A WEEK LAST MONDAY was St Valentine’s Day. Next Tuesday will be St David’s Day. Everyone knows that. If you forget, Google will alter its logo to remind you. But what day was commemorated last Monday, 21 February? Few people know, and Google’s logo remained its usual particoloured self.

Last Monday was International Mother Language Day. It is the annual celebration of the importance of maternal languages and linguistic diversity, established by UNESCO in 1999 and first observed in 2000. The day was chosen because on 21 February 1952 several students campaigning for the recognition of Bangla as a state language of Pakistan were killed by police. It is one of only two special days devoted to languages each year. The other is 26 September, the European Day of Languages. This is broader than its name suggests. It is an annual celebration of the languages used in Europe, initiated by the Council of Europe in 2001 as an outcome of the European Year of Languages. The remit includes all languages used within the region, not just those which are indigenous to Europe. Chinese is a European language now.

The European Year of Languages, 2001. That was a year organised by the European Union and the Council of Europe, in which 45 European countries participated. Four years later, in the USA, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages organised a Year of Languages. In 2006, the African Academy of Languages, launched the Year of African Languages at the African Union. And then, in 2008, the big one: the International Year of Languages, 2008.

Let me now be brutally honest. How many of these years did you know about? And, if you knew about them, do you still remember them? And if you remember them, do you do anything to celebrate them? Many language-aware teachers celebrate the days in schools around the country. But they are a tiny number, compared with the millions who are aware of, for example, St Valentine’s Day.

One reason for the collective memory loss is that several UN years competed for attention during 2008. Not only was it the International Year of Languages but also the International Years of Sanitation, the Reef, Planet Earth, and the Potato. There was a notable complementarity among these initiatives. To survive, humans need a viable environment, drinkable water, and food – prerequisites identified through the focus on the Earth, Sanitation, and the Potato. But the fourth prerequisite for humanity is language. Once human beings have the means to exist, then they must co-exist. And co-existence as humans is possible only through language.

It was, naturally enough, Planet Earth that attracted most public attention in 2008, and continues to attract most attention. I say ‘naturally enough’, because there is no point in us worrying about diversity of languages if there are no people left to use them. In all parts of the world where endangered languages exist, we need to give priority to survival and quality of life. Medical and economic wellbeing are prerequisites for linguistic wellbeing.

But a second reason for the lack of public awareness is a lack of marketing on the part of the organisations concerned. And that relates to a further issue: that there was precious little to market. The Resolution setting up the IYL had 33 operative clauses or sub-clauses. The vast majority dealt with internal organisational matters at the UN, such as recommending parity among the six official languages and identifying ways in which the UN operation can be improved. Only three of its clauses were of general import, but don’t hold your breath, expecting something of great originality to emerge from them:

OP 23 affirmed that ‘linguistic diversity is an important element of cultural diversity’.

OP 24 reaffirmed that 21 February should be proclaimed International Mother-Language Day, and calling upon member states and the secretariat to promote the preservation and protection of all languages.

OP 25 announced the International Year, and asked member states ‘to develop, support and intensify activities aimed at fostering respect for and the promotion and protection of all languages (in particular endangered languages), linguistic diversity and multilingualism’.
Poster advertising UNESCO’s International Mother Language Day.
In the language of international diplomacy, such statements are important. But to the outside world, they are bland, vapid, anodyne.

I am not disputing their importance. On the contrary. The intellectual health of the planet is dependent on multilingualism. Without exposure to the alternative visions of the world expressed by other languages, our view of ourselves and of our planet remains inward-looking, unchallenged, and parochial. It is only by experiencing another language and culture – whether at home or abroad – that we discover the defining contours of our own. That is why it is important for the UN to affirm, and to keep on affirming, the principle of linguistic diversity as a basic human good. It fosters an intellectual and emotional climate in which triumphalist language attitudes and organisations feel increasingly uncomfortable and outmoded. Great progress has already been made with relation to racism. Antagonism to linguistic diversity is a first cousin of racism.

But the fact remains that the IYL and the other Years have not been the successes their creators wanted. They have already receded from public consciousness – remembered with affection only by those already committed to the cause. Why is this so, and what can be done about it? These are the questions I want to address in this paper.

Background

Let me briefly review the recent history of this subject, so that we can see where we are. The 1990s was a revolutionary decade in the way it brought the language crisis into the forefront of academic and political attention. It is remarkable what we have in fact managed to do since 1991, which was when the crisis began to be systematically addressed through a number of visionary articles and public statements, notably those arising out of the Endangered Languages Symposium organised by the Linguistic Society of America in 1991, and the statement emanating from the International Congress of Linguists in Quebec in 1992. UNESCO came on board in 1993, with its Endangered Languages Project. By 1995, the organisations began to appear – such as the Tokyo Clearing House, the UK Foundation for Endangered Languages, and the US Endangered Language Fund. In the mid-1990s the articles began to build up, both polemical (in the best sense) and descriptive, and collections of papers began to appear. The first exposé aimed at a more general public were published. Then by the turn of the century, we find a flurry of book-length expository syntheses of the topic. In this respect, the years 2000–2001 were special years, with three general books coincidentally appearing from Claude Hagege, Suzanne Romaine and Daniel Nettle, and myself – very different perspectives, but with a single focus.

Within a decade, in short, the academic linguistic world had begun to realise that Something Was Up – or at least those linguists did who still retained an interest in real languages as part of their professionalism! The statistics, whether expressed by pessimists (80 per cent extinction within a century) or optimists (25 per cent extinction), were compelling, and the accounts of ongoing endangerment, as well as of successful revitalisation when conditions are right, were persuasive. A middle-of-the-road figure was 3000 languages so seriously endangered that they were likely to die out during the course of the present century: that is one language dying on average every two weeks. The descriptive literature having grown dramatically, it was possible to make informed and judicious appraisals of the general situation. And I think now we all know the answers, at least in general terms, to the basic theoretical questions: what are the factors which lead to language death? why are we experiencing this crisis now? and what conditions need to be present in order to revitalise a language? We are also aware of the central role of documentation in addressing these questions. Obviously there is still a great deal of empirical and procedural work to be done, and we have hardly begun to develop ‘documenta-

'tion theory' as part of an ‘applied preventive linguistics’ – by which I mean the application of our theoretical, descriptive, and methodological advances to individual endangered situations. We do not yet have a typology of intervention and best practice to match those available in some other applied linguistic domains, such as language teaching and speech pathology. But at least all these issues are recognised, and research is ongoing. So what do we do next? There is a dimension of our responsibility which still receives hardly any recognition – the gap which exists between academic awareness of these matters and the awareness of the general public. This, I believe, is the domain which next demands our attention.

Anyone who works in the conservation field will tell you that bridging this gap is the most difficult goal to achieve. It has taken the ecological movement as a whole over a century to bring the world to its present state of consciousness about endangered plant and animal species. For example, the National Audubon Society in the US was founded in 1866: we have been bird-aware for nearly 150 years. For world heritage sites, we have the highly successful UNESCO programme, begun in 1972. Greenpeace, the year before, 1971. The World Wildlife Fund, 1961. The World Conservation Union, 1948. It took over 30 years before this Union was able to establish a World Conservation Strategy (1980), which led to the principles laid down in the booklet 1991 document Caring for the Earth.

How, and how much

Compared with such time-frames, linguistic achievements by way of consciousness-raising within just a decade have been remarkable indeed. Thanks to an enormous amount of effort by a fairly small number of individuals and institutions, we have made great progress in relation to the three criteria which we know must be present before progress can be made with an endangered language. First, there is what might be called the ‘bottom-up’ interest – the speech-community itself must want its language saved – and there are now many recorded accounts of how attitudes can be sensitively managed and energies channelled to ensure that this happens. It is also true that we have learned from
our mistakes, in this connection. Second, there must be ‘top-
down’ interest: the local and national government need to
be in sympathy with the philosophy of language
revitalisation and supportive of the task in hand. ‘Top-down’
also includes obtaining the support of international political
organisations, such as UNESCO and the Council of Europe,
who are crucial in forming an appropriate political climate
within which pressure can be brought to bear in difficult
situations. We need only reflect for a moment on the
number of political statements which were made over the
past 20 years to realise that there has been enormous
progress in this respect – but we are still, it seems, some way
from the goal of an unequivocal United Nations statement
of human linguistic rights.

But neither bottom-up nor top-down support are enough,
without the third criterion – cash. We know that
implementing a minority language policy is expensive, in
the short-term. In the long-term, of course, any policy of
balanced multilingualism, in which minority languages are
respected and protected, guarantees massive savings – if for
no other reason, by avoiding the huge expenditure (often, in
terms of life as well as money) which arises when people,
seeing their linguistic identity threatened, take civil action
to protect themselves and their future. But the initial outlay
does cost money – though not huge amounts. It is not as
expensive as we might think, to foster a climate of language
diversity and sustainability. Take the case of the 3000 most
endangered languages. It was estimated a few years ago, by
the Foundation for Endangered Languages, that a figure of
around $55,000 per language would provide a basic
grammar and dictionary for a language that had received
negligible documentation, assuming two years of work by
one linguist. Another estimate suggested that we would need
to allow a linguist three years, and there would then not be
much change from $200,000, after taking into account a
salary, fees for indigenous language consultants, travel,
equipment, accommodation, publication of the findings,
and the provision of basic facilities for revitalisation.

Another linguist took an even broader view, anticipating in-
depth studies, the development of an audio-visual archive,
and a wider range of publications and teaching materials,
concluding that the estimate per language would be more
like 15 years and $2 million. Conditions vary so much that
it is difficult to generalise, but – looking for common ground
between these figures – a figure of $65,000 per year per
language cannot be far from the truth. If we devoted that
amount of effort over three years for each of the 3,000 cases
referred to in Chapter 1, we would be talking about some
$585 million. That may seem like a lot of money; but, to put
it in perspective, it is equivalent to just over one day’s OPEC
oil revenues (in an average year). Or a seventy-fifth of the
worth of the richest man in America. Or a banker’s bonus.

The sums are tiny, but enough to put governments off,
and enough to give support organisations (such as the
Endangered Language Fund) a tough time finding capital to
make even a small contribution to the present need. That is
why the efforts of the large organisations, such as the
Volkswagen Stiftung and the Lisbet Rausing Charitable Fund
have to be loudly applauded. I would never have dreamed,
ten years ago, that two such bodies would be helping our
cause to the extent that they are. But the question remains,
why are there not more of them? Why, if language
conservation is the intellectual equivalent of biological
conservation, have we yet made so little progress in
obtaining the requisite funding? The International Union
for the Conservation of Nature had a budget of 135 million
Swiss Francs in 2010, and heaven knows how many millions
more goes into the support of biological conservation
projects worldwide. Compared with that, the support for
linguistic projects is so far minuscule. Why?

‘Very few people are aware of the existence and scale of the problem’

Public awareness

The answer, I believe, is that still very few people are aware
of the existence and the scale of the problem; and there are
many people who still need to be persuaded that the
situation *is* a problem. To take the latter point first: many
believe in the Babel myth – that a single language on earth
would guarantee a mutually intelligible and therefore
peaceful planet (as was assumed to be present before the
‘curse’ of Babel differentiated languages). However, Genesis
chapter 10 shows that there were languages (in the plural)
on earth before the Babel event (which is reported in chapter
11), and there is widespread evidence from all over the
planet that the history of monolingual communities does
not prevent civil wars (Vietnam, Cambodia, UK, USA...). But
leaving this issue aside, the level of unawareness of the
language crisis is remarkable, and contrasts dramatically
with awareness in other eco-domains. I doubt whether there
is anyone in the thinking world who is not now aware, even
if only dimly, of the crisis facing the world’s bio-ecology. By
contrast, only a tiny proportion of these people have any
awareness at all of the crisis in linguistic ecology. This is the
gap I referred to above: Us who know versus Them who
don’t. How many are Them? Some time ago, in preparing for
a radio programme, I asked a series of passers-by in the street
whether they were aware that so many of the world’s
languages were dying. The people who claimed to be aware
(whether they really were or not I do not know) were one in
four. The other three had no idea what I was talking about.
A similar exercise at the University of Manchester got the
same result. And I get the same result today. Seventy-five
per cent of the population do not know there is an issue,
therefore; and a fair number of the remaining twenty-
five per cent do not believe that it is an important issue.
Many of these are the opinion-formers of this world – such
as journalists, politicians, media personalities, and
businessmen. How can we get through to Them?

We can of course lecture to Them, and write books for
Them – but let us not fool ourselves. Even if one of our
The media

Some progress has been made with reference to the first way: enlisting the support of the media. I have been quite impressed with the increased interest shown by some sections of the media during the past decade. Several articles have appeared in general-interest magazines and newspapers. There have been pieces, often illustrated with stunning photographs, in such periodicals as Prospect, National Geographic, Scientific American, and even the British Airways in-flight magazine, High Life. Radio has also served us well. Since 2000-1 I know of a dozen or so radio programmes devoted to the topic of language death on the BBC’s two main documentary channels, Radio 3 or Radio 4 – in one case a series (called ‘Lost for Words’) of four half-hour programmes. There seems to have been similar radio interest elsewhere: I have contributed to programmes being made in the United States, Canada, and Australia, and several of my linguistic colleagues have too. Television, by contrast, has been less interested. Since the mid-1990s I know of ten proposals to the various UK television channels for documentaries or mini-series on language death, and although three of these reached a quite advanced stage of preparation – including in one case scripted and partly filmed material – none ever reached completion. The only success story was the component on language death which was included in the series Beyond Babel, which has now been screened in over 50 countries, and which is available on DVD.¹ This was, ironically, an account of how English has become a world language; but the producers sensibly accepted the argument that there was another side to the coin.

We should not take our television failure too personally, by the way. We must not forget that there has never been a television blockbuster series on the general topic of language, as such, anywhere in the world. There have of course been individual programmes on some of the ‘sexier’ aspects of language – such as child language acquisition, or sign language, or speech disability. And there have been a number of series or programmes on individual languages. English, as you might expect, gets the most attention. The Story of English appeared in the 1980s – a huge eight-hour transatlantic co-production – and another eight-hour epic, Melvyn Bragg’s The Adventure of English told the same story. A few other individual languages have attracted interest too. A six-part series, The Story of Welsh was made on BBC Wales, presented by Huw Edwards; and I know of similar programmes on Breton, Irish, and a number of other European minority languages, as well as on the indigenous languages of Australia, the USA, and Canada.

But in all these cases, the creative energy is entirely inward-looking. These programmes tell the story of endangerment only as it affects the individual communities – the Welsh, the Bretons, or whoever. None of them takes the requisite step back and looks at the language endangerment situation as a whole. The nearest you get is when a programme deals with more than one language together, such as a programme made for the Netherlands TV network, in 2001, which looked at the similar plights of Welsh and Frisian, and inevitably began to generalise as a consequence. Another is an ongoing project by the Czech film-maker Michael Havas, whose project on a single Brazilian language, spoken by the Kranak, ‘Brasilian Dream’, is conceived as a symbol of the world situation. Such perspectives are rare. It seems very difficult to get people who are desperately anxious about the state of their own language to devote some of their energy to considering the broader picture. It is short-sighted, because each endangered language can learn something from the situation of other languages – why some languages seem to be doing better than others. Nonetheless, in 2011 our theme still awaits effective television treatment.

Films are the ideal medium for our purposes, because they enable us to see and hear diversity in action. And one of the most promising developments in the past few years has been to see a slow but steady growth in cinematic efforts to capture language diversity and endangerment, from film-makers in several parts of the world. One of the most striking comes from Barcelona: Última Palabra (The Last Word), a documentary made by Grau Serra and Roger Sogues in 2003 about three endangered languages in Mexico (Lacandon, Popoluca, and Mayo). Another is Voices of the World, made in 2005 by the Danish film-makers Janus Billeskov Jansen and Signe Byrge Sørensen. The success story of recent years has got to be The Linguists, which got rave reviews at the Sundance Film Festival in 2008, and later an Emmy nomination. But that is an isolated case.

As I say, we should not take the lack of a television presence too personally. There are reasons why television executives do not like programmes on language. I know what they are because I have been in the fortunate position, thanks to my work in broadcasting over the past 20 years, of being able to ask programme-commissioners. The usual ‘Television executives do not like programmes on language’

¹ From Infonation Media: http://www.beyondbabel.co.uk/
answer is that language is too abstract and complex a subject. The decision-makers are either thinking back to their days of studying grammar in school (broadcasting senior management is of the age when they all had to parse sentences and study prescriptive grammar) or they have had a close encounter of the third kind with Chomsky, and it has scared them. They are also worried by the generality of the subject: that language does not fit neatly into a TV niche, such as current affairs, or comedy. They are petrified by the risk of the academic approach making people switch off. Even though there have been highly successful TV series by academics – Jonathan Miller’s *The Body in Question* on human physiology, Simon Schama’s series on history, Lord Winston’s on medicine – when it comes to language, the eyes glaze over. Even the specific-language programmes are Winston’s on medicine – when it comes to language, the human physiology, Simon Schama’s series on history, Lord Hupa Valley in Northern California, say: Beyond Babel when you hear Cally Lara, a teenager from prospect of a revitalised language – like the moment in animal species. How many experience real joy at the dying language, as I have seen people weep over a dying have an emotional grasp? How many would weep over a the issues which they did not have before. But how many anyway – now have a degree of intellectual understanding of under the latter heading: a lot of people – well, one in four, emotions as well as their intellects have to be engaged. I about the issues surrounding language death. Their need. We also need enthusiasm. People have to be enthused entering the general population. And personalities can help awareness of the nature and likelihood of language death which of course means the politician-electing, fund-raising attracts the interest of most of the general population (which of course is right and the quality is assured, then a big media...
as a subject. I have come across just one sculpture – the living sculpture produced by Rachel Berwick, which some of you may have seen in New York or London in 1997-8. It was based on an event said to have taken place when the explorer Alexander von Humboldt was searching for the source of the Orinoco, in South America, in 1801. He met some Carib Indians who had recently exterminated a neighbouring tribe (possibly a Maypuré group) and captured some of their domesticated parrots. The parrots still spoke words of the now extinct language, and von Humboldt – so the story goes – was able to transcribe some of them. Having heard this story, Rachel Berwick, professor of sculpture at Yale University, saw its intriguing possibilities, and constructed an artwork based upon it: she designed a special enclosure in which were displayed two Amazon parrots who had been trained to speak some words from Maypuré. Approaching this work for the first time, you are nonplussed. Once you read the explanation, you look at the parrots with awe, and wait to hear some words. You do not forget the experience.2

I would have expected music and dance to be especially interested in this topic. Music has been characterised as ‘the universal language of mankind’ (Longfellow), ‘the speech of angels’ (Carlyle), ‘the only universal tongue’ (Samuel Rogers). You would expect these metaphors to have motivated composers to reach for their staves to deal with linguistic issues. But I have not yet encountered pieces which deal with the subject explicitly. The topic of language death deserves at least a symphony, a fantasia, an opera, a ballet, or – to change the genres – a large-scale jazz piece, or a guitar extravaganza. Even the folk-singers have failed to lament about the world situation. The nearest I have come to a major musical work is the marvellous score Philip Glass composed for Godfrey Reggio’s film, Powaqqatsi, the second of his Hopi qatsi trilogy – the name means ‘a way of life [technology, in this vision] that consumes the life forces of other beings in order to further its own life’. The anthem composed for that film well expresses the notion of loss, but Reggio’s theme is cultural destruction in general, as a result of technology, not linguistic loss in particular. A few years ago I was talking to the composer Michael Berkeley on Radio 3 in ‘Private Passions’, and I asked him whether he knew of anything about language death. He did not.

We might expect, from its nature, that the world of the verbal arts would yield more positive results – the world of poetry, drama, the novel, the short-story. Here too, though, there is very little. I know of no novel directly concerned with the general theme, though there are a few which reflect on an individual cultural or linguistic situation – such as Joan Bodon (Jean Boudou) writing on the death of Occitan (e.g. Lo Libre de Catoia), the Argentinian writer Leopoldo Brizuela’s fable about an imaginary encounter between English and Patagonian cultures (Inglaterra, una fabula), or the Abkhazian writer Bagrat Shinkuba’s account of the demise of Ubykh, translated as Last of the Departed. There is Alphonse Daudet’s short story, ‘The Last Class’, about the reaction of a schoolchild to the news that French was being replaced by German in his Alsatian school. But I know of no novel and only one short story on the general theme, by the Australian writer David Malouf. In a succinct, breathtaking four-page tale, ‘The Only Speaker of his Tongue’, he tells the story of a lexicographer visiting a last speaker.

Moving into the genre of poetry, a few writers have taken the theme on board. I have been collecting poems on the subject, and so far have about 30. But the genre which puzzles me most, because it is the genre most obviously applicable to expound our subject, is theatre. Where are the plays? Here too there have been works which deal with the problems of a particular linguistic/cultural situation – the best example I know is Brian Friel’s Translations, about Irish. Another is Louis Nowra’s The Golden Age, about the community discovered in the wilds of Tasmania in 1939, for whom the playwright created a special variety of speech. But what plays deal with the problems of language endangerment in general, or which generalise from individual instances in the way R S Thomas’s poem did? Harold Pinter’s Mountain Language, a 20-minute virtuoso explosion, was my solitary discovery, but that is of little general use for it deals only with the topic of linguistic genocide which, relevant as it is for some parts of the world, is only a part of the overall picture. Apart from that, until recently I knew of only my own play, Living On (1998).3 But in November 2010 there was some progress: in Australia, Kamarra Bell Wykes’ play, Mother’s Tongue, was staged in Perth by the Yirra Yakin Aboriginal Corporation; and Julia Cho’s The Language Archive was staged in New York – really about personal relationships, but its lead character is a linguist constructing an archive of endangered languages.

However, we have to be realistic. Language death is not mainstream theatre. It is not mainstream anything. Can you imagine Hollywood taking it on? It is so far outside the mindsets of most people that they have difficulty appreciating what the crisis is all about, because they are not used to thinking about language as an issue in itself. Somehow we need to change these mindsets. We need to get people thinking about language more explicitly, more intimately, more enthusiastically. Interest in language is certainly there, in the general population – most people are fascinated by such topics as where words come from, or what the origin of their town’s name is, or whether their baby’s name means anything; they are certainly prepared to play Scrabble and a host of other language games ad infinitum; and language games are often found on radio and television – but a willingness to focus that interest on general issues, a preparedness to take on board the emotion and drama inherent in the situation of language endangerment, is not something that happens much. This a goal which artists can help us reach.

‘The arts are the greatest untapped resource that we can exploit’

I believe the arts are the greatest untapped resource that we can exploit to help us do what has to be done. We know the urgency. We need the input of artists, and we need it

2 See the website at http://www.rachelberwick.com/Maypore.php

now. Somehow – perhaps through UNESCO – the artists of
the world need to be mobilised in our support, using all the
resources at their disposal. Artists are extraordinary people.
Once you catch their interest you do not have to persuade
them to act. By their nature, they cannot not. The trick is to
draw their attention to the fact that language, as such, is an
issue. Give an artist an opportunity and he/she will take it.
The problem is that, in so much work, opportunities are
missed – not because of any active antagonism towards the
language question, but simply because people have just not
taken it as an issue. A few years ago I returned from
Brazil clutching a beautiful glossy art-book of photographs
on the country, in which the writer and photographer had
gone out of their way to find communities and
environments at risk. Not a single mention of the Brazilian
language crisis, in the whole book. There were statistics
about the amount of rainforest which was disappearing, but
none about the number of languages which were
disappearing. The writer, I suspect, had simply not noticed
it, or had taken it for granted, or had forgotten about it. The
photographer had not even conceived of the exciting artistic
challenge of attempting to pictorialise it.

We need the arts to help us get our initiative into the two
domains where it can make greatest impact – the home and
the school. How to get awareness of the language crisis into
the home? I know of only two ways of easily getting into
people’s homes: the Internet and the arts. The Internet is an
important and still under-used resource for our theme, but it
has its problems: it is still not available to a huge proportion
of the human race; it can be slow and cumbersome,
especially in downloading multimedia material; and those
of us who do use the Internet routinely know how difficult
it is to get a simple message across – or even noticed, within
the floods of pages that exist. But the arts can get into the
home every day in all kinds of mutually reinforcing ways –
whether it be via a radio or television programme, a CD or
DVD, a computer game, a calendar, a wall decoration or
painting or photograph, a novel, a postcard, or a text-
message poem (currently one of the coolest of artistic
practices). We are used to writing about language diversity
and endangerment. But age 16 is too late; awareness of the biological crisis is in schools at age seven. It
should be the same with language. It is not too abstract a
subject. I have heard seven-year-olds debating the language
crisis, thanks to a skilled presentation by their teacher. All
teachers should be doing this, and we need to be helping
them, by providing materials and examples of excellence in
practice. We are used to writing about language diversity for
adults. How many of us have ever written on language
diversity for children? The role of children to any ecolinguist
is patently obvious: they are the parents of the next
generation, so the sociolinguistic reality of the inter-
generational transmission of language depends primarily on
them. If they can be enthused about their native languages
and language diversity, or have their enthusiasm maintained, we can be optimistic about any scenario for
diversity and sustainability. By providing opportunities
for language-specific chatrooms, making available multi-
lingual websites, and doing all the things that the Internet
enables us to do, we can make considerable progress.

I would like to conclude this paper by making three
recommendations. First, bodies interested in language
diversity should commission an artwork of some kind to
symbolise its content, or perhaps mount a competition. It
would, in its recorded form – whether on paper or electronic – be a permanent reminder to their members as well as a
means of spreading the message to others. I have discussed
the kinds of artwork that might be envisaged, so I say no
more about this point now.

Secondly, there needs to be a major award for language.
Whether we like it or not, we live in an age of competitions
and awards, and these produce some of the most watched
programmes on television. Who is not aware of this year’s
Oscar nominations? Who in our newly extended Europe does
not know of the Eurovision Song Contest? Not only are there
Oscars, there are Grammies, Emmies, Golden Globes,
Bookers, Pulitzers, Goncourts, ... We seem to be obsessed with

4 http://www.whystudylanguages.ac.uk/calendar2011
awards, but they work. The annual award of the Turner prize in Britain, in its often controversial decisions, has generated an extraordinary amount of discussion about the nature of visual art. The point hardly needs labouring, so let me make it briefly. I have already made it at UNESCO, but if an idea is worth saying it is worth saying twice, so let me repeat it. There needs to be an annual prize for artistic achievement in relation to language diversity, at Nobel level, to be announced perhaps on World Language Day (26 September). Let there be something, anything, concrete, to focus public attention on the language crisis. A dimension of this kind, I believe, would complement our professional linguistic activities, and ultimately aid them, for public awareness and sympathy is prerequisite if we are to alter the intellectual, emotional, and financial climate within which we have to work.

Thirdly, we need a physical location. If you are visiting London (or many another major city), and you are interested in science, where might you go, to follow-up your interest? The Science Museum, at least. And if you are interested in Natural History? The Natural History Museum? And art? The Tate Gallery. And Shakespeare? Shakespeare’s Globe. But there is no language ‘space’ – no Language Museum, or Gallery, or whatever you would like to call it. There is no space where people can go to see how language works, how it is used, and how languages evolve; no space where they can see presented the world’s linguistic variety; no public place where they can meet like-minded people and reflect on language diversity, sustainability, and peace.

A proposal for such a space, called World of Language, was promoted during the late 1990s in the UK. This would have been a multi-storey building, the first of its kind, with floors devoted to the world of speech, the world of writing, the world of meaning, the world of languages, and the world of language study. A building had even been identified, in Southwark, right next to Shakespeare’s Globe. The plans had reached an advanced stage, with the support of the British Council, and all that was required was a small tranche of government funding (£20 million) to get the project off the ground. Things were looking promising. But then the government had a better idea. It was called the Millennium Dome. The money which was wasted on the Dome project would have supported 20 ‘worlds of language’.

The world needs houses of language for the same reason that it needs expositions of all kinds, from the arts to natural history – to satisfy our insatiable curiosity about who we are, as members of the human race, where we have come from, and where we are going, and to demonstrate that we, as individuals and as communities, can make a difference to life on this planet. We expect, in a major city, that there will be a museum or gallery or other centre which will inform us about the main fields of human knowledge and creativity – to show us what others have done before us and to suggest directions where we can stand on shoulders and see new ways forward. Most of these fields, indeed, now have their expositions. But language, for some reason, has been seriously neglected – until now. Barcelona opens its Casa de les Llengues next year. In the USA, there is a National Museum of Language. Last month I heard of a proposal to establish one in Paris. In the UK, so far, there is nothing. And my final recommendation is that somehow, somewhere, somebody creates one.

Note:
This paper is a revisiting of my UNESCO keynote of 2003, incorporating material from papers delivered at Barcelona to Linguapax in 2004, at Reykjavik to the Dialogue of Cultures forum in 2005, and again at Barcelona to a UNESCOCat forum in 2007.
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