language sustainability. Closing down and reducing the number of schools with X as the language of instruction, opening up new schools with the Y language makes pupils consequently switch their medium of instruction. Propagating “the freedom of choice” among parents who decide whether to choose for their children an educational path with all opportunities or an impasse is one option that worked swiftly in Central Asia in 1950s-1980s. As a result, this blocked or at least severely restricted the intergenerational language transmission. In addition, no literacy is required in X, instead, literacy in Y is compulsory, to be checked at all sorts of tests and exams.

In addition to this, or in case the method does not work, there can be used another option of rearranging X-language curriculum into transitional educational program from X to Y on the primary or even elementary level. Sometimes the X-language is taught as an optional subject in higher grades also, usually as the last lesson of the schoolday. As a rule, textbooks and other studyware is outdated, teachers are elderly and with vague training background, just to cover the embarrassing requirement. This situation is often contrary to that with teaching and acquiring Y, where the support is almost total: more lessons, out-of-classroom activities, teacher training and support, modern studyware.

Language corpus planning dimension provides options and means of casting off from the literary standard, making it confusing and outdated. First of all, the access to literary language aids is made difficult or these are nonexistent altogether. No language aids or guides for better and orthographically correct usage, no orthological dictionaries are available or within easy reach. As a result varieties of language structure come into being, people are unsure of their correct writing skills and ready to compose their texts in some other language, if permitted. Simultaneously, loans and interference phenomena from Y are promoted as a positive sign of civilisation, mixed languages are regarded as a positive step towards Y. Expert bodies coin no new terms and other lexical inventory.

Name policy (personal, business and geographical names) is taken over from Y (standards, Y-language version always preferred). Names for streets, bus and tram stops, towns, buildings and even for ships are taken from the Y language or from its worthy speakers. In the case of differing alphabet switch to Y-language alphabet is encouraged, or required by law (e.g. Karelian in Russia, 2002). Publications in X are rare, requiring some additional financial investment in order to be published. X language is

broadcasted in audiovisual media usually out of prime time, e.g. in the afternoon, often irregularly. Translations from and through Y are made a standard procedure. From X almost no translations are made, making creative writing in X an impasse.

Language planning in technology has come to fore to stay, constituting by now a significant dimension in language planning. Here a phenomenon called technological discrimination takes place: Human Language Technology (HLT) solutions are implemented only for Y, local administration has to use Y-language versions of mass consumer programs (e.g. Microsoft Office), computers are sold with the Y-language software and support (spellers, thesauri, dictionaries). Search engines are devised only in Y, government supports HLT projects only for Y, while even the alphabet of the local language is not supported by UNICODE. Sometimes the laissez-faire policy is implemented, leaving X-language HLT development stranded. As a result, X-speakers have to switch to some other (Y) language in order to carry out their various tasks (e.g. banking, buying through Internet). If they cannot, their access to a number of services and opportunities is blocked.

Open Model Approach focuses on interaction with various extralinguistic environments that may have deep impact on the language concerned. Demographic aspect is one the most significant: for example, the measures supporting the in-migration of Y-speakers to the X-speaking territories, reducing thus the share of X-speakers and hindering daily communication in X (public and private sphere), may consequently trigger a language shift. Genocide, deportation, slavery and massive arrests are fortunately prohibited by law in most countries. However, promoting ethnically and linguistically mixed marriages leading to the Y-language offspring and the rotation of population groups (army drafting, employment conditions) requiring the Y-language use are legitimate steps for governments.

Economic aspect plays a significant role in one's language choice. Here a state budget may be the most destructive weapon, causing schools to be closed, X-language broadcasts in the media to be dropped, or directing financial support to the detriment of the X language. This may result in selling the Y-language products and offering Y-language services cheaper than the X-language ones.

Under the open model one has also to consider the impact of physical environment, such as natural catastrophes (famine, diseases, floods and changing sea levels, tsunamis, volcanic eruptions, earthquakes, meteorites, etc., see Dixon 1997) and wars.

As a result Y, the language with higher status, taken as such by the common sense, will be thriving among the X-population, especially in case of mixed marriages, migrants and speakers of the kin languages. Together with the language shift, new attitudes and beliefs popular among the speakers of Y are adopted. As language in its use is never neutral (discourse!), attitudes and beliefs enforcing negative attitudes emerge and grow: in the X language community minority complex, regarding their language useless and even shameful, revealing their "low" background, while among the Y language speakers (they don't necessarily form a homogenous community) cultural prejudices and linguistic imperialism may prevail, they feel privileged and may claim the "Herrenvolk" status even in numerical minority.

6. Language policy and planning

However, these are neither languages nor technological advances that are the active agents of the process. Instead, language policies make use of technologies influencing speakers of certain languages in order to reap economic and/or political benefits. Language policy may simply be defined as an application of power to language. These applications may be language practices, language ideology (beliefs and attitudes), language management, interpreting language hereby widely, covering its speakers and the language environment. Usually the goals of language policy lie outside the language policy aiming at social changes, competitiveness, etc. (or the access to power, resources, security, information, entertainment, etc.) There is neither contact nor conflict between languages, but between speakers and language communities, providing infinite source of conflicts (Nelde 63: 2007). Thus, language planning problems are, as a rule, outside the language domain, not linguistic in their nature (Lo Bianco 2004).

Language policy may be divided into various types (Rannut et al. 2003) based on the international legal standards (hard and soft), providing a minimum of rights for establishing an appropriate language regime, or vice versa, in the absence or violation of those:

- Minority protection models based on ethnic mobilization (securitization) (e.g. GIDS by Fishman 1991).
- Language ecology models for indigenous peoples (Mühlhäusler 1995, Maffi 2001). Indigenous languages have a limited social existence, i.e. a community of a sufficient number of speakers, for whom the language is the essential tool of communication and information in all areas of human experience, having no stable foothold in urban culture. Therefore the challenge lies in the elaboration of the language in new functional domains, securing simultaneously its separate social environment.
- Nation-building models applied within state framework. Attempts to solve language problems through rational planning, similar to economic models (planning language resources rationally and systematically), producing language strategies, language plans and minor programs for various domains (foreign language teaching, terminological work, language technology, etc.). These models focus on building the state as a sovereign unit (nation-building, strengthening congruence between the state, language and nation).
- Language spread models (Ammon 1993), including linguistic imperialism (Phillipson 1992).
- Laissez-faire policy (Phillipson 2003) treating language planning issues as secondary.

While the first two models strive for societal (group) security – maintenance of the basic identity of the group under the changing conditions and threats (sustainable development of language, culture, religious, ethnic identity) – the third one, nation-building regards as its main task national security (state's capacity to manage and eliminate threats).

Language component in the current security thinking belongs to the domain of soft security. Ager (1999) divides linguistic insecurity into three:

- Territorial insecurity as a fear of regional (minority) languages, based on the threats of disintegration, regionalism and fragmentation. Policy in this case is based on linguistic integrity and primacy of official/national languages in high-status functional domains (administration, court, education, army, public media, etc.). Officially various integration models based on additive bilingualism are encouraged.
- Social insecurity as a threat of a social outsider group (class, social layer, e.g. immigrants, poor, younger generation). Policy instruments here are equal access, participation and cooperation, promoting social inclusion. Main emphasis here is on assimilation, though partial native language support is sometimes available.
- Virtual insecurity as a new domain in language conflict (modification of Ager 1999 by Rannut 2003), leading to the status decrease and loss of functional domains (IT, science, higher education, media & entertainment), due to the ever-increasing impact of technology upon language environment. In this case the physical presence of the ousting speech community is not necessary as the battleground is the virtual space.

In order to eliminate and defend from various linguistic threats an expert language planning and its consequent implementation through policy is required. Language planning covers all legitimate and proficient actions in the whole language environment. They may be carried out by states (and international organizations such as the EU, the UN), usually at the macro level, institutions and even private persons, (micro level, Tollefson 1991). Methods and approaches as well as aims and indicators vary here. Distinction is made between the 4 dimensions of language planning:

- **Status planning** (Kloss 1969) is concerned with policies attributing a recognized status and functions in national, regional and even institutional life of a language. Planning activities are carried out in the domains of legislation, management and marketing (or prestige planning, Haarmann 1990).
- **Corpus planning** (Haugen 1983; Maurais 1993) is concerned with the quality of language concerning its structure and lexicon, establishing the literary norm, corresponding to the referential and non-referential potential of the language and its capability for translation. Codification planning, terminological planning, name planning and translation (plus interpretation, adaptation, etc.) planning are the domains involved in this language planning dimension.
- **Acquisition planning** (Cooper 1989) or language planning-in-education (Baldauf/Kaplan 2003) is concerned with teaching and acquiring languages and their literary norm as a necessary skill and basis for success in one's education and further career. They deal with literacy, various educational programs in multilingual environment (second language and native language planning, linguistic accommodation of immigrant pupils, cf. EU Directive 486/77/EC, etc.) or for multilingual aims (foreign language planning), teacher training and preparation of educational materials for language purposes.
- **Technological planning** is concerned with providing technological support to language, be it either in oral or in written form. This is usually divided into speech technology and text processing or alternatively, to language resources (incl. corpora) and language software. Some authors have regarded this dimension under

corpus planning, however, the quality seems secondary in this dimension, but rather a criteria of comprehension and further processing (e.g. running nose might cause bigger distortions in speech recognition systems than the usage of lexicon far from literary standard, as systems may be trained through frequent exposal to those).

Sustainable development is guaranteed through competitive functioning in all language planning dimensions. Formula of success is based on the principle of conformity: language use must be provided through language as an instrument of communication (language corpora and technology), regulated by law, allocated to high-status functions and sustained through intergenerational transmission.

7. National languages in Europe

Europe has been at the forefront of language wars for a long time. The first ones between tribal languages and later, in the framework of various chiefdoms and kingdoms (in their classical form) against the big languages with script, are by now history: the last indigenous group in Europe (without Russia) is Sami, which has been quite successful for the fight over sustainability of their languages.

Europe has also gone through the second stage of language wars that resulted in the distribution into minority and state (national) languages in the framework of national states. The major battles were connected with (the aftermaths of) the two World wars, the last skirmishes took place at the dismissal of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, when the status of several minority languages was upgraded. As a result of those language wars and survival of the fittest only, the total number of autochthonous languages in Europe is small, varying between 70 and 90 in various sources. Also rules are quite clear here, written down in several human rights instruments, such as European Charter for Regional and Minority Languages, Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and several other acts. Ultimate limit in language planning is also fixed, not allowing development of any language to the detriment of the national language (ECRML).

National language is not necessarily the mother tongue for the whole population and a home language for its residents. It is foremost an integral part of the nation-building process, attaining official functions to it as the language of governance (working language of officials, language of official meetings and documents) and as the language of instruction at school and in further education. Thus, the state allocates instrumental functions to the language concerned. Together with this, the language takes over symbolic function, adhering conscious values to a host of words and concepts related to history and patriotism (Berdichevsky 2004: 245). Simultaneously it molds language attitudes and beliefs, providing basis for language loyalty and linguistic identity, constructing national culture and shaping common medium of discourse.

The exclusivity of national languages within the territory of the state molds the new roles for other speech communities. If a group does not wish to assimilate or is not allowed, it becomes a minority group in terms of political power and structural inequality, its identity often being defined by others while it nurses low self-esteem (Ozolins

1993). According to Porter (1975) minorities are faced with either following the path of mobility and opportunity, or endangering this by emphasizing ethnicity and cultural identity. From conditions of exclusivity arises the phenomenon of minority language which can only exist when there is a formally constituted majority language (Heller 1998) and which becomes aggrieved when its survival depends on the degrees of restriction to which it is subjected (Lo Bianco 2002). Language use of the minority tends to be regulated by the majority.

The new battle grounds for language hegemony globally is legislatively vague, there is no multilateral agreement for protection language rights in virtual space by now. Lo Bianco (2004) lists challenges to the national state as follows: globalisation of economies and culture, vast mobility of populations and success of communication technologies.

Postmodern information society and language environment is influenced by the process of globalisation, bringing along extensive migration of labour force and of goods and services. This new situation has created the need for global communication network through potential users and simultaneously, provided technological solutions, thus increasing language contact and multilingualism. This is characterized by a multitude of languages in urban areas (200 home languages in Hamburg, 250 in Amsterdam, 350 in London, cf. Extra/Gorter 2001), but also by language conflict and language shift in the aftermath of language contact. This is possible thanks to less control by the states and administrative network, as there is more room for social fragmentation, enabling new (and old) minorities (together with their linguistic identities) to come to the fore.

There are three main trends in communication that have direct impact on languages. The first concerns language processing. Formalisation in document management and processing is taking place, enabling to cut costs in administration at various levels. Simultaneously, freedom and more creativity in other language domains (internet, SMS, MSN) is increasing, individuality limits expanded. Technology permits the establishment of virtual communities, and while the share of English in virtual world is gradually declining, use of different languages in Internet is expanding. According to Crystal (2001), more than 1000 languages are present in Internet, thanks to low launching costs (though some modifications concerning missing letters or even script are used, for example Latin script instead of Devanagari in SMS). Lo Bianco (2004) notes that

global connectedness makes it possible for dispersed minority communities to continue to operate with dense and frequent communication and can have the effect of challenging national entities from beyond their sites of control. Their identities may be sustained through communications technology [...] in cyberspace.

The last trend increases the role of languages in production and services. While the share of services (with high communication capacity) is increasing at the cost of production, the latter requires more highly educated (through the medium of language) specialists, raising the importance of communication and other language skills, including foreign language skills. All these processes increase the instrumental value of the language involved, increasing the share of language costs in production and services, which may be outside the state of the customer.

These processes diminish distinguishing features of nation-states (e.g. homogeneity of population) and their sovereignty, making political and economic boundaries more transparent. Role of the state in language regulation is limited to public interests, leaving more domains open for individual language choice. Together with the introduction of virtual reality, difference between second language and foreign language environment is vague and diffuse, making national language protection a serious challenge.

There is no joint policy towards globalisation in the domain of language. As a matter of fact, there is no common or primary language policy in Europe, besides the fact that all national languages of the member states of the European Union are official, as a rule. There are just recommendations enhancing multilingualism, for example, in language teaching Europe pushes for minimum standards, e.g. 1+2 formula. The principal locus of policymaking still remains the nation state, where language enjoys special place: it is usually a key component in defining national identity, integration and exclusion mechanisms operation on the basis of languages most often.

European languages have entered the stage of globalization, with the distribution between national and minority languages almost complete. If national languages in Europe can maintain control over multilingual environments unaffected by the new “second languages” and keep the already lost (e.g. science and technology) or shifting domains marginal and resist takeover of functional domains important to the majority population, the new multilingual environment in Europe will be enjoying sustainable development in the diglossic framework.

8. References

- Ager, D. (1999): *Identity, insecurity and image. France and language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Ammon, U. (1997): Language-Spread Policy. In: *Language Problems and Language Planning*, Spring, Vol. 21, No. 1, 51-57.
- Bamgbose, A. (2005): *Language of instruction policy and practice in Africa*. www.unesco.org/education/languages_2004/languageinstruction_africa.pdf (accessed 14.02.2008).
- Berdichevsky, N. (2004): *Nations, language and citizenship*. Jefferson, NC/London: McFarland & Company.
- Boyd, S. (2007): *Communication and community: Perspectives on language policy in Sweden and Australia since the mid-1970s*. In: Pauwels/Winter/Lo Bianco (eds.), 141-179.
- Cooper, R.L. (1989): *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge/New York/Port Chester/Melbourne/Sydney: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2000): *Language death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2001): *Language and the internet*. Cambridge/New York/Oakleigh/Madrid/Cape Town: Cambridge University Press.
- Danzin, A. (1992): *Towards a European language infrastructure*. Report by the Strategic Planning Study Group for the Commission of the European Communities (DG XIII).
- Dixon, R. (1997): *The rise and fall of languages*. Cambridge/New York/Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

- Extra, G./Gorter, D. (2001): *The other languages of Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, J.A. (1991): *Reversing language shift. Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, J.A. (ed.) (2001): *Can threatened languages be saved? Reversing language shift, revisited: A 21st century perspective*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Fried, M.H. (1975): *The notion of tribe*. Menlo Park: Cummings Publishing Company.
- Glazer, N./Moynihan, D.P. (1975): *Ethnicity. Theory and experiences*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Gordon Jr., R.G. (ed.) (2005): *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*. 15th ed. Dallas: SIL International. www.ethnologue.com (accessed Jan 28, 2008).
- Haarmann, H. (1990): Language planning in the light of a general theory of language: A methodological framework. In: *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 86, 103-26.
- Haugen, E. (1983): The implementation of corpus planning: Theory and practice. In: Cobarrubias, J./Fishman, J.A. (eds.): *Progress in language planning: International perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton, 269-289.
- Heller, M. (1998): *Linguistic minorities and modernity: A sociolinguistic ethnography*. London: Continuum.
- Kloss, H. (1969): *Research possibilities on group bilingualism: A report*. Quebec: International Centre for Research on Bilingualism.
- Krauss, M. (1992): The world's languages in crisis. In: *Language* 68 (1), 4-10.
- Liddycoat, A.J. (ed.) (2007): *Language planning and policy. Issues in language planning and literacy*. Clevedon/Buffalo/Toronto: Multilingual Matters.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2002): Real world language politics and policy. In: Baker, S.J. (ed.): *Language Policy: Lessons from Global Models*. Monterey: Monterey Institute of International Studies, 8-27.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2004): Language planning as applied linguistics. In: Davies, A./Elder, C. (eds.): *The handbook of applied linguistics*. London: Blackwell, 738-763.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2005): Globalisation and national communities of communication. In: *Language Problems and Language Planning* 29, 2, 109-133.
- Maffi, L. (ed.) (2001): *On biocultural diversity. Linking language, knowledge, and the environment*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Maurais, J. (ed.) (1993): *Politique et aménagement linguistiques*. Paris: Le Robert and Québec: Conseil de la langue française.
- Mühlhäusler, P. (1995): *Linguistic ecology: Language change and linguistic imperialism in the Pacific Rim*. London: Routledge.
- Nelde, P. (2007): *Maintaining Multilingualism in Europe: Propositions for a European Language Policy*. In: Pauwels/Winter/Lo Bianco (eds.), 59-77.
- Nettle, D./Romaine, S. (2000): *Vanishing voices. The extinction of the world's languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ozolins, U. (1993): *The politics of language in Australia*. Cambridge/New York/Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

- Pauwels, A./Winter, J./Lo Bianco, J. (eds.) (2007): *Maintaining minority languages in trans-national contexts*. (Palgrave Studies in Minority Languages and Communities). Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Phillipson, R. (1992): *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Phillipson, R. (2003): *English-Only Europe? Challenging Language Policy*. London: Routledge.
- Porter, J. (1975): *Ethnic pluralism in Canadian Perspective*. In: Glazer/Moynihan (eds.), 267-304.
- Rannut, M. (2003): Postmodern trends in current language development. In: Metslang, H./Rannut, M. (eds.): *Languages in development*. München: Lincom-Europa, 19-30.
- Rannut, M./Rannut, Ü./Verschik, A. (2003): *Keel, võim, ühiskond*. Tallinn: TPÜ kirjastus.
- Romaine, S. (2007): Preserving Endangered Languages. In: *Language and Linguistics Compass* 1 (1-2), 115-132.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2000): *Linguistic genocide in education – or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tollefson, J.W. (1991): *Planning language, planning inequality. Language policy in the community*. London/New York: Longman.
- UNESCO (2001): *World Atlas of the world's languages in danger of disappearing*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Wæver, O. (1993): Societal security: The concept. In: Wæver et al. (eds.): *Identity, migration and the new security agenda in Europe*. London: Pinter Publishers, 17-40.
- Wæver, O./Buzan, B./Kelstrup, M./Lemaitre, P. (eds.) (1993): *Identity, migration and the new security agenda in Europe*. London: Pinter Publishers.
- Wiik, K. (2002): *Eurooppalaisten juuret*. Jyväskylä: Atena.