

English as threat: reality or myth?

Robert Phillipson, www.cbs.dk/staff/phillipson

An article produced in preparation for a plenary lecture at the conference at the University of Copenhagen, 19-21 April 2013 for the project *English in Europe: Opportunity or threat?*
Conference theme: *The English Language in Teaching in European Higher Education*

The power to control language offers far better prizes than taking away people's provinces or lands or grinding them down in exploitation. The empires of the future are the empires of the mind. *Winston Churchill, 1943*¹

Within a generation from now English could be a world language – that is to say, a universal language in those countries in which it is not already the native or primary tongue. *Report for the British Cabinet, 1956*²

The plan is for the United States to rule the world. The overt theme is unilateralism, but it is ultimately a story of domination. It calls for the United States to maintain its military superiority and prevent new rivals from rising up to challenge it on the world stage. It calls for dominion over friends and enemies alike. *D. Armstrong, 2002*³

Contrary to the wording affirmed in the Bologna Declaration, the reform of higher education serves the purpose of replacing the linguistic and cultural diversity of Europe by an English linguistic monopoly. *Hans Joachim Meyer, 2011*⁴.

Every time that the question of language surfaces, in one way or another, it means that a series of other problems are coming to the fore: the formation and enlargement of the governing class, the need to establish more intimate and secure relationships between the governing groups and the national-popular mass, in other words to recognize the cultural hegemony. *Antonio Gramsci, 1931*⁵.

The paper analyses how and why the expansion of English in continental Europe can be seen as representing a threat. In several parts of the world, perception of a threat to a national language and national identity triggered language policy activity, for instance in France, Australia, and the Baltic states. Recognition that a national interest is at stake can lead to a threat being converted into an opportunity for analysis, and potentially to action to neutralize or minimize the threat. So opportunity and threat are not alternatives that exclude each other. Currently in continental Europe, English is manifestly both. In some contexts the threat is being addressed, whereas in others the market forces that propel English forward persist unchallenged. English as opportunity can be seen in language policy decisions endorsing the use of English from kindergarten to university, without adequate educational planning, and triggered by the myth of English as a panacea, a universal necessity. The expansion of English has ridden on the same wave as corporate globalization and neoliberalism, as captured in Margaret Thatcher's slogan 'There Is No Alternative'⁶. Her successors, Tony Blair and Gordon Brown, championed an expansion of English in the same spirit. Opportunity is a vague concept, and open to many interpretations, including some opportunistic ones⁷. I provide

some concrete examples of related misguided scholarly discourses, as well as generalizing about overall patterns and trends.

I need to stress that nothing that I write should be understood as meaning that I have anything against English *per se*. Any language can be used for good or evil purposes. What I am against is some of the purposes to which English, like other imperial languages, has been put in the past and present. Secondly, unlike many of those who write about the significance of English in the modern world, I have lived outside the United Kingdom for almost my entire adult life. My understanding of the complexity of multilingualism, its joys and agonies, has been strongly influenced by the existential experience of living as an immigrant, and functioning regularly in my personal and professional life in five languages⁸, in many countries and contexts. In our field, there are opportunities and threats – in relation to English and other languages - at the individual as well as the societal levels. It is important to begin by relating developments in language policy in higher education to causal factors of historical, political, and economic significance, which the initial quotations are indicative of.

The global context

English as threat relates to its connection to major powers, in the past - the British Empire and Commonwealth - and the present, the United States of America. In each context, military force has served as a trigger for economic, financial, political and cultural dominance. Christian missionaries also played a decisive role in global colonization by Europeans and Americans (Islam expanded in a comparable trajectory), but faith-based cultural imperialism has progressively given way to a more secular opiate of the people, the consumerism that is at the heart of capitalism⁹. Asymmetrical relationships between countries and between social classes are underwritten by ideologies of dominance that attempt to rationalize the inequality. Language policy plays a crucial role in the societal structures and practices that consolidate dominance and subordination. Education, examination bodies, ‘international’ publishers, the media, and the creative industries - in the dissemination of all of which language is crucial - impact now worldwide. In recent decades, politicians and economists opportunistically endorsed neoliberalism and corporatism, as though the market would take care of social justice. Facilitating this process, mostly uncritically in this ‘information society’, are communications gurus and Western ‘experts’, including language professionals.

The architects of the American Revolution were highly literate. 75% were English-speaking, seeing themselves as involved in ‘a sacred event ordained by God for the redemption of all of mankind. Even Benjamin Franklin, the leading scientific rationalist, declared, “Our cause is the cause of all mankind, and we are fighting for their liberty in defending our own. It is a glorious task assigned us by Providence” ’ (cited in Hixson 2008, 37)¹⁰. The Myth of America, manifest destiny, the global American dream, has been echoed continuously over three centuries –from the crude rhetoric of the Bush II administration to more subtle Obamaspeak - with active support from several European leaders¹¹. The USA has always been a warfare society rather than a welfare society, initially in North America (Hixson 2008), and currently through the expansion of NATO, globally (Nazemroaya 2012). For instance, ‘The United States is deploying troops in 35 African countries’ (Pilger 2013). The capitalist system of the USA has been copied in China, India and elsewhere, despite the clear evidence of its instability, crises, corruption in the banking world, ecological

unsustainability, and the appalling fact that the basic needs of most of the world's population are not met.

These traits are not recent phenomena. Ivan Illich denounced the capitalist model in a series of books over four decades ago, based on his work in the United States and Latin America: 'The central issue of our time remains the fact that the rich are getting richer and the poor, poorer' (Illich 1973, 148). Illich was shocked by the irrelevance of Western educational professionalism in relation to the needs of the poor and 'the destructiveness of imperialism on three levels: the pernicious spread of one nation beyond its boundaries; the omnipresent influence of multinational corporations; and the mushrooming of professional monopolies over production. Politics for convivial reconstruction of society must especially face imperialism on this third level, where it takes the form of professionalism ... Nations and multinational corporations have become means for the spreading empire of international professions. ... The knowledge-capitalism of professional imperialism subjugates people more imperceptibly than and as effectively as international finance or weaponry' (Illich 1975, 56, 57). He sees socialization into academic specialization as rigorous, self-perpetuating, and self-deluding.

The professionalism of most social science in the second half of the twentieth century evolved in subordination to political goals. In Hannah Arendt's essay 'On lying in politics. Reflections on the Pentagon Papers' (1973), she shows how the disaster of the Vietnam war was made possible by corruption in the US political system and the expertise it manufactured and drew on. In depth she reveals how spin operates, through deception, through self-deception, through concentration on image rather than realities, through 'defactualisation', through shifting goals repeatedly, and through ignoring historical and political facts. Such discourse is generated in expert think tanks and universities, and acted on by bureaucrats. These were trained in an approach of 'hypotheses and mere "theories" as though they were established facts, which became endemic in the psychological and social sciences during the period in question, [and] lacks all the rigour of the methods used by game theorists and systems analysts. But the source of both – namely the inability or unwillingness to consult experience and to learn from reality – is the same' (1973, 38).

Tragically the same features led to dysfunctional policies in Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere (Klein 2008). The United Kingdom invariably aligns itself with the USA, as have several European countries, even Denmark, with its former Prime Minister, Anders Fog Rasmussen, learning so fast to implement American policies that he became Secretary-General of NATO in its current phase of globalization. In the view of one eminent Western expert on the Arab world, Olivier Roy, '“Islamic terrorism” is a notion capacious enough to contain almost anything', and is being misused currently in Mali and the Sahel, '... the moralizing, the ideological posturing, the junk geopolitical strategizing (the west against Islamic terrorism) which has held politicians, journalists and the military captive for a decade, though it has been continuously disproved by events' (Roy 2013, 25).

These global developments are massively influential, and we need to attempt to relate them to our own professional expertise, to our understanding of the increased use of English and the purposes it serves. Silence may be golden in some cases, but not if our professionalism is totally detached from how our world is being shaped, or if we can be seen as condoning immoral policies undertaken by our governments in order to make our lives possible.

The changing nature of how English is conceptualized, interpreted, and marketed is integral to a global process of Americanisation: land in what became named the Americas was considered *terra*

nullius, land belonging to no-one, to which its benighted inhabitants had no claim or rights¹². The same fraudulent argument was used in Australasia and in colonial Africa (Ngũgĩ 2010, 168). The dissemination of Hollywood popular culture worldwide entails the promotion of the values of the USA as a *cultura nullius* (Kayman 2009). In parallel, those who argue that English is now detached from its ancestral roots, and is ‘owned’ by all who use it, that English is free of its origins and disconnected from the economic, political and military system that supports it, can be considered as seeing English as a *lingua nullius*, a free-floating language whose expansion should be considered advantageous for all (Phillipson 2011a). Seeing a language as purely instrumental, or seeing language teaching as ideologically neutral, as an apolitical, purely technocratic mission, entails closing one’s eyes and mind to how social structure operates nationally and internationally, and is in conflict with principles of social justice and a balanced sustainable language ecology.

These are complex issues that will be explored in this paper. English is now more widely in use in higher education in many parts of the world, including Europe. I have earlier analysed the expansion of ‘English-medium’ universities in Africa, Asia, and Europe (Phillipson 2009b, 2011). I have also undertaken a survey of the experience of bi- or multilingual universities worldwide, commissioned for a planned new university in Morocco (Phillipson 2011b).

A discourse of English expanding worldwide has existed in political rhetoric since the 1780s. The first ‘professional’ conferences on English as a ‘world’ language, as a means of strengthening British and US influence, were held in the 1930s on both sides of the Atlantic (Phillipson 2009a, 112-118). A new academic specialization was consolidated in the 1950s and has expanded exponentially ever since, also in Australia and New Zealand. The Anglo-American English Language Teaching industry acts as though its content and methods are globally relevant (Edge 2006), even if several of its cardinal pedagogical principles are false (Phillipson 1992, chapter 7).

A related thrust is the trend of universities in the Western world establishing campuses in Asia and the Middle East. It is comparable to developments during the colonial period, in that the teaching content and examinations are essentially what is on offer back home. For instance, the website of the University of Nottingham at Ningbo in China used to state baldly that what is done in China is an exact replica of UK practices, whereas it currently claims some adaptation towards Chinese needs. However, a 2013 advertisement for posts in English Language or Applied Linguistics stipulates:

Candidates must have a PhD (or close to completion) in English/Modern English Language/Applied Linguistics or related area, together with excellent research skills. The ability to attract funding for major research projects is a distinct advantage. Experience of teaching and tutorial work in relevant subjects at undergraduate and postgraduate level in an international English-speaking institution is also essential.¹³

The position assumes that qualifications acquired in the UK or the USA are appropriate for immediate application in an Asian context. No evidence of competence in Chinese is required, nor of successful foreign language learning. And what does ‘international’ in the ad refer to – location, student intake, the UK? International clearly does not mean a bi- or multilingual environment, since the ad requires experience in an ‘English-medium’, i.e. monolingual university. The Ningbo campus must in reality function at least bilingually, since Chinese students are engaged in (1) foreign language learning and (2) the use of a foreign language in developing competence in academic disciplines. Mention of success in obtaining research funding and the promise of doing so in the

future exemplifies the commodification of higher education, universities as cash cows. Nottingham is of course in China to make money and to create career opportunities and experience for its own staff. Should such research funding be from British sources, or Chinese ones? And surely in a subject like applied linguistics, for Mandarin speakers studying the English language, a paramount requirement ought to be deep insight into the mother tongue of the learners as well as familiarity with local learning traditions and culture? One size fits all is a travesty of professionalism. It smacks of academic and linguistic neoimperialism, the professionalism that Illich denounced forty years ago. English as the new opium for China¹⁴.

Change in higher education

Theoretical underpinning for my macro-sociolinguistic approach to language policy can be found in a range of humanities and social science disciplines, including gurus like Gramsci, Bourdieu and Harvey:

Gramsci's initial significant exposure to the concept of hegemony was in the field of linguistics, where it was used to describe how a given population would adopt a particular language form, parts of a language or an entire language from another group of people. The mechanisms of this adoption were not physical coercion, but were related to cultural prestige as well as economic, political, social and at times even military power (Ives 2004, 47).

Languages are thus consolidated through interlocking processes of coercion and consent. Bourdieu has revealingly analysed types of capital and symbolic violence in social reproduction, and the importance of forms of language in social class hierarchies. Harvey's multidisciplinary neo-Marxist analysis of new forms of imperialism (2005) has inspired my attempt to theorize linguistic neoimperialism (Phillipson 2009a, 131-138). Instead of analyzing the increased use of English as 'domain loss' - as is commonly done in the media in Denmark and Sweden, a concept that is imprecise and obscures agency - one can identify how linguistic capital accumulation for a particular language can entail the dispossession of capital invested earlier in other languages. One can also identify the agents, external and internal, in the Centre and the Periphery, who influence such processes. Thus in Singapore, where English is the sole medium of instruction in school, by 2005 English was the 'most frequently spoken language at home' of over 50% of Singaporean families (Pakir 2007, 197). Linguistic capital was invested in English as a social engineering strategy, and very little in ancestral languages. If users of German or Swedish shift to using solely English as their language of scholarship, similar forces are at work with potentially and over time the same consequences, linguistic capital dispossession, or at least a form of diglossia. The pressure on academics to publish in English is a coercive factor with major implications for publications in other languages (Lillis and Curry 2010).

Bourdieu considers that we social scientists have three possible choices: (1) remaining in an esoteric ivory tower, (2) conducting research commissioned and shaped by those in power, and (3) using established principles of academic freedom and autonomy to relate scholarship to significant political issues (1989, 486)¹⁵. His own work, like Gramsci's, Harvey's and my own, aims at the latter.

Articles and book-length studies of general trends in language policy in higher education in Europe are beginning to appear.

English '*the* language of higher education in Europe... it seems inevitable that English, in some form, will definitely become *the* language of higher education' (Coleman 2006, 11).

... today *the* language of higher education is English ... the inexorable global dominance of English across a majority of linguistic domains makes it the inevitable preference in the specific and influential domain of academe ... as English strengthens its hegemony over knowledge production and dissemination, local and national languages will become restricted to less prestigious contexts of use, and their very existence may be threatened (Coleman 2013, xiii, xiv, italics added):

Coleman is a British professor at the Open University¹⁶. His 2006 article is a thorough, sober synthesis of a great deal of information about current trends in European higher education. He correctly notes the paucity of research studies. As 'drivers of Englishization' he identifies Content and Language Integrated Learning, internationalisation, student exchanges, teaching and research materials, staff mobility, graduate employability, and the market in international students. There is however no evidence for Coleman's claim that there is a consensus about the likelihood of global diglossia with English as the exclusive language of science, that English will replace all other languages in higher education. His conclusion builds on speculations by several scholars who are anglophile and regard the expansion of English as unproblematical.

One is Abram de Swaan, on whose neo-Darwinian approach see Phillipson 2009a, 251-257. Another is Sue Wright, who Coleman cites as propounding that 'One language in the lecture hall precludes another'. Not at all: in northern Europe it is common for textbooks and course material to be in English with the local language as the medium of instruction and examination, a powerful integration of content learning and language learning. In addition, a meticulous doctoral study in Sweden demonstrates that courses that are nominally 'English-medium' actually involve the use of Swedish for a range of purposes. Rather more is used in engineering courses than in business studies, practices vary depending on task and pedagogical organization, and Swedish is used sensitively so that foreign students do not experience discrimination (Söderlundh 2010).

Coleman's conclusion (2006, 11) is that in future people will use 'native languages for local and cultural communication where their personal identity is engaged, and another for international, formal, practical communication', meaning English. This segmentation of linguistic reality, as though 'identity' is switched on in one case and off in the other, is deeply flawed. Scholarly communication does not discount identity. Einar Haugen, a language policy pioneer (cited in Phillipson 1992, 287) warned against this false dichotomy, but it is still invoked, in academia and by the non-specialist¹⁷. The argument is as false as the notion of a language of wider communication like English being 'neutral' when the reality is that it consolidates a hegemonic language internationally and nationally (Dua 1974, Chapter 1).

Coleman's portrayal of a massive switch to English and monolingualism is contradicted by most higher education in continental Europe, except in specialized departments of business studies or development studies. Thus recent data from Germany, as reported by Sabine Kunst, Minister of Science, Research and Culture in Brandenburg, and President of the German international academic exchange service, Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst, states that the number of English-

medium degrees in Germany tends to be grossly inflated: ‘The actual number of English-medium degrees represents no more than 4% of the total of 15,134 degrees currently offered in higher education – at the Bachelor level we are even down to just under 1%’ (Kunst 2012, 73). Proficiency in English is increasingly needed in many scholarly fields in Germany, but that is a different issue, one to which I will return.

In The Netherlands, a recent study states that although degrees are classified as monolingual, either Dutch or English, the reality is that universities are ‘in actual practice bilingual’ (van Oostendorp 2012, 261), unfortunately without specifying what types of bilingualism are in place. How bilingualism and the balance between Danish and English is handled at the University of Copenhagen in chemistry, mathematics, and life sciences is usefully summarized in Harder 2009, 129-135. An MA thesis that analysed the bilingual practices of the University of Århus, in Denmark, in the natural sciences paints a similar picture, one of selective, decentralized, locally appropriate language management (Madsen 2008). Historical and political factors account for faculties here not describing the acquisition of academic competence in the two languages as ‘bilingual education’¹⁸.

English-medium higher education is now a global commodity, which inevitably affects the nature and goals of universities. British universities have become increasingly dependent on income generated by fee-paying foreign students (the high cost for domestic students is a different issue). In January 2013 the British government established a new agency aiming to increase the intake of students from regions such as the Indian subcontinent and the Middle East; the goal is to increase ‘educational exports’, currently worth more than £14 billion (US\$22 billion) a year, potentially rising to £21.5 billion by 2020, and to £27 billion by 2025.¹⁹

Since Coleman’s 2006 article figured as a state-of-the-art survey in the well-established journal *Language Teaching* (originally an abstracting journal), it is likely to be cited as gospel. Thus a British article on ‘The commercialization of language provision at university’ that cites Coleman approvingly states:

English is becoming the language of instruction in HE across the European Union at a startling rate (Coleman, 2006) ... Coleman (2006: 3-5) notes: ‘National self-interest in attracting fee-paying international students seems likely ... to overtake any altruistic implementation of the Bologna Process, leaving the way free for market forces.’ (Fulcher 2009, 130, 131²⁰)

So for British applied linguists, any European higher education institution that seeks to ensure that a national language maintains its vitality as a medium of instruction in higher education and for scholarly publications is considered ‘altruistic’. The Bologna objectives that were formulated in 1999 were: ‘within the framework of our institutional competences and taking full respect of the diversity of cultures, languages, national education systems and of University autonomy - to consolidate a European Higher Education Area at the latest by 2010’. The process is a Council of Europe initiative, though currently it is the European Commission that is the principal driving force behind it, with universities and national ministries of higher education more or less committed to it. It is noteworthy that not once in the lengthy communiqués from the biennial ministerial meetings is there any reference to languages. There is nothing on bilingual degrees or multilingualism. There is no connection to EU policies that aim at promoting all the languages of Europe. The language of virtually all documents and deliberations at the meetings is English. This can perhaps be justified for practical reasons at a conference – though this does not guarantee equality in communication -

however the Bologna process has *de facto* largely been subordinated to the market forces that strengthen English, in conflict with the initial mandate for the process. ‘Internationalisation’ means ‘English-medium higher education’ (Phillipson 2006a, Meyer 2011, cited at the start of this article). The European higher education ‘area’ is in effect a market²¹.

This is not surprising because this European process is a direct result of education being increasingly considered a service that can be traded, under the aegis of the World Trade Organisation, and more specifically of the General Agreement on Trade in Services. Member states have been legally committed to this ‘liberalisation’ process since 1995, but there is a fundamental unresolved tension between education as a human right and trading in educational services. The pressures to reduce what are seen as national trading barriers are intense. Higher education is more vulnerable to international commercialisation than is basic education, though this is also increasingly seen as a market rather than a public service.

Prior to the biennial Ministerial Meeting taking stock of the Bologna Process in London, 17-18 May 2007, EU Commissioner Figel stated (press release IP/07/656):

Bologna reforms are important but Europe should now go beyond them, as universities should also modernise the content of their curricula, create virtual campuses and reform their governance. They should also professionalize their management, diversify their funding and open up to new types of learners, businesses and society at large, in Europe and beyond. [...] The Commission supports the global strategy in concrete terms through its policies and programmes.

In other words, universities should no longer be seen as a public good but should be run like businesses, should privatise, and let industry set the agenda. The new buzzwords are that degrees must be ‘certified’ in terms of the ‘employability’ of graduates. ‘Accountability’ no longer refers to intellectual quality or truth-seeking but means acceptability to corporate-driven neoliberalism (now enshrined in the EU’s constitutional treaty). A recommendation that there should be more ‘student-centred learning’ probably implies more e-learning rather than a more dialogic, open-ended syllabus. Before *European* integration can be seen as having been successfully achieved, universities are being told to think and act *globally* rather than remain narrowly European – and by implication use English rather than a national language. These ideas are insulting to higher education in general and to all universities that have been internationally oriented for decades, if not centuries.

Coleman does not relate his conclusions to these underlying causal factors. He fails to observe that any continental European country or university, big or small, that is replacing a well established national language by English – English expanding in subtractive rather than additive ways - is in conflict with the multilingual ethos of Bologna as originally conceived. Whether this threat from the way English is adopted is real or not, to an institution or country, for instance, is an empirical question, one that needs more thorough investigation Europe-wide.

Coleman’s two articles serve to strengthen the dominance of English. They make factually incorrect statements within what is in effect a discourse of linguistic neoimperialism (Phillipson 2009a, 130-138). By writing that ‘English strengthens its hegemony’ (cited earlier), and thereby falsely attributing agency to the language itself, the human forces behind the expansion of English - and these are identifiable - are concealed. His discourse provides apparent scholarly legitimation for a process and a structure that serve the interests of those keen for English to take over territory that

earlier was occupied by users of other languages. His discourse therefore endorses linguistic capital accumulation in English and the dispossession of the linguistic capital invested in other languages. It serves to strengthen the linguistic hegemony of English.

Influential authors like David Crystal endorse the expansion of English in similar ways: ‘English has become *the normal* medium of instruction in higher education for many countries – including several where the language has no official status’ (2004, 37, italics added). Crystal’s ‘normalising’ generalization is only valid for universities in most former British and American colonies and some countries in the Middle East. He cites as examples The Netherlands (advanced courses), and Africa, where he states that no indigenous languages are used in higher education (ibid.). None? In North Africa? South Africa? This discourse is anglocentric and unscholarly²², even if it is also true that World Bank policies have failed to strengthen African languages in general education and higher education (Mazrui 1997), and the British, French, and Portuguese have energetically worked to maintain their languages in former colonies. Similar policies are in force in Asia, for instance Sri Lanka:

The vast amount of money that was made available for universities in Sri Lanka would not have been possible outside of a context of coercion by the World Bank and other interested parties (such as the USA) to regress to English Only education in a multilingual country (Perera and Canagarajah 2010, 116).

Coleman and Crystal, despite being eminent scholars, remind me of Gandhi’s diagnosis of imperialists: ‘Perhaps, there is no nation on earth equal to the British in the capacity for self-deception’ (Gandhi 2008, 320).

Coleman’s 2013 generalizations about Europe are made in a Foreword to an anthology on English-medium instruction (Doiz et al 2013), but one cannot find much substance for Coleman’s conclusions in the many articles in the book. When the book’s editors sum up the contributions, they refer to many factors influencing current policies, and stress the risk of succumbing to the pressure to attract foreign students who are seen as a lucrative input to university funding. But Doiz et al are also inconsistent in that they echo the rhetoric of English as ‘*the current lingua franca ... the language of academia*’ (op.cit., 214, italics added) while warning against an uncritical use of English-medium education and a misplaced monolingual mindset (op.cit., 218). They advocate locally appropriate solutions that have been properly researched.

Evidence from continental Europe

Locally appropriate solutions can ensure that the expansion of English into new territories, such as continental Europe, is additive rather than subtractive, increasing and expanding the linguistic repertoire of students and researchers in higher education so as to meet both national and international needs. This is what the governments of the Nordic countries are formally committed to ensuring by signing the Declaration on a Nordic Language Policy 2006 (www.norden.org). The declaration endorses active policies to maintain the vitality of national languages, not least at universities – though clearly much of what is happening is pushing in the direction of English dominance, however it is termed or defined. I assume that speakers from the Nordic countries will take up topical issues at the conference.

The need in Germany for a thorough analysis of the relationship between German as a scholarly language and English led to a major conference in 2011, with participation by leading politicians and eminent academics from each branch of science in the country, and with good journalistic presence and coverage. The book resulting from the conference, *Deutsch in der Wissenschaft. Ein politischer und wissenschaftlicher Diskurs* (ed. Oberreuter et al, 2012), is a sophisticated analysis by over 30 contributors of the rationale for promoting multilingualism in scholarship while maintaining the position of German. Only two papers are by outsiders to Germany, reporting on the position of German in Denmark and the Czech Republic.

The German Rectors' Conference passed a resolution on *Language policy at German universities* at their 11th General Meeting of 22 November 2011. This diagnoses challenges and makes recommendations for promoting 'multilingualism and ensuring that German remains a language of science and scholarship'²³. The Volkswagen Foundation is active in promoting this goal. It funded the conference referred to in the previous paragraph, and celebrated 50 years of activity at a forward-looking conference in March 2012 on how creative research can be generated²⁴.

One of the many relevant issues is the evidence of intellectual creativity being greatest when conceptualized and formulated in the mother tongue, in the 'culture' language ('Kultursprache') of the relevant country (Trabant 2012, 107). A corollary is the principle that scholarly work should not be secluded in an ivory tower but must be shared with civil society. Albert Einstein provided a rationale for the involvement of the intellectual in the wider society: '... it is of major importance that the general public is given the opportunity to be made aware of the concerns and achievements of scientific research, to fully understand and experience them. It is not enough for any innovative finding to be taken up, worked on and applied by a few specialists. Limiting discoveries to a narrow circle kills the philosophical genius of a people and leads to intellectual impoverishment' (1948, cited by Krull 2012, 16). In other words, democracy benefits when civil society is well informed. This will generally be in the national language.

The difficulty of producing a valid translation into English of the German text exemplifies the fact that the semantic universe of any two languages is never isomorphic: concepts such as *scientific, finding, philosophical, a people, intellectual* (the original reads 'den philosophischen Geist in einem Volke und führt zur geistigen Verarmung') have different roots, referents, and resonance which cannot have the same cognitive, cultural and pragmatic value in a different language.

While it is true that most creative research is conceptualized and articulated in one's mother tongue, for people who emigrate to a different country, such as France or the USA, and if the local language becomes the primary language of scholarship, there is likely to be a partial or even total transition to dominance in the new language. This entails a high degree of cultural and linguistic assimilation. Many types of linguistic hybridity are also a possible outcome. For continental Europeans who remain resident in their country of origin, total cultural and linguistic assimilation to English or any other language is highly improbable. As Bourdieu stated in a panel debate, since English has acquired such major symbolic capital, it is important to evolve strategies to resist linguistic hegemony and symbolic imperialism: what has to be done is to become proficient in English without being brainwashed. This is a challenge because of the massive borrowing of concepts from English (Bourdieu et al 2001, 47-48).²⁵

There is reinforcement of the importance of differences between conceptual universes in different languages in research in Sweden that contrasts the learning of students of physics when instructed

in English or in Swedish: ‘university lecturers are, in fact, teachers of a disciplinary language ... each degree course should be analyzed in terms of the *desired combination of language specific disciplinary skills that we would like to be attained within that course* ... I have suggested that the concept of *bilingual disciplinary literacy* might be helpful’ (Airey 2011, 14, 15). Only in this way can students learn optimally to function in the specific disciplinary discourses that are integral to texts in each language and to the use of both languages as a medium of teaching and learning.

A further point made in the German book is that the language involved in all scientific activity, including work in the natural sciences, is complex, whereas a *lingua franca* in the original sense of the term is limited, shrunken, incomplete language. By contrast ‘the English used as an international scientific language is not a *lingua franca*, a non-language. English is a completely normal language with its specific monolingual semantics, like all other languages. [...] It is the bearer, like all other natural languages, of a particular vision of the world. As such it is not universal and purely objective, which is what real *lingua francas* were’ (Trabant 2012, 108). Trabant stresses that the term *lingua franca* may be valid for business English, but that scientific activity is quite different. It does not merely refer to objectively verifiable objects. Scholars from the English-speaking world draw on all registers, the entire English-using conceptual universe, in order to participate fully in scientific activity. English therefore cannot be universally valid or correspond to general human traits. Its expansion is imperialist:

In as much as these monolingual, specific textual worlds are replacing and suppressing other scientific languages, a particular semantic world is being expanded to the entire world. They are therefore not universal but imperial and colonial, in the same way as political empires destroy and degrade other particular (scholarly) cultures. A gigantic destruction of knowledge has taken hold (ibid.).

This analysis, like Bourdieu’s, connects the wider use of English to general societal developments, the interlocking of language policy with political, economic, military and cultural trends that trigger the multiple flows that make use of English. New discourses and technologies are adopted and creatively adapted, but in an unfree global and local market. Thus it is false to project English as though it is ‘neutral’, English as a mere tool that serves all equally well, in whatever society they live.

A survey of research into differences in scientific writing in different cultures draws similar conclusions. Fiedler argues convincingly that scientific communication in English is not neutral, a *lingua franca*; that native speakers of English act as gatekeepers in the field of publications, and stylistic quality differs in German, Chinese, Polish etc; that development of scholarly registers is important in the evolution of a national language, and, echoing Einstein, the general public must have access to scientific knowledge; that scientific productivity benefits from different models of thinking in different languages: ‘Monolingualism means monoculturalism and this leads to monotony’ (Fiedler 2011, 5-6).

Much of the celebratory literature on ‘global’ English analyses it exclusively in instrumental terms. However, as work on the semantics and culture embedded in the grammar and words of English by an eminent Polish-Australian linguist stresses, publications on ‘global English’, ‘international English’, ‘world English’, ‘standard English’ and ‘English as a *lingua franca*’ neglect the distinctive heritage embedded in the language, in its core semantic and grammatical structures, since ultimately ‘in the present-day world it is Anglo English that remains the touchstone and guarantor of English-

based global communication' (Wierzbicka 2006, 13-14). She also refers to the ethnocentricity of many theorists from the Anglo-American world who mistakenly take Anglo English – the English of the UK and the USA - for the human norm (ibid., 12). I would add that they are insensitive to the way the structural favouring of English in academia operates inequitably and reinforces English linguistic imperialism.

Invisibilizing English linguistic imperialism

Mainstream applied linguists tend to avoid addressing issues like linguistic imperialism, its relevance as an analytical tool, or even the existence of the phenomena that constitute linguistic imperialism²⁶. Coleman fits into this mould:

... English is not the kind of imperialist global movement which the more extreme conspiracy theorists suggest. The societal changes instead reflect the cumulative impact of myriad local discussions at departmental or faculty level, comprising false starts and experiential adaptation, and whose prime movers are motivated above all by local contexts and domestic concerns. (Coleman 2013, xv).

So there are no external constraints or pressures, internationalization is a local, domestic affair. I cannot know which 'theorists' Coleman is alluding to. Indeed I am not aware of the existence of any. An accusation of extremism is a sinister rhetorical strategy that should not figure in serious scholarship unless substantially documented. As demonstrated in the chapter on extremism in Steven Poole's book *Unspeak. Words are weapons*, people position themselves on a spectrum of stances: 'To call someone an 'extremist' is to denounce him merely for his position on our imaginary spectrum of ideas, rather than to engage with what he is actually saying' (2006, 221).

Other scholars have also distanced themselves from the study of linguistic imperialism. Spolsky writes that my analysis of the global dominance of English does not see it as 'a complex result of a multitude of factors' (2004, 79) but, like Coleman, as due to a conspiracy. Spolsky sets up an alternative way of explaining the spread of English: was it the result of active promotion or not? 'Did it happen, or was it caused?' (ibid.). Causal factors are presented as either non-existent, which is manifestly false, or are conflated with conspiracy. In my rebuttal of Spolsky's allegations (initially in an article in the journal *Language Policy*, reproduced in Phillipson 2009a, 72-81), I write that it is false to suggest that the theoretical underpinning and empirical documentation of my book ignores complex political and social developments. The British and US governments have been open about their aims for global English and adopted policies to promote it. I report on policy statements that were in the public sphere as well as some of the more 'confidential' ones. The imperialism theory that I elaborated tries to avoid reductionism by recognizing that what happens in the Periphery is not irrevocably determined by the Centre. The efforts of the Centre do not mesh in precisely with what the Periphery's needs are understood to be. Nor are the Periphery representatives passive spectators. They have a variety of motives, at the state and the personal level, as do the Centre inter-state actors. There are many push and pull factors (see Phillipson 2012a). I state (Phillipson 1992, 63): 'A conspiracy theory is therefore inadequate as a means of grasping the role of the key actors in Centre or Periphery. The conspiracy explanation tends to be too vague and undifferentiated to merit being called a theory. It also ignores the structure within which the actors operate'.

I also cite the denunciation of the use of conspiracy theories, taken from a book on globalisation and ‘value wars’, since invoking a conspiracy is:

the standard invalidating predicate to block tracking of strategic decisions. [...]

As a philosopher, I am not interested in ‘conspiracy theories’, the favoured term to invalidate all questions about 9-11. I am interested in the deeper question of the life-and-death principles of regulating value systems which connect across and explain social orders (McMurtry 2002, 17, xiv).

In a recent volume on trends in European higher education, *Language and the international university*, edited by Haberland and Mortensen (2012), linguistic imperialism is brushed aside as the ‘mere machinations’ of two unidentified ‘nation-states’, without the concept being presented for analytical purposes, or reference being made to the many variables that can clarify matters empirically. They write as though English just happened to be there; it expanded purely as a result of demand. No causes of internationalization or ‘globalism’ are explored. An article in the volume by Tove Bull refers to the reality of neoliberalism and neocolonialism impacting on the contemporary European university, however her text fails to explore how these pressures actually function.

Haberland and Mortensen, in their concluding remarks, do refer to market forces and hegemony but fail to identify whose interests this hegemony serves, and the contributions to the volume do not substantially clarify how or whether alternatives to the dominance of English are being established. The two editors retreat to a consideration of native and non-native competence, an issue that is only one facet of the overall issue of why and how English (whoever it is used by) has acquired the prominence it has. By ignoring the activities of the governments and corporate interests of ‘two nation-states’, the massive investments by US foundations in academia in Europe since 1919, US involvement in the denazification of Germany and Austria post-1945 and in the formation of the European Union, the way EU research funding privileges English, the Bologna process, gate-keeping by journal editors, and many related factors, the editors implicitly accept unfree market principles. They acquiesce in English linguistic hegemony, without questioning or exploring it. They exemplify how hegemonic discourses and practices permeate

the whole substance of lived identities and relationships, to such a depth that the pressures and limits of what can ultimately be seen as a specific economic, political, and cultural system seem to most of us the pressures and limits of simple experience and common sense. Hegemony is then not only the articulate level of ‘ideology’, nor are its forms of control only those ordinarily seen as ‘manipulation’ or ‘indoctrination’ (Williams 1997, 110).

Critical scholars like Pierre Bourdieu see globalization as involving exactly this, the acceptance of a particular economic system masquerading as though it serves the interests of all equally well (2001). Accepting English as a *lingua nullius* strengthens the myth of its universal relevance irrespective of the inequalities and special interests that its expansion serves. I have argued elsewhere that loose use of the *lingua franca* concept serves similar purposes, and that it would be important to distinguish the use of English for specific purposes, as a *lingua academica*, *lingua economica*, *lingua bellica*, etc (Phillipson 2009a, 147-194).

One variable in the acceptance of hegemonic language relates to the extent to which there are positive attitudes to the English language and US culture, and a concomitant negative attitude to the

national language. Meyer (2012) argues strongly how and why this is the case in Germany, drawing on historical evidence and the different trajectories of Western Germany and the German Democratic Republic. One consequence is uninformed national language policies. He also shows the fundamental inconsistency between the effort to enforce the integration of migrants through an exclusive focus on the learning of German, and the neglect of German in higher education, which functions as though internationalization means 'the Englishisation and Americanisation of German higher education and research' as though the use of English is intrinsically superior in quality to what is or can be done in German (Meyer 2012, 47).

I drew similar conclusions on the basis of the evidence in the Nordic countries (Phillipson 2006a), and likewise advocated bi- or multilingual policies as a counterweight to this thrust. It is false to assume that alignment with globalization and its European variant, European integration, requires the replacement of national languages by English. In Denmark the situation has many similarities to Germany, in the business and academic worlds and in popular culture, but there has been no systematic study of the reasons behind beliefs that English is superior to English. Concern about whether the expansion of English represents a threat to Danish led to two national studies of how to strengthen Danish (Kulturministeriet 2003, 2008). Both studies had a narrow mandate, limited expertise among its authors, and virtually no dissemination or impact. Market forces therefore remain virtually unchecked.

Prospects

Among the main conclusions that follow from the analysis of the German situation are the following (Ehlich and Meyer 2012):

1. The EU should elaborate policies for cultivating multilingualism in universities and scientific research.
2. There should be European citation indexes so as to counteract US indexes and the impact these have in encouraging publication only in English.
3. The multilingual proficiency of academics should be promoted, especially receptive multilingualism, including familiarization with Anglo-American rhetorical norms.
4. The ERASMUS programme should focus more on foreign language competence.
5. A range of initiatives for strengthening German as a scholarly language.
6. Comparative linguistic study of academic discourse in different languages should be strengthened.
7. University language centres should engage in research as well as teaching.
8. Success in higher education presupposes a generally favourable social climate and informed public debate. Political leadership has been lacking, and blaming the neglect of German on the EU is patently false.

Comments on these eight points.

1. This has never been done, except in so far as isolated project grants have furthered such aims, e.g. ELDIA. The Bologna process has failed to address the issue. Nor have 'European doctorates', which require use of more than one language and residence in two countries during the various phases of the research process, been promoted.
2. The EU and the European Science Foundation are actively pursuing this.
3. This is a plea for action in Germany.
4. This would require explicit inclusion as a key variable.

5. This recommendation is relevant in German-speaking countries and elsewhere.
6. This relates to Germany but would best be pursued in partnership with scholars in other countries. Isolated researchers have undertaken such work²⁷.
7. This is for German universities. The only European university that I have heard of where a language centre undertakes research as well as having teaching functions is the University of Copenhagen.
8. Change is urgently needed in most countries. The exceptions are probably Finland and the Catalan region of Spain, but Norway and Sweden have also done a great deal to raise awareness of the challenges.

Many of these issues urgently need to be addressed in other parts of the world. Much of the celebration of the diversity of English worldwide fails to address the extent to which English is a threat. I reveal serious theoretical and methodological weaknesses of work by Blommaert in a review of one of his books (Phillipson 2012b). For a powerful critique of the role of English in a variety of contexts, mainly Asian ones, see Rapatahana and Bunce (eds.) 2012. The threat that English represents is massive in South Africa (Alexander 2002, Ramphela 2012)²⁸. Its role in elite formation in former British colonies in Africa and Asia is being consolidated when basic education and higher education are exclusively in English. This is increasingly the case, facilitated in part by World Bank policies. Apologists for the spread of English exist worldwide. A distinguished African scholar writes that the spread of English has nothing to do with the condition of indigenous languages and that ‘It is ludicrous to suggest that teaching English as a foreign language in Third World schools is endangering the relevant indigenous languages’ (Mufwene 2010, 49). His argument trivializes and conceals the reality of English as threat. His argument is irrelevant because teaching English as a *foreign language subject* in African or Asian schools does not marginalize local languages. The problem is that the widespread use of ex-colonial languages as a *medium of instruction* marginalizes local languages in education, particularly if these languages are not actually taught and used as media of instruction. English then maintains the privileges of elites proficient in English, producing Afro-Saxons who use only English in the home. This is currently the case in, for instance, Ghana and Kenya, as it is in Pakistan and India. The situation is comparable in former French and Portuguese colonies.

It is logical that English throughout Africa, and elsewhere, is seen as an opportunity, but the way social hierarchies and education are organized ensures that what creates success for the few entails failure for the vast majority of citizens. Illich denounced Western professionalism for precisely this reason in the 1970s, as have many scholars from former colonies. English opens doors to the few, and closes them for the many. If the opportunity factor occludes the threat dimension, the result is a very divided society, a polarization that intensifies inequality. This is the logic of capitalism, with symptoms of social distress and malfunctioning greatest in countries in which there are extremes of inequality (Wilkinson and Pickett 2010).

Some conclusions

The paper began with an analysis of global Americanization. The USA is ruthless in its pursuit of ‘dominance over friends and enemies alike’, a subordination that many European political leaders have uncritically embraced for decades. One of the significant social effects of the phase of neoliberal globalization is that the economy has been seen as more important than active political cultures and the pursuit of equity and social justice: a radical change in how societies are run is

therefore needed, a challenge that the younger generation must act on, since ‘Ill fares the land’ (Judt 2011). Another negative result of ignorant political leadership has been blinkered language in education policies, and more specifically the naïve belief that English is the only language that matters. This is precisely how hegemonic structures and ideologies function, through a coalescence of coercion and consent.

I then pointed out how the discourse of applied linguists from the UK draws false conclusions in endorsing the replacement of continental European languages by English in higher education. There is a clear need for language policy-makers and scholars to scrutinize whether the promotion of ‘global’ English reinforces English linguistic hegemony. Scholars who relate their expertise to ongoing language competition and threats can, in the best traditions of academic freedom, demonstrate how linguistic diversity should and can be maintained. We need to unmask any academic rhetoric that claims that English is detached from its origins and the forces behind its expansion, as though it serves all equally well. Such argumentation is an extension of the false doctrine of *terra nullius* to English as a *lingua nullius*.

The conceptual universe, semantics and grammar of different languages means that students in Europe need to develop academic disciplinary competence in their first language and a second language. Both need conscious attention. The monolingualism of British higher education is a limitation that cannot be justifiably exported to satellite campuses worldwide. If British universities are to function in greater harmony with their European partners, there needs to be a break with a monolingual mindset. Ironically the privileged class in their great-grandparents’ generation were taught fluency in Latin and Greek!

If the national languages of continental European countries are to retain their vitality as languages of higher education and publication, it is vital that they do not blindly buy into internationalization and an uncritical use of English. English can threaten local creativity and national unity if policies that allow English to expand entail the dispossession of the linguistic capital of their national languages. There is a need not only for policies that ensure competence in both a national language and in international languages. There should be some with proficiency in a variety of languages, not only in English.

There is also a need for procedures to ensure that language policies and plans cover implementation and stipulate procedures for accountability. An increasing number of universities in Nordic countries have explicit language policies that articulate goals, but few specify responsibility for implementation at a variety of levels. Quality improvement also requires adequate funding as well as decent working conditions. The technical faculty of the University of Lund does specify duty-holders. The language policy of the University of Helsinki elaborates a sophisticated rationale explaining the importance of multilingualism but it has no detailed implementation strategy. The University of Kwa-Zulu Natal at Durban has both a comprehensive language policy and a separate language plan that articulates how goals are to be achieved. This is vital if the goal of strengthening African languages, mainly Zulu in this context, is to be achieved

Several of the conclusions drawn in the book on the German scene, the considered wisdom of senior German politicians and academics, relate to needs at the level of the European Commission, for policy formation, citation indexes, and a focus on linguistic diversity promotion in existing funding schemes. The overall purpose would be to ensure that appropriate principles for maintaining the diversity that the EU is explicitly committed to are in force throughout the 27

member states. By implication this would mean that any threat to the viability of other languages from the expansion of English is held in check.

Since I have several years of experience of functioning as an expert in the Directorate-General for Research, evaluating applications and assessing the progress of language policy projects, I have no hesitation in stating that much of what is being done currently strengthens the position and use of English and only English. In the administration of the Framework Programmes, the privileging of English, building on the implicit and incorrect assumption that English is the only ‘international’ language of science, quite definitely represents a threat to all of the EU’s 22 other languages. The procedures in force discriminate against researchers for whom the primary language of research is a language other than English. The same inequality applies in the processing of applications by teams of experts with great variation in their competence in spoken and written English. This affects project evaluation, and thereby complicates the process of just and efficient administration. There is a definite need for a reconsideration of the present order of things so as to work for a more balanced ecology of languages of research. It is not easy to organize this practically when individual experts may be multilingual but the wide range of relevant languages (Baltic, Finno-Ugric, Germanic, Greek, Romance, Slavonic) and scripts complicates matters. If the rhetoric of maintaining linguistic diversity is to be more than pretty words on paper, solutions have to be found.

In the Nordic countries the need to act on English as opportunity has been apparent in higher education for two decades. The question of whether English is a threat or not has been aired in the public sphere frequently, and some minor studies undertaken, but most policy has been left to market forces and improvisation. The results of a diverse range of types of experience are currently being analysed in two surveys commissioned by the Nordic Council of Ministers. The national language boards of Denmark, Finland (for Finnish and Swedish), Iceland, Norway and Sweden are coordinating efforts to clarify two principal topics, language policy at Nordic universities, and English as a medium of instruction. These will be completed in the spring of 2013. They will, not surprisingly, be written in a Scandinavian language, the assumption being that decision-makers and scholars from these countries are proficient in the language. I surmise that the documents will analyse English as both opportunity and threat and will endorse the need for university language policies to handle both so that the vitality of national languages is maintained and the promotion of competence in English ensured.

Although the Copenhagen conference theme has a focus on teaching in higher education institutions, language policy must necessarily be concerned with both teaching and research activities. Language in university research policy would require analysis in its own right, but a short survey by the President of the European Research Council stresses ‘the importance of research autonomy, small group size, international recruitment and a leadership that facilitates, as well as informal communication across research fields, adequate instrumentation and reasonable long-term funding’ (Novotny 2012, 42). Other contributions in the same publication (by the Volkswagenstiftung) on nurturing a productive ecosystem for research are inspirational. In continental Europe, the research environment will often be bilingual or multilingual.

The entire higher education community, teaching staff and students, needs to become actively aware of the language policy challenges and committed to their achievement. Both Gramsci (Ives 2004) and Harvey (2011) stress that change must be driven bottom-up and cannot be achieved top-down. University staff need to be committed to articulating policies that can achieve greater social justice, for instance ensuring that any threat from English is converted into an opportunity that does not

impact negatively on the vitality of other languages. At the grassroots level of language policies in our higher education institutions, and in our publications, we need to counteract English linguistic hegemony so as to ensure a balanced language ecology²⁹. For instance, there could be incentives to reward publication in a local, national language alongside international publication. This would be a concrete way of activating Bourdieu's insistence on the role of the academic in influencing political developments and counteracting inequality.

References

- Airey, John 2011. The relationship between teaching language and student learning in Swedish university physics. In Preisler et al (eds.), 3-18.
- Bourdieu, Pierre 1989. *La noblesse d'état. Grandes Écoles et esprit de corps*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.
- Bourdieu, Pierre 2001. *Contre-feux 2. Pour un mouvement social européen*. Paris: Raisons d'agir.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, Abram de Swaan, Claude Hagège, Marc Fumaroli, Immanuel Wallerstein 2001. Quelles langues pour une Europe démocratique? *Raisons politiques*, 2, mai 2001, 41-64. http://www.deswaan.com/frans/dans_nos_archives/Raisons%20pol%20RAI_002_0041.pdf.
- Coleman, James A. 2006. English-medium teaching in European higher education. *Language Teaching* 39/1, 1-14.
- Coleman, James A. 2013. Foreword to Doiz et al, xiii-xv.
- Coupland, Nikolas (ed). 2010. *The handbook of language and globalization*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Crystal, David 2004. The past, present, and future of World English. In *Globalization and the future of German*, ed. Andreas Gardt and Bernd Hüppauf, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 27-45.
- Cummins, Jim and Nancy H. Hornberger (eds.) 2007. *Bilingual education*. volume 1 of *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*, 2nd edition. New York: Springer.
- Doiz, Aintzane, David Lasagabaster and Juan Manuel Sierra (eds.) 2013. *English-medium instruction at universities. Global challenges*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Dua, Hans R. 1994. *Hegemony of English*. Mysore, India: Yashoda Publications.
- Edge, Julian (ed.) 2006. *(re)locating TESOL in an age of empire*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ehlich, Konrad and Hans Joachim Meyer 2012. Schlussfolgerung aus dem Kolloquium zur künftigen Rolle des Deutschen in der Wissenschaft. In Oberreuter et al (eds.), 271-273.
- Fiedler, Sabine 2011. Scientific communication in a lingua franca. Unpublished paper presented at the Internacia Ligo de Esperantistaj Instruistoj conference, Copenhagen, 22-23 July 2011.
- Fulcher, Glenn 2009. The commercialization of language provision at university. In Alderson, J. Charles (ed.) 2009, *The politics of language education. Individuals and institutions*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 125-146.
- Gandhi, Gopalkrishna (ed.) 2008. *The Oxford India Gandhi, essential writings*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Gramsci, Antonio 1985. *Selections from Cultural Writings*, ed. David Forgacs and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Haberland, Hartmut and Janus Mortensen (eds.) 2012. Language and the international university. Special Issue of the *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 216.
- Harder, Peter (ed.) 2009. *English in Denmark: Language policy, internationalization and university teaching*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press and the University of Copenhagen.
- Harvey, David 2005 [2003]. *The new imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, David 2011 [2010]. *The enigma of capital and the crises of capitalism*. London: Profile

Books.

- Illich, Ivan 1973. *Celebration of awareness. A call for institutional revolution*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Illich, Ivan 1975. *Tools for conviviality*. London: Fontana.
- Ives, Peter 2004. *Language and hegemony in Gramsci*. London: Pluto.
- Ives, Peter 2010. Cosmopolitanism and global English: Language politics in globalization debates. *Political Studies* 58, 516-535.
- Judt, Tony 2010. *Ill fares the land. A treatise on our present discontents*. London: Penguin.
- Kayman, Martin A. 2009. The lingua franca of globalization: “filius nullius in terra nullius”, as we say in English. *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 8/3, 87-115.
- Klein, Naomi 2008 [2007]. *The shock doctrine. The rise of disaster capitalism*. London: Penguin.
- Krull, Wilhelm 2012. Einleitung, in Oberreuter et al (eds.), 13-18.
- Kulturministeriet 2003. *Sprog på spil*. København: Kulturministeriet.
- Kulturministeriet 2008. *Sprog til tiden. Rapport fra sprogudvalget*. København: Kulturministeriet.
- Kunst, Sabine 2012. Podiumsgespräch ‘Bildungs- und wissenschaftspolitische Aspekte’. In Oberreuter et al (eds.), 73-75.
- Lillis, Theresa and Mary Jane Curry 2010. *Academic writing in a global context. The politics and practices of publishing in English*. London: Routledge.
- Locke, John 1988. *Two treatises of government*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Madsen, Mia 2008. “Der vil altid være brug for dansk”. *En undersøgelse af 11 naturvidenskabelige forskeres grunde til at vælge henholdsvis dansk og engelsk i deres arbejde*. København: Københavns Universitets Humanistiske Fakultet (Københavnstudier i Tosprogethed bind 48).
- Mazrui, Alamin A. 1997. The World Bank, the language question and the future of African education. *Race & Class* 38/3, 35-48.
- McMurtry, John 2002. *Value wars. The global market versus the life economy*. London: Pluto.
- McPhail, Thomas L. 2006. *Global communication. Theories, stakeholders, and trends* (Second edition). Oxford and Malden MA: Blackwell.
- Meyer, Hans Joachim 2011, Bologna eller Harvard? Realität und Ideologie bei der deutschen Studienreform. *Zeitschrift für Politik*, Sonderband 4, 51-62.
- Meyer, Hans Joachim 2012. Trägt die deutsche Politik eine Verantwortung für die deutsche Sprache? In Oberreuter et al (eds.), 37-48.
- Mufwene, Salikoko. 2010. Globalization, global English, world English(es): myths and facts. In Coupland (ed.), 31-55.
- Nazemroaya, Mahdi Darius 2012. *The globalization of NATO*. Atlanta, GA: Clarity Press.
- Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o 2010. *Dreams in a time of war. A childhood memoir*. London: Harvill Secker.
- Novotny, Helga 2012. Building outstanding research environments in Europe and beyond. In VolkswagenStiftung 2012, 40-44.
- Oberreuter, Heinrich, Wilhelm Krull, Hans Joachim Meyer und Konrad Ehlich (Hg.) *Deutsch in der Wissenschaft. Ein politischer und wissenschaftlicher Diskurs*. München: Olzog Verlag.
- Pakir, Anne 2007. Bilingual education in Singapore. In Cummins and Hornberger (eds.), 191-203.
- Perera, K. and S. Canagarajah. 2010. ‘Globalization and English teaching in Sri Lanka: Foreign resources and local responses.’ In V. Vaish (ed.): *Globalization of Language and Culture in Asia. The Impact of Globalization Processes on Language*. Continuum.
- Phillipson, Robert 1992. *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Phillipson, Robert 1999. Voice in global English: unheard chords in Crystal loud and clear. Review article on 'English as a global language' by David Crystal. *Applied Linguistics* 20/2, 288-299.
- Phillipson, Robert 2006a. English, a cuckoo in the European higher education nest of languages? *European Journal of English Studies*, 10/1, 13-32.

- Phillipson, Robert 2006b. Figuring out the Englishisation of Europe. In Leung, Constant & Jenkins, Jennifer (eds). *Reconfiguring Europe: The Contribution of Applied Linguistics*. London: Equinox, and British Association for Applied Linguistics, 65-86.
- Phillipson, Robert 2009a. *Linguistic imperialism continued*. New York and London: Routledge. Also published in New Delhi, India in 2009 for seven South Asian countries by Orient Blackswan.
- Phillipson, Robert 2009b. English in higher education, panacea or pandemic? In *English in Denmark: Language policy, internationalization and university teaching*, volume 9 of *Angles of the English-speaking world*, ed. Peter Harder. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press and the University of Copenhagen, 29-57.
- Phillipson, Robert 2010. The politics and the personal in language education: the state of which art? Review article on *The politics of language education. Individuals and institutions*, edited by J. Charles Alderson. *Language and education*, 24/2, 151-166. Alderson's response, pp. 167-168. Robert Phillipson's Final comment, p. 169.
- Phillipson, Robert 2011a. Americanización e inglesización como procesos de ocupación global. *Discurso & Sociedad*, Vol. 5(1), 96-131. <http://www.dissoc.org/ediciones/v05n01/DS5%281%29Phillipson.pdf>. The article in English can be downloaded from www.cbs.dk/staff/phillipson. Also in translation into Italian
- Phillipson, Robert 2011b. International benchmark on best practices of multilingualism in higher education. Prepared for Mohammed VI Polytechnic University, Green City Mohammed VI of Benguerir (unpublished).
- Phillipson, Robert 2012a. English: from British empire to corporate empire. *Sociolinguistic Studies*, 5/3, (2011) 441-464.
- Phillipson, Robert 2012b. How to strengthen the sociolinguistics of globalization: A review article based on challenges in *The sociolinguistics of globalization* by Jan Blommaert. *Critical Discourse Studies* 9(4): 407-414.
- Phillipson, Robert forthcoming. Additive university multilingualism in English-dominant empire: the language policy challenges. In *Professionalising multilingualism in higher education*, ed. Gudrun Ziegler, Bern/Frankfurt: Peter Lang
- Pilger, John 2013. Modern times are upside down – an invasion is not news; licence to lie takes you to the movies. *New Statesman* 1-7 February 2013, 38.
- Poole, Steven 2007. *Unspeak. Words are weapons*. London: Abacus.
- Preisler, Bent, Ida Klitgård and Anne H. Fabricius (eds.) 2011. *Language and learning in the international university. From English uniformity to diversity and hybridity*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Ramphele, Mamphela 2012. *Conversations with my sons and daughters*. Johannesburg: Penguin.
- Rapatahana, Vaughan and Pauline Bunce (eds.) 2012. *English as Hydra. Its impact on non-English language cultures*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Roy, Olivier 2013. The intervention trap. *New Statesman* 1-7 February 2013, 23-25.
- Schiller, Dan 2013. Masters of the Internet. *Le Monde Diplomatique* (English edition), February 2013, 14-15.
- Söderlundh, Hedda 2010. *Internationella universitet – locale språkval. Om bruget av talad svenska i engelskspråkiga kursmiljöer*. With English summary 'International universities – local language choices. On spoken Swedish in English-medium course environments. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet.
- Tonkin, Humphrey 2011. Language and the ingenuity balance in science. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies* 8/1, 105-116.
- Trabant, Jürgen 2012. Über die Lingua Franca der Wissenschaft. In Oberreuter et al (eds.), 101-107.
- van Ostendoorp, Marc 2012. Bilingualism versus multilingualism in the Netherlands. *Language*

- Problems and Language Planning* 36/3, 252-272.
- VolkswagenStiftung 2012. *Wissen stiften für heute. Wissen stiften für übermorgen. 50 Jahre Volkswagenstiftung. Dokumentation von Festakt und Symposium am 15. und 16. März 2012 in Berlin*, www.volkswagenstiftung.de.
- Wierzbicka, Anna 2006. *English: meaning and culture*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wilkinson, Richard and Kate Pickett 2010. *The spirit level. Why equality is better for everyone*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Williams, Raymond 1977. *Marxism and literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wong, Mary S. and Suresh Canagarajah (eds.) 2009. *Christian and critical English Educators in Dialogue. Pedagogical and ethical dilemmas*. London & New York: Routledge.

1 When receiving an honorary degree at Harvard University, 6 September 1943.

2 Cited in *Linguistic imperialism*, Phillipson 1992, 136.

3 In *Harper's Magazine* 305, cited in Harvey 2005, 80.

4 'Entgegen dem Wortlaut der Bologna-Erklärung dient also die Studienreform dem Ziel, die dort beschworene sprachliche und kulturelle Vielfalt Europas durch ein englisches Sprachmonopol zu ersetzen' (2011, 61). Meyer, a former Minister of Science and the Arts in Saxony, is convinced that the Bologna process builds on fundamental ignorance of the strengths and weaknesses of universities in the USA and the UK, and is a crude attempt to americanize European universities. He is appalled that German academia has distanced itself from its own rich traditions and is in effect substituting English for German as the medium of instruction and publication.

5 Gramsci 1985, 183, written between 1931 and 1935.

6 See McMurtry 2002, 8. Bourdieu (2001) sees globalization as being fraudulently marketed along similar lines.

7 The British Council flags itself as 'The United Kingdom's international organization for cultural relations and educational opportunities'. The opportunities include the fact that the organization finances over two-thirds of its activities through earnings, in teaching and examining English, and commissioned consultancies. It also assists British universities to recruit fee-paying foreign students. English is a global commodity.

8 I cite references in all five languages in this article.

9 Christian missionaries are however active within the global English teaching business, which raises major ethical issues, see Wong and Canagarajah (eds.) 2009.

10 The entrenchment of rival imperial powers, e.g. France with its explicit 'mission civilisatrice', Spain and Portugal, led to the imposition of their languages outside Europe. Military defeat of the Dutch, Germans, and Italians explains why their languages have not been consolidated globally.

11 The intellectual rationale that justified European occupation worldwide was articulated by John Locke, summarized in Phillipson 2011a. The former Danish prime minister, Anders Fog Rasmussen stated (in an interview for the newspaper *Information* on 28th June 2008) that European powers have a duty to attempt to impose their values worldwide: 'we have to go out and fight for them'. He was rewarded for his loyalty to the US by being made Secretary-General of NATO in 2009.

12 The influential British philosopher, John Locke articulated a rationale for this in the chapter on Property in *Two treatises of government*, 1698. He argues that God commanded people to labour, as a result of which they can increase their possessions: 'God, by commanding to subdue, gave Authority so far to *appropriate*' (1988, 292). Since the indigenous peoples of America have failed to labour, 'they are rich in Land, and poor in all the Comforts of Life'. Nature has given them the same resources as people elsewhere, and productive territory, but they 'for want of improving it by labour, have not one hundredth part of the Conveniences we enjoy: And a King of a large and fruitful Territory there feeds, lodges, and is clad worse than a day Labourer in England' (ibid., 296-7). From which Locke draws the conclusion that 'In the beginning, all the World was *America*, and more so than that is now; for no such thing as *Money* was any where known' (ibid., 301). The fruits of labour can be converted into gold, silver, or money, which can then be used as a way of legitimating 'disproportionate and unequal Possession of the Earth', this inequality being, in Locke's claim, 'tacitly but voluntarily' agreed on by society (ibid., 302).

13 This figured on the electronic website of the British Association of Applied Linguistics, BAAL email circular, 14 January 2013.

14 For brilliant historical fiction on how opium for China was produced in British India I warmly recommend *A sea of poppies* by Amitav Ghosh. The export of opium to China is dramatised in the city of Canton in *River of Smoke*, the second book in a trilogy.

15 L'alternative est claire, en effet, bien qu'elle soit très rarement perçue : ou bien accepter l'une ou l'autre des fonctions sociales que la nouvelle définition sociale impartit aux producteurs culturels, celle de l'expert, chargé d'assister les dominants dans la gestion des "problèmes sociaux", ou celle du professeur, enfermé dans la discussion érudite de questions académiques; ou bien assumer efficacement, c'est-à-dire avec les armes de la science, la fonction qui fut remplie longtemps par l'intellectuel, à savoir d'intervenir sur le terrain de la politique au nom des valeurs ou des vérités conquises dans et par l'autonomie. (Bourdieu 1989, 486).

16 Coleman is a specialist in foreign language learning at university level, with a high international profile and orientation (<http://www.open.ac.uk/education-and-languages/main/people/j.a.coleman>).

17 I analyse its misuse by an English language teaching pioneer, Michael West, and by scholars in the English as a Lingua Franca tradition in Phillipson 2006b, 75-76. Peter Ives recommends a Gramscian approach to overcome 'the usual bifurcation of language into a 'symbolic' or 'identity' dimension and a 'communicative' dimension rooted to a degree in differing traditions with Anglo-European philosophy between Locke and German Romanticism' (Ives 2010, 532).

18 An influential factor in Denmark is that children of non-Danish-speaking origin are termed bilingual ('tosprogede') and that government policies have for several decades imposed harsh assimilationist monolingual policies in order to cure them of this misfortune. The term bilingual is seen as correlating with stigma, being un-Danish, unwanted, and is symptomatic of mainstream xenophobia.

19 Details on <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=2013012418460773>, 27 January 2013.

20 I have written a detailed critique of the ethnocentricity of many of the contributions to the volume that Fulcher's article appeared in (Phillipson 2010).

21 The focus has recently shifted from creating a single European area of *teaching* to the integration of *research* in the 47 countries which are committed to the process.

22 For a critical review of Crystal's *English as a global language*, see Phillipson 1999.

23 This is a sophisticated, reflective 13-page document, calling for action, which has been translated into English, www.hrk.de.

24 See VolkswagenStiftung 2012.

25 Comment lutter contre ces abus de pouvoir linguistiques qu'autorise l'hégémonie linguistique et contre l'impérialisme symbolique ?... Et il faut réfléchir sur ce modèle pour voir si et comment il est possible d'accepter l'usage de l'anglais sans s'exposer à être anglicisé dans ses structures mentales, sans avoir le cerveau lavé par les routines linguistiques.

26 Likewise a textbook on 'Global communication', which explicitly aims at 'promoting no particular philosophical or ideological school, whether of the Left or Right' (McPhail 2006, xii)

endorses an electronic colonialism approach and world systems analysis but not imperialism, which is seen as a thing of the past – though the author does identify a ‘new “Empire of the Mind”’. Not an empire based on land or territory, but an empire based on taking over the minds of global listeners, viewers, readers, or users.’ (ibid., 24), as Churchill rightly anticipated. A key influence is the internet, which is ‘primarily in English and with a US-centric bias’ (ibid, 302). The book is comprehensive in its coverage of developments in communications, but uninformed about language issues, for instance on developments in Europe (ibid., 321). US dominance of the internet is not a question of language but of control. The International Telecommunication Union has failed to wrest control from the US, which fraudulently pleads for ‘internet freedom’. The reality is that ‘The Internet’s unbalanced control structure provides an essential basis for US corporate and military supremacy in cyberspace [...] the transnational Internet services are ...citadels built by US capital and state power’ (Schiller 2013, 15). Despite pressures from many countries, the present system ensures the dominance of Google, Facebook, Microsoft, Apple and Amazon.

27 See references in Fiedler 2011.

28 My wife, Dr Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and I were invited by the Academy of Sciences of South Africa as Distinguished Visiting Scholars in October 2012. We lectured on language policy issues and liaised with local scholars at eight university campuses. The need to strengthen African languages is urgent.

29 There is a detailed taxonomy of variables impacting on multilingual higher education and research, which fleshes out what needs to be considered in any institution, in Phillipson forthcoming.