Globalization and Structural Violence

Stefan Bucher

This paper is based on a broad concept of violence following the peace researcher Johan Galtung, who suggested speaking of violence whenever one of the following basic needs of mankind is infringed and violated: the very survival of an individual, general physical well being, personal identity, or the freedom to choose among various options. This extended concept helps us to coherently integrate a range of phenomena in a holistic and interdisciplinary approach to violence and facilitates the study of cases of violence in the context of an entire "culture of violence". Structural violence is a mostly invisible form of violence, embedded in social structures, thus it appears to be normal and is often hardly noticed. However, like direct violence, structural violence produces suffering and death. My paper explores the relations between direct violence and structural violence in the current development of global hegemonic structures and includes examples from the economic sphere, where so many people die as a result; however my main focus is on language and culture. In the linguistic world we can see, roughly speaking the emergence of structures with an Anglophone "centre" and a periphery of other languages. This creates asymmetric relations and leads to linguistic imperialism, colonization of the mind and a loss of languages, which are all forms of linguistic structural violence. The paper ends with a concept of linguistic human rights and an outlook towards overcoming structural violence.

1.   What is Structural Violence?

First of all we should clarify what is understood by the term *violence*. I suggest an extended concept of violence following the Norwegian peace researcher Johan Galtung, who says we should speak of violence whenever one of the following basic needs of mankind is infringed and violated: The very survival of an individual, his general physical well being, his personal identity, or the freedom to choose among various options[1]. He also states that it is violent to influence people in such a way that they cannot live the life they would otherwise be able to live. An example quoted by Galtung is that a life expectancy of just 30 years was not an expression of violence in the Stone Ages, while today the same life expectancy (whether due to wars, social injustice, or both) would by all means be a form of violence according to our definition.

This is obviously based on an underlying distinction between nature and culture (economic and political structures). Nature causes harm, not violence. Nature does not act. Humans do. Natural hazards often cause serious casualties or constrain human potential. But to call this violent is an anthropomorphization: speaking of the violence of an earthquake, a typhoon, even giving human names to typhoons etc. These cannot really be considered as "violence", as there is no act which would imply intentionality.

Besides anthropomorphization of natural events we can also find the opposite, naturalization of violence, which is a much more serious matter. Actually, most violence today is hidden, it is quasi-natural[2]. As there is no visible direct violent action, no direct intention to harm somebody else can be identified[3]. But it is not natural. It is structural and these structures are created and maintained or changed by humans. Thus, if people starve to death when there is food to feed them, or die from sickness when there is medicine to cure them, then structural violence exists because alternative social and economic structures could prevent such casualties. One explanation for the naturalization of violence is that 'natural' causes make it somehow easier for us to grieve and to accept the natural events that cut lives short or constrain human potential.

Galtung complements action-oriented views of human society with structure-oriented ones and defines the dominance system in the world in terms of the pattern of structural violence, where violence is seen as avoidable deprivation of basic human needs and an inegalitarian distribution of resources. Like direct violence, structural violence produces suffering and death, yet this form of violence is mostly invisible, firmly embedded in social structures and institutions. It is found inside societies as well as between societies, and we experience them (and, arguably, their violence) as familiar and normal. Because it seems they have always been like that, these structures tend to appear ordinary and become second nature.

I am aware that extending the concept of violence to structures might provoke criticism[4]; however I believe that the extended concept helps to integrate coherently a range of phenomena in a holistic and inter-disciplinary approach to violence that enables us to see cases of violence in the context of an entire "culture of violence". And of course there is a political and moral effect: calling structures violent differs from other descriptions (social injustice etc.) by conveying a much stronger appeal and urgency to change them and to work towards an alternative culture of peace.

2.   The Circular Relationship of Structural and Direct Violence

While structural violence is problematic in itself, it is also dangerous because it frequently leads to passivity, to apathy or to actions of personal direct violence. Aristotle knew that poverty was the parent of revolution and crime. Generally, those who are excluded, oppressed or abandoned are often those who resort to direct violence, today again more frequently, as in the process of globalization they have lost other ways to get noticed or to gain influence[5]. "Macht kaputt was euch kaputt macht" (destroy what destroys you) is a German slogan expressing a highly questionable attitude. Too often scapegoats are victimized in the process, whether they be people who are considered to represent the repressive structures, or even other groups on the periphery, like foreigners, who can become easy targets. Also problematic is the fact that suffering seems to be very hard to accept and to cope with in a society where full self-control over one's life and one's success is expected.

Those in power often feel they must use direct violence to curb the unrest produced by structural violence. Structural violence often requires police states to suppress resentments and social unrest. Huge income disparities in many countries are protected by correspondingly huge police or military operations, which in turn drain resources away from social programs and produce even more structural violence[6].

3.   Global Markets, Consumerism & Economic Structural Violence

The ideology of the free market and unlimited competition accelerates the growth of conflicts[7]. DuNann Winter and Leighton (1999) write: "As global markets grow, income disparity increases around the world. Relaxed trade regulations and increased communication networks are helping powerful multinational conglomerates to derive huge profits off under-paid labourers in developing countries. The result is horrific structural violence to workers who toil under brutal conditions".

In his book *Global Problems and the Culture of Capitalism*, Richard Robbins pointed out that as long as people have access to the means of production -land, raw materials, tools- there is no reason for them to sell their labour as they can sell the product of their labour. Robbins continues:

> For the capitalistic mode of production to exist, the tie between producers and the means of production must be cut; peasants must lose control of their land, artisans control of their tools. These people once denied access to the means of production must negotiate with those who control the means of production for permission to use the land and tools and receive a wage in return.

> Those who control the means of production also control the goods that are produced, and so those who labour to produce them must buy them back from those with the means of production. Thus the severing of the persons from the means of production turns them not only into labourers, but into consumers of the product of their labour as well.

Perhaps we should say it turns them into potential consumers, as they often cannot afford to buy these products. Religious thinkers have deplored the commodification of more and more aspects of our life; for example in his book *Following Christ in a Consumer Society*, Jesuit Father John Kavanaugh discusses the "Commodity Form of life"[8] , and groups together "consumerism and liberal capitalism" (p. 28). And even consumerism contains a competitive element, as we can see in Vittachi's humorous definition of Hong Kong society: "People spending money they haven't earned to buy things they don't need to impress people they don't like."[9]

Globalization also leads to cultural homogenization, in which people throughout the world identify the good life with western values of individualism and consumerism. This tendency leads to the disintegration of traditional societies which in the past provided meaning and care for their members.[10] One of the genocidal aspects of globalization is the conversion of subsistence lands in the Third World into cash-crop farming, depriving populations of relatively simpler access to subsistence food. This means denying food to the hungry and feeding the markets.

Also, physical and psychological harm results from unjust or exploitative social and economic systems. The number of casualties that result from the unequal distribution of wealth between countries dwarfs all other forms of violence other than nuclear war. For example, the figure for casualties from structural violence is 60 times greater than the average number of battle related deaths per year since 1965.[11] Thirteen to eighteen million human beings, most of them children, die each year as a result of hunger, while our planet has enough resources and know-how to provide enough for every person on earth.

This is not just happening to us, we are creating it. Today, the world's poor are the main victims of structural violence. The poor are not only more likely to suffer; they are also less likely to have their suffering noticed. Always, where there is a centre and a periphery, people in the centre tend to be apathetic about understanding and respecting the people in the periphery. Noting the fall of the Berlin Wall, Chilean theologian Pablo Richard has warned us to be aware that another gigantic wall is being constructed in the

Third World, to hide the reality of the poor majorities. A wall is being built between the rich and the poor. This ensures that poverty does not irritate or annoy the powerful and obliges the poor to die in the silence of history.

Capitalism is a system of exchange[12], based on markets for goods, services and labour power. As Brian Martin points out, oppression in capitalism is built into the exchange system, for example in the surplus extracted by owners, in the alienation of workers, in the degradation of the environment and in dependency of Third World economies. Social inequality is fostered *within* and *between* societies: the rich become richer and the poor become poorer. There is nothing in systems of exchange that promotes equality and the ability of governments to control and compensate for the tendency of markets towards inequality is decreasing in the process of globalization. The welfare state has become more and more dismantled, privatization is moving forward everywhere and world politics comes increasingly under the control of a single power.

4.   Military Hegemony and Structural Violence

The violence of globalization is further manifested in the global military hegemony. The only superpower attempts to make the global market an absolute order, ensuring this through unipolar military hegemony over the world. This situation could lead beyond mass destruction to the total annihilation of life on earth. The violence of these wars and the weapons used is often hidden by the terminology: there are "(military) operations", "targets" and "collateral damage". The latter seems to include damage to humans as well as to the environment. By the way, this would be another good starting point to introduce the term "structural violence"-as the collateral damage of unbridled capitalism.

And of course the military is connected to capitalism: market forces drive the arms trade throughout the world; half the world's countries spend more on arms than health and education combined[13]. Excessive militarization produces structural violence on a global scale, especially in the Third World. Market forces are also hidden motives for wars, e.g. the role of oil in the Middle East. "Market forces" doesn't mean these forces are anonymous or inescapable; there are people involved and they should be held responsible. For example, a look at the Bush administration in the US can yield a lot of insights into the workings of the military–industrial complex, particularly dangerous in connection with neo-conservative aspirations for global dominance. Furthermore, the Iraq war has underscored once more the arrogance and might of power over morality and international law.

5.   The Globalization of Language-Linguistic Structural Violence

It is not only economic exchange that is unequal, the inequality of communicative exchange is an important issue. In the following pages I will analyze the hegemonic structures of global communication with English as a global language. While this type of structural violence is more subtle and won't kill people, it causes severe disadvantages, discrimination, exclusion and threatens identity. These violations of human dignity should not be underestimated.

A. Global English and the Historic Background of the Dominance of English.

Currently, we witness the development of English as the global lingua franca[14]. This is evident in the rising number of people the world over who use English as their first foreign language. English is in the process of taking on the same role as Latin in medieval Europe as a common tool of communication across cultural and national boundaries. However for the first time in history we witness the rise of a *lingua franca universalis*: universal in a functional sense, i.e. going beyond the limited (commercial, religious etc.) functions of the past and in the sense of gaining a truly global reach, covering the most remote parts of the world. i.e. some of these are remote not only geographically, but also linguistically and culturally. In the past many attempts have been made to construct an artificial global language, with Esperanto being the most prominent example. However, these attempts were not very successful[15] and Esperanto doesn't seem to be a viable alternative.

The main reason for the spread of English can be found in history. Imperial expansion of European and US power changed the linguistic patterns among millions of people and superimposed English (and some other European tongues) in many parts of the world. When the imperial nations gave up their colonial empires, their languages remained[16].

B. Linguistic Homogenization and Cultural Hegemony

Today for the English-speaking countries English is a commodity that can be exported throughout the world. English-speaking countries have a larger linguistic capital than countries using other languages. Because of this great communicability and acceptability, English-language-related products like movies, videos, MTV, CDs, T-shirts, etc. are exported and consumed all over the world[17].

How do non-native speakers feel about using English as the global language? On one hand there is excitement about global participation or about being part of a local elite or at least about pretending to be part of an elite with the commodified language serving as a status symbol. On the other hand, we often find a general feeling of resentment; especially where the hegemonic use of this language is perceived as an encroachment over local cultures. Mahatma

Gandhi wrote the following extract in the magazine *Young India*, in 1921; it relates to an ambivalence about using English and the interaction between inside and outside:

> I do not want my house to be walled in on all sides and my windows to be stuffed. I want the cultures of all the lands to be blown about my house as freely as possible. But I refuse to be blown off my feet by any, I refuse to live in other people's homes as an interloper, a beggar or a slave. I refuse to put the unnecessary strain of learning English upon my sisters for the sake of false pride or questionable social advantage. I would have our young men and young women with literary tastes to learn as much English and other world languages as they like, and then expect them to give the benefits of their learning to India and to the world. But I would not have a single Indian forget, neglect or be ashamed of his mother-tongue, or to feel that he or she cannot think or express the best thoughts in his or her vernacular.[18]

The difficulty of identity maintenance and the violent tendencies of the dominant language and culture are described here in the colonial context and contrasted with an ideal of intercultural openness, understanding and fairness. Isn't it puzzling how much our current globalizing world resembles the colonial hegemonic situation, and how little it resembles the open and fair one?

6.   Communicative Inequality

A leading critic of the dominance of English in international settings is the Japanese scholar Yukio Tsuda. According toTsuda, the use of English as the lingua franca in international contacts does not facilitate communication because it creates inequality between native speakers (NSs) and non-native speakers (NNSs).

Communicative inequality is generated by the power that NSs have, being able to use their mother tongue while others have to use a foreign (or second) language. NSs are in a better negotiating position: they are fluent in the language and can concentrate on content while NNSs often have to focus on the linguistic form which reduces their ability to participate in the conversation[19]. This can also lead to linguistic and social discrimination as NSs tend to perceive NNSs as inferior due to their linguistic limitations.

Finally, it causes NNSs to develop linguistic, cultural, and psychological dependency upon, and identification with, the NSs, their cultures and people. "Colonization of the mind" (a term also used by Skuttnab-Kangas and Phillipson together with "neo-neocolonialism" and "linguistic imperialism") occurs as a result of linguistic domination. In their mental universe, the dominated, "the colonized", act as colonizers in their own culture. They turn the foreign power into their own power, undervalue their own culture, and replace it with the culture and values of the colonizer - this leads to a new form of colonialism.

7.   Other Aspects of Inequality: Time and Money

The expenses for language learning, caused by the fact that people need common languages in order to be able to communicate, are not shared evenly. The teaching of English worldwide is paid for by everybody else but the native English speakers. It continues to amaze and puzzle me how heavily not only countries but also individuals, especially Asian parents, are investing in English education. There seems to be hardly any awareness of being victims. Even in Korea which has witnessed so many demonstrations in the nineties (e.g. against the Uruguay Round), global English with all of its related inequalities is taken for granted. But let me return to inequality. It is to some extent the Anglophone monolingualism[20] that forces all others to learn their language while they do not learn other languages, which saves them time and money. Ulrich Ammon reports that he often heard American colleagues expressing the view that Europeans had no chance to compete with the US technologically because they have to spend time on language learning instead of working more intensively on science and technology[21]. This seems to indicate a conscious choice of monolingualism as a competitive advantage, which, by the way, would be even stronger in relation to Asians. Personally, I heard from American colleagues in the humanities that they had to give up their struggle for common language requirements due to strong opposition from the scientists in their university.

Finally, Anglophone countries not only save time and money from not learning languages, they are even able to *make money* from the learning of the others: English teaching is a multibillion dollar business for Britain and the US; linguistic capital can be turned into monetary capital.

8.   The Asymmetry of the Globalized Language World: Linguistic Homogenization and Cultural Hegemony

Critics of globalization have often pointed out asymmetries. The same can be said about the linguistic world where we can see, roughly

speaking the emergence of an Anglophone "centre" and a periphery of other languages which is aptly expressed in the cute acronym LOTE ("languages other than English"[22]). And it's not only the language itself which is spreading from the centre; there is a massive flow of information from central countries to the periphery which is not counterbalanced by a similar flow in the opposite direction. This is not only the case with the mass media, but with the fact that anything written in the Anglophone centre can be read in the periphery while it is rare that things written in the periphery can be read in the centre.

NSs and NNSs play different roles. NSs are active dispensers of knowledge, which is submissively taken by the NNSs. This is the case not only in relation to cultures that are remote or small. I have noticed that many great European scholars are unknown in the US. The prevalent belief seems to be "What is important is translated into English" or "If it's not translated, it's not important". One example is from the movie theatre, invented more than a century ago in France. Today, 80% of films shown in Western Europe are of Californian origin, while only 2% of films shown in the whole of North America are of European origin[23].

Apparently there are asymmetric relations in many areas ranging from academic discourse to popular culture. During the GATT negotiations in the nineties, one question that arose was whether the liberalization of trade should also cover cultural goods and services. The French introduced the concept "exception culturelle" into the discussion of international relations:

> cultural goods and services are something more than commercial objects. This doctrine holds that if cultural industries were governed exclusively by market rules they would be unable to compete against the products of the large media conglomerates. Thus states should reject trade liberalization in cultural goods and services-film and audiovisual materials in particular, and remain free to adopt their own internal cultural policies, including subsidies for the production and distribution of cultural products.[24]

This has been partly successful for Europeans and others in preventing cultural homogenization. While the US urged liberalization, the EU and others followed the French suggestions.

To achieve equality and fairness in communication Tsuda makes the following suggestions:

- Linguistic localism: the use of local languages by all the participants in communication.

- "Neutralingual communication" (third language use): interlocutors who are NSs of different languages communicate with each in a third (neutral) language

- Use of both languages: interlocutors speak in their native languages and compel each other to listen to each as a foreign language.

I believe that "linguistic localism" is unrealistic and its enforcement would not lead to desirable results: indeed, avoidant behaviour might be seen. The other two suggestions seem to be viable and actually compatible with the spread of English as a global language, but not English alone. In particular, these suggestions would give English NSs some obligation to learn foreign languages and develop an intercultural awareness of sharing the burden of using and learning foreign languages. Similar to Tsuda´s second suggestion is another proposal by Piron, "to decide that nobody in the UN family has the right to use his or her mother tongue"[25]. This effectively promotes the notion that nobody can expect to use his/her mother tongue in international contacts, and that there is [or could be] some stigma on mother tongue usage, at least in the sense that it would be against conventional etiquette.

9.   A Linguistic Human Rights Approach
UNESCO's recently adopted Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity[26] calls for action against the homogenization that results from the disappearance of languages:

> Cultural diversity is as necessary for humankind as biodiversity
> is for nature. In this sense, it is the common heritage of humanity
> and should be recognized and affirmed for the benefit of present
> and future generations[27] (Article 1).

The main argument for the need of linguistic diversity lies in the concept of linguistic relativity which was developed by Sapir and Whorf and goes back to Humboldt[28]. It means that language is not just an instrument for communication, which could easily be exchanged, but each language reflects a unique world-view and culture and, as UNESCO puts it, the means of expression of the "intangible cultural heritage" of people. This and the fact that the mother tongue is the primary medium of socialization through which a

child becomes part of a community make it a central symbol of individual and collective identity.

Unfortunately, a language becomes extinct every two weeks and a unique world-view, culture and source of human identity disappears with it. The intensive spread and promotion of English threatens linguistic diversity[29]. The emergence of a variety of "Englishes"[30] does not mean real diversity. Arguing this way would be like arguing that the burger chain McDonalds contributes to diversity, by including local dishes for sale from time to time. It is a partial re-localization after homogenization[31].

Aggressive promotion of English threatens the linguistic rights of speakers of other languages. With the human rights approach we can work towards the maintenance of linguistic diversity by stipulating the linguistic rights of speakers of languages which might be threatened, especially by subtractive learning of English or other dominant languages. "Subtractive" means at the cost of the various mother tongues. They could be learned *in addition* to them, additively. Unfortunately people often have either-or attitudes (if you want to maintain your L1, it means you won't learn L2 well; or: learning L2 may mean sacrificing your L1, at least to some extent). Subtractive language learning as the only alternative offered is in my view a violation of minorities' linguistic human rights.

In order to humanize globalization and to create a fair world language order the following have to be considered:

- Counter-balancing the market-an aspiration towards fairness and equality (the market is obviously not a level playing field but an arbitrary and unfair mechanism)

- The right to mother tongue and an official language (important for minorities)

- Freedom from imposition of language shift

- Language requirements in educational systems

These would be steps to implement an antihegemonic globalization as an alternative to that being so vigorously pushed by market forces, creating linguistic and cultural violence. Instead there would be an atmosphere in which everyone's culture and language are valued and not reduced to their market value. In addition, the financial inequalities could be diminished through something like a linguistic version of the Tobin tax/resource tax,

charged on monolinguals and used to compensate foreign language learners/users and support other language related services (interpreting etc.).

Notes

[1] Galtung, 1969.

[2] According to DuNann Winter and Leighton (1999), structured inequities produce suffering and death as often as direct violence does – I would say they do so even more often!

[3] It is often invisible both to its perpetrators and to its victims. Wherever violence becomes visible and conscious, we cannot help but be repelled and strive to reduce and avoid it. Therefore our first task is to become aware of it in all its forms.

[4] An entire range of such critical views can be found in Daase (1996), who tries to blame the failures of critical peace research on its terminology. However, it seems to me that the main failure of post-Cold War peace research, at least in Germany, was its unpreparedness for rising nationalisms (Balkans etc.) and global terrorism due to ideological and theoretical biases.

[5] *cf* . Beck (1997, 166): „Zugleich haben die Ausgeschlossenen – anders als das Proletariat im 19. und beginnenden 20. Jahrhundert – jegliches Machtpotential eingebüsst, da sie nicht mehr gebraucht werden. Ihnen bleibt nur die nackte Gewalt, um ihre Lage zu skandalieren." Also Waldenfels (1997, 133): „Auf die weiche Gewalt der Systeme antwortet eine harte Gewalt der Körper…" - Besides, this leads to a rise in violent crime; for example, cross-national studies of murder have shown a positive correlation between economic inequality and homicide rates across 40 nations as DuNann Winter and Leighton (1999) report, referring to various empirical studies.

[6] *cf*. DuNann Winter and Leighton, 1999.

[7] Actually, the so-called free market is a myth, as it is largely controlled by big monopolies and oligopolies.

[8] "The Commodity Form," says Kavanaugh, "reveals our very being and purpose as calculable solely in terms of what we possess. We *are* only insofar as we possess. We are *what* we possess. We are, consequently, possessed by our possessions, produced by our products" (p.26). Maybe we could assume an "I consume therefore I am" as the founding principle of the Commodity Form of life.

[9] Vittachi, 1995, 72.

[10] DuNann Winter and Leighton, 1999.

---

[11] Gilman, 1983, p.8. He continues: "It is 1.5 times as great as the yearly average number of civilian and battle field deaths during the 6 years of World War II. Every 4 days, it is the equivalent of another Hiroshima".

[12] Martin, 2001; *Nonviolence Versus Capitalism*, Chapter 2.

[13] *cf.* DuNann Winter and Leighton, 1999.

[14] English is not only the most taught foreign language across the world; it is also designated as an official language in 62 countries. Even in countries like Japan and Taiwan the option to make it a second official language is currently in public discussion.

[15] Artificial or planned languages can actually be learned fast due to their high degree of regularity. However, while Esperanto is still taken serious by a number of sociolinguists like Phillipson or Ammon, it seems to be difficult to motivate people to learn an auxiliary language that serves only limited functional purposes and refers to no "real" sociocultural context.

[16] English is still spoken in much of Africa, the Indian subcontinent, the Philippines, and certain areas of the Pacific islands. In most areas it functions as language of the educated elite and of government, commerce, and higher education.

[17] *cf.* Tsuda 1999, Chapter 2.3.

[18] Gandhi, 1921: *Young India*.

[19] This gap is hard to overcome especially for speakers whose mother tongues are linguistically distant from English who are increasingly facing this challenge in a world using a *global* lingua franca (*cf.* above).

[20] Monolingualism is rising. In 1910, one out of every four Americans could fluently speak some language other than English. Only 14 % could in 1990, which is also due to the shrinking of minority languages. This is despite an increase in minority population and demographic predictions that the end of the white majority in the United States is near, and that there will be a majority of minorities. Only Spanish speakers have had long-term success in keeping their language. In Britain, 66 % are mono-lingual according to Eurobarometer, 2001.

[21] Ammon 1994, 240.

[22] It should be noted however, that this term has been used mainly *inside* multicultural societies with English as the official language.

[23] Hamelink 1994, 114. In this regard also: "(…) the competitive ad-vantage against local cultural providers, the obstruction of local initiative, all converge into a reduction of local cultural space." (Hamelink, 1994, 112)

[24] Tardif 2002, 5.

[25] Piron 1998, 1.

[26] Adopted at the 31st session of UNESCO's General Conference, Paris, October 15 - November 3, 2001.

[27] Taking the link between biodiversity and linguistic/cultural diversity further is the so-called Ecology of Language Paradigm (e.g. Mühlhäusler, 1996; Skuttnab-Kangas, 2000) who see a correlational or even causal relationship between them and develop the new paradigm as a counter-strategy to the hegemony of English.

[28] According to Humboldt the diversity of languages doesn't mean languages use different signs meaning the same – they actually refer to something different: „Ihre Verschiedenheit ist nicht eine von Schällen und Zeichen, sondern eine Verschiedenheit der *Weltansichten* selbst"; Hum-boldt GS IV, 27.

[29] On the state of minority languages and the processes of language shift and language loss, *cf.* Skuttnab-Kangas 2000, Chapter I. Instead of "language loss", she prefers the strong term "linguistic genocide". A comparison with proper genocide can be found in Romy-Masliah, 1999: "…we cannot remain silent on the sad fact that the policy of the founding fathers of Australia has consistently consisted, for over a century in humiliating or suppressing the speakers of over 270 indigenous languages in conditions which are quite similar to a proper genocide".

[30] These are variations of English which have been summed up under the concepts "New Englishes" or "Post-Colonial Englishes".

[31] Phillipson/Skutnabb-Kangas point out, with reference to Mazrui and Kachru, that these Englishes are not decolonized or deculturized, stripped of their Anglo-American heritage. This would be as naive as hoping that imperialism and racism are eradicated from textbooks by substituting Lagos airport for London and by changing the skin colour of the arche-typal middle class text-book nuclear family. (Phillipson / Skutnabb-Kangas 1985, 167f.). Unfortunately, educational projects supported by the IMF allow local languages only at the primary level.

Bibliography

Ammon, Ulrich „Deutsch als internationale Verkehrsprache in Wirtschaft, Wissenschaft und Politik. In *Sprache zwi-schen Markt und Politik*, edited by K. Ermert, 13-52. Rehburg-Loccum: Evangelische Akade-mie Loccum.

Beck, Ulrich *Was ist Globalisierung?* Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1997.

Daase, Christopher „Vom Ruinieren der Begriffe. Zur Kritik der kritischen

Friedensforschung". In *Eine Welt oder Chaos?*, edited by B. Meyer, 455-490.
Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1996.
Du Nann Winter, Deborah and Dana Leighton *Structural Violence Introduction* [publication on line] 1999, accessed October, 2004; available From http://www.psych.ubc.ca-dleighton/svintro.html; Internet.
Gandhi, Mahatma *Young India,* 1 June, 1921.
Galtung, Johan, "Violence, Peace and Peace Research" *Journal of Peace Research,* 6, 3, (1969): 167-191.
Gilman, Robert (1983 *"Structural Violence". In *The Foundations of Peace* (IC#4). Updated 29 June, 2000. [publication accessed on line]
http://www.context.org/ICLIB/IC04/Gilman1.htm Accessed July 2004.
Hamelink, Cees J. *Trends in World Communication: On Disempowerment and Self-Empowerment* Penang: Southbound & Third World Network, 1994.
Humboldt, Wilhelm von *Gesammelte Schriften (GS),* 17 vols., edited by Leitzmann, A. *et al.* Berlin: Behr, 1903-1936.
Kavanaugh, John Francis S.J. *Following Christ in a Consumer Society: The Spirituality of Cultural Resistance.* Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1986.
Martin, Brian (): *Nonviolence Versus Capitalism.* [publication available on line] (London: War Resisters' International, 2001)
http://www.uow.edu.au/arts/sts/bmartin/pubs/01nvc/nvc02.html accessed July 2004.
Mühlhäusler, Peter *Linguistic Ecology: Language Change and Linguistic Imperialism in the Pacific Region.* London: Routledge, 1996.
Phillipson, Robert *Linguistic Imperialism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
Piron, Claude *Language Constraints and Human Rights*, 1998. [Publication available on line.] Accessed July 2003
http://www.geocities.com/c_piron/2.html; Internet.
Richard, Pablo *The 1990s: Hope for the Third World.* [Publication available on line.] (2002, accessed July 2004.)
http://www.epica.org/Library/millennium/richard.htm; Internet.
Robbins, Richard H. *Global Problems and the Culture of Capitalism.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1999. [see pp.88-89.]
Romy-Masliah, Daphné L.: *Victorian Multiculturalism: A True Example of Australian Ethnic Harmony.* [Publication available on line.] (1999, accessed 13 October 2004)
http://www.multiculturalisme.org/acarticles.htm; Internet
Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove *Linguistic Genocide in Education or Worldwide Diversity and Human Rights?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2000.
Tardif, Jean "Intercultural Dialogues and Cultural Security*Planet*

Agora, September, 2002.

Tsuda, Yukio *The Hegemony of English and Strategies for Linguistic Pluralism: Proposing the Ecology of Language Paradigm.* [Publication available on line.] (2003, accessed September 2004).
          http://www.toda.org/conferences/hugg_hon/hugg_hon_papers/-y_tsuda.html; Internet.

Vittachi, Nuri *The Hong Kong Joke Book* Hong Kong: Chameleon, 1995.

Waldenfels, Bernhard *Topographie des Fremden. Studien zur Phänomenologie des Fremden 1.* Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1997.