INTRODUCTION

When communism collapsed in eastern and central Europe, the British Foreign Minister, Douglas Hurd, proclaimed that English should become the first foreign language throughout Europe, the lingua franca of the changed economic and political circumstances. One wonders whether the German Minister of Foreign Affairs considered making a comparable proclamation of German as the language of eastern European liberation and economic incorporation. And should the French Foreign Minister have muscled in with an equivalent claim for French as the natural language of human rights and the traditional vehicle for diplomacy among democratic states?

Language appears to be playing an increasingly important role in social control and stratification. It is one element in social reproduction, whether this stratification occurs on the basis of class, gender, age or so called "race" - or the culture, ethnicity or language of an individual or a group. The corresponding -isms, classism, sexism, ageism and racisms (whether biologically, culturally or linguistically argued) intersect, often coarticulate and evolve dynamically.

It would be rash to predict firmly what the linguistic hierarchy in eastern and central Europe - or indeed in western Europe - will be in 30 years' time. With the benefit of hindsight, one can see the proclamations of many politicians, for instance Douglas Hurd's on Yugoslavia, as political rhetoric that events have since overtaken. But will his advocacy of English suffer the same fate? Will such linguistic triumphalism soon sound as hollow as the self-deluding promise that "western" (2) free market rhetoric would build instant prosperity on the ruins of the socialist economies? Trade and aid flows across Europe have manifestly not lived up to the expectations created in the euphoria of the close of the Cold War (Tomaševski 1993). But what about linguistic flows? How strong are these, and who or what is determining which languages are spreading, why, and in what ways? And to move from the macro level to the micro pedagogical one, and from status planning to acquisition planning, who are the languages being taught by and by what methods?

MARKETING ENGLISH = MARKETING "DEMOCRACY"

The British government, via its "East European Partnership" scheme (administered by Voluntary Service Overseas, the British equivalent of the Peace Corps) declares in its recruiting advertisements for English language teachers (for instance in the EFL Gazette, October 1993, 6):

English skills have been identified as a major factor in the process of reconstruction and transition to democracy...
Posts are offered in EEP's newest programme in Teacher Training Institutions in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. In addition to practical language skills you will teach cultural studies, literature and history.

English is evidently not being seen merely as an instrumental tool for undefined "communicative" purposes. It is integrally linked with cultural messages and assumptions. This is also reflected in the stipulation of what qualifications the teachers in question need (where TEFL stands for Teaching English as a Foreign Language, and PGCE for the Postgraduate Certificate in Education):

Applicants should have a degree in English, Modern Languages or the Humanities, TEFL and/or PGCE with a minimum of two years' teaching experience at tertiary or secondary level.

The focus is clearly more on general educational qualifications than the specifics of English learning and teaching in a country where English is manifestly (still?) a foreign rather than a second language.

Caution is needed in using the terms "foreign" and "second", as they tend to be used in misleadingly competing and conflicting ways. In North America "second" language acquisition also covers foreign language learning. In former colonies the ex-colonial language is referred to as "second", when it is a dominant language, which is used in administration and education, and is not the mother tongue, e.g. English in Nigeria, India xx or Singapore. And in Europe, second language learning generally refers to the learning of the dominant language by immigrant minorities. Frequently the "second" language is taught as though it was the first language of the learners, who are bracketed along with students with "mental handicaps", "special problems" or who are "educationally retarded". Looseness in the use of the terms tends to confuse and conceal the major differences that there are in the learning and teaching needs in the various contexts (Phillipson 1991, 1992b).

Terminological looseness sometimes approaches the ridiculous, as when the Danish Minister of Education, Bertel Haarder, in an interview with a language teachers' journal in the late 1980s, referred to English as the "second mother tongue" of the Danes, a bombastic claim that many Danes would be intrigued by. What is happening in Scandinavia is that the status of English is shifting from that of a "foreign" language to that of a "second" language in that it is being used in certain major domains internally in each country. It is acquiring an important hierarchizing role internally, as in former colonies, while awareness of the risks and consequences of this development appears to be low (Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson 1987).

English can be marketed confidently and persuasively because the language is promoted (and perceived by many) as the bearer of glittering promises. The British government is doubtless convinced that it is in the interest of the "English-speaking" world, and Britain in particular, that English should be more widely learned and used. Many Western governments, and international and regional organizations such as the World Bank and the European Community, doubtless also genuinely believe that an extension of the use of English is in the interest of the citizens of Eastern Europe. English is seen as being connected to "Western prosperity", "technological advance", and the glamorous hedonism projected in the ads of transnational corporations. And it is not difficult to see the appeal of this as an alternative to and an escape route from the confines and constraints of the "command economy" and "communist" oppression.

The "demand" for English is there, whatever its origins. Should one then have any qualms about assisting the "supply"? English has become the dominant language in much scientific discourse, international politics and business, the media, etc. It serves a multiplicity of purposes, some positive, some inofficious, and some nefarious, buttressed by a sophisticated range of ideologies and structures. Is one at all justified in regarding "English" as a threat? How should language professionals, language planners, policy-makers and teachers, relate to the advance of English in the highly mobile linguistic situation in western and eastern Europe?

"ARGUMENTS" FOR ENGLISH

One important area where sociolinguists can play a useful role is in investigating in more depth the ideologies attached to particular languages, the arguments used to market them or to legitimate their presence on school timetables, and in particular in relating the beliefs and values ascribed to particular languages to the underlying structural power of the speakers of the languages in question.
We have analysed the qualities associated with English, in particular in former colonies, and have categorized the \textbf{arguments} as \textit{English-intrinsic} (what English "is"; supposedly inherent qualities or capacities), \textit{English-extrinsic} (what English "has"; resources connected to the language), and \textit{English-functional} (what English "does"; the uses to which English is put) (see Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson 1986a and chapter 9 of Phillipson 1992).

The "English-intrinsic" arguments for what English "is" consist of examples where English is described as rich, noble, pliant, interesting, expressive (all from Jespersen 1905, 234), well adapted for development and change (Strevens 1980, 85), a vehicle of the entire developing human tradition: the best (and worst) that has been thought and felt by man in all places and in all recorded times (Richards 1961, 19), a unique non-national, non-regional, non-ethnic stature as the world's first truly global language (editorial comment in the preview issue of English Today: the international review of the English language, 1984), etc.

"... Any literate, educated person on the face of the globe is in a very real sense deprived if he does not know English" (Burchfield 1985, 160-161).

The "English-extrinsic" arguments describe what English "has": trained teachers, teacher trainers, teaching materials, literature, dictionaries, multinational publishers, computers and software, etc., i.e. both material and immaterial resources.

The "English-functional" arguments describe what English "does": it gives access to workers and specialists to all branches of science and technology, including medicine (UNIN 1981, 40); it facilitates the administration of a country and helps overcome regional differences and ensures that no particular advantage is given to one language group (Mundia, in Commonwealth Secretariat and SWAPO 1983, 6-7); it is a gateway to better communications, better education, and so a higher standard of living and better understanding (Makerere Report 1961, 47). "If a community has decided to participate as speedily as possible in the technological and other advantages of a wider society", an early introduction of English as a medium of education is "inevitable"; if it "lays more stress on the preservation of a traditional way of life", it "will not introduce English as a medium until later in the school life of the child" (Makerere Report 1961, 21). The underlying argument is that maximum exposure to English is what makes a society modern and technological, whereas use of other languages, hence less English, typifies stagnation and obscurantist traditionalism.

Granted that there is evidence, as the introductory quotation to this article indicates, that comparable arguments are being used in the marketing of English in eastern and central Europe, the important question to ask is how such arguments can be analysed.

\section*{HOW CAN THE ARGUMENTS BE ANALYSED}

Analysis of the arguments can be approached in several ways. The \textit{English-intrinsic} claims can be analysed as representing what Johan Galtung (1980) calls "innate power", a form of power which he sees as a socially constructed illusion, a myth. It is easy to show that most of the English-intrinsic arguments are incorrect (Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson 1986), which comes as no surprise to linguists who are trained to see languages as having equal intrinsic value.

The \textit{English-extrinsic} arguments represent resource power and the \textit{English-functional} arguments mostly structural power, in Galtung's terms. Many of the "English 'has" arguments are of course true. What is important here is \textbf{why} the English language has come to acquire or be accorded all the assets it has (and this clearly has to do with the allocation of more resources to the development and "equipment" of one language rather than another). Many of the English-functional arguments are false, or falsely focus on one language and ignore the claims and rights of others. It would be important to analyse both whether there are English-intrinsic arguments concealed behind arguments which are \textbf{formulated} as English-extrinsic or English-functional, and to look at the conversion processes through which one type of power is converted into another type of power.

Normally, material resources (e.g. money, textbooks) can be converted to immaterial resources (e.g. knowledge) and vice versa. Both types of resources can be converted into positions of structural power, and structural power can be
converted into an accumulation of both material and immaterial resources (Galtung 1980).

The evidence from studies of minority education and post-colonial education is that the resources of powerless groups, especially their immaterial resources, among them their languages and cultures, are socially constructed through stigmatization, so that they become invisible or are seen as handicaps. In this way minority resources are invalidated, become non-resources, hence cannot be converted to other resources or to positions of structural power. At the same time the resources of the dominant groups, among them their languages and cultures, are through glorification validated, socially constructed so that they are seen as resources (actual or potential) and can thus be converted into other resources or to positions of structural power (see Figure 1).

The vital third process, in addition to stigmatization of the powerless and glorification of the powerful, consists of legitimating the relationship between them, so that the hierarchies seem natural and inevitable and so that, for instance, the learning of a dominant language by the speakers of dominated languages at the expense of their own languages, in a subtractive way, is presented as being in the best interests of the dominated. The marketing of majority languages and other resources to minorities is skilfully packaged as "help" or "aid".

The English-intrinsic arguments are obviously part of the glorification process. Often the stigmatization of other languages that is involved in portraying what English "is" does not need to be verbalised, it is implicit. The structural power of the speakers of a dominant language (for instance English) has, through the conversion process, resulted in an accumulation of the (material) resources which this language unquestionably has. This fact can then, together with intrinsic arguments, be used to legitimate the functional arguments. English can then be equated with democracy, as is done in the initial quote from the Chair of British Council, or or any desirable traits that can be linked to use of the language.

There is an obvious need for work in the study of linguistic dominance to rest on solid theoretical foundations. Some very sound work has been done on developments in Europe, such as Truchot's study (1990) of the role of English in France, and Ammon's study (1991) of the international position of German, and the encroachment of English (1989). While these pioneer works show how complex the position is, they also reveal how little has thus far been done in clarifying language spread policy (but see Ammon 1992) and the implications and consequences of language spread. In order to place the arguments within a more overarching framework, we will, before considering the relevance of arguments used in the context of former colonies to eastern and central Europe, present some theoretical concepts that might prove useful.

**LINGUICISM AND LINGUISTIC IMPERIALISM**

Linguicism and linguistic imperialism are concepts which can serve to clarify the nature of linguistic dominance and linguistic injustice. **LINGUICISM** is defined, by analogy with racism and ethnicism as "ideologies, structures and practices which are used to legitimate, effectuate and reproduce an unequal division of power and resources (both material and non-material) between groups which are defined on the basis of language" (or "race", in biologically argued racism, or ethnicity/culture, in culturally argued racism) (Skutnabb-Kangas 1988, Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson in press).

It is important to note that linguicism, racism and ethnicism are defined as both ideological and structural (as in van Dijk 1991, 1993a, cf. Miles 1989 who defines racism as only an ideology). Racism is in our view NOT just a question of people being ill-willed, ignorant or misinformed. Ethnicism is NOT ONLY people's attitudes or prejudices towards other individuals or groups. Linguicism is NOT ONLY an information problem (that all languages are of equal worth, and if this is understood and respected, problems of discrimination will disappear or at least diminish). In addition to the ideological dimension, racism, ethnicism and linguicism all involve structures and practices which result in unequal access to power and resources.

For instance posts in higher education (for language A but not language B) and time in the curriculum (for which languages compete) involve the allocation of **material resources** and represent **structural constraints or potential** which can be distributed equally or unequally in relation to different languages. Attitudes towards particular languages, and beliefs about what linguistic and cultural capital derives from competence in a given language are constituents of the ideologies associated with the languages, and these ideological phenomena are likely to dovetail
with structural resources (see van Dijk 1993b on mediating factors). The official British view is quite frank about economic and linguistic links operating in tandem:

"The collapse of communism may have lessened the threats to British security but it has increased the opportunities for the Council: ... reinforcing British trade and the use of the English language." (British Council Annual Report 1991-92, 4, Acting Director-General's Review of the year).

In linguistic hegemony, as in other types of hegemony, the hierarchies (between languages) are constantly being negotiated, contested and de- and re-legitimated. They are often so ingrained in social structure that they go unquestioned. Thus even well-intentioned administrators, bureaucrats and "experts" can, unintentionally, reinforce linguicist structures.

**LINGUISTIC IMPERIALISM** can be seen as one sub-type of linguicism, where speakers of one language dominate speakers of other languages within an exploitative structure (Phillipson 1992). The progressive spread of English internationally has implications nationally for the role assigned to English for an increasing number of domestic functions (including the education systems). The dominance of English is asserted and maintained by the establishment and continuous reconstitution of structural and cultural inequalities between English and other languages. These inequalities lead to the continued allocation of more resources to English than to other languages, legitimated by appropriate ideologies, including academic and professional tenets and theories and benefit those who are proficient in English. Whether English linguistic imperialism is taking place in a given context, for instance in a former colony or in a former communist country which is opening up to free market forces, is an empirical question.

There is abundant evidence of linguicism in colonial and post-colonial contexts working in favour of the European languages and against local languages (see, e.g., the 2 volumes published by the now defunct OAU Inter-African Bureau of Languages (Mateene 1980, Mateene, Kalema and Chomba 1985). Resources were overwhelmingly allocated to the dominant language, despite many reiterations in official reports of the need to develop the languages of colonized peoples (for examples from the British empire, and their replication in educational language planning right up until the 1980s, see Phillipson 1992). A study, commissioned by the Ford Foundation and written by a former senior British Council officer, assessed to what extent language policies were formulated explicitly for education in the phase of intensive decolonisation, around 1960.

The first conference of African Ministers of Education, called by UNESCO in Addis Ababa in 1960, makes no mention at all of language in the main body of the report. Its main concern is to set a target for attaining universal literacy: the language in which literacy is to be achieved is not considered (Cawson 1975, 413).

In the educational planning documents for countries such as Malawi, Kenya, Uganda and Ghana, virtually no attention was paid to language and then it was merely passing references to English (Cawson 1975, 412). The committees to launch education in the newly independent states were invariably chaired by "British university men unassociated with the colonial period" (ibid.).

Is it possible that in the rush to "help" eastern and central Europe, the agenda is being set by the next generation of "British university men" and politicians, administrators, experts and teacher trainers from a country which is notoriously deficient in foreign language learning and teaching? Is English again being marketed as a panacea, with a re-run of the same arguments, even though these have not fulfilled their promise in former colonies?

**THE RELEVANCE OF THE POST-COLONIAL ARGUMENTS AND EXPERIENCE TO POST-COMMUNIST ENGLISH**

In our discussion of the arguments for English for underdeveloped countries, we shall mainly concentrate on the English-functional arguments and the overall framework. What emerges may have some relevance for eastern and central Europe, as both decolonisation and the rapid demise of the Cold War occurred surprisingly fast, and the principal actors were unprepared. There are more similarities between eastern and central Europe in the 1990s and "Third World" countries than one might expect: acute economic and social problems, unequal terms of trade with the west, investment and aid being made conditional on vaguely defined principles of "democracy" and respect for human rights (mainly civil and political, Tomaševski 1993).
Many of the virtues and promises associated with advocacy for English have involved a large measure of (self-)deception. English has not guaranteed "access to modern technology" and "prosperity for all" in any former colony. The language serves rather as a boundary-marker between haves and have-nots internally, and the link externally to market forces that keep former colonies in a position of dependence. Western commercial interests may be very keen to achieve the same in post-communist countries.

English is no more a language of "national unity" in Nigeria or Uganda than it is in Northern Ireland (see our analysis of the criteria selected, and those omitted, in a policy document on choice of an official language for Namibia, in Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson 1986 and Phillipson 1992, chapter 9).

Education systems relying on use of the former colonial language are in disarray (World Bank 1988). The discourse of "development" mediated through the continued use of the former colonial languages, in education as in the "modern" economy, is fundamentally suspect. Awareness of this has not yet led to any major reappraisal of language policies, however. A major change of policies is unlikely in the short term, as the structural adjustment policies that the World Bank and the IMF are imposing on underdeveloped countries are not designed to change the overarching framework of North-South relations, nor to bridge the gulf between haves and have-nots internally in South countries, even if the aid policies of some governments, such as the Scandinavian ones, aim at assisting the most deprived. It would though be false to give the impression that the World Bank staff represent a united front on language policy. Some of the World Bank's own representatives criticize the overuse of former colonial languages and dominant languages in general in the education of pupils with other mother tongues, Dutcher, forthcoming).

There are parallels between economic and linguistic underdevelopment. Use of dominant western European languages (English in Kenya, French in Senegal, etc.) has prevented local languages from going through the extension of range and repertoire that many European languages went through in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries when they became official languages of (nation) states. This HAS to be there - otherwise it can be exploited as an evolutionist stupidity: they are hundred years behind us xx. The evidence from virtually all former colonies is that the underdeveloped world has remained dependent on or even increased the dependence of the former colonial languages both for external relations and as the dominant language internally (Mateene 1980), and this linguistic dependence parallels economic dependence.

Despite the obvious differences between the "Second" and "Third" Worlds, the relevant question to ask is whether a similar pattern of economic and linguistic dependence will evolve in former communist states. There is a major challenge involved in unpicking the multiple threads of language policy in post-colonial and post-communist polities, and comparing them, in order to contribute to the elaboration of policy in a more democratic direction, in ways which respect linguistic human rights.

One can elaborate various possible scenarios, tabulate some of the variables, identify significant external and internal factors, hypothesize about probable outcome. One could, for instance, contrast countries which are at the receiving end of the advance of English, and explore the differences between those which have chosen to resist the advance of the dominant language and seek to "defend" their languages, e.g. France, Japan or Norway, and those which have seen no reason to do so, e.g. Denmark, Hongkong or Holland. There is a substantial descriptive, empirical task ahead in studying and collating these matters.

In eastern and central Europe, there are several factors that may counteract xx the more uncritical forms of xx the marketing of English and expose the dubious relevance of much expertise currently being channeled xx to them xx through western organizations.

Firstly, states which used to be part of the Soviet Union, e.g. the Baltic states, experienced under Stalinism an imposed diglossia (euphemistically called "bilingualism", meaning that this term is regarded with suspicion in states which are shaking off this legacy, e.g. Hint 199x xx) which effectively marginalized Latvian, Estonian, Lithuanian, etc xx in the more formal spheres xx. It would therefore appear to be unlikely that these states would xx uncritically xx substitute one dominant language, whether English or German, for the Russian that they are in the process of shedding. Here it seems probable that the visibility and prominence of language in the struggle for change and ethnic mobilisation leading up to the disintegration of the former Soviet Union, for instance the passing of the language laws in the Baltic states (Rannut forthcoming) is likely to be significant xx in terms of the degree of
awareness of issues around language and power or the symbolic importance of language choice xx. The urge to reinstate xx (i.e. "normalize") xx their own languages should be stronger than the thrusting image of English. This presupposes that enough resources are allocated to the relevant languages.

On the other hand, there may be evidence from western Europe which indicates that diglossia, with English as the intrusive dominant language is imminent. If the state language is construed or presented as being unable to function adequately for certain purposes, for instance as the medium for higher education, or as the in-house language in commercial enterprises aiming at the export market, it is arguable that linguistuctructures and ideologies will gradually result in the spread of the dominant "international" language, in a diglossic division of labour which marginalizes the state language. There are trends of this sort in Scandinavia, the implications of which have been little explored. One crucial factor in this equation is whether the state language is effectively being marginalized in ways that make the increased use and learning of the dominant language a subtractive rather than ad additive one.

Secondly, xx in contrast to most African ex-colonial countries, xx most of the eastern and central European countries have long established xx and well-developed xx national languages, and extensive experience of foreign language teaching and learning (though apparently this was often xx less successful than expected, partly because of motivational reasons, xx unsuccessful when Russian was the target language). The marketing of English is often linked to professional skills (classroom management, modern methods, multi-media teaching materials, etc.), but it seems more than unlikely that young EFL/ESL teachers xx from core English countries xx again, this has to be there, otherwise one thinks you mean young etc from eastern etc, their own countries xx are culturally or linguistically qualified to take on major responsibilities in eastern or central European education systems.

On the other hand it is also likely that there will be major incentives to do so xx do what, it is unclear, specify ? xx , because of the miserable economic plight of most eastern and central European countries, the absence of qualified local people xx local people, qualified to teach English xx otherwise it sounds as if they had NO qualified local people xx , and the opportunity of getting "something for nothing". This is exactly the position of many underdeveloped countries, where western "aid" in language in education policy-making has had disastrous effects (Kachru, Ngugi, Phillipson xx Robert, add these to bib. First, go to where you want it in bib. Then go to doc 2 (Shift + F3), then F5, Return, go to index BIB, take storbib to screen. Search (F2) for e.g. Ngugi, and then take over what you need with Blok (F12) and Ctrl + Insert. Do NOT save the storbib, unless you have added. If you put in something that is not yet in the storbib, then save (everything we use, should be there, without exception) but make sure that you have not deleted anything from storbib) xxxx Here the lure of the arguments for English was too strong.

Thirdly, as a monolingual approach is the hallmark of Anglo-American English teaching, both in its internal variants (ESL for linguistic minorities) and its export version (standardized EFL qualifications, such as those expected of the British teacher trainers bound for the Baltic states, and the many thousands of EFL teachers operating in language schools in southern Europe), this may not xx R, all this is new xx fit the bilingual approaches normally found in countries which have a long legacy of teaching foreign languages in schools, as most European countries do. It has lithero been normal that the person teaching a foreign language shares a mother tongue with her/his students and has herself gone through the process of learning the foreign language in question. It seems that many of the eastern and central European countries may follow the example of many other "small" European countries (e.g. the Nordic countries) in expecting English teachers to be bilingual and in using locally produced materials in addition to "authentic" British or American materials (though economic restrictions might initially make their production less likely). Tendencies of this kind can be seen in several of these countries (3).

In addition, the efforts by many states and the Council of Europe to promote the learning of at least two foreign languages have produced many imaginative new language-related educational experiments in Europe. This can be seen in the increase in the number and type of bi- or multilingual schools (Baetens Beardsmore 1993, Sociolinguistica 7, 1993) and the more precarious efforts to establish the presence of immigrant minority languages on the mainstream school curriculum. The innovators are increasingly making the necessary distinction: that there are groups with different preconditions who need different educational strategies when the goal is high-level multilingualism. But what is common for the successful experiments is that all of them see bilingual teachers as a sine qua non. This is true for immersion programmes for majority children (see e.g. Duff 1991 for English immersion in secondary schools in Hungary), for European Community Schools (e.g. Baetens Beardsmore 1992, 1993), for maintenance programmes for minority children (e.g. Skutnabb-Kangas 1984, 1990, 1993c) and for two-
way programmes (e.g. Dolson & Lindholm 1993). It is therefore unlikely that methods that only suit monolingual English teachers would gain ground.

xx Native speakerism for the wrong reasons. xx

**Fourthly**, many of the eastern and central European countries have had a better coverage of linguistic minority rights in education than most western European countries. It has been seen as natural that (many) national minorities (regardless of what they have been called, nations, nationalities, minorities, etc) have had at least part of their education through the medium of their own language, and that the learning of the majority language has taken place under the tutelage of a bilingual teacher. This trend does not seem to be diminishing (4).

**Fifthly**, the awareness of the role of language in what has been termed "ethnic" conflict may be growing everywhere in Europe, with both false and also hopefully more realistic analyses and conclusions. The false kind sees either (voluntary or forced) repatriation of minorities or their rapid linguistic and cultural assimilation as ways of avoiding "ethnic" conflict, meaning the mere presence of (unassimilated) minorities is seen as a threat. The more hope-inducing analyses see a higher degree of awareness of linguistic and cultural rights as a hallmark of a civilised society, and the granting of these rights as a way of avoiding conflict, partly through prevention of the overlapping of linguistic and economic or linguistic and political cleavages in society. The continental recognition of the rights of "minority or regional" languages (e.g. in the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages) is, despite the shortcomings of the Charter (see Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, forthcoming) a step in this direction. With the history of a combination of many language-related minority rights and also harsh linguistic oppression, it does not seem likely that eastern and central European countries would fall prey to voluntarily introducing the preconditions for new linguistic and cultural imperialism and oppression. Or are we too naively optimistic?

**Notes:**

1. Panacea - "Universal remedy"; Pandemic - "(Disease) prevalent over the whole of a country or over the whole world." (The Concise Oxford Dictionary, 1976 edition)

2. The terms "eastern", "western", "Europe", even "central", are tricky. They can be used as mere **toponyms**, denoting geographical area (central Europe might be the most "purely" toponymic of the terms above). They can also be used as **politonyms**, denoting areas which have certain political ties with each other, as in "the eastern bloc" or using "Europe" when what is referred to is member states of the European Community or the European Parliament. Often the terms are also used as **ideologonyms**, names which purportedly denote the ideological colour of the countries concerned, as in "western market economy". The difficulties in using these terms at all are of two kinds. Firstly, since many of them can be used in any or all of the three senses or two combined (as in "European integration"), it is difficult to know which of the meanings is intended. Secondly, by accepting the increasingly ideologized use (as when using "Europe" as a politonym or ideologonym) one may inadvertently reinforce divisions which are being actively imagined (in the sense of Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities* (1983), the imagining of which benefits a Eurocentric (!), Centre-Periphery, capitalist vision of the world (see also Tomaševski 1993). See Bromley 1984 for the origin of the terms toponym and politonym. xx R, check the parenthesis in this xx

3. As the examples show, language schools and others advertising in *The Prague Post* (August 18-24, 1993, 17) do not seem to be eager to get monolingual English speakers (only), and competence in other languages is seen as a definite advantage. They also advertise many Czech courses for English speakers, the presupposition being that knowledge of English is not enough for doing business in Prague: "English Instructor positions open for native English speakers and for Czechs and Slovaks with English teaching experience"; "Seeking qualified native speaker EFL and Czech teachers for our small language school"; "International law firm seeks native English assistant...Knowledge of WordPerfect and of Czech and/or other European languages would be a definite asset"; Principal required for successful expanding Language School in Prague...Czech or English native"; Real Estate seeks...native English speaking person...Knowledge of Czech a definite advantage"; "Fluent Czech and English"; "Must speak Czech and English"

4. The Polish Education Bill of 7 September 1991 and Education Act of 21 March 1992 extend the possibility to organise education through the medium of ethnic minority languages to cover kindergartens, primary and secondary schools and vocational schools. The new laws "help respect the right of ethnic minorities to education through the
medium of their mother tongue with special emphasis given to bilingual schools” and reduce the minimum number
of participants in language groups from twelve to seven. In “adaptation classes” for ethnic minorities in kindergarten
and primary schools Polish (i.e. the official language) is taught “for four hours per week through the medium of
the language of a given ethnic minority” (our emphasis) (Council of Europe Education Newsletter 3, 1992, 28-29)
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