

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	9
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS USED IN THIS BOOK	11
FOREWORD	
English: Is it a “basic need”? <i>by Robert Phillipson</i>	13
INTRODUCTION	
FL teaching and learning in Greece	29
SECTION I: The politics of English, language education policy and planning in the EU	
1) FLE policies: planning hegemony	63
2) Discourses of homogenisation in FLE	77
3) Discourses shaping the subjectivity of the EFL teacher	89
4) Linguoracism in FLE discourse	105
5) The marketisation of English as a global(ising) language	119
SECTION II: European language policies and the multilingual turn in education	
6) Is multilingualism taking a back seat in the EU?	135
7) Multilingualism and monolingualism in language education	153
8) Multilingualism policies: paradigm shift in language education	167
SECTION III: Multilingual curricula, FL textbooks and ideology	
9) Multilingualism and curriculum development	189
10) Language use in the FL class, social values, ideology	213
11) The politics of ELL: instructional materials for EYL and ideology	261
SECTION IV: Multilingualism, language testing and assessment	
12) The global English language proficiency testing industry and non-hegemonic local alternatives	285
13) Social meanings in global-glocal language proficiency exams	293
14) Multilingual testing and assessment for plurilingual education.....	315
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES	329

FOREWORD

ENGLISH: IS IT A “BASIC NEED”?

by Robert Phillipson

This chapter¹ explores the reasons for the current strength of English, the constraints that affect language in education policy, the maintenance of diversity in FL learning, and the role of scholars. There are strong forces behind the expansion of English both in the EU institutions and in EU Member States. The uncritical discourse of English as a medium of instruction in higher education and as a universal *lingua franca* needs to be counteracted. Anxiety about the impact of English on national languages has led to the five Nordic countries agreeing on measures to ensure the vitality of each national language, but diversity in FL learning is reducing and minority language promotion is weak. In Greece by contrast, in part due to the activities of Bessie Dendrinou, the learning and testing of a wide range of FLs is being strengthened. The chapter also assesses whether the departure of the UK from the EU will influence language policy in the EU system and Europe more widely.

A referendum in 2016 in the UK on membership of the EU decided by a narrow majority that the British should leave the EU. The English language played no role in EU institutions from their foundation in 1958 until the UK, Ireland, and Denmark became members in 1973. Since that time English has progressively replaced French as the dominant in-house language of EU institutions. 23 other national languages are used for a wide range of written and spoken functions, facilitated by the world's largest translation and interpretation services. In law, all EU languages have the same status as official and working languages, but market forces have gradually established English linguistic hegemony, which many factors contribute to. English is the language in which most policy documents are formulated. It has a privileged status in

1. The text is based on a lecture delivered at the valedictory conference at the NKUA, on the 6th of November 2015, held to honour Bessie Dendrinou.

the EU's communications with the outside world and on its website. English has also been strengthened by the Bologna process, by the way EU research applications and their evaluation are handled, and in many other ways, even if the EU is in principle committed to maintaining multilingualism. Britain's departure from the EU, Brexit, therefore, raises the question of how far the status and use of English will change in the EU system in the future. What are the language policy implications for the remaining Member States, including their education systems?

These questions are explored by assessing the role of academics in neoliberal times, in a world of linguistic inequality, and the iniquities of an excessive focus on English, as exemplified by recent trends in Denmark, ways of resisting neo-imperial English-only policies, historical factors behind the rise of English, and what can be expected when the UK leaves the EU. It concludes with ideas for influencing language pedagogy so as to promote greater diversity and linguistic justice.

1. Using one's academic freedom productively

Scholars in universities have three choices when deciding on their priorities, according to Pierre Bourdieu, probably the most influential social scientist in Europe in the twentieth century:

- as an expert serving societal needs as these are understood by the politically and economically powerful, i.e. undertaking commissioned research;
- as professors trapped in esoteric, erudite scholarly isolation, remaining in a specialised ivory tower;
- as scholars who intervene in the political world in the name of the values and truths achieved in science and through university autonomy and academic freedom (Bourdieu 1989, 486)².

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

These three options may well overlap and reinforce each other, but what is important for academics is to be aware of the sociopolitical as well as the professional constraints that affect scholars and their academic freedom. The constraints in the field of language education derive from three sources: (1) national policies for the learning of particular languages, and how institutions act on them; (2) EU and Council of Europe discourse and recommendations on language learning and language diversity; (3) external forces behind the promotion of particular languages (English, French, German *et al*) in school and university curricula, and how the status and importance of such languages is manufactured and internalised.

The choices identified by Bourdieu can clearly be seen in the profile and achievements of Bessie Dendrinou. She has had a distinguished career in influencing FLE in Greece, strengthening the pedagogy and evaluation of several languages, and ensuring that national needs are determined by Greeks rather than international ‘expertise’ and pressure. This has resulted in the learning of a considerable number of FLs being strengthened, a positive development that few European countries are currently attempting. At university level the situation is more diverse³. Dendrinou’s activity integrates Bourdieu’s first and third options, acting in concert with educational authorities while remaining an independent critical scholar. For such a dialogue to be successful also presupposes that national ministries of education are staffed by people who understand how language policies can be addressed. The Council of Europe has pioneered efforts to strengthen language education nationally and internationally, in relation to overall policy and in furthering the cause of minority regional languages, but the take-up in different countries has been very uneven.

Dendrinou wrote in 2003 that FL teaching is still synonymous with dominant language teaching, an insight that educational policy seldom recognises. She also notes the ambivalence of the EC’s *modus operandi* and what it advocates for Member States (in Macedo, Dendrinou and Gounari 2003, p. 45).

On the one hand, the EU aspires to achieve political and hence cultural integration, and on the other it wants to maintain its cultural and linguistic diversity. ... These aims seem to conflict because Europe’s discursive formations of integration are situated in its homogenisation discourses – discourses which facilitate the articulation of linguoracist practices.

3. Two examples: The University of Kaunas in Lithuania and the University of Venice in Italy teach 40 languages, but may well be under pressure to limit the number, as has happened at all Danish universities.

Dominance is articulated in forms that serve to legitimate a hierarchy of languages and racism. Her term for this is linguoracism, which integrates inequality by means of inequitable language policies, linguisticism, with societal racism. Linguicism is defined as ‘ideologies, structures and practices which are used to legitimate, effectuate, regulate and reproduce an unequal division of power and resources (both material and immaterial) between groups which are defined on the basis of language’ (Skutnabb-Kangas 1988). Linguicism, racism, classism, and sexism co-articulate in most countries. The African American scholar, John Baugh (2000), has written compellingly about the interlocking of race, language, and class, and how this ought to be addressed in education so as to promote more social justice.

2. Blind faith in English for all purposes

Linguicism and xenophobia can be seen in the way that European elite cultures have changed over the past two centuries. We are abandoning the principles that Johan Wolfgang von Goethe propounded:

Wer fremde Sprachen nicht kennt, weiss nichts von seiner eigenen.

Whoever knows no foreign languages knows nothing of their own language.
to

Wer English kennt, braucht nichts von andere Sprachen.

Whoever knows English has no need of other languages.

Goethe’s profound belief that “texts in all languages enrich humanity” built on the tradition in Europe of formal education building on proficiency in Greek and Latin. He was writing at a time when national languages were being consolidated throughout Europe and beginning to figure prominently in school curricula alongside classical and modern FLs. These constituted cultural competence with proficiency evolved through reading and translation. In demographically small countries, FL competence was important for instrumental reasons, for scholarship and trade as well as the intellect. A national language became the dominant medium of instruction, and several FLs were taught. As a result of such policies, in Sweden a century ago an approximately equal number of titles were translated into Swedish from French, German, and English. At present, and due to the increased learning and use of English for many functions, most translation is from English (Melander 2001).

English tends to be ascribed sovereign importance, as a universal need, as much in Asia and Africa as in Europe. In most postcolonial “Third World” and “Fourth World”⁴ contexts, mother-tongue-based multilingual education is not in place, despite a consensus among academics that this is what linguistic minorities need, a policy that has the endorsement of UNESCO. Linguoracist practices are therefore widespread in mainstream education.

The expansion of English is due to many factors, not least US global importance in economic, cultural, scientific, and military domains. The para-statal body, the British Council, has as a primary task the strengthening of the learning of English and an appreciation of British culture worldwide. It is involved in attempting to influence education systems, as are publishers and examination bodies from the UK, in synergy with university applied linguistics and English Language Teaching departments. These are generally committed to a monolingual, monocultural approach to language learning and teaching that is in many respects unsound (Phillipson 1992, chapter 7). British Council discourse also conflates the learning of English with “development” in post-colonial countries, quite falsely, and sidelines local languages, though some recent language education studies are addressing multilingualism in education (e.g. Coleman 2017). British Council policy documents have singled out English as a special case in language education by claiming that the language is a “basic skill”⁵ that every child in the world needs. English is marketed as a global necessity rather than a FL⁶. By contrast, strengthening a variety of FLs, as is being achieved in Greece, provides access to a variety of cultural influences, and can counteract the internalisation of a narrow Anglo-American worldview. Goethe would approve.

Centrally imposed financial constraints in Denmark have influenced decisions on university cutbacks. About half of all FL degrees throughout Denmark have been abolished in recent years, despite the indisputable need for them, and a shortage of translators and interpreters. Proficiency in many languages is needed in the EU system, in business, in cultural life, and in the school system. In the media, people in northern Europe are vastly exposed to

4. This label applies to Indigenous peoples, Aboriginals, First Nations, the minoritised majority world.

5. This concept has been marketed worldwide by the OECD in conjunction with the organisation of PISA tests, see OECD 2015.

6. Graddol 2010, and the Chief Executive of the British Council in its Annual Reports. For a detailed analysis, see Phillipson 2016.

US culture, whereas familiarity with the cultures of other EU Member States is limited.

An extreme example of the impact of an excessive focus on English is developments at Copenhagen Business School (CBS, originally Handelshøjskolen i København, The Trade College of Copenhagen). The institution was founded in 1917 specifically to service the commercial needs of Denmark as a small trading nation. CBS gradually acquired the same status and functions as all universities in Denmark, which are state-funded. CBS offers a large and diverse range of business degrees. Unlike Anglo-American business schools, CBS also built up a strong language faculty, with French, German, Italian, Spanish, and Russian strongly represented as well as English, for commercial, financial, legal, cross-cultural, and cross-lingual purposes. Chinese and Japanese were also taught, in integration with area studies. Translators were trained up to a level where their products were certifiable as having legal validity, which is important for many international purposes. Interpreters were trained for employment in the EU system and elsewhere. CBS had a strong research profile in several language fields, as well as servicing the needs of Danish business and government.

Over the past two decades, there has been an increasing use of English-medium instruction alongside Danish at CBS, to the point where the two languages now function more or less in parallel. The dubious assumption is that all Danes can function equally well in both languages. There is anecdotal evidence that this is far from the case, and Copenhagen University (a separate institution from CBS) has a substantial unit that is involved in ensuring language quality, including certification of competence to lecture in English⁷. There is hard data that in the business world decisions to impose English as the corporate language have seriously negative consequences.

CBS has eliminated virtually all FL activity, with the exception of English for instrumental purposes. CBS management has neglected analysis of language policy issues and needs, despite strong representation of business on the governing board. The Danish government operates as though English is the only language that matters in the modern world. This is incorrect, as Danish commerce knows, and as membership of the EU entails, but this mindset has been generated through Danish politicians being cravenly loyal to the USA, including uncritical contributions to wars of aggression in Afghanistan and Iraq. Language policies have been a low priority, recommendations by the EU and

7. Center for Internationalisation and Parallel Language Use, <http://cip.ku.dk/english/IP>.

the Council of Europe have been ignored, and no national policy for languages exists⁸. The elimination of FLs represents short-sighted national self-harm.

3. Resisting English-only policies

Developments in Denmark have also not been influenced by any effort to implement a government commitment to a Nordic Declaration on Language Policy. This aims to ensure a healthy balance between national and international languages and needs, and to strengthen public awareness about language rights. Useful relevant research has been undertaken, such as the Report on parallel language, *‘More parallel, please! Sprogbrug i internationaliseringsprocesser’*⁹. *Final Report of the Nordic Parallel language Group with 11 recommendations for universities on ideal arrangements for the use of international and local languages*. The recommendations build on many years of analysis in Sweden, Norway, Finland, Iceland and Denmark on the evolution of English-medium instruction¹⁰. They aim at ensuring that all functions that the national language has fulfilled in academia in Nordic national languages are maintained. They recommend ensuring that “international” staff and students develop academic competence in the relevant local Nordic language alongside English, including its academic discourse features. The report argues for raising language awareness, and counteracting linguisticism effectively through a variety of measures. Universities in the five Nordic countries should have a language policy integrated with internationalisation policies¹¹, a multi-purpose language centre, and undertake regular monitoring of teaching quality and language choice, of languages of publication, and of university administration.

These principles are important as they underline the significance of local languages rather than adherence exclusively to ‘more English’. Many EC

8. There has been extensive coverage of these issues in the media. A recent book by two eminent scholars represents an attempt to force decision-makers to admit that there is a problem and that action is needed, Verstraete-Hansen and Øhrgaard 2017. The title can be translated as ‘Language-less citizens of the world. On educational policy that vanished.’

9. Language use in processes of internationalisation.

10. See Dimova, Hultgren and Jensen 2015, Gregersen and Thøgersen. In addition a great deal more is available in Nordic languages.

11. Several universities already have these, e.g. Helsinki, and for Sweden, see Hult and Källkvist 2016.

policies fail in this respect. One example of this is the report to the EC in June 2013 of a High-Level Group on the Modernisation of Higher Education. Recommendation 12 endorses English as *the* language of internationalisation, i.e. the sole international *lingua academica*. This expert tunnel vision shows how leading academics have internalised this largely unquestioned hegemonic practice.

That English is not global or universal is shown persuasively in a study of publications in the field of biodiversity conservation. A research project at the University of Cambridge identified 75.513 scientific manuscripts on biodiversity conservation on Google Scholar (Amano, González-Varo, and Sutherland, 2016).

The number of articles in the top languages was:

English	48.600 (which is 64,4%)
Spanish	9.520
Portuguese	7.800
Chinese	4.540
French	2.290

The valid conclusion from this study is that the notion that in the scientific world, everything of importance is published in English is simply incorrect. In addition to the languages investigated here, German, Japanese and Russian are also important languages of science, as are doubtless others in particular areas. A second conclusion is that scholars who function exclusively in English are not optimally qualified. This limitation also applies in the language policy field, and in educational research, on which topics a great deal is published locally. One should not be led astray by bias in research fields that are dominated by monolingual scholars working in the USA and UK¹².

The influential Smithsonian Institute in the USA recently published the article arguing that a bias toward English-language science can result in preventable crises, duplicated efforts and lost knowledge. The article also cites several examples of research published in languages other than English being ignored, despite their major international importance.

A further example of active resistance to English linguistic imperialism can be found in the writings of scholars based in continental Europe, who are

12. On a personal note, I can add that I am familiar with language policy research written in French, German, Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish, and occasionally lecture on such topics in French or Danish as well as English; this is possible even for scholars of British origin!

often proficient in several languages. Jürgen Trabant (2012) has denounced the rhetoric that labels ELF for international scholarship:

.... the English used as an international scientific language is not a lingua franca, a non-language. English is a completely normal language with its specific monolingual semantics, like all other languages. [...] It is the bearer, like all other natural languages, of a particular vision of the world. As such it is not universal and purely objective, which is what real lingua francas were.

Scholars from the UK and US also often tend to exaggerate or misrepresent the importance of English. For instance the claim “English: *the* language of higher education in Europe... it seems inevitable that English, in some form, will definitely become *the* language of higher education.” (Coleman 2006, Phillipson 2015). This assertion in an influential journal, which happens to be British, is simply false. What is happening in much of Europe is that English is being added to a national language (Danish, French, German, Italian etc.), and not replacing these languages. In effect a form of bilingual higher education is emerging, especially in the Nordic countries and the Netherlands. This is well documented, and steps have been taken in many countries to ensure that English does not replace a national language in higher education and research.

For example see Oberreuter *et al.* 2014, Hultgren, Gregersen & Thøgersen, 2014, Dimova, Hultgren and Jensen, 2015, Nordic Council of Ministers 2006¹³.

In much of continental Europe the role of the national language is relatively unchanged, even when greater use is made of English. A mix of FLs in education still exists in many countries, but, as the Danish example shows, overall planning to ensure that a diversity of FLs is maintained is sometimes neglected. The idea of two FLs being learned in primary school was part of the EU’s Lisbon strategy of making Europe ‘the most dynamic and competitive knowledge-based economy in the world by 2020’, but this remains an unrealised and unrealistic ambition, like many of the goals of the Lisbon strategy, which was formulated before the global financial crisis, the euro crisis and the self-defeating austerity measures triggered by it, the refugee crisis, the resurgence of nationalist populism, and the Brexit upheaval¹⁴.

13. Nordic Council of Ministers 2006. Deklaration om Nordisk Språkpolitik, Copenhagen: Nordic Council of Ministers. Published in eight Nordic languages and English.

14. See ‘Why the EU has no industrial policy’, by Jean-Michel Quatrepoint, *Le Monde Diplomatique*, August 2017, pp. 12-13. This argues that the European Commission has

4. Historical factors behind the expansion of English

The primacy of English learning in schools throughout Europe can be seen as an outcome of policies for establishing English as a “world language” that were first mooted in the 1930s, and warmly endorsed by Winston Churchill in the 1940s (Phillipson 2009, 2017). In a speech at Harvard in 1943 Churchill identified five policy priorities for a post-Nazi world. His vision was that “the cause of freedom across the world” would be established by (1) *the UK and USA acting jointly* – the UK has faithfully supported the US since that time, the only exception being a refusal to take part in the Vietnam war; (2) *military collaboration* – NATO was established in 1949; (3) *plans for global peace-keeping* – the United Nations Organisation came into being in 1945; (4) *the US and UK should be dominant worldwide* – the USA has consistently aimed at global domination in rhetoric and actions stretching from President George Washington to the present-day. President Truman stated in 1947: ‘The whole world should adopt the American system. The American system can survive in America only if it becomes a world system’. This was echoed by President Obama in 2014: “Here’s my bottom line: America must always lead on the world stage”; (5) *an active promotion of global English under American and British leadership* – this has been pursued energetically from the mid-1950s (Phillipson 1992, 2009).

The cause of “freedom across the world” is still the declared aim of the USA and the UK, a cause that has been increasingly dictated by corporate interests and the military-industrial complex since the entrenchment of neo-liberalism. This economic system is enshrined in the Lisbon treaty, ensnaring all Member States’ economies. This pernicious economic system has reached an extreme form in the Trump administration and with a British government committed to Brexit (Klein 2017). The expansion of English over the past 50 years is viscerally connected to corporate-driven globalisation. Globalisation has also immensely strengthened the Chinese economy, leading to a major effort to increase Chinese competence in English, and the establishment of Confucius Institutes worldwide to strengthen Chinese soft power¹⁵, in much

had weak leadership, and that national interests have been pursued rather than pan-European ones, successfully by Germany, less so by other Member States, all of which has strengthened the US economy,

15. This concept is well established, but contentious, since it implies detachment from economic, military and geopolitical activities, although it invariably interlocks with these.

the same way as British and American soft power has been strengthened through language teaching.

Rather than addressing the language policy implications of a one-sided acceptance of the inequalities and injustices that are integral to the way English is currently favoured, often in linguistic policies, one currently fashionable research activity in applied linguistics is ELF. The goal is to study English when used by people for whom it is not their first language, and to see this type of English as distinct from that standard forms. A revealing book in this spirit is *New perspectives on English as a European lingua franca* by Heiko Motschenbacher (2013). On the basis of a limited spoken language corpus, it generalises about communicative and linguistic traits, and concludes that ELF is detached from native English norms of language and Anglo-American cultural values. She cites ELF gurus: Jenkins (“international academic communication is today hardly ever native communication”), Seidlhofer (people can operate with their own ‘common sense’ criteria), and Widdowson (“the old conditions of relevance and appropriateness no longer apply”). This implies that ELF can do without the vocabulary, syntax, or phonology that has evolved in the UK, USA and elsewhere. It is also typical of ELF empiricist studies that their examples are drawn exclusively from *speech*, and *written* English is ignored, but this does not deter ELF converts from drawing bold conclusions about the English language.

There have been many denunciations of the theoretical weaknesses and pedagogical irrelevance of ELF (by, among others, Ian Mackenzie, Gibson Ferguson, François Grin, and Martin Kayman). The most powerful critique, drawing on a wealth of critical social theorists, is by John O’Regan, “English as a lingua franca: an immanent critique” (2014). He reveals how ELF misrepresents the role of *forms* of English, reifying and hypostatizing them in theoretically invalid ways that ignore key social variables and sociopolitical realities. ELF misrepresents the diversity of English in globalisation.

This research activity is an empiricist dead end. The ELF movement deludes teachers of English with false promises of what is important to know about the use of English in the modern world. In view of the current popularity of ELF, with annual conferences and a journal, O’Regan’s analysis, as well as the work of many other critics, has a comparable importance to Chomsky’s denunciation of Skinnerian behaviourism in 1959.

Criticism of ELF studies does not apply to scholarly work done in relation to English for Special Purposes, English for Academic Purposes (especially if translation is integrated into this), nor does it apply to Business ELF, which

has a strong tradition in several continental European countries (Piekkari and Westney 2017).

A further problem with describing ELF is that this generally seems to imply that the language is intrinsically a neutral instrument for “international” communication between speakers who do not share a mother tongue. While English does of course fulfil many useful functions, this understanding of the term may mislead one into believing that *lingua franca* English is disconnected from the many purposes it serves in key societal domains. English can be more accurately related to distinct contexts of use. It can and does function as a pre-eminent international *lingua economica* (in business and advertising, a principal though not exclusive language of corporate neoliberalism), a *lingua emotiva* (the imaginary of Hollywood, popular music, consumerism and hedonism), a *lingua academica* (in research publications, at international conferences, and as a medium for content learning in higher education), and a *lingua cultura* (rooted in the literary texts of English-speaking nations that school FLE traditionally aims at, and integrates with language learning as one element of general education). English is a major *lingua bellica* (the USA with military activities worldwide, 350 bases and 800 military facilities in 130 countries, NATO not only active in Europe but worldwide in the dubious “war on terror”). English is also a major *lingua politica* in international organisations such as the United Nations and the EU. The worldwide presence of English as a *lingua americana* is due to the massive economic, cultural and military impact of the USA. English functions in each of the categories indicated here.

I consider that describing English loosely as a *lingua franca* is pernicious if the language in question is a first language for some people but for others a FL. It is also misleading if the language is supposed to be neutral and disconnected from culture. It is a false term for any language that is taught as a subject in general education. There is also an ironic historical continuity in that the origin of the term was the need in the Middle East to describe the language of western European Christian crusaders many centuries ago. They spoke a wide range of mother tongues and were seen as Franks. *Lingua franca* was later used as a term for limited commercial transactions in the eastern Mediterranean and spoken *ad hoc* by people drawing on several languages. No *lingua franca* in this sense was ever codified. Now, by contrast, if *lingua franca* is used in relation to English, it is to a national language of several countries which is not a limited, partial language but the dominant language for many functional purposes. Scholarship on the international use of English

ought to be concerned with all of the relevant functions that English serves, and its potential relevance for learners with a variety of mother tongues.

At the European level, what is needed is grassroots mobilisation generated bottom-up, as in the European Civil Society Platform on Multilingualism (<http://ecspm.org>), which Bessie Dendrinos presides over. This sees multilingualism as an asset and commitment, and appreciation of the linguistic and cultural diversity of Europe.

Winston Churchill would probably thoroughly approve of this way of consolidating the cultural richness of Europe. He was in favour of European countries collaborating rather than fighting each other. He also delivered some profound thoughts in a speech he gave in 1950. After presenting a strategy for global English in 1943 as one element in a neo-imperial world that fuses UK and US interests, Churchill was awarded an honorary doctorate by the University of Copenhagen, in recognition of his role in the Second World War, and his books on historical topics. His speech articulated a rationale for universities that was strikingly different from his wartime thoughts and has extreme relevance for universities now. Universities are under massive constraints and should heed Churchill’s words:

The first duty of a university is to teach wisdom, not to train, and to confirm character and not impart technicalities. We want a lot of engineers in the modern world, but we do not want a world of engineers. We want some scientists, but we must make sure that science is our servant and not our master... No amount of technical knowledge can replace the comprehension of the humanities or the study of history and philosophy. The advantages of the nineteenth century, the literary age, have been largely put aside by this terrible twentieth century with all its confusion, exhaustion, and bewilderment of mankind. This is a time when a firm grip on all the essential verities and values of humanity and civilisation should be the central care of the universities of Europe and the world.

5. The future of English

Regardless of the UK’s political alliance with Europe, it is conceivable that English will retain its key role in EU affairs. This is the view of a German scholar, Jürgen Trabant, in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* (13 July 2016), in an analysis with which I largely agree. The Irish and Maltese (1% of EU population) have the right to use Irish Gaelic and Maltese, but in practice use

English. A more important factor is the instrumental functions that English has progressively acquired over the past 44 years, a hegemonic dominance. While French still has a privileged place in the Commission and Parliament, and especially in the European Court of Justice, any more widespread use of French and German, and possibly other languages, would require a long and complicated transition process. Eurocrats from many different national backgrounds, and with varying degrees of proficiency in English, will not wish for a major change in the management of multilingualism. The cost of all EU translation and interpretation services is less than 1% of the annual general budget, around €2 per person per year, and these services will continue. Trabant foresees a deterioration of the quality of English in the EU once the UK leaves.

Trabant also anticipates that the UK will put even less effort into learning FLs, which will consolidate monolingualism and anglocentricity (Phillipson 1992, 47¹⁶). This will probably occur if an Anglosphere network emerges. The Anglosphere is the idea that the settler countries of the white dominions (Canada, Australia, South Africa, and New Zealand) and the USA, which British people emigrated to, have strong cultural and linguistic affinities with the UK, and are based on the same principles in politics, the law, and in belief in free trade. The assumption by proponents of an Anglosphere network is that the cultural and linguistic unity that underlies the political and economic systems of these countries is deeper than what is shared with continental European countries, despite geographical proximity and 44 years of membership of the EU, and a deepening of European integration. The Conservative government's Brexit mission is for the UK to leave the EU, and appears to be aiming at reviving 'global' Anglophone links to replace continental European ones. The Anglosphere network idea has been promoted by think tanks in both the USA and the UK over the past two decades. The reasons for right-wing politics in the UK reviving a vision of a re-establishment of what used to be the British empire have a complex history of well over a century (Kenny and Pearce 2018). This goal is probably totally unrealistic, as is becoming clear

16. I define this concept as follows (Phillipson 1992, pp. 47-48). "The term anglocentricity has been coined by analogy with ethnocentricity, which refers to the practice of judging other cultures by the standards of one's own. There is a sense in which we are inescapably committed to the ethnocentricity of our own world view, however much insight and understanding we have of other cultures (...). Anglocentricity takes the forms and functions of English, and the promise of what English represents or can lead to, as the norm by which all language activity or use should be measured. It simultaneously devalues other languages, either explicitly or implicitly."

through analysis of what leaving the EU involves, and countless indications of how harmful any Brexit will be. Granted the uncertainty of what kind of divorce agreement will be agreed on between the UK and the EU, it is equally uncertain how far an Anglosphere alternative might be re-created.

My conclusions on lessons that can be drawn for language policy on the basis of these reflections are that:

- *laissez-faire* market forces strengthen English
- we need to be constantly active in counteracting linguistic and linguoracist practices and ideologies in language education
- the dominance of English as a scholarly language needs to be counteracted by educational and institutional policies that ensure a healthy balance between national languages and international languages
- a single international language has some practical advantages but closes access to all other cultures
- a single international language privileges its native speakers as models of competence, pedagogy and culture
- a single international language handicaps most native speakers of other languages in contexts where near-native competence in this language is required
- ensuring the vitality of the learning of a range of FLs is an important challenge for education
- a monopoly of English attempts to impose, in a hegemonic way, thought processes and conceptual worlds from a specific culture
- if an Anglosphere network emerges after Brexit, this will consolidate Anglo-American power, which represents a threat to all the cultures and languages not only of continental Europe but the whole world.