



**CONGRÉS MONDIAL SOBRE POLÍTQUES LINGÜÍSTIQUES**  
**CONGRÈS MONDIAL SUR LES POLITIQUES LINGUISTIQUES**  
**CONGRESO MUNDIAL SOBRE POLITICAS LINGÜÍSTICAS**  
**WORLD CONGRESS ON LANGUAGE POLICIES** Barcelona, 16-20 d'abril de 2002

---



**DE/CONSTRUCTING WITH GLOBAL PARADIGMS**  
**On Governance, Democracy And Policies For Language Communities.**

**Angéline Martel** [\[1\]](#)

Télé-université, Montréal, Québec, Canada

· **Summary**

· **Preamble**

· **Introduction**

· **Globalised ideologies**

1. Ideologies of competition
2. Ideologies of solidarity

· **Globalised concerns**

1. *The deficit model of the vertical axis*
2. *The reconciliation with a holistic perspective*
3. *The breakdown of the authority model*
4. *The necessary isolation of paradigms*

· **The movement towards good governance**

1. The notion of good governance: seeking for alternatives to competition and hierarchical government
2. *Intentions of solidarity, institutions of competition*
3. Good governance for minorities: increased self-decision-making through the example of Francophone communities in Canada
4. *Democracy and good governance*

· **Tool to analyse paradigmatic allegiance of policies**

Table 1 Paradigmatic allegiances. Or where does each discourse fit?

· **Conclusions**



## · References

## · Summary

To what extent do language communities need autonomy, decentralisation and self-determination in order for languages to survive and develop in creative and contemporary contexts?

In this paper, I address this central question against a backdrop of globalised concerns set by our contemporary world order and political practices.

I begin by identifying two constellations of ideologies constituting paradigms that influence, overtly and covertly, our political and social actions and structures: ideologies of competition/competitiveness and ideologies of solidarity.

Then, I identify primary concerns that should be addressed in order for the paradigm of solidarity to emerge freely in discourses and institutions.

Next, I present the main issues dealing with governance and their importance for minorities, world-wide. Using State and litigation experiences of Francophone communities in Canada, I address the need for self-decision-making for all communities, be they language communities, families, Nation-States.

In order to help make enlightened choices in governance designs/language policies, I provide a grid/tool to categorise discourses and particularly language policies according to the two paradigms.

I conclude that minorities have an important role to play in a paradigm shift from competition to solidarity because they are in a position to call for solidarity. Through the establishment of language policies based on a clear paradigm of solidarity, they can help prove that solidarity can work, even in a world with vast importance given to competition.

But minorities have another advantage. Traditionally, their cultures are closer to nature than Western civilisation's urban identities. This is an untold advantage but a very real one because these minorities, often called autochthonous communities, have the reflexion tools to help guide a reintegration of nature in structures of solidarity.

In short, ecology, in its sense of biocentrism, and language protection = same battle, same thinking, same solutions.

## · Preamble

The separation between theory and practice has plagued language policies, as it has plagued much of our human endeavours.

Language communities and their leaders attempt to work out solutions for very real and very concrete language problems which theoreticians attempt to transform into meaning, generalisations and advice. But the gap between an informed practice and a terrain-guided theory is, in appearance, still very wide.

This paper was written from the perspective of someone involved, over the years, in drafting and evaluating language policies in Quebec and in Canada, from that of a theoretician of languages in contact, and from that of an activist of language rights.



I prepared this paper as a attempt to reconcile theory and practice through the articulation of a common set of original principals which are latent to both types of endeavours.

The basis assumption is that if we clearly articulate the vision of solidarity that underlies mmost of language policies and language theories, we can ensure that all actions and reflexions steer in that direction, free from the wind of competition that makes us loose track of what we are and what we wish to accomplish.

## · Introduction

The beginning of the twenty-first century is a time of distress and questioning, and this not only in the domain of languages where their disappearance is a major concern for language communities and humanists alike.

This distress and questioning are particularly keen when we think of our general way of being in the world as human beings. Many thinkers and activists [2] are now calling, in one way or another, for radically different ways of thinking and acting, world wide:

The historical drama of our epoch is situated precisely here [period of turmoil, acute humanitarian crises, and disillusion], and has its roots in the failure of social consciousness to imagine positive and progressive alternatives. (Amin, 1993: 8).

Language, of course, is not separate from our way of being in the world although scientific conventions have encouraged sectioning into disciplines. Languages are, in fact, an essential part of our being in the world. They are the main interface through thoughts and discourse in contact with the material and the social worlds. Sectioning largely prevented a fusion of interests between linguistic concerns and our overall being in the world.

We could then, at this point of our historical times, review our basic modes of consciousness within language as an effort to eradicate violence by establishing concurrent non violent ways of being in the world, particularly through reflections on languages, language policies and language protection dispositions ; all of which are tools to help eradicate distress and destruction, in its physical, material, psychological, environmental, social and societal manifestations through language.

It is with this point of departure that I first present two constellations of globalised ideologies constituting paradigms. Next, I present a condensed version of what I see as necessary globalised concerns. Further to this, I define governance tendencies and present a tool to analyse governance structures according to the two constellations of ideologies. Finally, I address the need for self-governance of solidarity for all communities, be they language communities, families, Nation-States, etc.

## · Globalised ideologies

There are, historically, two ethically-based constellations of ideologies [3] that collide on a global scale, be it in discourses or in social practices. These constellations of ideologies form paradigms [4] made up of multiple alternatives, according to cultures and historical moments.

Unequally positioned, these ideological constellations confront each other ; but they also inter-influence and inter-penetrate each other. Sometimes, one is disguised and masked so that it largely resembles the other. These paradigms are thus not pure, neither in their constructions, nor in their institutions, nor in their effects. These ideologies constitute vast primary influences and frame discourses, ideas, actions and cultures.

Today, the ideologies of competition are very largely majoritarian whereas those of solidarity are minoritised and often seem inefficient.



## 1. Ideologies of competition

On a hierarchical (vertical) axis, dominant ideologies cluster around relations of competition. And the current globalisation of market economies and societies under the leadership of Western civilisation intensifies competition into competitiveness<sup>[5]</sup>. These ideologies rest on (at least) four poles :

- on a Darwinian conclusion, inspired by natural and primitive survival conditions in the physical and animal world, that the *strongest* survives better ;
- on the notion of *freedom* as a privileged instrument of human development ;
- on the idea that *profit*, as an extension of the economic framework, is a legitimate and desirable reward (the Good) for human activities ;
- and on the thought that *money*, as an instrument of universality, governs the need for positioning and can provide a desired "object".

Privileged positioning in power struggles is provided by profits. Action has instrumental ends. Technique and reason are effective means for impersonal objectives. And money, as a symbol of exchange of material objects, has lost its original utility to become an end in itself:

Money, for example, is originally a symbol used to represent material objects, so that they can be exchanged. But in a market economy, this representation becomes an end in itself, shouldering aside the substantive things which it symbolizes and dominating the global economy of the postmodern world. It moves further and further away from any grounding in reality, becoming progressively more abstract as it takes the form of precious metals, banknotes, figures on computer screens, credit, interest and investor "confidence". At the same time, money becomes an active or subjective power, so that the minutest fluctuations in the relationships between the various forms of money have profound effects on the material lives of human beings throughout the world. We can say that the postmodern economy is characterized by the autonomy of representation. (Hawkes, 1996 : 3)

Numerous experiences can attest to the strength of these ideologies. The most obvious is the generalised pricing and merchandising of words, languages, ideas, cultures, individuals, nature, objects, etc.

Competitiveness has profound effects on socio-political structures, changing the West, changing other civilisations. States, whose conduct is determined by power and wealth, align their objectives on market logic and position themselves against each other, form strategic alliances against other large blocks. Mafia organisations rival each other and dominate societies and governments. Cultures are colonised, namely through the influence of Western -primarily American- media and entertainment industry. Millions of children and women work in semi-slavery conditions when multinationals seek to reduce production costs. New privileged classes are rising : "info-rich" who have access to Internet and communication technologies ; "Triadians" who live in the three richest regions of the world (North America, Western Europe and Japan) ; "Jet setters" who work for multinationals, etc. Ecosystems essential to life (soils, oceans, animals, genomes, etc) are exploited to depletion.

Small, autochthonous, minority languages are disappearing at a rate faster than ever in history, to the benefit of international and/or dominant languages.

In short, competitiveness reinforces conditions of oppression / submission / conflict / rivalry / control / authority / imperialism / centralisation / monopoly in capital-oriented actions.

Overall though, the paradigm of competition rests on a theory, yet unmasked and unarticulated, of penury, mostly economic penury, in such a way that competition is a seemingly normal result of vying for all too scarce resources. But money and economic scarcity are social conventions that make no sense unless they are enmeshed in a manufacture of consent that makes its basis seem unreverseable.



And the greatest challenge of the ascending paradigm of solidarity is to unmask this seemingly unbreakable premise. Let us see how.

## 2. Ideologies of solidarity

On an egalitarian (horizontal) axis, clusters of ideologies based on solidarity and complementarity are attempting to deflect the power axis, seeking to resist to, and counteract, parasitic and predatory socio-political organisations favoured by competitiveness. They too are a product of globalisation through intercultural communication and inter-civilisational exchanges. They also rest on (at least) four poles ;

- on a challenge to the Darwinian notion of survival of the fittest substituting the notion of *responsibility* of the stronger towards the weaker ;
- on *complementarity with "Others"* as a privileged instrument of human development ;
- on constant *resistance* to (absolute) power, authority and domination through new actors who share the podium : individuals (activists, intellectuals), non-profit organisations, gender, ethnic and linguistic communities ;
- on qualitative goals (the Good) of *individual wellness* through collective development as support.

This constellation of ideologies is a people to people, a person to person movement through horizontal networks. Of importance are lived identities and personal logic (vs rationality). And exchange is valued to replace parasitic symbiosis and predatory behaviour. This cluster legitimates and values diversity, be it linguistic, cultural, racial, sexual, geographical, etc. In so doing, it recognises equality to peoples, communities and individuals and favours a non-violent ethos in revolutionary politics and social interactions. Diversity then is not marginal to the centre. On the contrary, diversity is a community of individuals. The notion of "inter-actant" could be used to name the actors in this paradigm.

Enlarging this cluster of ideologies could be called the "true progress of humanity".

Although successes are mitigated by the domination of oppressive power structures, forces attest to the widening radiation of the solidarity ideologies. Democracies, although not actually providing free and democratic life possibilities, are rising, particularly since the 1970's, defining themselves as structures of emancipation from totalitarianisms (and not only in opposition to communism). Paradoxically, it is under the leadership of the West, whose efforts to contain its own violence attempt to establish principles of coexistence, that national constitutional dispositions and international covenants for the protection of the weaker communities and individuals are increasingly promulgated. Numerous non-governmental associations, be they community-based, national or international, are founded in defence of, solidarity with, help for the weak/poor/less-powerful. Social and civil movements are bonding through activism and critical resistance. Dictators are beginning to be held accountable for their crimes.

Minorities are increasingly given the means to develop their community and their language, in particular through education. The words of people at the margins of power, at the margins of cultures are being published and made accessible world wide.

In short, complementarity/solidarity reinforces individual and collective actions of emancipation / empowerment / liberation / negotiation autonomy / independence / self-determination/decentralisation/self-management.

The paradigm of solidarity has to build itself on a theory of abundance, yet to be elaborated : abundance of emotional care, abundance of natural resources, abundance of possibilities, abundance of geographical space, abundance of languages, abundance of ideas and creations, abundance of "grey matter", etc.



There is no doubt that the vast majority of human beings today aspire to a being-in-the-world-of-solidarity [6] and that they feel imprisoned by a being in the world of competition. To concretise this aspiration, I see four globalised concerns that need to be addressed : (1) the deficit model of the vertical axis ; (2) the reconciliation with a holistic perspective ; (3) the breakdown of the authority model ; and (4) the necessary isolation of paradigms.

*(1) The deficit model of the vertical axis*

There is a sense today that ideas, institutions, and political structures resting on the vertical axis represent a deficit model of human organisation. Largely products and constructs of the Western world and of its political culture, like the Nation-State, products exported with Western Europe's historical world-wide displacement of its internal competitions, wars and triumphalism, they are not adapted to meet the budding axial shift. They are not structures based on peace and sharing. On the contrary, they are based on competition and warfare.

*(2) The reconciliation with a holistic perspective*

A movement calling for solidarity does not only rest on social solidarity. And the highest political levels of global governance (Martel, 1999) also call for a holistic perspective. It is in terms of "humane governance" that the World Order Models Project, five study groups through the United-Nations, encourages to plan in a context of total comprehension which includes not only the social and cultural world but also the material and natural world:

The distinctive challenge in the establishment of humane governance is to connect development with the stewardship of nature in a manner that realizes economic and social rights for all peoples, adjusting for unevenness of circumstance (correcting what has been identified in this report as "global apartheid"). At the same time, the enjoyment of the beauty of nature is the foundation of spirituality and creativity, and thus stewardship cannot be conceived of merely in materialist terms. (Falk, 1995: 253)

This reconciliation between the material and the social world in a symbiotic respectful manner is also what Bertalanffy was calling for :

We need a global system of mutually symbiotic societies, mapping new conditions in a flexible institutional structure and dealing with change through constructive reorganization.

The main concern to be addressed is then the separation between the material world, nature and human consciousness. Our Western societies are built on the presupposition that human beings act on the world and nature and this anthropocentric or environmentalists vision of the world is challenged by ecological movements. The debate is then between anthropocentrism of all action and social structures vs the biocentrism and dynamics of respect and complementarity of all life:

Marcuse's unyielding radicalism and his relentless efforts to uncover the roots of the repression of human nature and the violation of nonhuman nature in the development of Western rationality and bourgeois civilization provides a clear alternative to the shallow liberalism characteristic of mainstream "environmentalism". Murray Bookchin uses the latter term, as opposed to "ecology," to designate "a mechanistic, instrumental outlook that sees nature as a passive habitat" which must be protected so as to ensure continued human use. This approach, which dominates mainstream discourse, does not begin to challenge the assumptions of industrial capitalism, but merely seeks less crude, more efficient means of extracting natural resources. "Environmentalism does not question the most basic premise of the present society, notably, that humanity must dominate nature; rather it seeks to *facilitate* that notion by developing techniques for diminishing the hazards caused by the reckless despoliation of the environment.

Environmentalism argues for a more rational science and technology without challenging, as did Marcuse, their normative and conceptual foundations. According to Stanley Aronowitz, "the reason for this omission



is that liberal ecology, like much of Marxism, separates the domination of *nature* from *human* domination." It does not recognize that in capitalism, the same logic which reduces nature to its abstract, measurable features is extended to all spheres of economic and social life. However, our external environment, like psychic nature, "can neither be reduced to their quantitative aspects for the purposes of control, nor exploited instrumentally, without dire consequences for us."... (Blanke, 1996: 201)

A paradigm of solidarity therefore cannot be without a radical adhesion to biocentrism for it makes no sense to act with solidarity in the social world if we do not act also with solidarity with the material world and nature.

### (3) *The breakdown of the authority model*

In the context of the paradigm of competition, there are numerous ways to determine authority and hierarchy : faith in traditional cultures, physical and legal coercion, organisation of closed environments, law as a system of rules and practices, censure, hierarchical delegation, etc.

Natural as well as human resources are used without questioning the impact of this usewitnessing a rampant need to control all. We can look at an example to understand this and see how actions, whether towards nature or humans, perpetuate competition. Winner analyses this in the context of solar energies deeming this type of energy use more compatible with political visions of equality, liberty and cultural pluralism<sup>[7]</sup>.

In *Technology and Culture*, Mumford adds that :

From late neolithic times in the Near East, right down to our own day, two technologies have recurrently existed side by side: one authoritarian, the other democratic, the first system-centered, immensely powerful, but inherently unstable, the other, man-centered, relatively weak, but resourceful and durable. (1964:1)

The authority model then has to be contested, but it must be contested all the way to be effectively contested : from human being in the world to being in the world with nature. And in this manner, numerous autochthonous communities can help the Western world rethink its bases.

The authority model also has to be contested as a discourse phenomenon, in the tradition of Foucault, Bakhtin and Bourdieu (Lincoln, 1994). To treat authority as an aspect of discourse and to be more attentive to the labile dynamics than to its institutional incarnations is an interesting way to transform ideological competition :

Who is speaking with authority?

How can an this speech have authority?

What are the interests of the speakers?

What responses are anticipated and desired?

What responses are allowed?

What are the conditions for maintenance of authority?<sup>[8]</sup>

And to replace authority, we have to elaborate structures to favour "reflexions " from (and not faith through) traditional cultures, creation of collective environments for resources, representation as response-ability, law as a basis for justice, sanctions and isolation of unjust practices, etc.

(4) *The necessary isolation of paradigms*

When we analyse discourses and institutions, however, we find that the paradigms of competition and solidarity are not only interpenetrating, as we have mentioned earlier, but that there is a very real pollution of ideologies. This is how actions in the name of solidarity end up feeding the competition hold on the social and material world, giving what we call "perverse effects", (*des effets pervers*) contrary to the original intent and objectives.

In order to clearly avoid such a pollution, we need to design tools for analysis. The section entitled "Tool to analyse paradigmatic allegiance of policies" presents such a tool, as a starting point for analysing all discourses but particularly policies for language communities.

But before, let us look at new governances as a democratising trend tending towards solidarity but with perverse effects from competition.

• **The movement towards good governance**

The notion of governance has gained a great deal of attention over the last two decades. It finds its origin in the aspirations of the paradigm of solidarity with visions of extended democratisation and increased participation from civil societies but, over the years, its use has served largely the paradigm of competition.

**1. The notion of good governance : seeking for alternatives to competition and hierachical government**

First, the theoreticians of governance attempt to give meaning to visions and practices that more traditional liberal or critical approaches no longer seem able to make intelligible (Hirst, 2000 : 85). They speak of old governance and new governance to illustrate the difference between a statist and centralising approach and one based on co-ordination and the role of networks. The State is seen as one partner amongst many :

In addition, the new governance involves a study of the procedures used to achieve a new form of organized power and collective action (Stoker, 1998: 19). It has a normative ambition that involves giving new meaning to the very idea of government (Cardinal and Andrew, 2001: 4). Among other things, it takes the form of a changing model of organization based on the principles of interdependence, negotiation and coordination (Peters, 2000; Stoker, 1998). Its chief characteristic is subsidiarity, whose objective is to bring the solution of problems as close to citizens as possible (Paquet, 2000 : 2).

[...]

In other words, when governments now call upon a multiplicity of players, there arises the challenge of effective coordination of action based on collaboration and on new forms of collective accountability.

Stoker has proposed a frame of reference and principles of organization to better account for the development of the new governance (Stoker, 1998 : 20 in Cardinal & Hudon, 2002). His observations are organised into five propositions, as follows :

- governance involves the action of a set of institutions and players not all of whom belong to the sphere of government";
- "in a situation of governance, boundaries and responsibilities are less clear with respect to social and economic action";
- "governance shows interdependence between the powers of the institutions involved in collective action";



- "governance involves the action of networks of independent players";
- "governance starts from the principle that it is possible to act without surrendering to the power or authority of the State. The State's role is to use new techniques and tools to orient and guide collective action" (Stoker, 1998: 20-21) [our translation]. (Cardinal & Hudon, 2002)

It is clear, from the above quotation, that the intentions of the proponents of governance attempt to conceptualise a more democratic model of social/political organisations through solidarity (networking) but that they often slide into the competition paradigm.

Good governance, like the notion of democracy, functions as a leading utopia but unfortunately remains an utopia at the thought and discourse level. We find for example :

- a "new dynamic governance, complex and diversified" which cannot be hierarchical nor centralized any more and which builds on complexity, differentiation and diversification (Kooiman, 1993), yet solidarity is not complex. Complexity is a way of dividing and separating a task that seems thus insurmountable ;
- a "new reality of shared identities which shapes a new sociality, a new citizenship" (Millon-Delsol, 1993) which in fact are new forms of competition built by officialised memberships, generally to State-based ;
- new "forms of organisations, built not on coercion, nor on the rules nor the requirements of the market but on voluntary adhesion" and "one passes from the strongholds and administrative feudalities to shattered structures which resemble clans " (Paquet, 2000, 63);
- new "social cohesions<sup>[9]</sup> which try to build a shared culture" (Lamarche and of Troyer, 2001) "not through experience nor personal opinion but on measures built through social sources" but social cohesion is itself a State-built idea for top-down adhesions with apparent bottom-up constructions.

## 2. Intentions of solidarity, institutions of competition

I have, elsewhere (Martel, 2002), analysed three structures calling for good governance and have found the same phenomenon : intentions of solidarity but concretisation of competition.

For example, the ideals of international good governance, have encouraged large financing organisations like the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank or the OCDE to change policies towards developing States by withdrawing from economic management and social services (Hewett de Alcantara, 2001). That has been the history of funding over the last two decades.

Another example is the European Union's *White Paper on Governance (2001)*. The process is largely aiming at a recentration of the bureaucratic apparatus and at the continuation of market competition on a world scale. It attempts to find means to allow citizens and civil society to participate more freely in a very large government apparatus, without calling into question the well-being of individuals and communities. In fact, it is an attempt at further bureaucratised democratisation.

A third example of the application of good governance is that established for French-speaking minorities of Canada. A study on the subject (Cardinal & Hudon, 2002) deals with the negotiation of funding protocols through more horizontal structures of consultation in an effort of setting structures of collaboration between the federal government bureaucracy and minorities. The report notes that such negotiation gave place to conflicts between civil servants because the ultimate imputability of funding was kept in their hands. It also fostered accrued competition between language communities vying for funding.

Of these three models of good governance, however, the Canadian model is the only one based on explicit principles of protection of minorities, of solidarity with the least powerful elements of society



although the means put in place did not question the status quo of funding as the main source of development.

### 3. Good governance for minorities: increased self- decision-making through the example of Francophone communities in Canada

In principle, "good governance ", "horizontal governance " and "democracy " are conceptual ideals that guide the establishment of conditions of social life that respect individual and collective well-being in the world. They, in themselves, at this moment of our history, still serve as unrealised utopias.

And this is so because we have not as yet designed in effect a "governance of solidarity ". But this governance begins with the realisation that within a paradigm of solidarity, we need not fear the design of structures of self-determination, of autonomy, of self-management. In fact, these structures would naturally make so much sense if it were not of the competitive environment created largely through the Nation-State and the bureaucratic apparatuses that follow.

The Canadian experience is here enlightening. The promulgation of section 23 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms has provided, since 1982, for three types of rights for official minorities :

- a) right to schooling in the minority language ;
- b) right to minority language schools and
- c) right to self-management and control of these schools.

The cumulated effects of these rights have been most important for the French language communities throughout the country (Martel, 1999) :

- the ability to make choices **by** language communities and **for** language communities has provided for increased participation in school and community affairs;
- increased the number of students schooled in French environments, giving greater possibilities for minorities to survive as communities;
- changed the management structures everywhere in Canada and helped majorities understand the need for grass-roots management and control;
- allowed the school to serve as the hub of community development through community centres where young and old and older intermingle as closer knit communities ;
- allowed litigation through the courts to serve a pedagogical purpose for increased pride in minority communities and increased attention of majority government to minority concerns.

And now, the considerations are for the development of lived management, ie. management practices that are compatible with the necessary solidarity for survival and development in the difficult conditions of being a minority.

In short, thus, language minorities are not only the possible recipients of structures of solidarity governance, they also are the locus of formation of such structures. Their positioning leads to the recognition of the principle for the need for groups and communities to refute and refuse authority that cannot decide for their own self well-being, for communities and individuals to freely decide their own actions, within the limits of respect for others and the material world.

### 4. Democracy and good governance

We are thus at a governance crossroad. At the moment,

There are two opposing principles of organising political relations: majority rule and consociation. They have been linked to distinct structural settings. Majority rule is supposed to be least suited to a homogeneous political environment and a pragmatic orientation of political elites which makes it compatible with an adversarial style of political discourse. Consociation is located in a pluralist society marked by deep leverages which can only be bridged by a coalescent policy style and all-embracing grand coalitions. By their sheer existence, however, structural settings do not produce particular patterns of actor relations they rather give way to a particular understanding on a given situation and the choice of matching strategies. concepts of "good governing" are developed in historic situations, interpreting contextual conditions in view of how best to deal with the problems and challenges which arise. (Kohler-Koch & Eising , 1999 : 10)

It is then within structures of consociation that majority and minority communities need to work since pluralism, by definition, is present when majorities meet minorities. And this can be done through planning.

Democracy, thus, as a guiding ideal, needs to be revised from multiple perspectives and we need to keep in mind that there is no unique model of democratic life.

#### · Tool to analyse paradigmatic allegiance of policies

History can be passively tolerated, or it can be projected and planned from ethical principles. That is, essentially, the project of language planning since it aims at planning the future of languages (Cooper, 1989) with language policies as a tool for establishing social/political conventions and structures.

Within this perspective, and with the overall aim of constructing language policies that guide towards the establishment of a being in the world solidarily, I resume the previous two sections on constellations of ideologies and on globalised concerns in a grid. This tool is designed to help planners solidify a planning based on solidarity, withdrawing the elements that rest on competition and competitiveness. I attempt to identify modes of being and acting that clearly uproot each paradigm. In order to help schematise each, I present a grid of interpretation dealing with such issues as :

- collective and individual vision;
- main concepts;
- sources of power/adhesion;
- epistemological pillars;
- proof of success;
- information sources to reach collective objectives;
- sources of development;
- key concepts for describing living conditions;
- type of socio-political and organisational relations;
- dominant symbols;
- position in the globalisation debate;



**CONGRÉS MUNDIAL SOBRE POLÍTICAS LINGÜÍSTICAS**  
**CONGRÈS MONDIAL SUR LES POLITIQUES LINGUISTIQUES**  
**CONGRESO MUNDIAL SOBRE POLITICAS LINGÜÍSTICAS**  
**WORLD CONGRESS ON LANGUAGE POLICIES**    Barcelona, 16-20 d'abril de 2002

- subject of intervention;
- and official discourse.

Table 1 Paradigmatic allegiances. Or where does each discourse fit?		
	<b>Ideologies of competition</b>	<b>Ideologies of solidarity</b>
<b>Collective and individual vision</b>  Are the goals one of the following?	Richness, profit, utilisation and accumulation of goods (individuals, corporations or States)	Sharing of wealth for collective and individual well-being
<b>Mains concept</b>  Is one of the following concept recurring in the discourse?	Competition (as end in itself) competitiveness, survival of strongest, unification for competition	Solidarity, complementarity, demystifying of power, sharing
<b>Sources of power/adhesion</b>  How is power and legitimation attained?	Faith in cultural traditions, physical and legal coercion, segregation and organisation of closed environments, law as a system of rules and practices, censures, hierarchical delegations	Adhesions, reflexions based on traditional cultures, creation of collective environments of resources, representation by a right to responsibilities, law is basis for collective/individual justice, sanctions and isolation for unjust practices
<b>Epistemological pillars</b>  Are one of the following premises invoked, overtly or covertly?	1. a Darwinian conclusion, inspired by natural and primitive survival conditions in the physical and animal world, that the <i>strongest</i> survives better;  2. <i>freedom</i> is a privileged instrument of human development ;  3. <i>profit</i> , as an extension of the economic framework, is a legitimate and desirable reward (the Good) for human activities;  4. <i>money</i> , as an instrument of universality, governs the need for positioning and can provide a desired "object"	1. challenge to the Darwinian notion of survival of the fittest substituting the notion of <i>responsibility</i> of the stronger towards the weaker  2 <i>complementarity with "Others"</i> as a privileged instrument of human development  3. constant <i>resistance</i> to (absolute) power, authority and domination through new actors : individuals (activists, intellectuals), non-profit organisations, gender, ethnic and linguistic communities ;  4. qualitative goals (the Good) of <i>individual wellness</i> through collective development
<b>Objective of action</b>  Is action based on the following modes of acting?	Instrumentalism, teleologic (towards ends), acquisition of strategic informations, individual development	Holistic, creative and preventive
<b>Proof of success</b>  How are results judged?	Positioning for profits, or profits  Richness is right	Collective and individual well-being
<b>Information sources to reach</b>	Techniques inspired from natural	Lived identities, shared personal



**CONGRÉS MUNDIAL SOBRE POLÍTICAS LINGÜÍSTICAS**  
**CONGRÈS MONDIAL SUR LES POLITIQUES LINGUISTIQUES**  
**CONGRESO MUNDIAL SOBRE POLITICAS LINGÜÍSTICAS**  
**WORLD CONGRESS ON LANGUAGE POLICIES** Barcelona, 16-20 d'abril de 2002

<p><b>collective objectives</b></p> <p>How is information obtained?</p>	<p>sciences towards progress, reason (without matter or body), finances</p>	<p>logic (and not rationality alone), principles of well-being collectively articulated</p>
<p><b>Sources of development</b></p> <p>What modes of development are invoked, overtly or covertly?</p>	<p>Historical monarchies, legal monarchies, State systems</p>	<p>Intercultural communications, intercivlisationnels exchanges, organisations (civil society and non-gouvernemental)</p>
<p><b>Key concepts for describing living conditions</b></p> <p>How would one critically describe the conditions at hand or desired?</p>	<p>Oppression, submission, conflict, rivalry,</p> <p>Through modes de governance: control, authority, imperialism, centralisation, monopoly, accumulation of capitals</p>	<p>Reactional movements : emancipation, liberation</p> <p>Through modes of management : autonomy, independence, self-determination, decentralisation, self-management</p>
<p><b>Type of socio-political and organisational relations</b></p> <p>What are the characteristics of the organisations?</p>	<p>Could be seen as predatory and parasitic ( associations and bureaucracies that are self-interested and self-perpetuating)</p> <p>Organised around management by objectives and evaluation of results : statistics and economics</p> <p>Manage a penury of resources rather than abundance</p> <p>Level differences, homogenise under the pretext of universality</p>	<p>Opt for networking and person to person relations and not structure to structure</p> <p>Legitimate and value diversity for diversity's sake (rather than positioning and strategy)</p> <p>Recognise equality of peoples, communities, individuals and favour an <i>ethos</i> of non-violence in politics as well as in human interactions</p> <p>Diversity is composed of a diversity of individuals, of "inter-actants".</p>
<p><b>Dominant symbol</b></p> <p>Are one of the following symbols invoked?</p>	<p>Money or finances (in order to manage a limited amount of resources)</p>	<p>Good life and well-being through sharing of resources</p>
<p><b>Position in the globalisation debate</b></p> <p>Is globalisation seen as an advantage or a foe?</p>	<p>Competition between States, continental blocs, multinationals being responsible for exploitations</p>	<p>Sharing of resources, ideas and cultures</p> <p>Access to the world's wealth</p>
<p><b>Subject of intervention</b></p> <p>Who are the actors?</p>	<p>The citizen, individual and et responsible towards him or her self and the nation</p>	<p>The whole human being, not only the member of a state or a community</p>
<p><b>Official discourse</b></p> <p>What is the official discourse? Are ideologies mixed? If yes, which ideology benefits?</p>	<p><b>Also includes ideological discourse of solidarity</b></p> <p>Penury, insufficiency and poverty of resources; Alarmist rhetoric resting on an interpretation of limitation; Imputability of funds; Inevitability of competition; Economics and its theories dictating social relations; Protection, by physical force of the dominants; Offer and demand lead</p>	<p><b>Includes regularly all the foundations and discourse the ideologies of competition</b></p> <p>Denounces exclusion, domination, and oppression; Positives and creative presentations that rest on opening; Richness of planetary resources, their abundance for sharing; Call for other social foundations; Equality and equity; Protection of minorities; Best</p>

	to high prices for the most popular products; High prices for good health and well-being products; Identity (the state of belonging) as a means to construct adhesion	products for well-being and most popular should be produced for less; Inversion of the theory of offer/demand; Multiple belongings recognised; individually constructed, not collectively
--	---	---

**- Conclusions**

In conclusion, we could say that minorities have an important role to play in a paradigm shift from competition to solidarity. Minorities are in a position to call for solidarity and through the establishment of language policies based on a clear paradigm of solidarity, they can help prove that solidarity can work, even in a world with vast importance given to competition.

But minorities have another advantage. It is that traditionally, their cultures are closer to nature than Western civilisation's urban identities. This is an untold advantage but a very real one because these minorities, often called autochthonous communities, have the reflexion tools to guide a reintegration of nature in the structures of solidarity.

In short, ecology, in its sense of biocentrism, and language protection = same battle, same thinking, same solutions.

**-References**

Amin, Samir. 1993. *A World of Chaos*. Mimeo. United Nations University.

Blanke, Henry. 1996. Marcuse's Discourse on Nature, Psyche, and Culture. Dans *Minding Nature. The Philosophers of Ecology*, David Macauley (Éd.). New York: The Guilford Press.

Cardinal, Linda & Marie-Ève Hudon. *The Governance of Canada's Official Language Minorities: A Preliminary Study*. On line at [http://www.ocol-clo.gc.ca/governance\\_e.htm](http://www.ocol-clo.gc.ca/governance_e.htm)

Cooper, Robert. 1989. *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

European Union. 2001. *European Governance. A White Paper*. On line at [http://europa.eu.int/comm/governance/team/index\\_fr.htm](http://europa.eu.int/comm/governance/team/index_fr.htm).

Falk, Richard (1995). *On Humane Governance. Toward a New Global Politics*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press

Hawkes, David. 1996. *Ideology*. London: Routledge.

Hewett de Alcantara, Cynthia. 1998. Du bon usage du concept de gouvernance.><http://www.unrisd.org/fraindex/media/articles/gouv/gouv.htm> 109-118.

Hirst, Paul. 2000. Democracy and Governance. In Jon Pierre (Ed.), *Debating Governance "Authority, Steering and Democracy*. Oxford : Oxford University Press. 13-35.

Jenson, Jane. 1998. *Mapping Social Cohesion: The State of Canadian Research*. CPRN study no F/03. 55 pages> [http://www.rcrpp.ca/Release/Back/bmsc2\\_e.htm](http://www.rcrpp.ca/Release/Back/bmsc2_e.htm)



- Khun, Thomas. 1962. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Kohler-Koch, Beate & Rainer Eising. 1999. *The Transformation of Governance in the European Union*. London & New York : Routledge
- Kooiman, J. (Ed.). 1993. *Modern Governance*. London: Sage Publications.
- Lamarche, Lucie & Marianne de Troyer. 2001. Introduction. *Revue Canadienne Droit et Société/Canadian Journal of Law and Society*. 16 (2), 1-16.
- Lincoln, Bruce. 1994. *Authority. Construction and Corrosion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Martel, Angéline. 2002. Gouvernances bonnes et idéologies planétaires. Dé/construction d'organisations sociales minoritaires/majoritaires. Paper to the Conference on Governance for minorities. University of Ottawa, 14-16 mars 2002.
- Martel, Angéline. 1999. Heroes, Rebels, Communities and States in Language Rights Activism and Litigation. In Miklos Kontra, Robert Philipson and Tibor (Eds), *Language: A Right and a Resource*. Budapest: Central European University Press,
- Martel, Angéline (1995). Les droits constitutionnels des minorités linguistiques en matière d'éducation sont-ils solides? *Ottawa Law Review/Revue de droit d'Ottawa*, 27 (1): 59-98.
- Millon-Delsol, Chantal. 1993. *L'irrévérence*. Paris: Mame.
- Mumford, Lewis. 1964. Authoritarian and Democratic Technics, *Technology and Culture*, 5,
- Paquet, Gilles. 2000. Gouvernance distribuée, socialité et engagement civique. *Gouvernance, revue internationale*, 1 (1), 52-66.
- Tollefson, James (1991). *Planning Language, Planning Inequality*. New York: Longman U.K. Group Ltd.
- Winner, Langdon. 1980. Do Artifacts Have Politics? *Daedalus : Journal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 109 (1), 121-136.

## Notes

[1] Angéline Martel is professor of sociolinguistics and language didactics at Télé-université, a distance education university in Montréal, Québec. For nine years, she has been a member of the Conseil de la langue française du Québec, a 12 member-board advising the government on language policies. She has written many books and articles on the subject as well as on technology and language teaching/learning. She is co-founder and editor-in-chief of *DiversCité Langues*, an electronic journal publishing socio-critical articles on language dynamics since 1996. She is also a painter and composer of contemporary music. E-mail at [amartel@teluq.quebec.ca](mailto:amartel@teluq.quebec.ca)

[2] We only need to think of the summit of Porto Alegre, Brazil, January 27-30 2002, to understand the mounting calls for alternatives, be they philosophical or structural. We could say that the hopes and callings are ascending although actions and social realities are not following the calling.

[3] I use the concept of ideology in a broad sense, refuting the Marxist meaning of false-consciousness (Martel, 1995). Ideologies are a body of received ideas, of representations of the world, of systems of more or less coherent ideas, of ethical principles that orient action and regulate relations between individuals and groups. Ideologies are not static. They are born, they develop, interact with other ideologies. In so

doing, they are transformed, lose their meaning and are reborn. Ideologies are associated with power in the sense that they become instituted in social structures (Tollefson, 1991: 10-11).

[4] Paradigms, on the other hand, extending Khun's definition, are fields of ideological activities where scientists and human beings in general, (1) engage in activities, including thinking, that are based on previous bodies of knowledge and (2) are engaged in the creation and advance of these bodies of knowledge and structures (Khun, 1962: 10).

[5] "Competitiveness" indicates that competition, which can be at times a source of creativity, is intensified and becomes an end in itself rather than a means to another end.

[6] I hyphenate this expression to indicate that when one lives entirely in solidarity, there are no barriers nor separation. It is a holistic way of being.

[7] ... dispersed solar sources are more compatible than centralized technologies with social equity, freedom and cultural pluralism (Winner, 1980: 121).

[8] For an in-depth analysis, see Lincoln (1994).

[9] The debate on the concept "social cohesion" is exemplary and the position of Jane Jenson (1998) is interesting. She analyses exclusion as the result of five factors: 1) the absence of feeling of belonging to a space, social and geographic (universal propriety would solve this problem); 2) the lack of participation in the decision-making process; 3) the illegitimacy of public policies that exclude; 4) the invisibility of the excluded; 5) the feeling of being at the margin of economic and political centres that also hate them. To solve these difficulties, Jenson denounces inequities, ties social cohesion to the respect of rights, particularly social rights, and she is of the opinion that social development and social justice cannot be a reality without an equitable redistribution of wealth.