Nonkilling Linguistics

Practical Applications

Edited by
Patricia Friedrich

Center *for* Global **Nonkilling**

creative commons
CREATIVE COMMONS LICENCE
Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0

You are free to share, copy, distribute and transmit this work*

Under the following conditions:

- **Attribution.** You must attribute this work in the manner specified by the author/licensor (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
- **Noncommercial.** You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
- **No Derivative Works.** You may not alter, transform or build upon this work.

* For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of this work.
* Any of the above conditions can be waived if you gain permission from the copyright holders.

Nothing in this license impairs or restricts the Authors' moral and legal rights.

Parts of this volume have been released under GFDL and Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 3.0 as part of Wikiversity's School of Nonkilling Studies (http://en.wikiversity.org/wiki/School:Nonkilling_studies).

The Center for Global Nonkilling does not necessarily endorse the views expressed by the authors.

Also available for free download at: http://www.nonkilling.org

© The Authors, 2012
© Center for Global Nonkilling, 2012 (this edition)

First Edition: November 2012

Published with the support of the Galizan Academy of the Portuguese Language
Academia Galega da Língua Portuguesa | http://www.academiagalega.org

ISBN-13 978-0-9839862-4-9
ISBN-10 0-9839862-4-X

Cataloging in Publication Data (CIP)

Issues in Nonkilling Linguistics : Practical Applications /
Edited by Patricia Friedrich.
ISBN 978-0-9839862-4-9
1. Nonkilling 2. Peace. 3. Nonviolence.
I. Title. II. Friedrich, Patricia, ed..

CDU - 172.4 : 327.36

A catalogue record is also available from the Library of Congress.

Center *for* Global **Nonkilling**

3653 Tantalus Drive
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822-5033
United States of America
Email: info@nonkilling.org
http://www.nonkilling.org

This volume is dedicated to the memory of our colleagues
James C. Whitton *and* **Alexandre Kimenyi**

Contents

Introduction

Introduction

Patricia Friedrich
Arizona State University

It has been my good fortune to work with the contributors to this volume to help us start exploring the potential of the nonkilling paradigm when it comes to language use, education and legislation. As many are aware, language permeates most facets of human experience: we use different forms of language and literacy (including computer and visual literacies) to establish contact with one another, to communicate our thoughts and feelings, to make sense of the world around us, and ultimately to realize our destiny as social beings.

It is true that we have the concepts of peace and nonviolence to lead us in a quest for a fairer and more just world and a meaningful social experience for all individuals. Indeed, these concepts are great light posts to guide us along the way. Their existence, however, does not obviate the kind of concrete goal that nonkilling can provide. Here we are talking about an absolutely measurable objective, one that can manifest itself both literally and figuratively. That is, nonkilling speaks both to the goal of preserving the physical lives of individuals, communities, other species, the environment as well as the more metaphorical but also extremely important survival of languages, cultures, histories (oral and written), literary manifestations, etc. The list is vast and varied, and the good news is that a nonkilling mentality can be applied to all these realms and lives.

We are barely scratching the surface in our potential to do good and spread respect for all living beings and their expressions, but we have to start somewhere. It is in this spirit that we have put together this volume and it is in the same spirit that we invite the reader to apply principles of justice, nonviolence, peace and nonkilling to their own realms of influence, professional and academic pursuits.

In the first chapter, the reader will find a reflection that Francisco Gomes de Matos and I wrote—and is reproduced here—on the nature of language and the nonkilling paradigm

In the second chapter, Lauren Chamberlain writes about the potential of the nonkilling paradigm and peace education to positively impact the lives of children, and she highlights a series of common goals for peace education and nonkilling linguistics. In chapter two José Marcelo Freitas de Luna describes some practices historically used for the education of immigrant population in southern Brazil in a reflection that may cause us to compare and contrast current practices around the world so that we can best serve the needs of these populations and learn from potential past mistakes.

In chapter four, Shelley Wong and Maryam Saroughi explain how teaching TESOL (teachers of English to speakers of other languages) in a language foreign to them can help raise awareness of the challenges facing ESL students and thus cause educators to review some of their pedagogical practices so that the latter are more attuned to a peace and nonkilling paradigm.

In chapter five Enio Moraes Júnior and Murilo Jardelino da Costa write about the relationship between the nonkilling paradigm and the ethical practice of journalism, while in chapter five Joseph-G Turi educates us on matters of linguistic law and how this realm of language use can also foster a nonkilling mentality, especially vis-à-vis respect and policy making that guarantees the survival of languages and linguistic expression.

James Whitton's chapter presents us with a definition for applied nonkilling linguistics in the developmental composition classroom while it also highlights some of the foundational work that has been done to safeguard the linguistic rights of language learners. It explores potential difficulties that exist for educators attempting to promote nonkilling language in the classroom and presents strategies to promote the kind of learning environment that leads to peace and respect for the students' own linguistic experience.

Finally, for the last chapter, I interview Brazilian linguist Francisco Gomes de Matos and ask for his views on matters pertaining to the rest of the book. Prof. Gomes de Matos, whose nonkilling-inspired poetry also opens each of the chapters, has always been in the forefront of linguist pursuits as they relate to peace and, now, nonkilling. The first self-entitled peace linguist, Gomes de Matos was helping forge that discipline (as well as important linguistic rights documents) before many people were even aware this realm could be so prolific. We thank him for his vision and inspiration and hope the reader will greatly benefit from his insights on dignity, peace, nonkilling and diversity.

Speaking of diversity, to stay in tune with our belief in language diversity at many levels, we present these articles to you in the styles, linguistic varieties, and in one case in the language-other-than-English in which they were originally conceived. It has been the general practice in academia to choose one of

the perceived "standard" linguistic dialects and ensure that all chapters conform to its norms. One of the advantages of being in the forefront of a paradigm shift, such as the one proposed in nonkilling, is the flexibility to engage is new practices, especially if they uphold the same values (in this case of diversity and creativity) that the field itself proposes. We hope that in the future many reflections in different linguistic varieties and in varied languages will come to join these, and thus we further hope that the principles of pluralism and justice contained herein will reach a broader, multilingual audience.

Work like this would not be possible if it were not for the visionary insight of individuals such as Glenn Paige, the founder of the Center for Global Nonkilling and the originator of the nonkilling concept. We dedicate this volume to his foresight with wishes that the nonkilling paradigm can help communities around the world lead a more just, uplifting and respected/respectful existence. We have chosen to also dedicate this volume to the memory of our colleagues James C. Whitton and Alexandre Kimenyi, late members of the Nonkilling Linguistics committee. May their teachings and insights stay with us. We also thank Joám Evans Pim for his tireless work for the Center and his work on this volume and the Academia Galega da Língua Portuguesa / Galizan Academy of the Portuguese Language and Arizona State University for all of their support. We hope you enjoy the work.

Arizona, May 2012.

Chapter One

Toward a Nonkilling Linguistics

Patricia Friedrich
Arizona State University

Francisco Gomes de Matos
Federal University of Pernambuco

More than a universally avoided violence
It's the constructing of peaceful permanence
More than preventing the evils of violence
Let's universally sustain Nonkilling sense.

(from "Nonkilling Sense," a poem by Francisco Gomes de Matos, dedicated by the author to Glenn D. Paige)

It is the age-old question: are human beings naturally predisposed to violence and therefore bound to a perpetual and elusive quest for peace, or are we a peaceful group falling prey to the traps of aggression and hostility?

In *Nonkilling Global Political Science*, Paige (2009 [2002]) raises the question of whether or not a nonkilling society is possible and what it would take to build such a society. He explains that a nonkilling society is,

> a human community, smallest to largest, local to global, characterized by no killing of humans and no threats to kill; no weapons designed to kill humans and no justifications for using them; and no conditions of society depend upon threat or use of killing force for maintenance or change. (p. 21)

Paige acknowledges that the answer to the first part of his question is a product of one's "personal experience, professional training, culture, and context" (p. 22). The answer to the second, in case one agrees that such a society is possible, would in our view, depend upon a collective effort in which each member of the society employs their expertise and special skills to contribute to the nonkilling paradigm. Our contribution to a nonkilling society would involve the use of languages and the social power derived from such use.

In our nonkilling linguistics we can express our desire for languages to be employed in all of their peace-making potential. It is easy enough to observe that languages can be employed as instruments of harm; one can, for example, hurt with the words he or she chooses or yet segregate and exclude those who share a different linguistic background. Thus, it seems intuitive to us that we need to tip the scale in the opposite direction by rein-

forcing instead those humanizing uses of language which help boost respect for human dignity and social inclusion. By doing so we may in some direct and indirect ways be advancing a nonkilling mentality.

The linguistic power conveyed by the juxtaposition of the negative prefix *non* and the noun *killing* recalls another felicitous combination, namely, *nonviolence*, a Gandhian concept-term which according to Random House (1995: 891) originated in 1915, meaning "the policy or practice of refraining from the use of violence, as in protesting oppressive authority." That same source tells us that *violence* made its debut in written English at the beginning of the 14th century. How about *killing*, the reader might be wondering? The verb *kill* first appears in written form in 1175. According to the *American Heritage Dictionary* (2001: 469), *kill* can mean: To put to death; To deprive of life; To cause to cease operating. When, however, we add the prefix *non*, we positivize what would otherwise be destructive terms. Another history-making concept-term in that respect is, for example, that of *nonproliferation* as in the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, signed in 1968 by the U.S.A., the then USSR, the UK and over 80 nonnuclear weapon states.

What these examples show is that language plays a significant role in the way we see and build the world because it has the power to transcend and transform. In the current state of affairs, Paige argues, "Language reflects and reinforces lethality, contributing a sense of naturalness and inescapability" (p. 30). His examples are many; for instance, the way in which metaphors which make reference to violence, war and conflict abound in the English language. He reminds us of expressions such as "making a killing in the stock market," or being "stab[bed] in the back," or movie stars being dubbed "bombshells." We can add our own: Lou Dobbs's constant reference (2006, for example) to the "war on the middle class," the disagreements between men and women as "the battle of the sexes," or taking part in a discussion as engaging in a "war of words." There are also two ecolinguistically inappropriate—unfair!—nouns in English referring to animals: "killer bee" (for African honeybee capable of stinging repeatedly) and "killer whale" (large carnivore which is intelligent and relatively docile). Such labeling is biased against those species and again emblematic of our desensitizing toward the use of linguistically violent terms. English is not the only language through which we display violence-inspired metaphors. In Portuguese, for example, the combination of either "morrer" or "matar de vergonha" (to die or kill of embarrassment) fits this description as well (see also Arabic and Chinese for languages which extensively use linguistically violent terms). The existence, in several languages, of reference works on

insulting words and expressions attests to the near-universal omnipresence of violent or *killing* communication across languages-cultures.

Because we live in a world which has, to a certain extent, been the backdrop for a rather indifferent attitude toward killing, allowing us to become also somewhat unmoved by it, linguists might be interested in mapping the lexicon of violence, an area which is in need of cross-cultural data collection. For a useful section on violence in a reference work, a starting point could be Glazier (1997: 634-638). That work features subsections on violent events, fights, attacks, violent actions, and violent persons. The listing of over 300 types of violent actions provides evidence to support the hypothesis that human beings are the most destructive creatures on Earth. However, we must also ask what listing would be made to exemplify the opposite, that is, the fact that human beings can/could be constructive creatures as well.

Other contexts of use also evidence this indifference and actually give away a certain acclamation of violence. A quick search through a movie guide (Maltin, 2008) for example revealed the popularity of such titles as *Kill Bill* (2003), *The Matador* (2005) and *A Time to Kill* (1996). An interesting challenge could be to try to find an equivalent number of titles displaying peace-fostering terms. This challenge could be a desirable practice among conscientization (to use a Freirean term) activities aimed at communicatively enhancing constructive vocabulary, humanizing uses of languages and linguistic activism.

Of course the role of language in both the maintenance of peace and unfortunately the pursuit of violence is not restricted to its more metaphorical or purely linguistic uses. Effective diplomacy through peace talks, for example, can mark the divide between practicing peace through constructive dialogue or engaging in war through armed conflict. Further pacific pursuit of agreement and understanding can be exemplified by the growingly researched phenomenon of public peace dialogue (Saunders, 1999).

At the micro-level, the use of language can signal our desire to respect and honor human dignity on the one hand, or to offend and attack one's self-esteem on the other. Recently, a friend of the senior author received a phone call from a stranger telling her that her daughter had been kidnapped. What ensued was a near-killing communicative exchange. The would-be kidnapping turned out to be a horrible prank, that is, an instance of *killing* use of Portuguese, for the mother, in this case, had to receive medical treatment to overcome the shock. Whereas this is an extreme example of both physical and psychological harm through language, human beings do indeed have the capacity to use linguistic boundaries to segregate, to deny membership, to belittle or conversely to educate, to empower, to establish contact and to elevate.

Surprisingly enough, given the ubiquitous nature of language, it took linguistics quite a long time to be more formally recognized as an important element of peace and the establishment of fairer social institutions. Luckily for us and our contemporaries, Peace Linguistics (Gomes de Matos, 1996; Crystal, 1999; Crystal, 2004; Friedrich, 2007a and 2007b) now figures alongside Peace Psychology, Peace Education and other disciplines, among the contributing subjects helping in the development of interdisciplinary Peace Studies which in turn can inform those interested in the building of a nonkilling society.

However, the task ahead for linguistics scholars, teachers, language policy makers, government officials and language users themselves is not a small one. Language is so intricately connected to human experience that it can be said to permeate all aspects of our lives, from school to work, from entertainment to family relations, from conflict to diplomacy and governmental action. Yet, we often take language for granted and fail to recognize its power and reach, and we often trivialize its use. We neglect to engage in peace-fostering dialogue or we become cocooned in our own silence. We often find it hard to say "I am sorry," to yield to the other speaker, and to choose our words according to their potential for peace. We at times fall short of recognizing situations in which language, if used constructively, could avoid serious conflict both at the personal micro-level and at the global macro-level.

In a nonkilling society, language must play a pivotal role as a tool for peace, as it needs to be widely engaged. Language users need to be empowered, and constructive dialogue needs to replace violence. This chapter is organized around the idea that several elements related to language are central to the establishment of a nonkilling society. We will visit but a few. While these elements relate to linguistics in its more abstract form, which means that they do not refer to any one particular language and at the same time include all languages, examples of their applicability are given vis-à-vis existing languages and the dynamics of power that unite and unfortunately also divide them. While many of our examples come from English, we do not in any way mean to imply that the use of English is more "harmful" than the use of any other language. We truly believe that the power to change a language as a vehicle of peace and nonkilling power lies within the realm of the users (i.e., language as an abstract entity cannot be to blame). Therefore, the list which includes many instances of uses of English is simply an acknowledgement that we share English with the readers and thus can rely on an understanding of our examples. Whereas the list is not exhaustive, it is guided by two encompassing, fundamental principles and two general pleas as follows:

- **First fundamental principle**: "Language is a system for communicating in nonkilling ways."
- **Second fundamental principle**: "Language users should have the right to learn to communicate nonkillingly for the good of humankind."
- **First plea**: "Let us be communicative Humanizers, treating all language users with compassion and dignity."
- **Second plea**: "Let us opt for communicatively nonkilling uses of language."

Respect for Language Users and the Uses they Make of Language

Languages are not autonomous entities. They exist to serve the perceived needs of the societies who build them. They are made into tools or weapons depending upon their users. They are not intrinsically good or bad; however, they are used as vehicles of good or evil by the people who utilize them. Each user of language impacts the language in many ways by modifying, creatively applying, denying, or embracing it. Each language user is also unique because no one's experience with language and with the world is the same as anyone else's. Even considering identical twins, obviously born to the same parents in the same place and roughly at the same time, we will come to realize that the twins' experiences with language are unique; each will speak to different users, read different books, and develop unique interests which in turn will help shape language use differently. Recognition of the multiplicity of users, realms of use, cline[1] of proficiency, and educational environments of different languages and language varieties is paramount to building a nonkilling society.

Multiple users will present different linguistic features. Pronunciation will vary, and choice of vocabulary and type of variety will also oscillate according to the situation of communication, educational background, geographical location, gender and age of participants. While we must recognize and seize such diversity, we must also learn to refrain from using it against language users. How many times has violence resulted from denied membership due to linguistic separatism? How often do negative attitudes toward users or groups of users of specific dialects end up impacting people in nonlinguistic realms of life?

[1] The continuum that extends itself from not proficient at all to fully competent.

Fought (2002: 127) provides an example of such attitudes. In a study conducted with college students from California about attitudes toward the various regional dialects of the United States, she found out that "the South was labeled as a separate geographic area more frequently than any other region." In addition, "a majority of terms associated with the South are negative." The same stigmatization of regional dialects is true for Japanese (Gottlieb, 2008).

Scientifically speaking, no evidence exists that using a certain linguistic variety correlates with accomplishment, intelligence or skill. Yet, people are often stereotyped and pigeonholed with dialectal variation and language proficiency as criteria, and these criteria are then later wrongly reapplied to include or to exclude users. In a nonkilling society, multiple linguistic expressions exist in harmony, and people have a chance to develop their full potential regardless of the native status of their language use (i.e., whether they are native speakers or not), the regional origin of their dialect, or the functional range of their language use.

Additionally, notions about cline of proficiency and frequency of use are not employed judgmentally. Some people will use a certain language for a variety of functions (e.g., the speaker of English who uses the language in his medical practice, to talk to his kids, to write in academic journals and to chat with friends) while others will use it for only one (e.g., the airport controller in a primarily Spanish speaking country who uses English for a specialized function at his workplace). In a nonkilling society, all kinds of users have a right to use such languages, and for those languages to be recognized and revered. They feel they are valuable members of their linguistic communities, and other members of such societies are grateful that because of those people's linguistic skills others have access to, for example, a medical diagnosis or the safe landing of their plane.

Thus, in a nonkilling society, beside the respect for dialectal variation, the questionable deficit approach to language use (i.e., the view which focuses of language users' shortcomings) is replaced with support for the further development of their skills and appreciation for the skills they already possess.

Respect for a Healthy Ecosystem of Languages

Recently, *The Economist* (October 23, 2008) published an article on endangered languages. The renowned publication reflected on the fate of thousands of languages which may disappear by the end of the 21st century, languages such as Hua, spoken in Botswana, and Manchu, from China. The most optimistic estimates foreshadow that about 50% of the almost 7,000

languages of the world are endangered (Wurm, 2001; Gordon, 2005; Austin and Simpson, 2007); the most pessimistic bring the number of those endangered up to 90% (Krauss, 1992).

Disagreements aside, most specialists concur that the rate at which languages are disappearing is unprecedented, and part of our inability to know what to do is intimately connected to its uniqueness—no historical antecedent tells us what needs to be done. Austin and Simpson (2007: 5) point out that besides being unparalleled, "[l]oss of linguistic diversity on this scale … represents a massive social and cultural loss, not only to the speakers of particular languages but to humanity and science in general." Scanlon and Singh (2006), referring to Maffi's scholarship (2001), cite colonization, the rise of the nation state, globalization, and environmental degradation as the most important phenomena contributing to the disruption of linguistic diversity and a healthy ecosystem of languages (see also Mühlhäusler, 2003).

The fact that many languages are currently endangered has to be juxtaposed with the fact that languages also do fade away more 'naturally' too and that some of the sociolinguistic phenomena accounting for such disappearance is beyond our scope of action. Nevertheless, despite the fact that we might not be able to save all endangered languages, we do not need unnaturally to push for their demise. In a nonkilling society, the danger of languages displacing other languages is diminished because respect for language diversity also signifies that multilingualism is revered and encouraged (Phillipson, 1992). In that case, the need for languages of wider communication (which fulfill a pragmatic purpose) does not need to clash with the desire to build community and preserve local language and culture.

Notice, however, that the term "preserve" is a tricky one; some preservation efforts are an attempt to catalog and document the language as it was last conceived. Such efforts are to a large degree undertaken by language preservationists when there is no hope of a language surviving (e.g., when the last few speakers are of an advanced age and no young users can be found). The other complementary effort is to preserve a language's ability to continue changing, that is, to continue to be used functionally by a community. In this case, policy making, which includes sound educational policies, can be an important step to maintaining a language. Smith (2000: 174) argues "… mutual recognition of all linguistic heritage should be the goal. Without such mutual respect and tolerance, internal and international tension and hostilities may result." While Smith is referring more specifically to languages indigenous to Europe, the researcher's reflection bears relevance to all relations among languages with regional and international status and those used only within

smaller communities. It also establishes the connection between disrespect for linguistic diversity and social unrest (see also Fishman, ed., 2001).

Therefore, as individuals interested in upholding the ideals of a nonkilling society, ideals which can be extended to the nonkilling of languages, we should take measures to preserve dying languages, counteract unnatural homogenizing forces when necessary, and recognize the necessity of lingua francas (but strive to establish them alongside local languages). In a nonkilling society, languages and speakers of languages are not purposefully exterminated. There is no effort of an educational, political or armed forces nature to decimate linguistic groups and extinguish their language and culture.

Focus on Diplomacy: Negative Peace

Galtung's (1964) widely known concept of "negative peace" refers to the absence of war, thus the word "negative." Attempts to uphold peace in situations where conflict has already erupted fall within the realm of negative peace. Thus, a great deal of the effort to re-establish and restore peace in undertaken by diplomacy. In a nonkilling society diplomacy also is the primary vehicle used to resolve differences because armed conflict is not an option. The use of language in diplomatic talks is paramount to sustaining a nonkilling paradigm. Gomes de Matos (2001) has created a very thorough list of principles for diplomatic communication to be carried out "constructively." Some highlights include:

- Avoidance of dehumanizing language
- Investment in handling differences constructively
- Emphasis on language with a potential for peace rather that language employed with a strategic agenda
- Focus on agreement rather than on polemics
- Avoidance of pompous language used to separate and hide

Gomes de Matos (2001) also speaks of the importance of upholding the ideals of diplomacy to the utmost degree and believing in the ability of diplomats and other representatives to pursue their ideals through pacific and honorable means. We would add that in a nonkilling society efforts need to be undertaken and investments made in research and education so that we can increasingly understand which features of languages make them more apt to generating peace in diplomatic talks. As Gomes de Matos (2001) similarly points out, our efforts should not be to take advantage of language to "win" peace talks but rather to arrive at the kind of understanding which will lead to longer lasting peace.

Focus on Building Strong Social Institutions: Positive Peace

Galtung's (1964) other form of peace, "positive peace," can also be framed in terms of language use. Positive peace refers to the building of strong social institutions which would help prevent war in the first place. As pointed out elsewhere (Friedrich, 2007b), language, as a uniquely human institution, can largely contribute to this effort because, if individuals see their linguistic rights respected, they will be less likely to engage in violent conflict. Amongst the necessary steps to building a strong language institution, we can highlight efforts to offer sound, peace-promoting education with a curriculum which emphasizes rights and duties, moral values and ethic, and sound linguistic skills. Complementary, a solid linguistic structure also relies on access to resources, information and opportunities by speakers of different languages and by users of various dialects. In a nonkilling society, individuals are encouraged to use their language-related skills for the development of society as a whole and for the upholding of human dignity.

Peace educators, peace psychologists, peace linguists and all those concerned with the nonkilling education of language users are urged to exercise their right to be communicatively creative for peaceful purposes and, in such spirit, to add, adapt, expand, refine, and probe the practices found most relevant to specific socio-cultural contexts. The overall goal should be to make learners aware of the open-ended practical activities aimed at enhancing one's nonkilling communicative potentialities. Group discussion of results achieved is desirable since communicating is above all an act of sharing. Examples of educational activities which could help fulfill this goal are:

Practice 1. Answering the question "When do we kill a person linguistically?" by adding verbs or verb phrases to the list in the suggested answers. Answer: When we antagonize, coerce, desecrate, frighten with threats of harm, intimidateviolently, oppress, provoke in a violent way, exclude from our network.

Practice 2. Answering the question "How can we humanize a person linguistically?" by adding verbs, phrases or sentences to the list of suggested answers. Answer: When we refer to him or her in admiring respectful ways. For instance, when we call the person a peacebuilder, an expert, a connoisseur, a creative genius, a luminary, a mentor, a patriot, a prodigy, a role model, a trendsetter, a virtuoso, a visionary, a prophet.

Practice 3. Creating nonkilling sayings (adding to the challenge and the fun by using alliterations. rhyme, etc.). Examples: Wicked words wound the world/ Nonkilling words nourish nonviolence.

Practice 4. Creating constructive alliterations.

Example: Challenge yourself to add other letters:
AAA = Activate life-Affirming assertions
MMM=Monitor manipulative messages (in the media)
TTT = Transform tension into tranquility
VVV =Value a vital vocabulary

Practice 5. Creating a poem celebrating the power of nonkilling communication or celebrating the vision of a nonkilling "planetary patriot," such as Mahatma Ghandi or Johan Galtung.

Practice 6. Creating some entries for a dictionary of encouragement and praise, so conspicuously absent in the literature (there are Dictionaries of Insults even in Portuguese.) or a dictionary of (name of language) for nonkilling purposes.

Practice 7. Paraphrasing inspiring statements by Glenn Paige in his seminal book.

Practice 8. Adapting famous quotations to a nonkilling perspective. For example: Confucius' statement " Without knowing the force of words, it is impossible to know men" could become "Only by knowing the nonkilling power of words it is possible to humanize human beings communicatively." Another example: "Beauty is eternally gazing at itself in a mirror" (Kahlil Gilbron, *The Prophet*, "On Beauty" [1923]) could become "A nonkilling society is Humankind swimming in a Sea of Serenity."

Practice 9. Listing more reasons for not killing, besides those mentioned by Glenn Paige.

Practice 10. Creating practical, transforming communicative alternatives. Examples: Turning an intended threat into a thought-provoking text; turning an intended intimidation into an invitation. In these two examples, the belief in loving one's linguistic neighbor is challengingly applied.

Practice 11. Composing a poem on "Why more nonviolent people are needed."

Practice 12. Completing a Nonkilling paradigmatic set with nouns in –ation. Example: nonkilling is (a) moral obligation, spiritual elevation, humanizing conscientization, global salvation, life-affirming education, planetary cooperation, vital preservation, etc.

Practice 13. Engaging your students in this creatively humanizing activity of building a repertoire of actions to avoid, with the use of non+noun words in an alphabetically arranged paradigm (for a complete list, see appendix): nonaggression, nonanimosity, nonantagonism, nonattack(ing), nonbelligerance, nonbrutality, nonbombing, nonbombarding, nonconspiracy, nonconcealment.

When will educational systems include the systematic learning of nonkilling language in their language programs? How can *peace* educators, psychologists, linguists and other peacebuilding humanizers get together and help design *nonkilling language* programs for use in schools at all levels? Herein lies a formidable universal educational challenge. Besides learning to systematize one's nonkilling vocabulary, every planetary citizen could be educated in a Critical nonkilling Linguistics framework, or in other words, learning to question *killing* uses of language(s). In such spirit, human beings would learn not to *kill* their "linguistic neighbors" communicatively, by avoiding linguistically violent actions.

If we take the above considerations about education seriously, it becomes clear that a curriculum of nonviolence and peace should be the next step to fostering a nonkilling mentality. Such a curriculum should include teachings about communicative aspects of peace, linguistic ecology, peace linguistic terms and language appropriate for peace-fostering action. Crystal (2004) writes about the importance of fostering a curriculum of peace from the early grades. Alongside teachings about ecology, he explains, young students can receive education on linguistic ecology, linguistic rights and other language-related topics.

Other scholars have addressed the importance of the classroom as a site for all facets of peace education. Gomes de Matos (2002), reviewed by Rector (2003), explains aspects of his "humanizing pedagogy" which integrates Dell Hymes's concept of *communicative competence* (1966) expanded to include *communicative peace*. He urges the reader to promote language uses which reflect a preoccupation with the linguistic rights of others as well as respect for the participants in communicative acts regardless of their status or of the communication site.

In Friedrich (2007a and 2007b), an argument is found for the importance of linguistic peace education in promoting encompassing peace and for the appreciation of the classroom as a prime environment for education about peace (Peace Education), education about linguistic forms which enhance peaceful communication (Peace Linguistics) and education about all things sociolinguistic which impact the ways in which we communicate (Peace Sociolinguistics).

In a nonkilling society, classroom education, as well as life-long education in all of these language-related aspects of peace, is taken very seriously and given a position of relevance and influence alongside other disciplines.

Respect for Individual Linguistic Choices

The matter of linguistic choices has largely become a political one. Whether one chooses to remain monolingual, embrace bilingualism or multi-

lingualism, or primarily use a language other than one's native tongue has social implications. Furthermore, these choices are usually framed by critics in terms of group membership rather than individual decisions. The widely debated phenomenon of linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992) is an example of how choices are made into political entities. Phillipson argues that the global use of English is a result of linguistic imperialism and that people in the "periphery" (countries where English is acquired as second or foreign language) are victims of the imperialistic moves by countries such as the US). However, what theories of imperialism fail to recognize (among the many other elements brought forth by nonsupporters of this view) is that whether or not to use English or another language is ultimately a matter of personal choice and that individuals in the so-called periphery make these choices consciously based on weighing the benefits and drawbacks of using a given language[2] (regardless of the original intentions of leaders in the alleged imperialistic countries).

In a nonkilling society, these choices are easier to make because language use is not seen as part of an "either/or" paradigm in which languages are disseminated (rather than spread) for purposes of domination. Since human beings have an infinite capacity for language acquisition, if we could remove the fear that language could be used as a weapon of domination and subjugation, then individuals would be free to make these choices based on functional needs and personal interests. In that kind of society, we would also be able to abandon all metaphorical references to killing vis-à-vis languages of wider communication, e.g., "killer languages," as used by Skutnabb-Kangas (2000) to refer to English and other dominant languages, and we would focus on a language's capacity to bring people together instead while maintaining diversity and a healthy ecosystem of languages.

Respect for Language Change

Languages go through a natural process of birth, change and death. Many times the "death" of a language actually means that it changed so much that it gave birth to new varieties which in time became so independent (and ultimately partially or totally unintelligible) that these varieties originate new languages.

---

[2] It is our belief that in former colonial contexts, the languages first introduced through imperial power have come to change so as to express the culture, values and linguistic choices of their users and have therefore defied the colonial structures that first brought them there. (See also Mufwene, 2001).

Geopolitical phenomena also contribute to such a development because these new languages, by virtue of being embedded in different societies with different state-ruling and outside influences, continue the process of differentiation and modification. That was the case, for example, of Latin and such languages as Portuguese, Spanish, French, Italian and Romanian. Because of spread and then concentration in different regions, different outside influences, and even different climates, what was once one (Latin) became many (Romance languages). So languages also die because their functional uses have ceased, no new native speakers exist and, as a consequence, linguistic change within that language becomes stagnated.

Language change will occur whether we like it or not. In a nonkilling society, however, the process of language death is not accelerated unnaturally because linguistic decisions are forced upon language users; nor is language change arbitrarily stopped in the name of language purism. In a nonkilling society, there is no policy impeding users to employ a given language and no violent and unnatural attempts to impact the ecosystem of languages. Legislation exists to protect individual linguistic choice but not to forbid it (see also the section on North Korea in Kaplan and R. B. Baldauf, eds., 2003 and the work of Baldauf Jr. and Kaplan, 2003).

On the other hand, in a nonkilling society individuals are not punished for engaging in linguistic change processes. Change is not seen as corruption, impurity, or error. It is seen as a natural process of linguistic evolution, one which is brought about by social transformation and/or one which aims at transforming society as well.

Respect for Language Teachers, Language Learners, and Users with Special Language Needs

Language learning environments are not immune to some of the problems which plague other spheres of our society. In fact, in many cultures, learning settings suffer from a lack of resources and conditions because education has yet to be recognized in real and concrete terms as an important part of the foundation of any society which values human development. As a result, too often we see teachers working from a position of scarcity, with fewer resources than minimally necessary to perform their duties adequately. In other places, while the infrastructure is adequate, educational decisions are made capriciously or in the name of political interests.

In a nonkilling society educators are given a prominent social role because members of such a society recognize that violence is to a great de-

gree a result of ignorance. Once we empower (the term is used in the *Freirean* sense) individuals to the point that they feel the safety of being in control of their own future (and education can do just that), they can feel less inclined to resort to violence.

In a nonkilling society, we empower language teachers, and in fact all teachers by offering them a safe, clean and appropriate environment in which to work. We compensate them with fair wages for the important service they provide, and we encourage them to make pedagogical decisions based on sound knowledge and experience, not on their political impact.

By supporting the work of teachers, we directly affect the lives of students and consequently the whole social structure in which they are embedded. The classroom has been shown to be a perfect site for peace education, peace linguistics education, and for discussing ecological concerns vis-à-vis languages with the students (Crystal, 2004). Any society which places education anywhere but in a prominent position is bound to be faced with ignorance which in turn breeds violence, disrespect for human dignity and a relentless sense of underdevelopment. On the other hand, any society which values education and places it amongst the strategic elements greatly contributing to social justice and dialogue (also as understood by Freire), is on its way to greater social inclusion and ultimately nonkilling potential.

People with language-related disabilities (e.g., hearing and speech impairment and impediment, paralysis impacting speech production, aphasia) also have a right to education and communication in a dignified manner. We have the opportunity to provide them with tools, adaptive technology and other forms of support to allow them to express themselves, to claim their rights, and to contribute to their communities. In a nonkilling society the rights of all language users, including those with language-related disabilities are not only acknowledged but also, and more importantly, observed.

Upholding of a Vocabulary of Peace rather than One of War

Because language changes both to *reflect* social transformation and to *affect* such transformation (e.g., we created the word "computer" because society had changed and needed it, but we employ politically correct terms because we want to change society), revising our metaphors to express a preoccupation with peace is a necessary step to becoming nonkilling. In that paradigm, as mentioned elsewhere in this chapter, terms such as "killer languages" (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2000: 46), which is attributed to Singaporean linguist Anne Pakir, are replaced with peace fostering ones. We stop the

"fight" for human rights and start the educational process toward upholding such rights. We do not scare social groups into action by denouncing the "war on the middle class" but instead establish a dialogue in which different constituencies in society can pursue social justice.

Within that paradigm we also avoid resorting to "scare tactics" or appeals to fear to sell products or change one's mind. Everywhere, from political campaigns to television commercials, we emphasize the positive rather than the negative. Fear tactics only make us perceive reality as one of danger rather than harmony, and fear only fuels violence. On the other hand, wise linguistic choices can help change our perception and act more sensibly toward one another.

Forging of New "Humanizers"

Although linguists kept refining their enumeration of aspects of language, one trait was conspicuously absent: the humanizing nature of language use. Thus, in Gomes de Matos (1994) a plea was made for such a conceptual gap to be filled, since by merely stating that language is human we do not do justice to its humanizing power. Humanizing has to do with both acknowledging language as a system shared by human beings as well as investing in making language humane. Realistically, such characterization of language would be worded so as to cover both its humanizing and dehumanizing power, after all, linguists such as Bolinger (1980) and Crystal and Crystal (2000) have already expressed that language unfortunately can be employed as a weapon (Gomes de Matos, 2006: 159).

Humanizers are persons imbued with the ideals of human rights, justice, and peace and who apply such values in everyday interaction. In such spirit, language users, depending on their humanizing or dehumanizing uses of languages, can be described as Humanizers or Dehumanizers, and of course we need many of the former. While language is a mental marvel for meaning-making used by members of one or more communities in varied sociocultural contexts for humanizing or dehumanizing purposes, the latter dimension seems to have received the most interest by linguists, especially when dealing with detrimental effects of language use. Jay (1999), for example, adopts a neuro-psycho-social approach for developing a theory of speech that can be explanatory of cursing. Of interest to researchers in Nonkilling Linguistics is his section on "Do words wound?" in which he summarizes research on harmful, psychological effects of words on listeners. It seems appropriate for us as humanizers to ask that linguists take fur-

ther interest in investigating the neurological, psychological and social makings of a theory of language which explains positive uses of language such as praising, comforting, and reassuring. Additionally, we need linguists, psychologists, sociologists and language users in general to employ their time, energy and knowledge in becoming humanizers themselves.

Implications for an Applied Peace Linguistics

An awareness of or conscientization about the need for a Nonkilling Society not only helps shed light on an equally needed Nonkilling Linguistics but also provides insights on actions to be implemented which can contribute to the rise and development of an Applied Peace Linguistics. Among the implications which could be drawn, derived from an initial study of Nonkilling Linguistics as presented here, five stand out:

a) Nonkilling Linguistics prioritizes nonkilling, peaceful, humanizing uses of languages at the individual, group, community, national, and international levels.
b) Nonkilling Linguistics needs to interact with many other fields so as to help build an interdisciplinary approach to Nonkilling communication, in varied types of societies.
c) The preparation of Nonkilling linguists calls for a keen perception and thorough analysis of both constructive and destructive ways of interacting intra- and internationally, in face-to-face or online situations.
d) Nonkilling Linguistics can also be thought of as a humanizing realization of an
e) Applied Peace Linguistics. As such, it should be able to join other interdisciplinary areas within the ever-growing macro-field of Applied Linguistics. For an overview of the latter, see Kaplan (2002).
f) A steady, universal increase in the number of killings and homicides—sometimes deplorably labeled "justifiable"—calls for immediate nonkilling action by all individuals and organizations committed to protecting and preserving human linguistic health and life.

May we close this section with a plea for the systematic application of principles and practices of Nonkilling Linguistics all over the world. May Glenn Paige's prophetic, transformative wisdom of a Nonkilling Society also influence the work of linguists committed to helping improve the living conditions of human beings as language users at the service of universal, communicative Peace.

Conclusion

Our list of elements connecting language and peace or language and nonkilling ideas could go on for a long time. It would come to include the importance of empathy and sensitivity to different rhetorical patterns in cross-cultural communication (e.g., Kaplan, 1966; Hofstede, 1980; Friedrich et al., 2006). It would also describe the need to respect and preserve linguistic artifacts, from books to original manuscripts, so often destroyed for political reasons. What all of the elements above and the many still missing from the list have in common is their central role in making human beings, in their uniqueness as producers of complex linguistic expression, feel included, valued, and reverenced (see also Lee, Mikesell, Joaquin, Mates, and Schumann, 2009). Respect for human communication and human dignity is paramount to building a nonkilling society and as such should be pursued in all aspects of our lives.

Languages per se are not dehumanizing, lethal, or killing
It is the linguistic choices made by the users that may be
The new, universal challenge school systems could be facing
Has to do with why and how nonkilling language uses should be
May all education systems their citizens prepare
As communicative beings of an unprecedented kind
By assuring them of a human right beyond compare
Learning to use languages for the good of humankind.

References

American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language (2001). Boston: HoughtonMifflin.

Austin, P. K.; Simpson, A. (2008). "Introduction," in Austin, Peter K.; Simpson, Andrew, eds. *Endangered Languages*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Velarg.

Baldauf Jr., R. B.; Kaplan, R. B. (2003) "Language Policy Decisions and Power: Who are the Actors?" Ryan, P. M.; Terborg, R., Eds. *Language: Issues of Inequality.* México, D.F.: Universidad National Autónoma de México, pp. 19-40.

Bender, L., producer; Tarantino, Q., director (2003). *Kill Bill* (vol. I) [Motion picture]. United States: Miramax Films.

Bolinger, D. (1980). *Language, the Loaded Weapon: The Use and Abuse of Language Today.* London: Longman.

Brosnan, P.; Del Rio, R.; Furst, B.; Furst, S.; St. Clair, B., producers; Shepard, R., director (2005). *The Matador* [Motion picture]. United States: Stratus Film Co.

Crystal, D. (1999). *The Penguin Dictionary of Language*. London: Penguin.

Crystal, D.; Crystal, H. (2000). *Words on Words: Quotations about Language and languages.* London: Penguin.

Crystal, D. (2004). "Creating a World of Languages," Introductory Speech presented at the 10th Linguapax Congress, Barcelona, FIPLV (International Federation of Language Teacher Associations), *World News*, 61:22-35.

Dobbs, L. (2006). *War on the Middle Class: How the Government, Big Business, and Special Interest Groups Are Waging War on the American Dream and How to Fight Back*. New York: Viking Adult.

Elvin, W.; Grisham, J.; Lowry, H.; Milchan, A.; Nathanson, M. G., producers; Shumacher, J., director. (1996). *A Time to Kill* [Motion picture]. United States: Regency Enterprises.

Fishman, J., ed. (2001). *Can Threatened Languages be Saved?* Clevedon: Multilingual.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Fought, C. (2002). "California students' Perceptions of, You Know, Regions and Dialelects?" in Long, Daniel; Preston, Dennis, eds. *Handbook of Perceptual Dialectology*, Volume II. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Friedrich, P.; Mesquita, L.; Hatum, A. (2006). "The Meaning of Difference: Cultural and Managerial Homogeneity Stereotypes of Latin America," *Management Research*, 4(1):53-71.

Friedrich, P. (2007a). "English for Peace: Toward a Framework of Peace Sociolinguistics," *World Englishes*, 26(1):72-83.

Friedrich, Patricia (2007b). *Language, Negotiation and Peace: The Use of English in Conflict Resolution*. London: Continuum Books.

Galtung, J. (1964). "A Structural Theory of Aggression," *Journal of Peace Research*, 1(2):95-119.

Glazier, S. (1997). *Word Menu*. New York: Random House.

Gomes de Matos, F. (1976). *Linguistica aplicada ao ensino de inglês*. São Paulo: McGraw-Hill do Brasil.

Gomes de Matos, F. (1994). "A Thesis 20 Years On: The Theory-Praxis of the Rights of Language Learners," in Barbara, Leila; Scott, Mike, eds., *Reflections on Language Learning: In honour of Antonieta Celani*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Gomes de Matos, F. (1996). *Pedagogia da Positividade: comunicação construtiva em Português*. Recife: Editora da Universidade Federal de Pernambuco.

Gomes de Matos, F. (2001). "Applying the Pedagogy of Positiveness to Diplomatic Communication," in Kurbalija, Jovan; Slavik, Hannah, eds. *Language and Diplomacy*. Msida: DiploProjects.

Gomes de Matos, F. (2002). *Comunicar para o bem: rumo à paz comunicativa*. São Paulo: Editora Ave-Maria, 2002.

Gomes de Matos, F. (2005). "Using peaceful language," in *Encyclopedia of Life-Support Systems*. Oxford: EOLOSS Publishers.

Gomes de Matos, F. (2006). "Language, Peace, and Conflict Resolution," in Deutsch, Morton; Coleman, Peter T.; Marcus, Eric C., eds., *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gomes de Matos, F. (2008). "Learning to Communicate Peacefully," in Bajaj, Monisha, ed., *Online Encyclopedia of Peace Education*. See: <http://www.tc.edu/centers/epe/>.

Gordon, Raymond G., Jr., ed. (2005). *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*, Fifteenth edition. Dallas: SIL International. See: <http://www.ethnologue.com/>.

Gottlieb, N. (2008). "Japan: Language Planning and Policy in Transition," in Kaplan, R. K.; Baldauf, Jr., R. B., eds., *Asia, Vol. 1: Japan, Nepal and Taiwan and Chinese Characters*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, pp. 102-169.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Hymes, D. (1966). "Two Types of Linguistic Relativity (with Examples from Amerindian Ethnography," in Bright, William, ed., *Sociolinguistics*: The Hague: Mouton, pp. 131-156.

Jay, T. (1999). *Why We Curse: A Neuro-Psycho-Social Theory of Speech*. Philadelphia; Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kaplan, R. (1966). "Cultural Thought Patterns in Intercultural Education," *Language Learning*, 16(1):1-20.

Kaplan, R.B., ed. (2002). *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Kaplan, R.R.; Baldauf, R. B., eds. (2003). *Language and Language-in-Education Planning in the Pacific Basin*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Krauss, M. (1992). "The World's Languages in Crisis," *Language*, 68(1):6-10.

Lee, N.; Mikesell, L.; Joaquin, A.D.L.; Mates, A. W.; Schumann, J. H. (2009). *The Interactional Instinct: The Evolution and Acquisition of Language.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Maffi, L. (2001). *On Biocultural Diversity: Linking Language, Knowledge, and the Environment.* Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Maltin, L. (2008). *2009 Movie Guide*. New York: Signet.

Mufwene, S. S. (2001). *The Ecology of Language Evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mühlhäusler, P. (2003). *Language of Environment, Environment of Language: A Course in Ecolinguistics.* London: Battlebridge.

Paige, G. (2009). Nonkilling *Global Political Science*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Random House Webster's College Dictionary of the English Language (1995). New York: Random House.

Rector, M. (2003). "Review of Frascisco Gomes de Matos, *Comunicar para o Bem: rumo à paz comunicativa*," *Hispania, Journal of the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese*, 86(3):529-531.

Saunders, H. H. (1999). *A Public Peace Process: Sustained Dialogue to Transform Racial and Ethnic Conflicts*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Scanlon, C.; Singh, M. (2006). "Theorizing the Decline of Linguistic Diversity," *International Journal of the Sociology of language*, 182:1-24.
Smith, Rhona K. M. (2000). "Preserving Linguistic Heritage. A Study of Scots Gaelic," *International Journal of Minority and Group Rights*, 7(3):173-187.
Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2008 [2000]). *Linguistic Genocide in Education-or Worldwide Diversity and Human Rights?* London: Longman Orient.
Wurm, S. (2001). *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger of Disappearing*. Paris: UNESCO.

Appendix

Here is the full list of terms positivized by the prefix NON. We invite you to add your own contribution to the list.

NONaggression, nonanimosity, nonantagonism, nonattack(ing), nonatrocity
NONbelligerance, nonbrutality, nonbombing, nonbombarding
NONconspiracy, noncealment
NONdestrution, nondevastation, nondiscrimination, nondomination
NONexploitation, nonexplosion, nonextermination, nonescalation
NONfrightening, nonfear
NONgore
NONharassment, nonhatred, nonhumiliation
NONintimidation, noninvasion, nonintervension
NONjeopardy, nonjeer
NONKILLING
NONlethality
NONmurdering
NONnegativity, nonnegativism
NONoffending, nonoppression
NONpersecution
NONquarreling
NONretaliation
NONslandering, nonslaughter
NONterror(ism), nontorture, nonthreat(ing)
NONusurpation
NONVIOLENCE, nonvillainy, nonvillification, nonvengeance
NONwar, nonwarmaking, nonwickedness
NONxenophobia
NONzealotry

Chapter Two

Language, Early Education, and Nonkilling

How can students by Human Rights Education be impressed?
What happens educationally when students are oppressed?
When, where, and how are students' rights being expressed?
Universally, what kinds of students' rights are being suppressed?

Teaching Peace Peacefully

A Call for Collaborative Dialogue Within Peace Education, Nonkilling Linguistics, and Early Childhood Education

Lauren Chamberlain
Arizona State University

Introduction

Both peace education scholars and linguists have noted the critical role that language plays in peacebuilding and conflict resolution efforts (Friedrich, 2007; Friedrich and Gomes de Matos, 2009; Wenden, 2003). Language not only shapes the tone and nature of our interactions with others, but also reflects culturally-embedded 'root metaphors' that reveal implicit beliefs about how such interactions can and should take place (Hook, 1984; Bowers, 2003). Nonkilling linguistics has emerged to highlight the ways in which language itself can foster the development of more peaceful societies by expressing an explicit respect for life in all its forms.

This chapter argues that the emergence of nonkilling linguistics as a growing field has exciting implications for early childhood education. In particular, it examines how the principles of nonkilling linguistics overlap with what is considered 'developmentally-appropriate practice' in early childhood education, and highlights a number of common goals between the fields. In so doing, this chapter seeks to bridge communication among the fields of peace education, nonkilling linguistics, and early childhood education, and suggests several possible avenues for interdisciplinary collaboration. Such dialogue and collaboration, it is argued, offers significant benefits for all three fields, including: 1. higher levels of academic success among children in schools; 2. enhanced effectiveness within youth violence prevention and social skill development programs; and 3. greater opportunities for applying the principles of nonkilling linguistics to new areas, contributing to a societal shift toward peaceful communication and resolution of conflicts in the interest of protecting both human and nonhuman life.

To explore these issues in greater depth, this chapter is divided into three major sections. Section one begins with an exploration of critical applied linguistics and its emphasis on the power of language to shape our perceptions of

the world. Nonkilling linguistics is described as a natural extension of critical applied linguistics, in which language is seen not only as a tool for reproducing power relations, but also as a vehicle for deconstructing harmful ideologies while promoting peaceful interactions within and across societies.

Section two describes efforts to incorporate these understandings into peace education, and explores the extent to which critical linguistics and peace linguistics have influenced peace education efforts. It describes, in particular, the rise of peace education programs on the international stage, and contrasts this trend with the implementation of 'conflict resolution' and 'violence prevention' programs in schools throughout the United States. It then examines recent research on the effectiveness of such programs toward reducing youth violence and promoting a culture of peace. This section concludes by highlighting parallels between "what works" in violence prevention and core principles of peace and nonkilling linguistics, thus arguing for the development of school-based peace education programs with an explicit peace linguistics focus.

Section three argues that peace linguistics principles are particularly well-suited for early childhood education settings, and argues that applying these principles could contribute significantly toward the creation of highly effective peace education programs for young children. Drawing on existing overlaps between peace linguistics and developmentally appropriate practice for early childhood education, I argue that a peace linguistics approach would enhance the quality of early childhood programs while also contributing to the creation of more peaceful societies.

Section three also describes existing efforts to promote peace through early childhood education, and examines several possible opportunities for enhancing early childhood curriculum through an emphasis on peace linguistics. Classroom conversations and dramatic play are described as prime settings for developmentally appropriate peace education practices. Finally, the paper concludes by calling on scholars and practitioners within nonkilling linguists, peace education, and early childhood education to design new and innovative opportunities for collaboration in order to develop more effective practices and research within each field.

Critical Linguistics and the Emergence of Nonkilling Linguistics

Beginning in the early 1980s, scholars in the field of critical applied linguistics have argued for a closer examination of the role that language plays in shaping how we view the world and how these views, in turn, shape reality itself. Hook (1984), Lakoff and Johnson (1980), and Bowers (2003) have de-

scribed how linguistic metaphors implicitly frame our understandings of (and attitudes toward) new concepts and ideas, while, in many cases, legitimizing political manipulation and social control. Gorevski (1998) argued that seemingly neutral "discursive practices" often reveal deeply embedded biases and beliefs, which in turn reproduce social inequalities and even violent behaviors. Wenden (2003:170-171) summarized many of these findings, noting that language "actually shapes and gives meaning to human experience, influencing actual practice and the way in which people think about particular objects, events, and situations". Through a close examination of "linguistic macro-structures" and "micro-structures," Wenden explores how the way we format our arguments, structure our papers, and choose our words all serve to either reinforce or resist dominant ideologies; such linguistic structures, in turn, shape both personal and political decisions from local to global levels.

Until recently, however, few scholars had applied these findings directly to peace research, and the role of language in peace and conflict has remained relatively unexplored (Wenden, 2003). Peace linguistics and, more recently, nonkilling linguistics emerged largely in response to this absence; researchers in both fields argue that, while language has often served as a tool for reinforcing existing power structures, it can also form the basis for comprehensive social transformation (Friedrich and Gomes de Matos, 2009: 221). Friedrich (2009: 29) has thus described peace linguistics as a study of the "intersection of peace, language, communication and power, and urges scholars to explore how language can be used to fundamentally reshape the way humans interact with each other and with other forms of life.

As an interdisciplinary field with ties to both linguistics and peace studies, peace linguistics argues that *how* we teach about peace is as important as *what* we teach about peace. Applied peace linguist Gomes de Matos has described these two areas of focus as "communicating about peace" and "communicating peacefully, constructively, humanizingly" (2000: 339). Both principles seek to counteract violent ideologies and unjust social metaphors through a careful examination of the roots of violence and prospects for peacebuilding, on the one hand, and by cultivating respect for life and diversity through the use of humanizing language, on the other.

Peace Linguistics and Peace Education: Challenges and Opportunities

While rarely stated explicitly, emerging research in peace studies points to significant overlaps between the principles of peace linguistics and effective peace education programs, highlighting the need for increased collabo-

ration between both fields. For example, Danesh (2006), Toh (2002), and Vriens (1997, 1999) have argued that peace education programs are most effective when they are both multifaceted and comprehensive; such programs, they assert, must work to inform children and youth about human rights and social justice issues, provide tools for resolving conflicts peacefully, and contribute toward the cultivation of a 'culture of peace' within educational settings and the broader community. Moreover, several scholars note the powerful impact that peace education programs can play in shifting worldviews among participating youth, particularly among youth in regions of protracted conflict (Danesh, 2006; Salomon, 2004). Such findings emphasize the critical role that language plays in effective peacebuilding efforts, and supports a collaborative, multi-disciplinary approach to peace education.

The following section describes the emergence of peace education programs in various regions throughout the world, and explores critical questions that have developed in relation to this emergence. In particular, this section examines recent research on the effectiveness of peace education and violence prevention programs, and argues that the principles of critical linguistics and peace linguistics may help to explain the degree to which such programs have been successful in reaching their intended goals. Throughout, this section argues that increased collaboration between the fields of peace linguistics and peace education could significantly enhance efforts to reduce violence and cultivate a 'culture of peace' through youth education programs.

Peace Education on the International Stage: Creating Cultures of Peace

Since the 1990s, several factors have contributed to a rising interest in peace education programs, both in the United States and around the world. As the twentieth century came to a close, a number of international organizations began to explore how global society might shift away from the wars and violent conflicts that had so plagued the previous hundred years. Many of these organizations saw education as a critical tool in expanding global awareness around alternative approaches to conflict. On July 29, 1998, the United Nations Economic and Social Council put forth a resolution to declare 2001-2010 an "International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Nonviolence for the Children of the World". Having previously defined a 'culture of peace' as a set of

> values, attitudes, modes of behaviour and ways of life that reject violence and prevent conflicts by tackling their root causes to solve problems through dialogue and negotiation among individuals, groups and nations (UN, 1998).

The resolution called upon member states to foster such a culture "by teaching the practice of peace and non-violence to children" in both formal and informal educational settings (para. 7). The resolution, which was adopted by the UN General Assembly in 2000, launched a series of efforts by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to promote an international peacebuilding movement with peace education at its center. Throughout these efforts, UNESCO urged nations around the world to "revis[e] curricula to promote the qualitative values, attitudes and behaviour inherent in a culture of peace; training for conflict prevention and resolution, dialogue, consensus-building and active non-violence" (UNESCO, 2002: 6).

While UNESCO's efforts to promote a culture of peace garnered a great deal of international attention, this organization was certainly not alone in advocating for peace education on a global scale. In 1999, the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) put forth its first working paper on peace education, in which it affirmed a commitment to a "vision of basic education as a process that encompasses the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values needed to live peacefully in an interdependent world" (Fountain, 1). That same year, member organizations making up the Hague Appeal for Peace formed the Global Campaign for Peace Education (GCPE). In its founding Campaign Statement, the GCPE argued that

> A culture of peace will be achieved when citizens of the world understand global problems; have the skills to resolve conflict constructively; know and live by international standards of human rights, gender and racial equality; appreciate cultural diversity; and respect the integrity of the Earth. Such learning can not be achieved without intentional, sustained and systematic education for peace (para. 1).

Some thirty years before, Johan Galtung similarly defined the term 'positive peace' as the presence of social justice and equality within and among societies, differentiating it from 'negative peace,' which he described as merely the absence of direct violence (1969). Today, both "culture of peace" and "positive peace" are used widely by scholars to describe the aims and vision of peace education.

Since the launching of the International Decade for a Culture of Peace in 2001, a wide array of peace education programs have been implemented in countries and regions around the world. As these programs have expanded and evolved, a number of critical questions surrounding peace education have emerged. This section will address three such questions, and explore how a peace linguistics approach could contribute to the discussion in each

of these areas. These questions include: 1. What have peace education programs taught us about the nature of conflict? 2. What should peace education programs include? and 3. What impacts have peace education programs had, both on participants and on the broader community?

What have peace education programs taught us about the nature of conflict?

While the content and methodology of peace education programs vary greatly from program to program and from region to region (Salomon, 2002), the expansion of global peace education since the 1990s has led to the emergence of several common themes relating to issues of peace and conflict. Most notably perhaps, is the widely-accepted notion among peace theorists that violence is learned, rather than innate, and that violent approaches to conflict are reinforced through economic, political, and social structures, institutions, and ideologies (Anamio, 2004). Peace theorists argue that a culture of peace can, therefore, also be learned through a systemic reshaping of these same structures. The Seville Statement on Violence, drafted in 1986 by scientists from around the world, challenged "alleged biological findings that have been used, even by some in our disciplines, to justify violence and war," arguing that such findings were "scientifically incorrect" and politically-charged. The scientists concluded their Statement by asserting that

> humanity can be freed from the bondage of biological pessimism and empowered with confidence to undertake the transformative tasks needed in this International Year of Peace and in the years to come. .... Just as 'wars begin in the minds of men', peace also begins in our minds. The same species who invented war is capable of inventing peace. The responsibility lies with each of us.

The Seville Statement has since become a guiding document for peace educators around the world.

While scientists may have been among the first to assert the socially constructed nature of violence, social scientists from a variety of fields (including peace studies) have helped to develop more complex understandings of how such socialization toward violent conflict takes place. Bar-Tal and Rosen (2009: 558), for example, assert that intractable conflicts in regions throughout the world are fueled, in large part, by "an evolved culture of conflict that is dominated by societal beliefs of collected memory". Scholars further note the central role of education in forming and reinforcing such a culture, both through daily interactions among students and school staff, and through the content and character of lessons themselves (Bar-Tal and Rosen, 2009;

Danesh, 2006) Peace education, it is argued, must, therefore, work to deconstruct violent narratives and ideologies, while simultaneously promoting a culture of peace (Vriens, 1997; Danesh, 2006; Kupermintz and Salomon, 2005).

The guiding principles underlying peace education—namely, that violent conflict is learned and can be 'unlearned' through the construction of alternative narratives—highlights the important role that language plays in creating a culture of peace, and suggests that the incorporation of peace linguistics into peace education research could further enhance efforts toward this goal.

What topics and goals should peace education address?

While all peace education programs seek to reduce violence and promote peaceful societal interactions, the scope and goals of such programs have been widely discussed and debated among peace education scholars. Clarke-Habibi (2005: 33-34) notes that peace education programs around the globe have dealt with a broad range of topics, from "communication skills" and "conflict resolution techniques" to "environmental responsibility," "human rights awareness" and "coexistence". The topics covered, she argues, depend largely on the overarching goals of a given program. Historically, such goals have commonly fallen under one of four distinct categories, in which peace education is seen, primarily, as "conflict resolution training", "democracy education", or "human rights awareness training" (Clarke-Habibi, 2005: 35-36).

In recent years, however, more and more peace scholars have begun to argue for a holistic approach to peace education, in which students learn to build peace in a variety of ways, throughout all levels of society (Danesh, 2006; Toh, 2002 and 2010; Kester, 2008). Such an approach sees topics such as nonviolent conflict resolution, demilitarization, and environmental sustainability as interconnected components of a larger culture of peace, in which "conflict-based worldviews are replaced...with peace-based worldviews" (Danesh, 2006: 58).

Several comprehensive peace education models currently exist to address these goals, which have been applied in different settings under a variety of societal circumstances (Kester, 2008). Toh (2002: 92), for example, argues that "peace education can and, indeed, must emerge in the very midst of violence" and advocates for a holistic, nonlinear approach to program design, in which "values formation," "dialogue," and "critical empowerment" are interwoven throughout the peace curriculum. Danesh (2006: 61), on the other hand, asserts that comprehensive peace education programs should progress gradually through several stages. He argues that such programs must begin by working to build a "unity-based worldview" among participants, which will, in turn, lay the foundation for a "culture of healing" in which fear is slowly re-

leased and "a safe and positive atmosphere of trust" is allowed to flourish among students and within their respective communities.

In more recent years, Bar-Tal and Rosen (2009) have differentiated between what they call 'indirect' and 'direct' models of peace education, and argue that practitioners must take into account the level of political and social support for peacebuilding and reconciliation when determining the appropriate model for a given society. According to Bar-Tal and Rosen, direct peace education models, which examine the historical and structural roots of a local conflict, work well when the majority of society members hold favorable attitudes toward peace and reconciliation. On the other hand, indirect peace education, in which students explore broad themes, such as "tolerance, ethno-empathy, human rights, and conflict resolution" (2009: 564), may be better suited for societies in which members are not yet ready to change "their conflict-related repertoire, which includes collective memory and an ethos of conflict" (2009: 561).

Despite their varied approaches, Toh, Danesh, and Bar-Tal and Rosen all describe similar goals for peace education, and assert that effective programs must provide opportunities for learning about peacebuilding and reconciliation throughout all elements of the school day. Moreover, each of the scholars described above argue that peace education must ultimately contribute to a cultural shift toward nonviolence, empathy, and inclusion.

A nonkilling linguistics approach to peace education supports such a cultural shift. Through an explicit examination of the linguistic 'macro-structures' and 'micro-structures' embedded within a given conflict, peace educators can more effectively design curriculum that affirms peace and rejects killing, while at the same time helping students to critically analyze the messages they receive from various sources throughout their daily life. Moreover, by emphasizing both "communicating about peace" and "communicating in peaceful ways", peace education curricula could contribute toward a culture of healing and reconciliation while also providing tools for building a society based on peace.

What impacts have peace education programs had, both on participants and on the broader community?

In his article, "Does Peace Education Make a Difference in the Case of an Intractable Conflict?" Salomon noted that "Despite the large number of peace education programs and projects taking place all over the world...there is very little research and program evaluation to accompany such activities" (2004: 261). However, in the past five to ten years, peace

education research has begun to shift toward evaluating the impact of such programs. Significant work remains to be done in this area; however, despite a number of challenges faced by peace education programs, recent evaluative studies show several reasons for cautious optimism.

Throughout his article, Salomon describes results from several case studies in which researchers have analyzed the effectiveness of various approaches to peacebuilding through education. Within these studies, researchers have found a number of barriers that have impeded efforts to build a culture of peace among participants. For example, Salomon notes that "face-to-face encounter[s] between members of groups in conflict," while common in peace education programs, have frequently proven problematic (2004: 261). In many cases, despite the quality of interactions among students during these (often brief) program activities, participants must eventually return to "unsupportive home environments" (2004: 262) and societal institutions that often fundamentally reject peacebuilding efforts, thus making it difficult for participants on either side of the conflict to sustain attitudes and beliefs that run counter to dominant narratives.

However, Salomon also points to a number of positive outcomes that have emerged from more sustained peace education efforts. Drawing on results from peace education programs among Israeli-Jewish and Palestinian high school students (Lustig, 2002; Biton, 2002; Bar-Natan, 2004) and adults (Bar-On, 2000), Salomon noted several significant peacebuilding achievements, including increased abilities among participants to describe their own conflict from the perspective of the 'opposing' side; more complex understandings of positive peace concepts, reduced adherence to a sense of "victimhood", and "greater acceptance of members of the other group" (2004: 269-270).

In addition to Salomon's research, several other case studies highlight several promising outcomes among a variety of peace education models. Moffat (2004: 18) used surveys and interviews to evaluate a peer mediation program at an integrated Protestant/Catholic school in Northern Ireland; while acknowledging the limitations of such an approach to program evaluation, Moffat noted that student and teacher responses suggested that the program had helped to create a "tolerant and cooperative school culture". An evaluation of a United States-based peace camp for Georgian and Abkhaz youth between 1998 and 2000 (Ohanyan and Lewis, 2005: 73) showed modest success; while the authors noted that "the impact of interethnic contact and peace education was less pronounced in changing attitudes than hoped," Ohanyan and Lewis did find an increase in "willingness to cooperate on joint projects" among program participants. Finally,

Clarke-Habibi's (2005: 33) publication reporting on the Education for Peace (EFP) pilot program in Bosnia and Herzegovina found "transformative results among intrapersonal, interpersonal, inter-community and inter-institutional relations" among students and teachers over a two-year implementation period. Findings from this study were primarily anecdotal, highlighting a need for more thorough follow-up evaluations to determine the long-term impacts of this particular peace education program. However, it is worth noting that the Bosnia/Herzegovina EFP program represents the most comprehensive of all peace education programs described above. If future evaluations confirm Clarke-Habibi's findings, these results will further support claims among peace scholars who assert that comprehensive, multi-layered peace education programs yield the greatest levels of success.

Here, as in other areas of peace education research described throughout this section, peace linguistics has a great deal to contribute to program evaluation efforts. By examining the language used among participants in peace education programs, evaluators could track changes in students' discourses, attitudes, and beliefs over time. Moreover, by documenting the language used by teachers during instruction, and analyzing the ideologies and perspectives expressed through curricular materials, peace linguistics could help to highlight areas for future improvement in peace education programs themselves.

Recent research in the field of peace education has led to significant advances in understandings of the purpose and impact of peace education programs in conflict regions around the world. This section has argued that the lessons taken from such studies highlight a need for increased collaboration between peace educators and peace linguists. Given the critical role that language plays in shaping discourse and ideologies, a peace linguistics approach to peace education could help to focus efforts aimed at shifting worldviews through the use of humanizing, unifying language. Moreover, by referring back to the two main pillars of peace linguistics, namely, 'communicating about peace' and 'communicating in peaceful ways', peace linguistics could assist peace education programs by ensuring that both areas of focus are integrated throughout the peace education curriculum.

This section concludes by describing the emergence of school-based 'violence prevention' programs in the United States, and argues that several distinct historical factors contributed to the implementation of narrowly-focused programs that have often failed to meet the goals of either comprehensive peace education or peace linguistics. Many such programs, consequently, have had limited positive impacts on communities, and, in some cases, have even made aggressive behaviors worse among participating

youth (Elliot, 1998). Contrasting these efforts with internationally based peace education programs, this section highlights how a shift to a peace linguistics-based approach to peace education in the United States could help in the shift toward more effective school-based programs.

Prevention Without Peace? Violence Prevention Programs in United States Schools

In recent decades, most peace education programs around the globe have focused their efforts on youth in areas of prolonged and often intractable conflicts (Salomon, Bar-Tal and Rosen, Danesh, Toh). Many have made reference to publications by the United Nations (1998, 2000) and UNESCO (2002) in designing programs for youth that contribute toward the creation of a 'culture of peace'; moreover, most peace scholars call for comprehensive approaches to peace education that help participants develop "peace-based worldviews" (Danesh, 2006).

In the United States, by contrast, relatively little discussion has taken place around the topic of peace education since the United Nations declared its International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Nonviolence in 2000. While many university-level peace studies programs emerged in the United States in the 1980s (Harris, 2006), the percentage of colleges and universities offering degree programs in the field remains comparatively small. Moreover, peace education programs remain notably absent among elementary and secondary schools across the country.

However, while policy-makers and the media remain largely silent on the topic of peace in United States schools, violence among school-aged youth has been the subject of many heated debates since the 1980s, and remains largely contested to this day. According to Tolan (2001: 1), "the upsurge in lethal youth violence in the 1980s and mid-1990s prompted legal and social welfare attention in the search for effective responses". Beginning in the early 1990s, a variety of legislative and school-based efforts emerged throughout the country in an attempt to curb youth violence; while some such efforts focused on teaching youth pro-social behavioral skills and nonviolent approaches to handling conflicts, a majority of legislative efforts focused on "crack-down" policies designed to act as deterrents to violent behavior (Elliot, 1998; Scott, 2009). Such approaches included the use of "boot camps or shock incarceration programs for young offenders, to instill discipline and respect for authority" and "longer sentences for serious violent crimes" among convicted youth (Elliot, 1998: 1-4). Enforcing crackdown policies, however, placed a high financial burden on states, while "shock/scare type programs...demonstrated harmful effects, increasing the risk of violent or delinquent behavior".

At the same time, school-based attempts to reduce youth violence also faced significant challenges in the United States. As Elliot pointed out, "Under pressure to do something, schools...implemented whatever programs were readily available" (1998: 5). This rush to action, many researchers soon concluded, yielded disheartening results (Tolan and Guerra, 1994; Elliot, 1998; US Surgeon General, 2001). Elliot summarized these findings as follows:

> most of the violence prevention programs currently being employed in the schools, e.g., conflict resolution curriculum, peer mediation, metal detectors, locker searches and sweeps have either not been evaluated or evaluations have failed to establish any significant, sustained deterrent effects. In sum, we are employing a set of programs and policies that have no documented effects on violence (1998: 5).

Since Elliot's initial report in 1998, several follow-up studies have emerged to evaluate the effectiveness of school-based violence prevention programs in the United States (see, for example: Tolan, 2001; Farrell, Meyer, Kung, and Sullivan, 2001; Vaszonyi, Belliston and Flannery, 2004). A meta-analysis of 36 evaluative studies (Park-Higgerson, et al., 2008: 477), however, found there to be "no single protocol governing the conduct of these kinds of studies," making it difficult to determine the reliability of evaluation findings or compare results across studies. Furthermore, their own review of school-based programs described by such studies found that most approaches to violence prevention had "negligible effects" on students, while the most successful approach showed only "a mild positive effect on decreasing aggressive and violent behavior" (id., 465). Such reports indicate continued, significant gaps in our understanding of violence prevention efforts in the United States.

To date, legislators, policy makers, and researchers continue to call for expanded evaluations of US-based violence prevention programs in order to design more effective approaches to reducing youth violence and aggression. However, while this paper agrees that such evaluations are necessary, it furthers asserts that the ideological foundations driving current approaches to violence prevention must also be carefully examined. A critical linguistic analysis of such programs may ask, for example, how an emphasis on preventing *youth violence* has shaped both national and local discourses around prevention, and to what extent such discourses have excluded examinations of the larger societal structures and institutions impacting students' lives. Such an analysis may ask how framing programs as "violence prevention" rather than "peace education" has further shaped the content and tone of such programs. Finally, a critical linguistic analysis may explore

how "appropriate" student behaviors are defined within violence prevention programs, and how these behavioral expectations reinforce values of either 'peace-based' or 'conflict-based' worldviews. Such questions remain, to my knowledge, largely unexplored, and highlight critical opportunities for dialogue among researchers and practitioners in the fields of global peace education, peace linguistics, and violence prevention.

Nonkilling Linguistics and Peace Education in Early Childhood: Enhancing 'Developmentally Appropriate Practice'

The previous section outlined some of the historical and socio-political factors that have contributed to the emergence of peace education and violence prevention programs in different regions throughout the world. While examining the goals, methods, and impacts of various programs, this paper has also explored how the theoretical principles of critical linguistics and peace/nonkilling linguistics could further enhance efforts to design and critically evaluate programs aimed at building more peaceful societies through education. Most of the programs discussed up to this point have been designed for work with adolescents and teens, and have addressed issues such as nonviolent conflict resolution, human rights awareness, and multi-perspectival conflict analysis. While addressing such issues with youth has yielded positive results in a number of settings, this paper argues that both international peace education programs and US-based violence prevention programs have often overlooked a critical opportunity for peacebuilding: early childhood education.

This section explores this opportunity by examining common themes within peace education, nonkilling linguistics, and developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood education. It argues that the principles of nonkilling linguistics and comprehensive peace education are particularly well suited to early childhood settings, and asserts that such an approach could enhance both peacebuilding efforts and early childhood programs. Drawing on findings from studies aimed at reducing early childhood aggression, as well as current research on developmentally appropriate practice, it explores several possible ways in which the principles of nonkilling linguistics and peace education could be applied to existing curricular activities in early childhood classrooms.

Why Early Childhood?

As described in section two, significant research remains to be done to determine 'best practices' in peace education and violence prevention for adolescents and teens. While evaluative studies of such programs have

found some promising results in terms of their ability to strengthen feelings of empathy, enhance understandings of peace concepts, and reduce aggressive responses to conflict among participants, such findings are far from conclusive, and, in many cases, have left researchers with nearly as many questions as answers (see, for example, Park-Higgerson, et al., 2008).

However, within the field of early childhood development, studies exploring aggression and other 'maladaptive' behaviors among very young children have found strong evidence to support the effectiveness of school-based early intervention strategies.

Results from such studies show a strong causal link between positive teacher-child relationships and the development of pro-social behaviors among young children, contributing to reduced aggression and violence, increased empathy and problem-solving skills, and higher rates of academic success throughout the elementary school years, and often into adulthood (Silver, Measelle, Armstrong and Essex, 2005; Levin, 2003; Hawkins, Von Cleve and Catalano, 1991).

Moreover, research on developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood education further emphasizes the importance of building positive relationships and communication skills within early childhood settings (NAEYC, 2009). Such skills support healthy social and emotional development in young children and have been shown to reduce the likelihood of aggressive and violent behaviors later in life (Silver et al. 2005). However, this paper argues that instilling such skills at an early age would also enhance peacebuilding efforts designed to increase empathy and compassion toward people on various sides of a conflict. As such, peace education programs aimed toward early childhood education could effectively support the goals of both fields.

Finally, this section argues that a nonkilling linguistics approach to early childhood peace education could be particularly useful in designing curriculum that is both peace-oriented and developmentally appropriate for young children. Through emphasizing language development, communication skills, and positive relationship-building, nonkilling linguistics provides early childhood educators with opportunities to incorporate peace education throughout their existing curriculum, while also offering new strategies to support healthy cognitive, social, and emotional development among students. Thus, by focusing on both "communicating about peace" and "communicating peacefully," nonkilling linguistics could become the foundation of developmentally appropriate peace education programs for students in all stages of early childhood, and could strengthen peacebuilding efforts for years to come.

Early Childhood Intervention: Scope of Discussion

The term 'early childhood' encompasses the years from birth through age eight, and this paper asserts that an emphasis on nonkilling linguistics among teachers, parents, and other caretakers throughout this critical period could have significant positive impacts on children from a very young age. Family-based interventions, for example, which often emphasize effective parenting techniques and family relationship-building strategies, may prove to be particularly useful in supporting pro-social behaviors and healthy early childhood development among infants and toddlers. Research in the United States has already found family-based interventions to be among the most effective strategies for reducing adolescent violence (Tolan and Guerra, 1994; Elliot, 1998); early childhood psychology research has similarly found positive parenting techniques and strong family relationships to reduce the likelihood of future 'externalizing behaviors' (aggression, opposition, etc.) in young children (Karreman et al., 2009; Eisenberg, et al., 2005; Campbell, Shaw and Gilliom, 2000). Together, these studies suggest that family-based intervention programs may provide a highly effective framework for preventing violence in children from infancy on, and highlights the importance of future research in this area.

However, in order to explore how early childhood education settings could enhance existing efforts in school-based peace education, this section will focus primarily on research dealing with young children in pre-kindergarten though third grade (generally ages four through eight). In so doing, this section seeks to highlight opportunities for dialogue and collaborative action within the fields of nonkilling linguistics, peace education, and early childhood education.

Violence Prevention in Early Childhood: The Impact of Teacher-Child Relationships

A substantial body of research currently exists supporting a strong link between positive teacher-child relationships (characterized by low levels of conflict and high levels of warmth and closeness) and pro-social behavioral development in young children in early childhood classrooms (O'Connor, Dearing and Collins, 2010; Buyse, Verschuern, Verachtert and Van Damme, 2009; Pianta & Stuhlman, 2004; Keinbaum, Volland and Ulich, 2001; Howes, 2000). The positive impacts of such relationships have been shown to extend beyond the early childhood years, benefiting children throughout middle childhood and often into and adolescence (Pianta and Stuhlman,

2004; O'Connor, Dearing and Collins, 2010; Howes, 2000). Moreover, evidence suggests that strong teacher-child relationships support children in a variety of ways, contributing both to higher rates of pro-social behaviors and healthier interactions with peers and adults.

For example, a study by Silver, Measelle, Armstrong and Essex (2005: 39) found that "decreases in externalizing behavior were associated with teacher-child closeness, especially for children with the highest levels of externalizing behavior upon school entry". Research by O'Connor, Dearing and Collins (2010: 148) similarly indicated that "Teacher-child relationships were among the strongest predictors of externalizing behaviors," noting that "High-quality relationships were negatively associated with children's externalizing behavior problems throughout elementary school". Furthermore, teacher-child closeness was found to support the development of strong peer relationships (Howes, 2000; Howes and Phillipsen, 1998) and the ability to express sympathy and concern for others (Kienbaum, Volland and Ulich, 2001). Multivariable studies noted that positive impacts were highest in settings where strong teacher-child relationships were coupled with "positive, prosocial [classroom] environments" (Howes, 2000: 192).

While the studies described above seem, on the surface, to reflect the goals of violence prevention programs more than peace education, this paper argues that early childhood interventions could contribute significantly to peacebuilding efforts both in areas with high rates of crime and delinquency (such as in the United States) and in regions of violent intractable conflict around the globe (such as those described in section two of this paper). Because both settings require a shift among participants toward 'peace-oriented worldviews' (Danesh, 2006), early childhood peace education programs, rooted in strong teacher-child relationships and positive classroom settings, could lay a critical foundation for the development of positive social behaviors, such as empathy, compassion, self-restraint, respect for diversity, etc. These behaviors could further enable the acquisition of more complex peacebuilding skills later in life, such as multi-perspectival conflict analysis, critical problem solving, and nonviolent conflict resolution.

Thus far, this section has argued that early childhood intervention programs could successfully enhance violence prevention and peacebuilding efforts from a child's earliest years in school. However, current research on developmentally appropriate practice further suggests that the implementation of peace-oriented early intervention programs could also enhance the quality of early childhood education itself. By exploring existing linkages between peace education and developmentally appropriate practice, this section will now de-

scribe how the creation of such programs for young children could enhance the quality of both peace education and early childhood education programs.

In 2009, the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) put forth its Position Statement, titled *Developmentally Appropriate Practice in Early Childhood Programs Serving Children from Birth through Age Eight,* in which it outlined key findings from throughout the field of early childhood education research. Drawing on these findings, the Statement advocated strongly for early intervention to assist children in healthy cognitive, physical, and social/emotional development, noting that "Changing young children's experiences can substantially affect their development and learning, especially when intervention starts early in life and is not an isolated action but a broad-gauged set of strategies" (2009: 6). The Statement also put forth several guiding principles that they argued must "inform practice" in early childhood education settings (2009: 10).Though this paper will not discuss each of these principles in detail, it is worth highlighting several that relate specifically to the value of violence prevention efforts at the early childhood level. These include the following (2009: 11-14):

- All the domains of development and learning—physical, social and emotional, and cognitive—are important, and they are closely interrelated. Children's development and learning in one domain influence and are influenced by what takes place in other domains.
- Early experiences have profound effects, both cumulative and delayed, on a child's development and learning; and optimal periods exist for certain types of development and learning to occur.
- Children develop best when they have secure, consistent relationships with responsive adults and opportunities for positive relationships with peers.
- Play is an important vehicle for developing self-regulation as well as for promoting language, cognition, and social competence.

The guiding principles listed above suggest that the implementation of peace education programs at the early childhood level would not only contribute to peacebuilding efforts, but also enhance existing early childhood education programs. First, because *"domains of development and learning"* are linked to one another, developing a child's peacebuilding skills (such as the ability to express care for others and resolve conflicts peacefully) would also enhance development in other areas. Second, since "*early experiences have profound effects...on a child's development and learning,"* developing positive teacher-child relationships and peacebuilding skills at an early age would prepare children to deal with more complex issues of peace and conflict in future years. Third, an emphasis on *"secure, consistent relation-*

ships" with adults and *"positive relationships with peers"* would contribute to healthy early childhood development while also promoting pro-social behaviors necessary for peacebuilding. Finally, the importance of play highlights opportunities for incorporating peace concepts throughout the school day while also "*promoting language, cognition, and social competence"*. Such overlaps highlight critical opportunities for future research and collaboration between peace scholars and early childhood educators.

Implications for Violence Prevention and Peace Education Programs

The evidence presented throughout this section suggests that school-based early childhood interventions could contribute significantly to the goals of existing violence prevention programs. These findings may be particularly useful in the United States, where school violence has been an issue of great concern for over twenty years. However, this section has argued that early childhood interventions could also support the work of comprehensive peace education programs. By shifting efforts toward promoting pro-social behaviors in children during the preschool and early elementary school years, educators and school administrators may be able to more effectively reduce aggression and other violent behaviors among adolescents. Moreover, by emphasizing the importance of teacher-child relationships and positive classroom culture, early childhood educators can play a critical role in contributing to peacebuilding efforts around the world. Whether implemented in regions of intractable conflicts or in areas of high crime and adolescent aggression, early childhood peace education programs encourage educators, school staff, families, and policy makers to see violence prevention and peacebuilding as the collective responsibility of a community of adults and children working together to build positive, peaceful relationships at every level of society.

Nonkilling Linguistics as the Guiding Principle for Developmentally Appropriate Early Childhood Interventions: Promoting Peace through Conversation and Play

While the previous section argued for increased collaboration between peace education and early childhood education programs, this section asserts that nonkilling linguistics could further enhance such efforts, by providing a framework for designing developmentally appropriate early childhood peace education programs. By focusing on the twin principles of "communicating about peace" and "communicating peacefully," a nonkilling linguistics approach would emphasize the role of language in promoting healthy,

peaceful development in early childhood. Such an approach, therefore, calls upon early childhood educators and curriculum designers to closely examine both the content and the delivery of daily lessons and activities, and to determine the extent to which these activities and interactions model and promote a peace-oriented, nonkilling worldview among young students.

This section will explore just two examples of daily activities in which a nonkilling linguistics approach to peace education might be implemented in an early childhood setting: classroom conversations and dramatic play. Researchers have described both activities as essential components of a high-quality early childhood classroom. In addition, these activities lend themselves particularly well to an integration of peace-oriented concepts and discussions.

Classroom Conversations: Opportunities for Discussing Peace in Peaceful Ways

NAEYC notes that developmentally appropriate early childhood classrooms must work to create a "caring community of learners," characterized by "consistent, positive, caring relationships between the adults and children, among children, among teachers, and between teachers and families" (2009: 16). Such relationships are built daily through a variety of classroom structures, activities and routines. For example, NAEYC asserts that "Opportunities to play together, collaborate on investigations and projects, and talk with peers and adults enhance children's development and learning" (id.).

Classroom conversations provide one such opportunity for building a 'caring community of learners' within early childhood classrooms. Research has noted the importance of conversations in building oral language skills (Bond and Wasik, 2009; Massey, 2004; Kirkland and Patterson, 2005) and developing social competencies and positive relationships among young children (Levin, 2003a; Crawford 2005). In particular, Bond and Wasik (2009: 467) note that regular conversations with teachers and other adults provide young children with critical opportunities to "talk, get feedback on their language, and to have appropriate language modeled for them". Many early childhood educators currently incorporate conversations into the regular school day through whole group "morning meetings" (in which students and teacher(s) typically sit together in a circle to share feelings, respond to "get to know you" questions, and/or discuss the day's activities), one-on-one teacher-child 'conferences' (in which academic, social, or behavioral topics may be discussed), and small group interactions. In addition, some scholars and educators have begun to explore how such conversations can serve as a tool for peacebuilding and conflict resolution skill building (Levin, 2003a; Vance and Weaver, 2002). For example, in her ground-

breaking book, *Teaching Young Children In Violent Times*, Diane Levin (2003: 39) discusses how classroom conversations can become a vehicle for creating what she calls a "peaceable classroom". She calls these conversations "give-and-take dialogues," in which teachers and students discuss "issues that grow out daily classroom life". In such dialogues, teachers act as caring facilitators who guide conversation in an open and nonjudgmental way, helping children to express feelings and brainstorm solutions to classroom conflicts. Over time, these classroom conversations "teach children—in a safe way and at their developmental level—the process and skills they need to work cooperatively and solve problems with others".

The following is a class discussion taken from Levin's book, which exemplifies how conversations can serve as a critical element of peace education for young children:

> ***Teacher:*** *I need your help. I have a bit of a problem, and since you all know me pretty well, you know the classroom, and you know each other, I thought maybe you could help me solve my problem. Would you be willing to do that?*
> ***Class:*** *[enthusiastically] Yes!*
> ***Teacher:*** *Here's the problem. I've been noticing that sometimes in the afternoons I get really grouchy. I noticed this happens when there are a lot of kids asking me things at the same time—calling out "Teacher, teacher"—and lots of kids waiting for me to do things to help them. It doesn't feel good to be grouchy. After you all go home, I think, "Oh, I was kind of grouchy. I don't feel good about that." I was wondering if you have some ideas to help me solve this problem.*
> ***Jenna:*** *You could let people take turns.*
> ***Teacher:*** *How would that work?*
> ***Jenna:*** *People take turns—first one, then the other.*
> ***Teacher:*** *So your idea is that children wait to take a turn—first, I help one child, then another, then another. Okay. Who else has an idea?*
> ***Jackson:*** *You could line up.*
> ***Teacher:*** *So you could line up to wait for your turn.*
> ***Carlos:*** *Raise your hand.*
> ***Teacher:*** *Raise your hand and wait for the teacher—instead of calling out my name. Okay.*
> ***Ray:*** *Raise both hands.*
> ***Rosa:*** *I would go to another teacher.*
> ***Tosca:*** *Ask a child.*
> ***Teacher:*** *So you don't always have to go to a teacher—sometimes you could help each other? Do you mean like how you asked Kerry to help you find the tape you wanted to hear in the tape recorder?*
> ***Tosca:*** *Yeah.*
> ***Sam:*** *Oh, brother!*

> ***Teacher:*** *Sam, it sounds like you don't like the idea of not going to a teacher when you need help.*
> ***Sam:*** *You better go to someone who's good.*
> ***Teacher:*** *Someone who's good. Can you say more about that?*
> ***Sam:*** *You know. You ask someone who can do it.*
> ***Kendra:*** *Make a list.*
> ***Teacher:*** *Can you tell us more, Kendra?*
> ***Kendra:*** *Make a list of who's good.*
> ***Teacher:*** *I think I get it. Do you mean we could make a list of who is good at what, so children who need help could figure out who to ask for help—so you know who could help you? [There are enthusiastic nods.]*
> ***Teacher:*** *I think a list like that could really help me not feel grumpy and it could help you all get help when you need it too.*
> ***Teacher:*** *We've spent a long time talking about this now. You all have sat still for a really long time. You have come up with so many good ways to help me. You have really helped me. Thank you. For now, let's stop and have snack. Tomorrow, we'll work on our helpers' list* (2003: 41-44; reprinted with permission from Educators for Social Responsibility).

The above conversation between an early childhood educator and her classroom of students shows how "give-and-take" discussions can become a platform for not only successfully solving everyday problems, but also for practicing peaceful interactions that demonstrate acceptance, respect, and openness. In this example, the teacher expresses her feelings honestly and invites students to participate in helping her to solve a problem. She communicates calmly and acknowledges students' ideas throughout the conversation, even when students seem frustrated with the process (such as when Sam shouts, "Oh, brother!"). At the end, she commends the students for their work in brainstorming solutions, and outlines how the problem-solving process will continue in the future.

Particularly when examined through the lens of nonkilling linguistics, classroom conversations, such as the one described above, provide critical opportunities for teachers to create a culture of peace in their classrooms through peaceful, humanizing interactions that empower students to take on issues of peace and conflict in developmentally appropriate ways. Such interactions lay a foundation for future peace education efforts, while also building positive teacher-child relationships that have been shown to help reduce aggression and promote pro-social behaviors in young children. As such, these conversations can serve as a powerful tool in both preventing violence and promoting peace.

Making It Up For Real: Developing Peacebuilding Skills Through Dramatic Play

In addition to conversations, daily opportunities for play have been described as essential to creating high-quality educational settings for young children, providing rich opportunities for development across all areas throughout early childhood (Van Hoorn et al., 2010; NAEYC, 2009; Dever and Falconer, 2008; Levin, 2003a and b; Isenberg and Quisenberry, 2002). In particular, dramatic or 'pretend' play, in which children work together to create and act out various roles in an imagined scene or setting, has been shown to "contribut[e] significantly to [children's] self-regulation and other cognitive, linguistic, social, and emotional benefits" (NAEYC, 2009:15). Similarly, Levin (2003a: 80) notes that "Children actively use play to master experience, to try out new skills and ideas, and to feel powerful and strong". In other words, play allows children to 'try on' different roles, negotiate relationships, and work out conflicts and strong emotions in a safe, light-hearted environment.

In recent years, however, many early childhood educators have raised concerns about the level of violent themes present in childhood play (Levin, 2003b). More and more, children today are exposed to violence in large doses through an ever-increasing number of media types and sources; as such, the nature and content of play has begun to shift, as young children both imitate the violence they see and attempt to make sense of the violence present in various ways through out their lives (ibid). While this shift may tempt early childhood educators to ban aggressive play (and, in some cases, play altogether), Levin (2003b: 3) asserts that "a total ban on this kind of play may leave children to work things out on their own without the guidance of adults". As such, she encourages educators and families to work together to reduce the amount of violent images to which young children are exposed, to prompt ongoing discussions with children about violent issues of concern to them, and to collaborate with children in designing boundaries and rules for safe play.

As discussed earlier in this chapter, critical applied linguistics argues that the language we use shapes and impacts our reality; as such, the language used throughout play in early childhood classrooms plays a significant role in shaping young children's worldviews. Early childhood educators, in designing peace-oriented curricular activities for students, must therefore work to support children's use of peaceful language throughout play, and encourage open, constructive dialogue when aggressive play emerges. Rather than blaming children and families for violent play or seeing such play as an 'inevitable' part of childhood, teachers can help to establish play environments that empower children to create and practice nonviolent responses to conflict. Moreover, by using classroom

conversations to discuss violent themes that emerge through play, teachers can guide young children in working through the "graphic, confusing or scary, and aggressive aspects of violence" with which we all struggle (Levin, 2003b: 2).

While several early childhood educators have begun to describe efforts to create a "peaceable classroom" through respectful dialogue, positive interactions, and peaceful play, much research remains to be done in this area. As such, this section has sought to show how increased dialogue and collaboration within the fields of nonkilling linguistics, peace education, and early childhood education could enhance applied efforts in all three areas. Classroom conversations and dramatic play serve as examples of how nonkilling linguistics and education could inform early childhood education. Thus, this chapter urges scholars and practitioners from all three fields to explore further opportunities for cross-disciplinary action. If the fields of nonkilling linguistics, peace education, and early childhood education can effectively work together to design curriculum, conduct research, and create policies, we can begin to lay a comprehensive foundation for building an international culture of peace from the ground up.

Conclusion

This chapter has sought to explore how the field of nonkilling linguistics could guide the development of effective, comprehensive peace education programs at all levels of society. Through tracing the historical and political emergence of peace education and violence prevention programs around the world, this chapter has described a number of critical questions that have developed around the content and purpose of such programs. It has described a number of evaluative studies that have grown out of the peace education and violence prevention movements, and explored how a nonkilling linguistics approach to peace education could further enhance efforts to design programs that would successfully reduce violence and promote a culture of peace throughout society.

Finally, this chapter has argued that early childhood classrooms offer a new and innovative setting for nonkilling linguistics and peace education efforts, and has called upon scholars and practitioners to develop interdisciplinary curriculum, research, and policies that would support the work of all three fields. Drawing on existing overlaps among nonkilling linguistics, peace education, and developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood education, this chapter has argued that all three approaches are necessary to establish a culture of peace throughout societies. By emphasizing the importance of both "communicating about peace" and "communicating peacefully" with children from their

earliest years, we can help these children to develop the skills and capabilities necessary for building a more just and peaceful world.

References

Adams, D. et al. (1986). *Seville Statement on Violence.* Available onlite at: <http://portal.unesco.org>.

Anamio, M. (2004). *The Role of Peace Education in Preventing Conflict*. Amsterdam: United Nations International Student Conference.

Bar-Natan, I. (2004). *Does friendship between adversaries generalize?* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Haifa University.

Bar-On, D. (2000). *Bridging the gap*. Hamburg, Germany: Korber-Stiftung.

Bar-Tal, D. and Rosen, Y. (2009). "Peace Education in Societies Involved in Intractable Conflicts: Direct and Indirect Models," *Review of Educational Research*, 79(2): 557-575.

Biton, Y. (2002). *Israeli and Palestinian's understanding of "peace" as a function of their participation in peace education programs*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Haifa.

Bond, M. and Wasik, B. (2009). "Conversation Stations: Promoting Language Development in Young Children," *Early Childhood Education Journal,* 36: 467-473.

Bowers, CJ. (2003). *Toward An Eco-Justice Pedagogy*. Available online at: <http://www.c-a-bowers.com>.

Buyse, E., Verschuern, K., Verachtert, P., and Van Damme, J. (2009). "Predicting School Adjustment in Early Elementary School: Impact of Teacher-Child Relationship Quality and Relational Classroom Climate," *The Elementary School Journal*, 110(2): 119-141.

Campbell, S.B., Shaw, D. S. and Gilliom, M. (2000). "Early externalising behaviour problems: Toddlers and pre-schoolers at risk for later maladjustment," *Development and Psychopathology*, 12: 467-488.

Clarke-Habibi, S. (2005). "Transforming Worldviews: The Case of Education for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina," *Journal of Transformative Education*, 3(1): 33-56.

Crawford, P. (2005). "Primary Peaceful: Nurturing Peace in the Primary Grades," *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 32(5): 321-328

Danesh, H. (2006). "Towards an Integrative Theory of Peace Education," *Journal of Peace Education*, 3(1): 55-78.

Dever, M., and Falconer, R. (2008). *Foundations and Change in Early Childhood Education.* Hoboken: John Wiley.

Eisenberg, N., Zhou, Q., Spinrad, T. L., Valiente, C., Fabes, R. A., and Liew, J. (2005). "Relations among positive parenting, children's effortful control, and externalizing problems: A three-wave longitudinal study," *Child Development*, 76:1055-1071.

Elliot, D. (1998). *Prevention Programs That Work For Youth: Violence Prevention*. Boulder: Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence, University of Colorado.

Farrell, A., Meyer, A., Kung, E., and Sullivan, T. (2001). "Development and Evaluation of School-Based Violence Prevention Programs," *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 30(1): 207-220.

Fountain, S. (1999). *Peace Education in UNICEF.* United Nations Children's Fund. Available online at <http://www.unicef.org>.

Friedrich, P. (2009). "Peace Studies and Peace Linguistics Now: What Has Language Got to do With it?" *Peace Forum*, 24(34): 23-28

Friedrich, P. and Gomes de Mato, F. (2009). "Toward a Nonkilling Linguistics," in Evans Pim, J., Ed., *Toward a Nonkilling Paradigm.* Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling.

Galtung, J. (1969). "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research," *Journal of Peace Research*, 6(3): 167-191.

Global Campaign for Peace Education (2008). Available at: <http://www.peace-ed-campaign.org>.

Gomes de Matos, F. (2000). "Harmonizing and Humanizing Political Discourse: The Contribution of Peace Linguists," *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 6(4): 339-344.

Gorsevski, E. (1998). "The Physical Side of Linguistic Violence," *Peace Review*, 10(4): 513-516.

Hague Appeal for Peace (2004). "The Tirana Call for Peace Education," Available online at: <http://www.haguepeace.org>.

Harris, I. (2006). "Introduction: Peace Studies at the Beginning of the Twenty-First Century," in *Global Directory of Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution Programs.* Peace and Justice Studies Association and International Peace Research Association.

Hawkins, J., Von Cleve, E. and Catalano, R. (1991). "Reducing Early Childhood Aggression: Results of a Primary Prevention Program," *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 30(2): 208-217.

Hook, G. (1984). "The Nuclearization of Language: Nuclear Allergy as Political Metaphor," *Journal of Peace Research*, 21(3): 259-274.

Howes, C. (2000). "Social-emotional classroom climate in child care, child-teacher relationships, and children's second grade peer relations," *Social Development*, 9: 191-204.

Howes, C., and Phillipsen, L. C. (1998). "Continuity in children's relations with peers," *Social Development*, 7: 340-349.

Isenberg, J. and Quisenberry, N. (2002). *Play: Essential for All Children: A Position Paper of the Association for Childhood Education International.* Association for Childhood Education International.

Karreman, A. et al. (2009). "Predicting Young Children's Externalizing Problems Interactions among Effortful Control, Parenting, and Child Gender," *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 55(2): 111-134.

Kester, (2008). "Developing Peace Education Programs: Beyond Ethnocentrism and Violence," *Peace Prints: South Asian Journal of Peacebuilding*, 1(1):1-28.

Kienbaum, J., Volland, C. and Ulich, D. (2001). "Sympathy in the context of mother-child and teacher-child relationships," *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 25: 302-309.

Kirkland, L. and Patterson, J. (2005). "Developing Oral Language in Primary Classrooms," *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 32(6): 391-395.

Kupermintz, H. and Salomon, G. (2005). "Lessons to Be Learned From Research on Peace Education in the Context of Intractable Conflict," *Theory Into Practice*, 44(4): 293-302.

Levin, D. (2003a). *Teaching Young Children In Violent Times: Building a Peaceable Classroom*. Educators for Social Responsibility and National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Levin, D. (2003b). "Beyond Banning War and Superhero Play: Meeting Children's Needs in Violent Times," *Young Children*. Available online at: <http://earlychildhoodcolorado.org/ inc/uploads/warandsuperhero.pdf>.

Lakoff, G., and Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Lustig, I. (2002). *The effects of studying distal conflicts on the perception of a proximal one*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Haifa.

Massey, S. (2004). "Teacher-Child Conversation in the Preschool Classroom," *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 31(4): 227-231.

Moffat, C. (2004). "Learning 'Peace Talk' in Northern Ireland: Peer Mediation and Some Conceptual Issues Concerning Experiential Social Education," *Pastoral Care in Education*, December: 13-21.

National Association for the Education of Young Children (2009). *Developmentally Appropriate Practice in Early Childhood Programs Serving Children from Birth through Age Eight: A Position Statement of the National Association for the Education of Young Children*. Available online at: <http://www.naeyc.org>.

O'Connor, E., Dearing, E., and Collins, B. (2010). "Teacher-Child Relationship and Behavior Problem Trajectories in Elementary School," *American Educational Research Journal*, 48: 120-162.

Ohanyan, A. and Lewis, J. (2005). "Politics of Peace-Building: Critical Evaluation of Interethnic Conflict and Peace Education in Georgian-Abkhaz Peace Camp, 1998-2002," *Peace & Change*, 30(1): 57-84.

Paige, G. (2009). *Nonkilling Global Political Science*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling. Available online at: <http://www.nonkilling.org>.

Park-Higgerson, H.-K., Perumean-Chaney, S. E., Bartolucci, A. A., Grimley, D. M., and Singh, K. P. (2008). "The evaluation of school-based violence prevention programs: A meta-analysis," *Journal of School Health*, 78: 465-479.

Pianta, R. and Stuhlman, M. (2004). Teacher-Child Relationships and Children's Success in the First Years of School. *School Psychology Review*. 33(3): 444-458.

Scott, R. (2009). *Youth Violence: Trends, Myths, and Solutions*. February 11, 2009 Hearing before the House of Representatives Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security Committee on the Judiciary. Serial No. 111-15.

Silver, R., Measelle, J., Armstrong, J. and Essex, M. (2005). "Trajectories of classroom externalizing behavior: Contributions of child characteristics, family char-

acteristics, and the teacher-child relationship during the school transition," *Journal of School Psychology*, 43: 39-60.

Salomon, G. (2002). "The Nature of Peace Education: Not all programs are created equal," in Salomon, G. and Nevo, B., Eds., *Peace Education: The concept, principles and practices around the world.* Mahway: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp.2-14.

Salomon, G. (2004). "Does Peace Education Make a Difference in the Case of an Intractable Conflict?" *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 10(3): 257-274.

Toh, S. (2002). "Education for Learning to Live Together: Peace Building and Peace Education: Local Experiences, Global Reflections," *Prospects*, 32(1): 87-97.

Tolan, P. (2001). "Youth violence and its prevention in the United States: An overview of current knowledge," *Injury Control and Safety Promotion*, 8(1): 1-12.

Tolan, P. and Guerra, N. (1994). *What Works in Reducing Adolescent Violence: An Empirical Review of the Field*. Boulder: Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence, University of Colorado.

United Nations Economic and Social Council (1998). *Resolution 1998/31: International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-violence for the Children of the World*. New York: United Nations. Available online at: <http://www.un.org/documents>.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2002). *Mainstreaming the culture of peace.* Paris: UNESCO.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2001). *Youth violence: A report of the surgeon general.* Rockville: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Van Hoorn, J., Nourot, P., Scales, B. and Alward, K. (2010). *Play at the Center of the Curriculum*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Vance, E. and Weaver, P. (2002). *Class Meetings: Young Children Solving Problems Together*. Washington: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Vaszonyi, A., Belliston, L., and Flannery, D. (2004). "Evaluation of a School-Based, Universal Violence Prevention Program : Low-, Medium-, and High-Risk Children," *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 2: 185.

Vriens, L. (1997). "Peace Education: Cooperative Building of a Humane Future," *Pastoral Care in Education*, 15(4): 25-30.

Vriens, L. (1999). "Children, war, and peace: a review of fifty years of research from the perspective of a balanced concept of peace education," in Raviv, A., Openheimer, L. and Bar-Tal, D., Eds. *How children understand war and peace*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 27-58.

Wenden, A. (2003). "Achieving a Comprehensive Peace: The Linguistic Factor," *Peace and Change*, 28(2): 169-201.

Chapter Three

Language Policy and Nonkilling

Creatively: a bend
Scientifically: a trend
Humanizingly: a mend
Spiritually: a GODsend
Universally: no END!

Language Policy in Brazil

A History of Linguistic Discrimination

José Marcelo Freitas de Luna
Universidade do Vale do Itajaí

Introduction

This chapter presents a discussion of the language policy applied by the Brazilian government to the education of immigrants, with a specific focus on the Germans, during the first four decades of the 20th Century.

Based on a deep exploration of primary sources related to the two nationalizing campaigns, we can observe that the government actions were, initially, geared towards the assimilation of immigrants, through a gradual and frequent exposure to the systemic teaching of Portuguese. Through this type of education, the cultural pluralism of its population was identified as something undesirable and threatening to the unity of Brazil.

In crafting the current study, I aimed to provide a contribution to the development of a line of research in the intersection of Portuguese (as a foreign language) Historiography and Linguistic Rights. It becomes evident that the reconstruction of a pedagogical and linguistic practice is anchored on a series of political, social and education factors that directly influence the content and evolution of teaching. It is relying on an understanding of past experiences that I offer an example of how a historiographical take is essential for an assessment of the degree of continuity or newness of the approaches and methods put forth today.

Such historical take seems to be key when it comes to the definition of linguistic and educational policies in present-day Brazil. I am referring more specifically to the scenario of a possible integration of Brazil in economic blocks. As it can be seen with Europe, integration results in great mobility for people who look for better work, study and life opportunities. It is therefore up to the State to plan and put in practice those policies that would generate a respectful integration of immigrants.

A policy of integration should refer explicitly to the immigrant's right to use his/her mother tongue and the right to learn the language of the country where he/she might come to live whether in temporary or permanent form.

The actions that took place in the period discussed in this chapter could now allegedly be seen by the international community as violating the human rights of the population in question as well as leading up to the genocide of the mother tongue of German-Brazilian communities. This problem often referred to as linguicide, can be defined as a prohibition to use the language of the group in question in day-to-day activities, in schools, in the printing of and circulation of printed materials (Skutnabb-Kangas and Bucak, 1995).

Because the issues presented in this chapter speak directly of the maintenance of languages and of linguistic rights, it is irrevocably connected to the themes pursued by nonkilling linguistics.

Historical Antecedent

Up until the First World War, teaching in areas densely populated through European immigration in the state of Santa Catarina, in the southern part of Brazil, was basically done in schools created by the immigrants themselves. The development of this kind of education, which gradually became a school system, was motivated by the failure of the State to provide these populations with the necessary public education. The first four decades of the 20th Century, the period selected for this chapter, were characterized by various reforms, which were consubstantiated by various laws and regulations. Before we study the period in question in more depth, a summary description will first be given of the public education in Santa Catarina at the end of the Imperial Period.

In general, the various reforms of education introduced over the 19th Century were unable to make the teaching system of Santa Catarina efficient. The school inspection service was seen as deficient, and teachers lacked the necessary training to provide students with adequate teaching. Of all of the former German communities in Brazil and in the State of Santa Catarina in particular, the municipality of Blumenau stands out for its successful economic endeavors and for the preservation of German values such as a great regard for education.

The town was founded in 1848 on the borders of the Itajaí River by Dr. Hermann Blumenau. Ten years after its founding, because of financial difficulties, Blumenau was incorporated by the Imperial Government and was made into a municipality in 1880. However, until 1882 it continued to be led by its founder.

The town of Blumenau is the result of German immigration almost exclusively. Willems (1980) points out that, up until 1899, 9.883 Germans had

established themselves there, together with other immigrant populations, such as 3.911 German-Russians and 1.649 Austrians, besides other much smaller immigrant groups. With the exception of Italians and a few immigrants from Poland, these small groups were integrated into the German and German-Brazilian communities.

Not only were the characteristics of said communities made known by Portuguese-Brazilians but also by Germans that visited the region. The head of the National Socialist Party in Brazil, Hans Henning von Cosselss, for example, visited Blumenau in 1935 and wrote about his take on the town in an article entitled *Eine Reise durch das Deutschtum in Brasilien*:

> Who can understand the feeling one gets upon finding in the heart of South America a town where it is hard to hear a single word in Portuguese, in which the houses resemble those of a central Germany village, in which all stores and inscriptions are in German? One sees palm tress there, but they almost seem out of place in an environment where even the few blacks who there reside speak German and feel like good 'Germans.' (cited in Gertz 1987: 69)

In this context, the reports of the behavior of the German communities during the first few decades of the 20th century usually indicate that German was spoken, in many situations, by a large portion of the population, and more notably so in rural areas.

Although it can be suspected that information contained in travel logs about the linguistic assimilation of German-Brazilians might not be scientifically based, it is still possible to use such descriptions to try and understand how this town, now famous as a touristic site for its very German characteristics, was utilized to plant the seeds of suspicion that the region could be the equivalent of an ethnic cyst.

The Imperial period (1822-1889) came to an end with the same educational scenario of the beginning of the century. In relation to the education of the population of foreign origin in the state, the summary description given above can be easily applied. The Government's concern with assimilation of immigrants, through compulsory teaching in Portuguese, however, was recorded as far back as the imperial period.

Through Law 1,114 of 30 September 1886, the Government linked the financial assistance for schools to the teaching of the vernacular tongue. In his report of 1887, the then President of the Province, Francisco José da Rocha, revealed that the application of the law had met with various forms of resistance among the teachers and state authorities of the time. Accord-

ing to da Rocha, there were, in the pedagogical didactic apparatus that existed in the colonization areas, no conditions for teaching on bilingual bases.

The concept adopted at that time was to teach the student initially in his/her mother tongue (German, Italian or other) and, only afterwards, introduce the teaching of Portuguese. However, this second phase was never concretized, as it coincided with the period when the students were taken out of school, by their parents, and made to work. Thus, the Imperial period came to an end with the problem of the teaching of Portuguese to the immigrant populations left entirely unresolved.

During the Republican period (1889-present), the Government's linguistic policy in relation to immigrants can be summarized in terms of the two campaigns to nationalize teaching, which were put into effect on the occasion of the two World Wars.

The First Nationalization Campaign: the Orestes Guimarães Program

With the proclamation of the Republic (1889) and the consequent adoption of new social and political values, the educational problems experienced by the states continued to be a target of various reforms. In Santa Catarina, the most important of these reforms, and the one that led to the first campaign to nationalize teaching, began in 1911. The state had been, since September 1910, under the governorship of Colonel Vidal José de Oliveira Ramos (henceforth referred to as Vidal Ramos). He was from the 'planalto' of Santa Catarina, born into a Luso-Brazilian family of landowners and cattle farmers. His government opened a dynasty in Santa Catarina politics, which determined the paths and the force of the State's nationalization actions.

To deal with the problem of education in Santa Catarina, Vidal Ramos looked to São Paulo, and more specifically Orestes Guimarães, for his teaching model. Guimarães arrived in Santa Catarina with the full backing of the Government and society in general, for the actions he would carry out during the twenty years he was connected with the cause of education in the state. The responsibility attributed to Orestes Guimarães, in addition to the general reform of the educational system, particularly in relation to the high illiteracy rates, was to resolve the issue of assimilating immigrant groups.

To this end, his work is notable for his direct action with schools and the teaching body in particular, to which he personally provided the guidelines and teaching strategies for the curricular disciplines.

The nationalization campaign initiated by Orestes Guimarães in 1911—well before the period of greatest conflict caused by the war—can be character-

ized as a gradual process of assimilation. Basically, this process was marked by the creation of school groups and complementary schools, in the municipalities of colonial origin, and by the imposition of education in Portuguese in the immigrant schools. Decree 794 of 2 May 1914 helped disseminate this strategy. The Degree states that,

> Private teaching may be carried out freely, except where supported by public funding, whether at state or municipal levels. In this case, teaching should always be given in the vernacular tongue (Art. 129, translation mine).

The main problem encountered by Orestes Guimarães in the implementation of the public school in immigration areas was a lack of teachers with the linguistic competence to teach in Portuguese. He believed that the best teachers for these schools should be proficient in both languages—Portuguese and the language of his or her students and of the community, particularly in the case of German. On this subject, he states:

> For the teacher that must teach children who speak a different language from his own, it is absolutely necessary to know this language. This is the case with our centers of German origin, where it is necessary to send teachers who speak German (Guimarães, 1918, preface, translation mine).

As finding teachers with this qualification, who were willing to remain at the most distant centers in the interior of the State, with very low salaries, was difficult, teachers without knowledge of the students' language took up the positions that opened at the new schools. However, their adaptation to the work with children whose language the teacher did not understand proved to be disappointing for all those involved.

The teachers often gave up the work, unable to understand, and consequently, transmit content to their pupils. Additionally, they felt socially segregated, due to a lack of contact with adults of Luso-Brazilian origin. For the children, learning Portuguese proved impossible, which led to a lack of trust on the part of the parents, concerning the quality of the public school.

To resolve the problem of linguistic proficiency, and consequently that of lack of teaching ability of the teacher for the immigration zone, Orestes Guimarães introduced the German Language as a curricular discipline in teacher training schools and complementary schools of the state. This measure, which was promulgated by decrees of 1911, and reinforced in 1926, displeased part of the Santa Catarina society, which had already shown an unwillingness to use the cultural expressions of the Teuto-Brazilian community.

The climate of opinion brought by the First World War, which intensified when Brazil joined the Allies in 1917, was accompanied by some legislative measures that affected education more directly in the German immigration zones. In October 1917, State Law 1,187 made the preliminary education of children aged 6 to 15 years compulsory, along with the inclusion of the disciplines of Language, History and Geography of Brazil, and patriotic songs and anthems, stating that all must be taught in the Portuguese language. This law, together with others of the period, addressed the private schools of the immigration zones as foreign schools, failing to take into consideration the fact that their clientele was comprised of pupils born in Brazil, and therefore, Brazilian.

On 8th November of the same year, Decree 1063 determined the class hours to be taught for each of the above-mentioned disciplines, authorizing only the works of national authors for use as reference. It also regulated the reopening of schools that had been closed due to the argument of ineffectiveness with regard to the teaching of Portuguese. Defining ineffectiveness, the decree referred to the teaching given by teachers who did not speak "Portuguese correctly", or who used unauthorized teaching materials.

The concession of reopening the schools was made based on the observation of some school inspectors and designated teachers, as shown in the document transcribed below:

> Amadeu Baeder, a private teacher in São Pedro, Olsen Colony, in the municipality of S. Bento and Ludwig Neuman, *idem* of the Schools of Cedro Grande and Aguas Claras, in the municipality of Brusque, requested authority to reopen their Schools, in accordance with Decree 1063, of 1917, teachers Martha Tavares Alves and Ilsa Tavares are designated to ascertain whether the first of these licensed teachers speaks Portuguese correctly, and teachers Guilherme Wiethorn Filho and Laura Garcia to ascertain whether the second of the two licensed teachers speaks Portuguese correctly. (Minutes of Public Instruction 1918 and 1919, p. 23, translation mine)

For the schools, adapting to the legal requirements of reopening brought many problems. Finding competent teachers and appropriate materials, in a public education system that was incipient, was almost impossible. The schools had to convince the local authorities that the curriculum had enough time for the inclusion of Portuguese, History and Geography.

Meanwhile, managing to pass the exams introduced was very difficult for many teachers. Many of them were trained by immigrants born in Germany, who were not concerned with acquiring Brazilian citizenship. Invariably, the examiners proved reluctant to allow the "enemy" to teach.

Many schools stayed permanently closed, which led to millions of Teuto-Brazilian children being denied a formal education.

During the period of the war, all the efforts at progressive assimilation gradually became intermingled with incidents related to the closing of the schools, requests for punishment of teachers who were clandestinely continuing to give classes in their homes, and some more bizarre cases like the one described below.

> According to your determination in a telegram of yesterday, I will now report the event that took place in my house or rather, in the School governed by me, on the 15th day of the present month. Roberto Hoffman, a teacher of German at the settlement of Matto-Preto, being forced to close his school by order of the Government soon after a state of war was declared between our country and Germany, decided to take Portuguese classes in order to reopen his classes. (...) The day before yesterday, as per usual, Hoffman arrived at my house at the time of the class, i.e. 4.30pm; I brought him inside, but he immediately told me that he no longer wanted to learn Portuguese and that on the contrary, he wanted to stop learning it because his homeland, Germany, had already conquered all its enemies ... Brazil, its allies having been beaten, would be obliged to pay a high war compensation, and having no money to do so would be forced to relinquish part of its territory—the state of Santa Catarina—Henceforth it was prohibited, in São Bento, that any language other than German be spoken. Making for door, he exclaimed, overcome with joy and beating his chest: "Ah! The German language is the language of glory; it will be the universal language: I was and am a German soldier and I know what Germany is worth". (...) Judging this to be not only a slight against me and my profession, but also a grave insult thrown by this individual, against my dear homeland, not having in the jurisdiction police authority and the Head of Schools being absent, I decided to apply to the Hon. Judge of Law of the Jurisdiction, who advised me to send you this telegraph describing the event and requesting that measures be taken (...). (Letters of Public Instruction, 1918, p.22, translation mine)

Orestes Guimarães spent this period convinced that his strategies of progressive assimilation could not suffer with the climate of antipathy and aversion towards the German language brought by the war. In his report of 1918, he defends himself against comments vis-à-vis his policy, and maintains the teaching of German in the teacher training schools, stating:

> The current state of war has not changed the pedagogical issue at stake: The language, trends and habits remain the same in the centers in question, (...) If, to teach Portuguese to those who only speak German, the

> teacher must know the latter language, it's just as well that the programs of the Normal School and complementary schools maintain the teaching of German, despite the Jacobin way of thinking of those who believe that learning a certain and specific language is paying homage to the nation that speaks it! (Guimarães, 1918, preface, translation mine).

The second Nationalization Campaign: the National Pro-Language League Program

A sizeable portion of the Teuto-Brazilian population, at the end of the war, could not bring their institutions back to a climate of normality. In Santa Catarina, many schools continued to suffer persecution, through restrictive additional legislation created after the armistice.

In September 1919, Law 1,283 reinforced the provision in Law 1,187 of 1917, defining as foreign schools those whose instruction in one or more disciplines was given in a language other than Portuguese, regardless of the teacher's nationality or place of birth. One month later, many schools were closed in Santa Catarina, due to supposed violations of these requirements. In January 1920, Law 1,322 stipulated that Teuto-Brazilian schools must offer, in the Portuguese language, twenty four periods of instruction of Reading, History, Geography, Music and Civil Studies. Furthermore, it stipulated that all school documents must be written in Portuguese.

All this legislation continued to reflect the attitude of the governments and the nativist trend, which conveyed this sentiment and support for the work of nationalization in the various documents of the period between the wars. The tone used in the speeches on private schools was generally one of accusation against the supposed lack of teaching in Portuguese in the Teuto-Brazilian schools and those of other foreign origins. This was used, by society in general, as an argument to support the second nationalization campaign, which took place during the 1930s. The texts partially transcribed below illustrate this attitude:

> (...) it should be emphasized that many of the rural colonial schools find themselves governed by teachers who, because they speak badly, or do not speak the vernacular tongue, cannot satisfy the needs for nationalization of primary education, an issue that in Santa Catarina, takes on real importance and to which its governments have for years been focusing greater attention (translation mine).[1]

[1] Report. Presented to Dr. Manuel da Nóbrega and Dr. Cid Campos.

> (...) The nationalizing work in this unit of the federation must be active, constant, and vigilant, in order not to create a foreign body within the Brazilian population, which would be a shame for our pride as the new nation, which must be one and undivided, and prevent the development, in its civic organism, of a cist of degenerating foreignism (translation mine).[2]

The explicit omission of the government in providing immigrant communities with the due public education is therefore characterized as a constant theme of the official documents related to the second nationalization campaign. However, it should be highlighted that, by provision, all the documents requested schools where the teaching of Portuguese was developed in such a way as to promote the assimilation of immigrants.

Following the absence of Orestes Guimarães from the nationalization campaign, due to his death in 1930, the state school system, when it came to the teaching of Portuguese in the immigration zones, gradually began to be guided solely by legal provisions. Decree 58 of 28 January 1931, still addressed the private schools as foreign, and determined that all the disciplines should follow the program of state public schools.

With the installation of the *Estado Novo* (1937),[3] a new nationalization campaign was carried out, once again targeting the schools of the foreign immigration zone. Assuming that the problem of assimilation had not been resolved by the flexibility of the previous laws, and according to one of the mentors of the laws of the second nationalization, by Ivo d'Aquino, "erroneous, and even to a certain extent naive ideas" (Aquino, 1942: 140), the second campaign found, in the authoritarian regime of the Estado Novo, a suitable climate for laws imposing a coercive and immediate assimilation. Three federal decrees can be indicated as examples of authorization for the State to infringe the educational and linguistic rights of their immigrant populations.

Decree-Law 868 of 18 November 1938, created, within the Ministry of Education, the National Commission for Primary Education. One of its objectives was to define the actions of integral nationalization of primary teaching in all the centers with populations of foreign origin.

Decree-Law 1,006 of 30 December 1938, in turn, regulated the didactic material, prohibiting the use in primary education of publications not written in the national language.

---

[2] Report. presented by professor Barreiros Filho.

[3] Motivated by the existence of an alleged communist plot to rule Brazil, Getúlio Vargas, the then president, enacts a coup two months before the presidential elections. He remains in power until 1945.

Finally, Decree-Law 3,580 of 3 September 1941 approved the provision in the above decree, emphasizing a ban on the importation of didactic books for use in primary education, as well as the production, in Brazil, of books written totally or partially in a foreign language. This ban also included newspapers, journals, church magazines, almanacs, devotional literature, and even translations of classical works of Portuguese and Brazilian literature.

In Santa Catarina, the interpretation and consequences of these laws caused a traumatic impact for the Teuto-Brazilian population. Although the nationalization campaign had begun in 1911, with the work of Orestes Guimarães, the assimilationist objectives of the Government had not been achieved. Another contributing factor was the fact that, politically, the state did not have a stronger positivist leadership, which caused nativist sentiments to prevail and intensify with the climate brought by World War II.

Exploring these factors, the anti-German propaganda in Brazil continued to identify Santa Catarina as a state that was vulnerable to Teuto-Brazilian insubordination and adhesion to Germany. Specifically, two decrees can be cited as examples of the level of imposition and prohibition that marked this campaign.

Decree-Law 35 of 13 January 1938 prohibited the use of foreign names in all establishments of the state, including schools. The decree stipulated a penalty of closure of any school that exhibited, in any form, a name that was not in the national language.

The prohibitive nature of the linguistic and educational rights of the Teuto-Brazilian community is even more evident, however, in Decree-Law 88 of 31 March 1938, which establishes the regulations for primary teaching of private schools. The decree demanded that private schools addressed during the first campaign as foreign, take out a government license in order to operate. The concession of this license, in turn, was linked, according to the decree, to the fulfillment of many requirements, including:

> 1- proof that the teachers of national language, geography, history of civilization and of Brazil and civil and moral education, in all courses, were born in Brazil. (...) 10- proof of the teaching ability of the teachers; (Art. 4º) (..) 1- all pre-primary, primary and complementary classes must be given in the vernacular language, including those of physical education, except where it is a foreign language class (...) 3- only the national language may be used, whether in the respective lettering, boards, signboards, posters, notice boards, instructions or signs, both inside and outside the school building (Art. 7). (...) Maps, photographs, stamps, signs or emblems, whether in the classrooms or in any other part of the school building, must not lose their characteristic of 'Brazilianness'. (Art.8) (...) Except for

> foreigners who are official guests of the State Government, no public speaker or conference lecturer may express him/herself in meetings or school celebrations in any language other than the national language (Art.13). (...) The establishment will be definitively closed down if it (...) teaches a foreign language to children who have not completed primary education in the national language (Art.19, translation mine).

Due to the high level of requirements, many schools were closed without any chances of reopening. A few remained open clandestinely, teaching based on their resources. With the worsening of the scenario of persecution generated by the War, however, all the Teuto-Brazilian schools were closed, and some were taken over by the state and transformed into public schools.

To pave the way for Decree 88, the Government announced Decree-Law 124 on 18 June 1938, with the creation of the Inspector General for Private Schools and the Nationalization of Education. The attributions of the Inspector General, among others, included the following: "the General Superintendent of Education proposes measures which, for this purpose (nationalization of teaching) it sees fit, in particular the dismissal of teachers and prohibition of school establishments which transgress those laws" (Art. 2).

The position of inspector, created by the above law, was first occupied by Luiz Sanches B. da Trindade, who had previously worked in the cause of nationalization as a member of Orestes Guimarães' team. The Inspector's actions were marked, basically, by the closure of schools, and the suspension and dismissal of teachers. Nevertheless, the creation of the National Pro-Language League (henceforth referred to as League(s)) was the work of professor Trindade.

Although they had been proposed for all the public schools of the State, the activities of the Leagues were more related to those schools in regions with immigrant populations. The leagues were created with the express objective of fostering in students an interest in the defense and diffusion of national values. Thus, the activities proposed by the Inspectorate involved the valorization, and in some cases, the exaltation of all traces of the culture and the Brazilian State, including the Portuguese language.

With the guidance of teachers, and supervision of the school direction, and often, with the inspection of the Inspector himself, the more advanced students were given the task of developing in students descended from immigrants the necessary linguistic skills and a positive attitude towards Portuguese. The teaching of the vernacular implied, however, prohibition of the use of the student's mother tongue, as the following instruction shows:

> (...) The duties of the president are: (...) to contribute, with his or her best effort, by not speaking another language, whether inside the establishment or outside, that is not the National language, when in a zone of foreign colonization. (National Pro-Language League Instructions p. 123, translation mine).

As already suggested, the work of the Leagues was systematically accompanied by the Inspector General through visits to schools, and more commonly, by correspondence sent to the leaderships. The objective of the Campaign is reinforced by the letters written by professor Trindade, as summarized below:

> (...) These albums should *show things about our beloved Brazil*. For greater knowledge of our people, I remind you that each classroom has the name of an illustrious Brazilian (...) The lives of these figures of national importance should be studied by the students (...) ALL FOR THE GREATNESS OF BRAZIL. (Letter no. 1. In: Department of Education Report, 1940, p. 8, translation mine).

In another letter, sent to another League in the same year, the coercive nature of the period is more evident:

> (...) I wrote to you, gave instructions on various services to be organized. Despite this you maintain a silence that I cannot understand. I have already communicated this failure to the authorities of the State. Soon I will inspect this teaching establishment to verify "in loco" the causes of this lack of interest in the national matters (…) (Letter no. 188 In: op. cit., p. 37, translation mine).

Some Considerations

Based on a brief exploration of the production left by Orestes Guimarães, we observe that his nationalizing action was geared towards the assimilation of immigrants, through a gradual and frequent exposure to the systemic teaching of Portuguese.

In summary, the educational policy of this first campaign cannot be characterized as one of submersion and of a strong tendency towards assimilation at the political and social level. Through this type of education, the Government of Santa Catarina, like other governments, identified the cultural pluralism of its population as something undesirable and threatening to the unity of Brazil.

When we analyze the government experience with the teaching of Portuguese to immigrants during the second campaign, we see clearly that

there was also a strong tendency, not only in the legal provisions, but also in the actions of the Leagues, towards the assimilation or absorption of immigrants by the Luso-Brazilian majority in an immediate and oppressive way.

In this context, the exclusive exposure to Portuguese served as a form of subjugation of the immigrants' mother tongue, through a strategy of reducing the function of this language for the community. By not promoting the teaching of the student's mother tongue, or even allowing their use in schools, the educational policy was based on a legislation which imposed an explicit and active prohibition on the language spoken by the minority.

The Brazilian legislation, and in particular, that of Santa Catarina, translated the myth that the rights of minorities represent a threat to the national unity and territorial integrity. This ideology, commonly illustrated by the jargon "one language one nation" (Mikes, 1986) reflects the view that the concession of linguistic and cultural rights leads to the possibility of greater claims for autonomy and economic and political independence.

The Brazilian language policy towards the immigrants during the 20th Century can be well summarized by the nationalizing actions towards the Escola Nova Alemã (New German School) of Blumenau in Santa Catarina State. Formed in 1889 as a response to the persistent lack of public schools in the region, the school had the majority of its clientele formed by students whose mother tongue was German. Portuguese, contrary to the Government's argument, was always a compulsory curricular discipline of the school.

From the year of the first report found, that of 1910, the references to the teaching of Portuguese are presented in an uninterrupted, complete and circumstantiated way, through the division of disciplines by teacher and through the curricular plan of the School. Added to these references is the production of didactic material specifically designed for this purpose.

The description of the programs and books of Portuguese of the Escola Nova Alemã enables comments on the main theories underlying the approach used and the objectives of the School as a whole. Firstly, it is seen that the program was based on a notion of functionality of linguistic knowledge, following the line of the Reform Movement of the Teaching of Languages, whose birth is associated with Germany in the last decades of the 19th Century. Regarding the objective of the School, once again in opposition to the arguments of the National Campaigns, we can characterize it as the developing civism and patriotism applied to Brazil. Germany was attributed the quality of a distant land, from where the grandparents and parents of some students came. With the reproduction of the classic poems, such as "*Canção do Exílio*" (Song of Exile) by the Brazilian Antônio Gonçalves Dias,

books written specifically for the teaching of the Teuto-Brazilian School reinforced the ideal of the Brazilian homeland.

On 30 November 1917, following the events related to the First World War, the school was closed, and was reopened on 18 February 1920. Judging by the reports after this date, the School continued to develop and widen its activities.

In 1938, in response to the legislation which forced changes, the School had its Bylaws reformulated, and was renamed the *Sociedade Escolar Pedro II*. In the midst of the political climate of the Second World War, the school was integrated with the public state network as the *Grupo Escolar Modelo Pedro II* and *Curso Complementar Pedro II*. After some modifications, based on the legislation, since 1976 the school has been named the *Conjunto Educacional Pedro II*.

The teaching of Portuguese, at schools like Escola Nova Alemã de Blumenau, is defined by measures which, taken in isolation, can be characterized as contradictory. On one hand, the Brazilian government provided, through its policy of attracting immigrants and the lack of school services in regions with foreign colonization, a favorable climate for the generation and development of the Teuto-Brazilian education system. On the other hand, motivated by political and economic issues at regional, national and international levels, the Government removed, through the destruction of the Teuto-Brazilian school system, educational and social gains such as bilingualism, and favorable attitudes towards cultural pluralism from a sizeable portion of our population.

References

Aquino, Ivo (1942). *Nacionalização do Ensino: Aspectos Políticos*. Florianópolis: Imprensa Oficial do Estado.

Barreiros Filho (1931). *Relatório. Serviços da Instrução Pública durante o ano revolucionário (25 de outubro de 1930 a 25 de outubro de 1931) - apresentado pelo professor Barreiros Filho - Diretor*.

Campos, Cid (1929). *Relatório apresentado ao Dr. Manuel da Nóbrega, Diretor da Instrucção pública do Estado de Santa Catarina ao exmo Snr. Dr. Cid Campos, Secretario do Interior e Justiça, em 31 de maio de 1929*. Florianópolis: s/e.

Circulares 1943 -1944 (1945). Florianópolis: Imprensa Oficial do Estado.

Governo da República (1938). "Decreto-lei nº 868 de 18 de novembro de 1938," in *LEX. Coletânea de Legislação*. São Paulo: Lex, p. 522-523.

Governo da República (1939). "Decreto-lei nº 1.006 de 30 de dezembro de 1938," in *LEX. Coletânea de Legislação*. São Paulo: Lex, p. 1-6.

Governo da República (1941). "Decreto-lei nº 3.580 de 3 de setembro de 1941," in *LEX Legislação Federal, Estadoal e Municipal*. São Paulo: Lex, pp. 368-369.

Santa Catarina (1886). "Decretos, Leis, etc. Lei nº. 1.114 de 30 de setembro de 1886," in *Coleção de decretos, leis e portarias de 1886*. Florianópolis: Imprensa Oficial.

Santa Catarina (1914). "Decretos, Leis, etc. Decreto nº. 794 de 2 de maio de 1914," in *Coleção de decretos, leis e portarias de 1914*. Florianópolis: Imprensa Oficial.

Guimarães, Orestes (1911). *Parecer sobre a Adopção de Obras Didacticas*. Florianópolis: Gab. Typ. d'O Dia.

Guimarães, Orestes (1888). *Trecho de um Relatório*. Florianópolis: Officinas graphicas d'A Phenix,

Guimarães, Orestes (1888). *Relatório apresentado à Assembléia Legislativa Provincial de Santa Catarina pelo Presidente Francisco José da Rocha em 11 de outubro de 1887*. Rio de Janeiro: Typ. União, 1888.

Mikes, M. (1986). "Towards a typology of languages of instruction in multilingual societies," in Spolsky, B., Ed., *Language and Education in Multilingual Settings*. Avon: Bath Press, pp. 16-22.

Rocha, Fransico José da (1888). *Relatório apresentado à Assembléia Legislativa Provincial de Santa Catharina na 2ª sessão de sua 26ª legislatura pelo Presidente Francisco José da Rocha em 11 de outubro de 1887*. Rio de janeiro: Typ. União.

Santa Catarina (1918). *Officios da Instrução Pública à Secretaria Geral dos Negócios do Estado*. São Bento.

Santa Catarina (1919). *Minutas da Instrução Pública 1918* e *1919*. Florianópolis.

Santa Catarina (s/d). *Instruções Liga Pró-Língua Nacional*. Departamento de Educação.

Santa Catarina (1917). *Decretos, Leis, etc. Lei n. 1.187 de 5 de outubro de 1917. Colleção de Leis, Decretos, Resoluções e Portarias de 1917*. Florianópolis: Officinas à e-lect. da Emprenza d'O Dia, pp. 77-81.

Santa Catarina (1917). *Decretos, Leis, etc. Decreto n. 1.063 de 8 de novembro de 1917. Colleção de Leis, Decretos, Resoluções e Portarias de 1917*. Florianópolis: Officinas à elect. da Empreza d'O Dia, pp. 65-66.

Santa Catarina (1919). *Decretos, Leis, etc. Lei nº 1.283 de 15 de setembro de 1919. Coleção de decretos, leis e portarias de 1919*. Florianópolis: Imprensa Oficial, pp. 34-36.

Santa Catarina (1920). *Decretos, Leis, etc. Lei nº 1.322 de 29 de janeiro de 1920. Coleção de decretos, leis e portarias de 1920*. Florianópolis: Imprensa Oficial, pp. 21-23.

Santa Catarina (1932). *Decretos, Leis, etc. Decreto nº 58 de 28 de janeiro de 1931. Coleção de Decretos, Resoluções e Portarias de 1931*. Florianópolis: Gab. Tip. Brasil, pp. 12-15.

Santa Catarina (1932). *Decretos, Leis, etc. Decreto Lei n.35 de 13 de janeiro de 1938. Coleção de Decretos-leis de 1938*. Florianópolis: Imprensa Oficial, p. 118.

Santa Catarina (1938). *Decretos, Leis, etc. Decreto-Lei n. 88 de 31 de março de 1938. Coleção de Decretos-Leis de 1938*. Florianópolis: Imprensa Oficial, pp. 119-129.

Santa Catarina (1938). *Decretos, Leis, etc. Decreto-Lei n. 124 de 18 de junho de 1938. Coleção de Decretos-Leis de 1938*. Florianópolis: Imprensa Oficial, pp. 119-129.

Chapter Four

Language, TESOL, and Nonkilling

Peace, Nonviolence, and Nonkilling are related
for all share a commitment to Life-celebration
Peace, Nonviolence, and Nonkilling are integrated
in the global construction of Life-preservation

Language Exposure in Farsi

Nonkilling Linguistics and Teaching English to Speakers of other Languages

Shelley Wong and Maryam Saroughi
George Mason University

Introduction

In this chapter we will report on a workshop for teachers. In it we attempted to create, through exposure to Farsi, awareness of the challenges that English as a Second Language (ESL) students or English language learners may face in learning social studies, science or math in a foreign language. Teachers who are monolingual English users and have never attempted to learn another language may not appreciate how difficult it is to develop communicative competence in another language or how challenging it is to adjust to a new culture. We were also concerned that, because of the climate of anti-Muslim and anti-Arab sentiment in the United States, teachers of immigrant students might have questions about how to better meet the needs of English language learners from the Middle East. Therefore we designed a workshop using Farsi as the medium of instruction to enable teachers to experience what it is like to try to participate in a class taught in a foreign language.

We will open with the problem of representation of Middle Easterners in the U.S. media and Hollywood in the context of the War on Terrorism. Media depiction of Arabs, Muslims, Middle Eastern and South Asian people in face of the continued U.S. military occupation of Afghanistan and Iraq justifies and offers a rationale for the drone strikes in Pakistan, the bombing of Libya and provide offers the ideological support for a military attack on Iran. This is a problem because American teachers, like the general public may be affected by the de-humanizing images of the Middle East.

We will then describe the context of our action research project, the graduate course for beginning teachers in the field and the teachers' concerns in teaching English to speakers of other languages. The theme of the day was "Multiple Perspectives" and the professor who invited us to the class introduced the topic of critical consciousness which framed our presentation. We will then describe the activities from our workshop to introduce Farsi. Finally, we will analyze the feedback we received from the teachers and reflect on the implications for nonkilling linguistics and for teacher education in the U.S.

Media Representations of the Middle East

The U.S. prides itself on being a democratic, free and open society. However, the concentration of the media in a few corporate media outlets silences voices against the status quo, for example, the occupation of Iraq (Artz and Kamalipour, 2005). There is also little coverage of protests against the drone strikes in Pakistan. Arabs and Muslims are represented as the Enemy and the War on Terrorism has been used to justify racial profiling (Tehranian, 2009).

In the U.S. mainstream news print and TV media, there is little coverage of perspectives that question or oppose U.S. occupation of Iraq and Afghanistan. Noam Chomsky and other prominent anti-war critics of U.S. foreign policy are only covered in independent and alternative media outlets, rather than commercial and corporate media. In the discussions over the U.S. federal government budget, there tends to be no significant debate concerning the framing of national priorities—of the number of schools, for example, that could be built with the money that is spent on one B1 bomber (Gutstein and Peterson, 2005). Anti-racist, immigrant rights, environmental justice and labor demonstrations are either not reported or under-reported.

An analysis of current events in the U.S. presents a very limited political spectrum of political viewpoints. Absent from the mainstream media are the voices of Palestinians, Arabs, Muslims. Jackie Saloum, an independent filmmaker, produced a short documentary film titled *Planet of the Arabs*—in which she pulled clips which depicted Arabs from Hollywood movies. The documentary is a visual portrayal of Jack Shaheen's analysis of more than 900 Hollywood films from as early as 1912, and it provides the history of representation of Arabs (2001).

Representation of Middle Easterns, South Asians, Arabs and Muslims in the cinema media is extremely stereotypical—often times there are allusions to terrorism. Hollywood films present a "good guy" "bad guy" view with Middle Easterners rarely seen as the heroes. Shaheen uncovered only a handful of heroic Muslims in a few 1980s and 1990 movies, for example, in *Robin Hood, Prince of Thieves* (1991) a devout Muslim "fights better than twenty English knights."

However, these are the exceptions. Shaheen's analysis shows that the "marketplace is saturated with all sorts of Arab villains. Producers collectively impugned Arabs in every type of move you can imagine, targeting adults in well-known and high-budgeted movies such as *Exodus* (1960), *Black Sunday* (1977), *Ishtar* (1987), and *The Seige* (1998)…" (Shaheen, 2003: 176) Dozens of films for almost 100 years of cinema history have presented

allied agents and military forces obliterating Arabs. If Arabs are portrayed as villains, the audience is encouraged to see their deaths as justified.

Photos in the newspapers such as the Washington Post show, on Veterans Day, full page images, row after row of photos, of U.S. servicemen in uniform who have been killed in Iraq. The photos that appear are not of service men and women who have been maimed or wounded, but well-groomed, handsome portrait shots as if for a high school year book. While the photos appear to honor those who have sacrificed their lives, they shield the public from the actual horrors of war.

Many researchers and activists have called attention to the fact that bodies of fallen military in the war are "invisible" and that making them so is a strategy to prevent the American people from opposing the war (Caspar and Moore, 2009). In addition, there are rarely photos of Iraqis who have lost their lives or are casualties of the war. Some health professionals (Yamada, Smith Fawzi, Maskarinec and Farmer, 2006) have pointed out the problem of lack of information on the part of Americans in the media coverage of U.S. media outlets, compared to the coverage in other countries, concerning narratives and images of Iraqi civilian suffering. They urge public health professionals to seek out these narratives and images as part of their responsibility to prevent unnecessary suffering of civilians.

There are regular reports in the Washington Post of the deaths of the U.S. military, but the number of Iraqis that have been killed is rarely reported. A notable exception is reportage of a study of American and Iraqi epidemiologists who conducted a random sampling of households and estimated that "655,000 more people have died in Iraq since coalition forces arrived in March 2003 than would have died if the invasion had not occurred" (Brown, 2006). U.S. teachers who do not have access to international news sources or independent films can't help but be influenced—even at the subconscious level—by negative stereotypes in a continuous barrage of messages that can be narrowed down to Middle Eastern men being terrorists and riding camels and women being either exotic belly dancers or religious "fanatics" oppressed by being forced to wear the veil. Stereotypes of Arabs in Hollywood draw on and incorporate negative stereotypes of other minorities. For example, the word "skeikh" means a wise elderly person, the head of a family, but you would not know this from Hollywood movies. As Shaheen (2003: 180) points out, "Instead of presenting sheikhs as elderly men of wisdom, screenwriters offer romantic melodramas portraying them as stooges-in-sheets, slovenly, hook-nosed potentates intent of capturing pale-faced blondes for their harems."

Context of the Action Research Project

We had been invited by an education faculty member at a university in a large Metropolitan Area in the United States to talk to a group of elementary and secondary school teachers (most were in their first 3 years of teaching) about how to support the academic achievement of students whose home language was not English in all subject areas (Art, Math, Social Studies, Physical Education, etc.) The teachers were all graduate students who were studying for their masters' degree while teaching students of various ages, grades and subjects.

The class was composed of almost 50 teachers. The size of the group and the schedule of the day-long sessions require that faculty provide structure to be able to stimulate, challenge and be relevant to the practical curricular and instructional concerns of teachers from a wide range of disciplinary and professional knowledge bases (for example music, science, physical education, special education and foreign languages). Teachers were provided with colorful handouts including a schedule of the day, lyrics to a song and some supplemental readings. Course assignments and the organization of the agenda helped to focus attention effectively to tie the themes of "multiple perspectives" and "critical consciousness."

Classroom Activities and Spaces for Dialogic Interaction

The room was a large auditorium and the chairs were permanently affixed in rows. While the architectural organization of the room (without flexibility to move the chairs into circles) lends itself more to lecture than group work, the professors of the course nonetheless worked effectively to employ a variety of cooperative learning techniques and various grouping patterns for class activities so that students were engaged all day. The theme of the day was "Multiple Perspectives" and the activities included guest speakers on linguistic diversity and academic achievement, honoring home languages and cultures, an independent film on immigration (filmed in the county in which some of the teachers worked) and reflection and peer feedback on the teachers' action research projects.

Goals and Description of the Farsi Awareness Lesson

The major aim of the workshop was to collaborate with the faculty and novice teachers to generate awareness of strategies that mainstream classroom teachers can employ to support English Language Learners (ELLs), English as a Second Language (ESL) or English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) students by providing an immersion activity. We wanted the teachers to experi-

ence first-hand being in a classroom as a language minority student. We selected Farsi, because it is a less commonly taught language in the United States. (We thought if the teachers were bilingual, that they would more likely speak Spanish, French, German or have a working knowledge of Latin, which are the languages most frequently taught in U.S. schools.) The selection of Farsi would enable participants to experience an activity in a language they were not familiar with. In addition, from a nonkilling linguistics perspective, Farsi is an important language to expose Americans to because Farsi is spoken in Iran.

There is very little information in the U.S. about Iran, and depictions of Iran in the news media and Hollywood are overwhelmingly negative. President Bush labeled Iran, Iraq and North Korea as "the axis of evil." When "evil" becomes associated with individual countries, then killing starts being portrayed as "justified" as a moral crusade of good against evil.

The goals of the workshop were: a) to help teachers become more aware of cultural and linguistic differences to support academic achievement for students whose home language is not English; b) to focus on critical literacy and engage in dialogue with teachers over racism, poverty, language and power; and c) to incorporate multi-modal (textual, visual and kinesthetic) strategies to address social justice in multilingual multicultural community. In the next section, Maryam Saroughi, a native of Iran and a native Speaker of Farsi, uses personal narrative to report on the lesson.

The Farsi Lesson: Personal Reflections

The purpose of this exercise was to let teachers experience the feelings of frustration and anxiety that students who are not proficient in English might experience in U.S. mainstream classrooms. I began my lesson by talking exclusively in Farsi. After introducing myself, I started to name some fruits and vegetables and then to categorize fruits and vegetables just by saying which one was a fruit and which one was a vegetable. After I opened the lesson in Farsi, my co-presenter, Shelley Wong, asked teachers (in English) if they knew what I was talking about. Most reported that they had no idea what was being said. Some teachers reported feelings of frustration and confusion. Although the introduction was only a few minutes in length, to the teachers it seemed like a very long time had elapsed; they were not used to hearing a long stream of talk in a foreign language they didn't recognize. They were not used to not understanding what was occurring in the lesson. Some began to feel impatient.

After this initial introduction, I repeated what I had said again. I repeated the names of the same fruits and vegetables in Farsi but this time I held up the fruits and vegetables for the teachers to see what I was naming. After naming the fruits and vegetables, I started to separate vegetables from fruits. While naming them in Farsi I put fruits in one basket and vegetables in a different basket. After I had finished this demonstration, the other researcher asked teachers the same question, if they had understood what was going on and what I was talking about. This time many teachers reported more understanding and less frustration. The physical demonstration had helped teachers rely on their prior knowledge of the classification of apples, carrots and celery into the categories of "fruits" or "vegetables" (Williams, 1988). This time they understood the activity better and many began to feel more relaxed.

The next activity required that we focus on a map of the Middle East. The map was shown in the workshop to introduce different countries in the Middle East. We wanted teachers to locate Iran on a map and to see its neighboring countries, their languages and different dialects. I pronounced the name of the countries and their major cities as they are pronounced in local languages and then as they are pronounced in English. I explained that Iranian people speak Farsi but in its neighboring countries people speak different languages such as Arabic, Urdu, Pashto, Tajik and Armenian. Many teachers were surprised to know that in Iran, people speak Farsi, which is a different language from Arabic, the language spoken in Iraq. Some teachers were completely unfamiliar with the way that the names of Middle Eastern were pronounced in local languages and some people were completely unaware of the existence of the various countries.

Teacher Feedback to the Farsi Workshop

We conducted our workshop with an eye on the nonkilling linguistic paradigm and tried to include activities which make teachers familiar with cultural differences and language barriers experienced by English Language Learners. At the end of the workshop, besides gathering some demographic data relating to where and what our teachers had been teaching, we asked the teachers to give us feedback about the workshop to help us improve our future presentations so that they could be more productive and more informative about cultural differences and linguistics awareness. Some of the responses to an open-ended question concerning what they had learned from the presentation included:

- how different and difficult pronunciations can be in different languages;
- the importance of reaching out to students through their native language;
- how interesting it was to experience what it might feel like to not understand a language;
- how there were more barriers for ESL families than they had thought;
- how using visual cues could help ESOL students;
- how much new-found empathy they felt for ELLs.

We ended the session by answering student-teachers' questions that included the following: "How do you help the new teachers be ready for the new cultures that they will be experiencing or the "culture shock" they might go through? How does your experience teaching in other countries affect your view on its culture when you see it in the USA?" (A full list of teacher questions is included in the appendix).

Maryam's Reflections on the Workshop

Before attending this workshop, I always perceived this Eastern USA location, a multilingual, multicultural state, as having a diverse educational system with a population of multilingual and multicultural teachers and staff; however, in the workshop I noticed little diversity. I have to say that I was surprised to see that the teacher population in the workshop was predominately a monoracial one, almost all white Americans, with a few exceptions. My overall impression was that there was very little exposure to other languages or cultures and in some cases a little ignorance and negligence. Nevertheless, most teachers were open-minded toward diversity; there were still some teachers with conflicting views about educating a diverse population of students, teachers who thought there was "no problem" with the educational system.

A teacher's views of diversity shape her/his tolerance toward her/his English language learner students. If a teacher believes that there is no problem with the education system and there is no danger of an achievement gap between language learners and native speakers, how can that teacher help a student facing those problems? Supporting English language learners starts with an awareness of systemic issues of discrimination, inequality and oppression and that was what our workshop aimed to initiate.

What did we learn from the workshop? Feedback from teachers shows the benefit of raising multicultural awareness among teachers by providing content-based learning experiences in a foreign language such as Farsi. Teachers reported that they benefited from exposure to less commonly taught languages. A few commented that they were able to experience the

frustration of being in an "immersion" experience and expressed appreciation for what their English as a Second Language students must be going through. A number of teachers expressed the desire to learn more expressions and common phrases of the languages of their students. Use of different instructional methods (use of experiential activities, manipulatives, visuals) can support literacy development for English language learners to be successful in academic achievement (Austin, 2011).

Teacher Questions: Shelley Wong's reflections

Although some were very experienced or veteran teachers who had taught many years, most of the teachers in our audience were beginning or novice teachers in their 1-3 initial years of teaching. Before our visit to the class, the faculty teaching the course gathered questions from the teachers for us to address. We really appreciated the care that the professors in this course took to "problem pose" with the teachers in advance of our visit so that the teachers would not be passive spectators but rather take on the challenge of teaching English Language Learners.

In many U.S. school districts, teachers who are not designated as "English as a Second Language" (ESL) teachers feel that it is the responsibility of the "ESL" teachers to teach English—not the job of teachers who teach math or science or social studies. However, this is a problem for the international (those who are studying in the U.S. with the plan of returning to their home countries) and immigrant students who spend most of their time in the "regular" or "mainstream" classroom and may only see ESL teachers for a few hours a week (if at all).

A major goal of Multilingual Multicultural Education is to encourage *all* teachers to feel responsible for teaching English Language learners not only the "English" or ESL teachers. Our workshop aimed at helping the "regular" or "mainstream" teachers to gain some empathy for ESL students and to take responsibility for supporting their learning. We wanted them to experience for themselves how hands-on demonstrations, use of colorful visuals, and use of tactile objects can facilitate comprehension and promote active learning. We also wanted them to put forward their questions and the challenges they saw in reaching ESL students so that we can all work as a team to address the achievement gap between native and nonnative English speakers and accelerate the progress of those who have the double burden of learning new content as they learn a new language (Walqui and DeFazio, 2003).

In our workshop we attempted to address most of the questions posed by the very diverse group of teachers (teaching elementary school, middle school and high school and all subjects from Physical Education and Arts to Science, History and Language. We shared some practical suggestions about how to have "buddies" or students in the class be responsible for welcoming new students to the class and showing them where the bathrooms were, the main office, the cafeteria. We talked about the overall challenges that students may face and the importance of working with librarians to get materials in the home languages of students. We also talked about the importance of having an additive (not subtractive) approach to the new language. We want to teach English as an *additional* language, rather than replace the home language with English (Wong, 2000).

The value of "problem posing" as a community of professionals is a key feature of nonkilling linguistics. "Problem *posing*" as opposed to "Problem *solving*" implies that we face a problem so entrenched—so massive that it may seem insurmountable. There is no single solution, nor "quick" fix. Within the U.S. context—opposition to war, occupation, militarism and imperialism is not easy. Given the bias in the media, the misinformation and omission from the educational curriculum of Middle Eastern history, language, culture--the challenge of recognizing the humanity of those who have been labeled "the enemy" is protracted. It involves a paradigm shift involving multiple dimensions of historic marginalization (Wong, 2006). Developing a body of work in nonkilling linguistics is part of the work and it involves collaboration.

Asking teachers to pose questions and to join professional associations, teacher unions and educational collectives and teams to discuss and seek solutions is *part* of the solution and a moral imperative. Nonkilling linguistics in TESOL calls for collaboration to take responsibility for the education of all students—especially those who come from historically marginalized communities—the poor, children of migrant workers, those who are undocumented, those who face oppression in schools and society because they are seen as different, or less than. The overarching goal of a nonkilling approach is to preserve "life" in all its forms, including the life of languages, the survival of dialects, and the maintenance of cultural diversity. Teachers can be a big part of this project.

Problem posing to address the challenges of teaching English learners is an important feature of nonkilling linguistics, but that does not mean that all questions posed by teachers will support ESL student learning. At least one question among the list of teacher questions #2), in our view was problematic. We pose this question for discussion to conclude this chapter.

> How can you approach crucial conversations with cultures, especially in a culture that seems to respect women less? I have a student who comes from Islamic kindergarten and is adjusting to a school community of women teachers. He does not listen to most of us due to gender.

Question #2 makes a number of assumptions about cross-cultural communication (the "us and them" binary, for example) and Middle Eastern culture and religion that the parents of the child (as well as the teachers from his previous Islamic school) might find problematic. The teacher believes that the boy does not listen to his (Western) teachers because they are women.

How might we as nonkilling linguists and multilingual, multicultural educators better respond to what we call "problematic" "ethnocentric" and "stereotypical" questions? How can we support social justice and the development of critical consciousness within our profession? We who are part of the majority or dominant group or community should take our cues from colleagues who are members of the minority group or community that faces discrimination. For example, if we want to overcome racism, we need to learn from African-American and other communities of color (Sue, 2003).

When I asked teachers who had taught in an Islamic school how they would respond to the question, I got a few insights. First, the majority of teachers in the local Islamic school are women. As teachers, professional women, they are respected. Second, it is important to realize that there are many mis-conceptions about "the oppression" of Muslim woman—including the assumption that wearing traditional dress is oppressive.

Gender inequality occurs in countries around the world. The problem of women being less respected than men is just as much an issue in U.S. culture and society as it is in other countries around the world. One reason we as Americans may not notice the tremendous gender inequality within our own culture and society—is that gender inequality is so embedded in our own culture, language and ideology that we are not aware of its multiple manifestations.

Within each culture we are so socialized to gendered relations concerning what is "normal" for girls (or boys)—that we are not conscious of the inequalities—they are taken for granted as "the way things are." Yet, we often catch ourselves and others saying things such as "Boys will be boys" "Boys don't cry," "That's not lady-like." The struggle to recognize gender, racial and class inequalities—as well as other hierarchical structures of oppression is an ongoing project of nonkilling linguistics and all critical disciplines for that matter.

In a multi-ethnic community, such a project may require that all children have the opportunity to hear from various Muslim women about the signifi-

cance of wearing a head scarf as well as hear debates and differing perspectives within particular religious and ethnic communities.

Returning to question two, perhaps we can reframe the question with the young boy in mind. First, we don't approach crucial conversations with *cultures*, but with *people*. To overcome racism an important principle is "to learn about people of color from sources within the group." (Sue, 2003: 204). Sue recommends reading poetry, literature to learn about other cultures. A second principle is "to learn from healthy and strong people of the culture." The relevant people for the teacher to have crucial conversations will be the young boy's family. What country does he come from? Who are the significant people in this family? How many live with him? Did he leave significant family members behind? Sometimes the families of children we work with may not be healthy and strong. Are there ways that we in schools can assist the families? In those cases, it is important to make contact with other professionals and community resources from the culture. Suggestions include visiting the Islamic school where he attended kindergarten, attending educational forums, events, street fairs put on by the community.

What are possible reasons why "the boy does not seem to listen to most of his teachers?" Many young children have trouble moving to a new school. Adjustment to a new language can be very frightening for some children. Does he listen to any of his teachers? Does he have a "buddy" in the class who can be his friend? What does he miss from his old school?

The stereotypes about Islamic culture respecting women less are part of the deep legacy of what Edward Said (1979) called "Orientalism" – knowledge in the Western academy that justifies colonialism, imperialism and military occupation. Nonkilling linguistics can help us recognize these discourses in the media and in Hollywood so we can take steps to make our schools more welcoming, inclusive communities for all children.

References

Artz, L. and Kamalipour, Y. R. (2005). *Bring 'em on: media and politics in the Iraq war*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, Publishers.

Associated Press/Fox News (2008). "States join legal brief supporting Arizona Immigration Law," http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2010/09/04/states-join-legal-brief-supporting-ariz-immigration-law-donations-roll-gov/

Austin, T. (2011). "Language learner-teachers: Evolving insights into emotions and second language teaching and learning," *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, March: 119-137.

Brown, D. (2006). "Study Claims Iraq's 'Excess' Death Toll Has Reached 655,000," *Washington Post,* Wednesday, October 11 A12.
Casper, M. J. and Moore, L. J. (2009). *Missing bodies: The politics of visibility*. New York: New York University Press.
Gutstein, E. and Peterson (2005). *Rethinking mathematics: Teaching social justice by the numbers.* Milwaukee: Rethinking Schools.
Said, E. (1979). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage.
Shaheen, J. G. (2001). *Reel bad Arabs: How Hollywood vilifies a people.* New York: Olive Branch Press.
Shaheen, J. G. (2003). "Reel bad Arabs: How Hollywood vilifies a people," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 588: 171-193.
Sue, D.W. (2003). *Overcoming our racism: The journey to liberation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Tehranian, J. (2009). "The Last Minstrel Show? Racial Profiling, the War on Terrorism and the Mass Media," *Connecticut Law Review*, 41(3): 781-874.
Walqui, A. and DeFazio, A. J. (2003). "The selection of written text for English learners," in *Teaching Reading to Adolescent English Learners*. San Francisco: Quality Teaching for English Learners, WestEd, pp. 1-12.
Williams, B. (1988). *Educating Linguistically and Culturally Diverse Students: An ASCD Professional Inquiry Kit.*
Wong, S. (2000). "Transforming the politics of schooling in the U.S.: a model for successful academic achievement for language minority students," in Hall, J. K. and Eggington, W., Eds., *Sociopolitics of English Language Teaching*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 117-39.
Wong, S. (2006). *Dialogic approaches to TESOL: Where the ginkgo tree grows*. New York: Routledge; Taylor and Francis.
Yamada, S., Smith Fawzi, M. C., Maskarinec, G. G. and Farmer, P. E. (2006). "Casualities: Narrative and images of the war on Iraq," *International Journal of Health Services*, 36(2): 401-415.

Appendix 1. Teacher Questions

1. Could you tell us more about the silent phase and navigating strategies for ESOL students?
2. How can you approach crucial conversations with cultures, especially in a culture that seems to respect women less? I have a student who comes from Islamic kindergarten and is adjusting to a school community of women teachers. He does not listen to most of us due to gender.
3. How can we get our ESOL and other students (especially young ones) to open about their culture (and teach us about it)?
4. I teach 7th grade science and have non-English speaking students "included" in my classroom for the first time this year. What is TESOL's stand on students that have just arrived to the country and speak no English being placed

in mainstream on-level classes? I'm sure that these students will eventually catch on, however for the short-term it seems almost like a form of torture for this child to be placed in an on-level mainstream class.

5. What do you do when testing ESOL students has become more important than actually teaching them?
6. Why have so many people from all over the world immigrated to the DC/Virginia area? How can we communicate with people of so many foreign cultures (parents and students) who don't speak English?
7. If our school systems are not providing enough professional development re: the many cultures in our classrooms, what resources would you recommend for us to educate ourselves? Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Middle Eastern, Indian, Islamic, Hindu.
8. How did you get to the position of being president of TESOL?
9. What are the biggest challenges of being an ESOL teacher?
10. How much do you study to do your job or equip teachers to do their job?
11. In FCPS students in kindergarten do not receive ESOL services due to a lack of funding. How do you feel about this?
12. How do you effectively communicate with ESOL students of many languages?
13. How do you help the new teachers be ready for the new cultures that they will be experiencing or the "culture shock"?
14. How does your experience teaching in other countries affect your view on its culture when you see it in the USA?
15. How do we approach education and teaching with a more multicultural perspective? How do you connect w/ home (parents) of other cultures? Especially when they do not speak English or have different ideas about education?

Appendix 2. Teacher Perceptions of the Barriers that ESOL Students Face

- If parents are advocates for their kids, the student has a voice
- under representation
- under REP ESOL
- limited or no translator for certain languages
- They are pulled for ESOL services, and then they miss what's going on in the class. They need interaction and conversation with their peers
- over Asians and Indians, under blacks and whites
- over representation of whites and Asians in Gifted and Talented programs
- students who don't understand English or Spanish
- home school communication , less advantaged
- we have one of the largest population of ESOL population and team, but we still need more staff to meet students need

- No one to advocate for them. Need translators for their parents to speak to teacher. Caucasians are small minority in my school. Biggest problem are parents who cannot help
- not enough adults to translate
- testing
- lack of access to an ESOL teacher
- not enough to provide mutual support
- learning a new language
- we have one of the largest population of ESOL population and team, but we still need more staff to meet students need
- lack of resources, 200 + ESOL students and 3 teachers
- not enough integration to allow ESOL students to feel like a big enough part of the school community
- being separated and not connected to larger school community
- we don't have any ESOL population that I am aware of
- lack of ESOL teachers to help in all areas
- they struggle with some social norms and lower reading and writing abilities
- parents lack of ability
- ESL students don't have the same parental involvement
- understanding- testing
- Cluster class room of ESL students- not enough role model. Their class is considered as inferior. Parents of white don't want their student in it.
- translations
- lack of resources, standardized testing
- adjusting to new culture, economy, emotional distress
- few teachers have ESOL training
- access to resource out of school, lack of parental involvement because of ability
- only 2 ESOL teachers/ feeling like outsiders
- lack of vocabulary and support at home because of language barrier- minimal service
- parental language barrier

Appendix 3. What they Learned from the Workshop (Importance of experiential)

- I enjoyed viewing Polish and Farsi, because I love seeing connections of other languages to grammatical constructions in Latin- great to be able to share with my multilingual kids.
- Start where you are but don't stay there
- Diversity!
- The idea of world English and that other views of English should not be considered second English
- how different and difficult pronunciation can be in different languages

- ways to help ESOL students make initial connections
- world Englishes—the idea of over and under representation of a group—foster child security as an issue
- Polish , Farsi
- reaching out to student through language
- the list of the idea of what to use in your classroom
- importance of home language
- playground/social language learning
- importance of encouraging students to use their language more often
- interesting to see what it might feel like if you don't understand a language
- your expectation are unrealistic
- there are even more barriers that I thought for ESL families
- reinforce my thinking for teaching ESOL students
- thinking of other ways to help ESOL students
- structure and routines are helpful and comforting, critical consciousness= double consciousness
- to encourage ESL students to take class in their own languages
- not intervention or screening
- using visual cues to help ESL students- I feel new empathy for my ELLs
- teachers can do to reach ESL students lies in learning a word or 2 in their native language
- children learn quickly, start where you are but don't stop there
- I loved hearing more languages
- strategies to help ESL students
- learn children language and native country
- understanding language barriers and ESL students feelings

Chapter Five

Language, Journalism, and Nonkilling

we believe there is a global service in which we journalists can excel:
that of contributing to improving universal communicative health
by practicing a Nonkilling Journalism which will help Society live well

Por uma linguagem jornalística fundamentada no paradigma do não matar

Enio Moraes Júnior and Murilo Jardelino da Costa
ESPM and UNINOVE/FASB

Em toda e qualquer sistematização científica ou acadêmica cujo objetivo seja realizar uma reflexão sobre a linguagem jornalística, vamos tatear inevitavelmente sobre uma série de considerações acerca do fazer jornalístico. Da agenda do que vai ou não ser publicado nos jornais, passando pela cobertura dos fatos, pelos filtros que articulam os interesses sobre a divulgação desses fatos, tudo são etapas da produção do jornalismo. Mas é no dizer, no comunicar a informação de interesse público – no discurso –, que o jornalismo finalmente se realiza.

Portanto, a articulação de uma linguagem jornalística trata, de partida, das contradições e das subjetividades do ofício. Contradições porque o jornalismo é, por natureza, uma área contraditória, cujo trabalho não se curva diante de uma verdade, mas que deve buscar "as verdades" dos fatos, ou seja, os interesses e as versões que estão por trás de cada acontecimento.

Ao buscar esses interesses e essas versões, essa atuação faz-se desafiadora e ousada para o jornalista. É um trabalho em que os limites entre o fato e a presença do jornalista acabam por produzir uma intensa carga subjetiva e / ou ideológica ao que é dito, ao que é contado.

Essas questões do fazer jornalístico trazem à tona inevitáveis reflexões que dizem respeito à ética e à deontologia da profissão. Talvez a mais desafiadoras delas seja pensar que é no dizer que o jornalismo se faz, que ele acontece e pode ser conceituado.

Portanto, jornalismo é sobretudo linguagem, expressamente discurso, produto de um agendamento, de uma apuração e de uma ética. Ao propor uma Pragmática do Jornalismo, a concepção de Chaparro sobre a qual deve ser o empenho da imprensa – uma construção ética, técnica e estética do relato veraz – ratifica essa ideia.

> Sempre que um editor ou um repórter – por incompetência, arrogância, interesse pessoal, ambição de poder, irresponsabilidade profissional, subalternidade a quem o controla ou qualquer outro motivo – priva o leitor da notícia correta e plena, trai o principal e mais belos dos compromissos que tem com a construção e o aperfeiçoamento de uma sociedade livre: assegurar a 'todo indivíduo' o direito de ser informado. Com relato veraz. (1984: 82)

Ademais, ao falar da veracidade do relato, Chaparro chama atenção para o fato de que a verdade não pode ser pretendida como conceito único, mas como um conjunto de possibilidades decorrente de cada olhar subjetivo. Por isso, no caso da narrativa do jornalismo, o autor fala em veracidade, tendo em vista que se tratam de "verdades" construídas pelo sujeito, o jornalista, que articula a informação. Muito se fala, no jornalismo, dos pré-requisitos técnicos e estéticos de sua linguagem. Manuais de redação ensinam aspectos como a construção do lide, as variações piramidais do texto e as normas de redação. O jornalismo literário de Truman Capote e Gay Telese muito contribuiu para textos mais sedutores e esteticamente resolvidos.

Se levarmos nosso entendimento de linguagem para uma esfera mais alargada, havemos de considerar impecáveis a qualidade estética da diagramação da página e a arquitetura da *homepage*, em mídia impressa e *on line*, respectivamente. A voz do locutor do programa radiojornalístico ou do apresentador e do repórter do telejornal são também de qualidade irrepreensível. Mas pouco se discute e se fala a respeito de uma ética dessa linguagem.

Em virtude disso, nesse texto, nosso objetivo é pensar em direção a um fazer jornalístico fundamentado em uma ética, em consonância com as bases transformacionais para um paradigma do não matar. Sabemos que essa mudança no fazer jornalístico não ocorrerá de imediato, uma vez que uma mudança de paradigma corresponde a:

> (...) um processo social longo que implica alterações significativas no modo como as disciplinas funcionam, modificando perspectivas sobre o que é pensável ou impensável, alterando estratégias intelectuais para a resolução de problemas e modificando o uso da terminologia e os marcos conceituais em um novo universo discursivo. Quando as anomalias resultam mais amplamente reconhecidas, a falta de consenso, novas articulações do paradigma e novas descobertas proliferam. Como Kuhn expressa, "o mundo dos cientistas é transformado qualitativamente e enriquecido quantitativamente por novidades essenciais, seja no âmbito da teoria ou dos fatos" *(1962:7, tradução própria)*. Neste ponto, novas ideias que previamente foram relegadas às margens do pensamento acadêmico são trazidas à tona e enfrentam o marco teórico previamente aceitado em uma disputa epistemológica. (Evans Pim, 2009: 190)

Embora reconheçamos que a proposta insere-se em um processo, não podemos deixar de levar em consideração a necessidade de reorientação do papel do jornalismo no contexto do não matar. Como dizem Kovach e Rosenstiel (2004: 31-32), "a imprensa ajuda a definir nossas comunidades, nos ajuda a criar uma linguagem e conhecimentos comuns com base na realidade".

O jornalista, portanto, deve ter consciência da complexidade da sua fala e do uso da linguagem na sua atividade profissional. É o que afirma Chaparro (2005) ao atentar para o fato de que jornalista será intelectualmente inepto se "não dominar, plena e criativamente, os conceitos, os recursos, as técnicas, as artes e as implicações da linguagem jornalística, ferramentas do seu ofício".

Pensar o fazer jornalístico nessas bases, inserindo-o no paradigma do não matar, começa com o pressuposto de que a realidade não é um dado *a priori*, mas um construto sócio histórico e cultural. A linguagem, nesse sentido, não pode ser considerada como reflexo da realidade, visto que ela não espelha os acontecimentos, fenômenos ou objetos independentemente dos modos de uso que se concretizam por regras de interação entre signos e signos (sintáticas), signos e referentes (semânticas) e os usuários entre si (pragmáticas).

Discurso e signo linguístico

A concepção de linguagem como forma de retratar fielmente a realidade é resultado de uma tradição de ciência positivista em favor da possibilidade de acesso direto, sem intermediação, a fatos, fenômenos etc. O Positivismo não só fundamentou boa parte dos estudos linguísticos e da teoria da informação na primeira década do século XX, como também se manifestou na relação entre comunicação e ciência. Acerca dessa relação, afirma Martín-Barbero (1998: 4): "O que continua sendo crucial para um discurso da comunicação ainda é frequentemente enredado no idealismo de uma objetividade da informação que não é senão *pretensão de um discurso sem sujeito*." (grifo do autor).

A linguagem se estabelece nas convenções sociais nas quais ela opera e pelas quais ele é determinada. A implicação em se pensar a linguagem assim consiste na reelaboração do conceito de signo linguístico, que passa a ser percebido em sua dimensão de algo em estado de equilíbrio dinâmico. Nesse sentido, o signo deixa de ser visto como resultado de relações naturalizadas, e passa a ser concebido como refração de uma luta histórica para referendar os sentidos que interessam a determinados grupos em detrimento de outros sem a mesma força política. Levando isso em consideração, cabe-nos pensar em que consiste uma linguagem jornalística fundamentada no não matar, para contrapor aqueles que consideram a letalidade inexorável à

condição humana. O signo, encarado dessa forma, em seu equilíbrio instável, é a possibilidade do vir a ser.

Ancorados nessa concepção de signo, Foucault (2003) nos auxilia a compreender a opção por determinada maneira de falar sobre as coisas, fatos, acontecimentos em um contexto específico, vinculada a um dado tempo e espaço, como a identificação a um modo específico de pensar e recriar discursivamente a sociedade.

Para esse filósofo, a suposta neutralidade das ciências, entre elas, a Linguística, o caráter dogmático da religião, a aparente onisciência do juiz e do médico e também o caráter aparente de informação desinteressada do jornalismo, podemos assim considerar, asseguram a manutenção da validade de determinadas significações, ao invés de outras, dentro das instituições que representam.

Como resultado de tudo isso, o senso comum, que aceitamos irrefletidamente porque 'todos' entendemos como sendo óbvio (natural), funciona como um véu que nos impede de refletir sobre conceitos, hábitos, afirmações etc. Em nosso caso, ao revelar como a maneira de falar sobre a letalidade em um contexto específico identifica-se com esse modo de recriar discursivamente a morte, damos um primeiro passo em direção à elaboração de uma linguagem jornalística articulada à ética do não matar.

O jornalismo tem sido prodigioso em matérias sobre segurança particular. Por um lado, os "cidadãos de bem", como fazem questão de frisar alguns apresentadores de telejornais vespertinos, precisam investir em segurança nas suas casas e no local de trabalho. Por outro, qual o destino que esses cidadãos pretendem para os "criminosos" – por oposição, esses geralmente subentendidos como "indivíduos do mal"?[1] Se o signo discursivo da letalidade não se explicita nesse tipo de matéria, é, no mínimo, silenciado.

Estabelecer a crítica e discutir o jornalismo nessas bases é considerá-lo também um modo específico de perceber, pensar e recriar a sociedade, juntamente com outras formas de atuação como as que se manifestam nas

[1] A televisão brasileira tem sido prolífica em programas desse tipo. Merecem menção os apresentadores Gil Gomes, que no início dos anos 90 apresentou o programa *Aqui Agora*, no Sistema Brasileiro de Televisão, e hoje, José Luiz Datena, apresentador do programa *Brasil Urgente*, na Rede Record de Televisão. Esse tipo de programa identifica-se com o que Angrimani Sobrinho (1995: 17) denomina sensacionalista. A esse respeito, observa o autor: "O meio de comunicação sensacionalista se assemelha a um neurótico obsessivo, um ego que deseja dar vazão a múltiplas ações transgressoras – que busca satisfação no fetichismo, voyeurismo, sadomasoquismo, coprofilia, incesto, pedofilia, necrofilia – ao mesmo tempo em que é reprimido por um superego cruel e implacável. É nesse pêndulo (transgressão-punição) que o sensacionalismo se apóia".

esferas jurídica, religiosa etc. A materialização dessa concepção de sociedade traz, ao longo do tempo, mudanças nos conhecimentos, crenças, valores e atitudes. Essa questão nos remete à ideia sobre a mudança para o paradigma do não matar como um processo social.

Linguagem do não matar

Poderíamos afirmar que o mundo nos é apresentado de uma maneira definida, contudo não definitiva, já que nesse processo de apreensão e reconstrução da realidade, sempre há a possibilidade de mudanças, tanto as almejadas quanto as que não resultam de nossa intencionalidade. Assim, é possível conceber a linguagem como *sistema aberto*, conforme Fairclough (2001), isto é, um sistema em que qualquer evento é influenciado por inúmeros mecanismos operativos que inviabilizam a separação, o controle ou a determinação do tipo de influência que cada um deles exerce. Portanto, por não ser um sistema fechado, a linguagem, além de permitir que os falantes reproduzam concepções de mundo já estabelecidas, possibilita-lhes a criação de novos sentidos.

Para tratar dessa dimensão, Bakhtin (1999) criou os conceitos de forças centrífugas e centrípetas. Esses vetores agem simultaneamente na linguagem, produzindo, além de concepções de mundo internalizadas, a possibilidade de recriação de novos sentidos. Esse pensador formulou o princípio dialógico da linguagem, em que se chama a atenção para a palavra do Outro, que consiste, na verdade, nos grupos designados *comunidades linguísticas*. Os falantes dessas comunidades dialogam entre si, em relações de força, nas quais cada palavra é parte de uma teia e detém em si própria uma tensão que se expressa de todas as maneiras. Seja no plano do conteúdo ou no plano da forma, num todo indivisível, formando um diálogo contínuo, em que forças de união e desunião atuam constantemente.

As forças centrípetas são responsáveis por manter a estabilidade desses discursos, assegurando a concepção de um mundo, aparentemente, homogêneo. Tentam estabilizar o valor do signo, tornando-o imóvel. Teriam, assim, um caráter conservador, reacionário. Para isso existem mecanismos, instrumentos e instâncias de produção de sentido, aceitas como as únicas capazes de "representar" a realidade.

A essa força conservadora, centrípeta, que Bakhtin (1999: 81) diz ser "regida por combinações linguísticas sistemáticas entre elementos interdependentes e complementares", corresponderia uma força centrífuga, que faz com que uma mesma língua, apesar de tender para a coesão, possua, simultaneamente, uma plasticidade que não se deixa facilmente perceber. Para o autor, essa plas-

ticidade seria justamente a condição para sua realização. No interior dessa aparente coesão, atuariam várias forças que concorreriam para mudar a correlação de poder, o que obriga as instâncias produtoras dessas forças centrípetas da vida social, linguística e ideológica a negociar mudanças com o intuito de conseguir manter-se em lugar privilegiado de exercício de poder.

No contexto de nossa discussão, podemos exemplificar como isso se manifesta nos referindo ao sentido para o matar (naturalizado, introjetado) e ao sentido para o não matar (para a possibilidade do não matar).

Essas posições antagônicas coexistem e se articulam na língua, nas mesmas *comunidades linguísticas*. Isso significa que o signo é um espaço de exercício de poder, no qual co-ocorrem e competem interesses sociais diversos, que tentam definir e controlar suas potencialidades. É dessa dinâmica que se sustenta sua vitalidade e também sua imprevisibilidade.

Essa forma de organização / articulação entre a prática linguística e outras práticas seria um conjunto de potencialidades em que o caráter de sociabilidade é fundamental. Essa pressuposição e exigência das práticas sociais entre si são modos de regulamentação. Ou seja, a materialização dessas práticas em forma de normas, hábitos, leis etc. é o que garante a sua própria reprodução. As práticas sociais são, pois, não apenas formas de selecionar e de controlar o que pode ocorrer, como também de regulamentar o que pode se materializar a partir de determinadas estruturas sociais. Elas são o mecanismo que serve de intermediação entre as estruturas sociais e suas ocorrências (Fairclough, 2003).

As jornalistas Adriana Nogueira e Ciça Lessa (2003) chamam atenção para a atuação da imprensa na predileção das brasileiras por partos cesarianos. Embora o livro não pretenda discutir essa questão e enfatize experiências de mulheres diante do nascimento de seus filhos, fica evidente uma das razões da opção pela cesariana em 40% dos partos no país e em 60% dos partos realizados no setor privado. Sobre essa questão, salientam as autoras (2003: 17):

> A imprensa, com exceção de algumas matérias bastante consistentes, tende a tratar o parto como um bem de consumo, cabendo à cliente definir qual o produto preferido, isto é, o parto normal ou cesáreo, e reconhecendo como bom provedor aquele que atende ao desejo do cliente.

A emergência conjunta de diversos elementos da vida numa determinada prática são acontecimentos dessa prática. Uma das ocorrências da materialização desses acontecimentos se manifesta em forma de enunciado, concebido como convergência de sistema interativo múltiplo, em que seus elementos são multifuncionais.

Mantém-se, portanto, a idéia de *sistema aberto*, assim como da transcendência das partes que se unem. O número de possibilidades de realizações textuais em nossas sociedades é, em virtude das mais diversas necessidades de interação, quase infinito. Portanto, encara-se a vida em sociedade como uma intersecção de textos produzidos indefinidamente, que adquirem como que vida própria, pois o que se produz transmite sentidos quase nunca controlados de acordo com a intenção dos interlocutores.

Entre as muitas práticas sociais, a língua é a que mais contribui para a construção da realidade, isto é, uma construção discursiva que fornece sentidos a nossa existência. Encontra-se articulada com outras práticas numa relação de equilíbrio dinâmico para responder às mudanças sociais.

Logo, a língua não pode ser concebida como um sistema que se basta *de per si*, único e homogêneo, mas é constituída por inúmeras linguagens que, com infinitas vozes, ressoam em todos os aspectos da vida. Todas, repetindo-se umas às outras, alimentando-se e se retroalimentando nessa *arena* (Bakhtin) na qual se digladiam todos os ecos. A língua se materializa em acontecimentos que trazem em si outros momentos dos quais não podem ser separados.

Essa concepção de linguagem, como prática social integrante, juntamente com outras, de uma determinada forma de construção da realidade, é necessária para o desenvolvimento de um novo paradigma para um jornalismo empenhado no não matar.

É no intervalo, no interstício – uma vez que se sabe ser a língua um sistema aberto –, e na instabilidade do signo linguístico que se pode atuar linguisticamente e defender o ponto de vista a favor da possibilidade de se criarem novos caminhos da criação de uma linguagem jornalística articulada à vida.

Balas perdidas, designação e preconceito social

"Bala perdida mata menina de 12 anos no Rio: Alana Ezequiel foi baleada durante operação da PM após deixar irmã na creche; 2 jovens suspeitos de tráfico morreram na ação", trazia o caderno Cotidiano da versão digital da Folha de S. Paulo, de 06 de março de 2007.

"Bala perdida mata mulher em São Paulo: vendedora foi atingida durante perseguição de PMs a dois jovens que iriam assaltar banco; é a 5ª vítima em 10 dias", informava-se na página 4 do caderno Metrópole do jornal O Estado de S. Paulo, de 9 de março do mesmo ano.

Há poucos anos, a mídia brasileira falava cotidianamente em "balas perdidas", o que soava muito eufemístico. No futebol diríamos que uma "bola perdida" é uma jogada errada, obviamente cometida por alguém e com

consequências para o placar final da partida. No mínimo, o artilheiro deixou de marcar um gol. Além disso, seja escanteio ou qualquer outra jogada, uma bola perdida por um time é uma bola ganha por outro. Assim, alguém assume a responsabilidade por essa jogada. Afinal é uma disputa esportiva, muitas vezes exacerbada. No caso das balas perdidas, no entanto, a questão é mais séria, alguém também dispara a bala.

O problema da violência não é apenas uma questão de que pessoas estão morrendo, mas também de pessoas que estão matando. Na ocasião, esse apagamento refrata-se no discurso – hegemônico – dos que defendiam a redução da maioridade penal e o rigor nas apurações de homicídios, muitas vezes encampado pela mídia nacional; deixava incompletas as discussões sobre violência e escondia que muitas crianças e adultos que hoje matam são produto de uma sociedade que não consegue pensar-se de forma ampla, democrática, articulada ao não matar.

Se, por um lado, o absurdo das mortes por balas perdidas chocava a sociedade brasileira, por outro, era hora de o discurso midiático chocar e preocupar essa sociedade com as mãos que seguram as armas e discutir as responsabilidades nesses episódios.

Mas a abertura da matéria sobre Alana, a menina de 12 anos morta no Rio, acentua os preconceitos de uma população que se comove apenas com um dos lados da questão:

> Uma menina de 12 anos *foi morta* ontem no morro dos Macacos, em Vila Isabel (zona norte do Rio), atingida por uma bala perdida durante operação da Polícia Militar. Outros dois adolescentes de 16 anos, apontados pela polícia como criminosos, *também foram mortos*. (grifos nossos)

Considerando o fenômeno da designação, apontada por Rajagopalan (2003: 84), podem-se fazer algumas conjecturas. Segundo o autor:

> Sabemos que toda notícia, toda reportagem jornalística, começa com um ato de designação, de nomeação. Aliás, a própria gramática tradicional nos ensina que é preciso primeiro identificar o sujeito da frase para então dizer algo a respeito ou, equivalentemente, predicar alguma coisa sobre o sujeito já identificado.(...) É, no entanto, no uso dos nomes próprios – ou, melhor dizendo, na fabricação de novos termos de designação para se referir às personagens novas que surgem no cenário e aos acontecimentos novos que capturam a atenção dos leitores – que o discurso jornalístico imprime seu ponto de vista.

Na matéria da *Folha*, a grande tragédia é que a menina foi morta. E quanto aos outros adolescentes? "Também foram mortos". E daí? Isso é natural, normal? É aceitável só porque eles estavam armados ou porque a própria designação – "criminosos" – já os incrimina?

Certamente um dos problemas centrais dos enunciados jornalísticos seja designar reforçando preconceitos, trazendo à tona a carga ideológica da severa divisão de classes, esquecendo alguns princípios da cidadania e da democracia por que deve orientar-se o trabalho da imprensa.

Ao preferir preencher o argumento "agente" do verbo matar com o argumento "instrumento", aquilo de que um agente se serve para realizar algo, ou seja, ao deslocar para a posição de sujeito sintático da oração esse instrumento – bala perdida – produz-se o apagamento a que nos referimos anteriormente.

Autores como Nelson Traquina (2000) têm dedicado especial atenção ao conceito de jornalismo cívico. Nessa perspectiva, o foco de atenção da cobertura jornalística não está nos atores políticos ou nas celebridades do esporte ou das artes. Deve ser o cidadão o protagonista da pauta do jornalismo.

> O jornalismo cívico parte da crítica que os jornalistas estão demasiado centrado nas acções dos atores políticos e estão muito pouco preocupados com os recipientes, ou seja, os leitores, ou seja, os cidadãos. E o jornalismo cívico, essencialmente, parte do princípio de que os jornalistas devem dar mais atenção às preocupações do cidadão: ouvir os cidadãos, perguntar aos cidadãos quais são as suas preocupações. Eventualmente, através de métodos científicos, tentar perceber melhor quais são essas preocupações e, depois, mudar a sua cobertura da política tendo isto em conta (entrevista, 2011).

Daí, do respeito a esse cidadão e à sua vida, decorrem dois pontos que consideramos chave para elaborarmos a crítica e, sem seguida, pensar uma prática discursiva do jornalismo empenhada no não matar.

Em primeiro lugar, com base nos conceitos da análise do discurso, é possível falar em uma revisão da designação com que o cidadão é exposto na mídia. São comuns e recorrentes termos como "bandido", "assaltante", "estuprador" e "criminoso" ao se referirem a indivíduos pertencentes aos estratos sociais mais baixos da população. Por outro lado, políticos, jogadores ou artistas acusados de corrupção ou atos que lesam o patrimônio público geralmente não recebem esse tipo de designação.

Têm-se portanto, aí, práticas designativas diferentes de acordo com cada estrato social. Por quê? Essa é uma questão a que o jornalismo poderia tentar esclarecer e evitar. Todos, desde os mais pobres até os indivíduos mais ricos, acusados ou sentenciados por crimes são cidadãos. É isso que

consta na *Declaração Universal dos Direitos Humanos* e na *Constituição* brasileira. E é nessa perspectiva que eles devem ser tratados.

Designações do tipo "bandido", "assaltante", "estuprador" e "criminoso" disseminam formas de repúdio, preconceito e, eventualmente, conduzem a linchamentos morais ou físicos, formas de violência que desencadeiam, em sentido contrário, a prerrogativa do não matar.

No Brasil, há casos clássicos desse tipo de conduta envolvendo imprensa e disseminação de ódio e violência a partir de práticas designativas. O mais sintomático é o caso de uma escola. No início da década de 1990, a imprensa brasileira publicou reportagens sobre o envolvimento de adultos em abuso sexual de crianças, alunos de uma escola localizada na cidade de São Paulo.

Sem checar a veracidade das denúncias e com base em laudos preliminares, o delegado responsável pelo caso divulgou as informações à imprensa, o que levou a população à depredação da escola. Os donos do estabelecimento foram presos.

Nada foi provado contra os acusados que, além de terem tido que conviver com tentativas de linchamento, vivem até hoje no anonimato, afastados da vida que haviam escolhido viver. Por trás de tudo, uma imprensa que os acusou e os designou "culpados" antes mesmo da Justiça que cabe julgá-los e que, no final, os inocentou.

No fim da década de 2000, um outro caso chamou atenção: a morte de uma menina de cinco anos, após cair de andar alto de um edifício, também em São Paulo. O caso ganhou repercussão nacional e, a partir das evidências deixadas no local do crime, adultos foram julgados e acusados pela Justiça.

Mas até o julgamento não escaparam de linchamentos morais e tentativas de linchamentos físicos. Mais uma vez, por trás de tudo, uma imprensa que apressadamente, e em nome de audiência, os acusou e os designou "culpados". Mais uma vez, antes da sentença da Justiça.

Crítica elaborada, passemos ao segundo ponto: a superação do dilema do jornalismo que se acerca da violência está no ensino, nos cursos de jornalismo, de uma linguagem que subverta esse tipo de designação baseada em apagamentos, que encobre formas de preconceito social ou que se apressa aos fatos ao incriminar eventuais inocentes.

Formação de jornalistas

Questões como as bases acadêmicas e intelectuais que o constroem o jornalista e o tratamento que a linguagem recebe nessa formação antecedem e perpassam a prática profissional. Por isso é importante que a con-

templemos em discussões a respeito da construção de uma linguagem jornalística focada no não matar.

A tese *O Ensino do Interesse Público na formação de jornalistas: elementos para a construção de uma pedagogia*, recentemente defendida por um dos autores deste artigo (Moraes Júnior, 2011) na Escola de Comunicações e Artes da Universidade de São Paulo, indicou que uma pedagogia do ensino do interesse púbico na formação de jornalistas deve questionar e inquietar-se diante da linguagem e da forma como a comunicação é estabelecida com o público.

A pesquisa de campo que resultou na tese ouviu 25 docentes de jornalismo do Brasil e de Portugal. Entre eles, o professor Heitor Ferraz Mello (2009), da Faculdade Cásper Líbero, de São Paulo.

Mello compartilha o pensamento de Chaparro (1994) e entende que o ensino da linguagem não tem apenas um viés estético ou técnico, mas implica também uma ética:

> Uma vez eu li uma matéria, acho que foi na Folha, eu não me lembro o nome do repórter. Ele foi descrevendo a polícia subindo o morro e enquanto ele ia descrevendo a polícia subindo o morro, descrevia outra cena que era a própria polícia avisando para alguns traficantes por onde os caras tinham que fugir, que os familiares tinham que sair por um outro lado… Ele foi descrevendo várias outras cenas que estavam acontecendo ali, a que ele teve acesso ou talvez trabalhasse com mais pessoas nessa matéria. Uma matéria em que ele deu a complexidade da coisa. Não era simplesmente mocinho e bandido como no cinema, é muito mais complexo. Tráfico de drogas é misturado não só como a polícia, mas com todos os escalões da sociedade brasileira. (...) Eu acho que esse cara foi um cara que tocou numa coisinha para mostrar a complexidade. Mas foi uma matéria em cem mil matérias.

Mais adiante, ele esclarece:

> Claro que a linguagem do jornal é uma linguagem informativa, mas eu acho que a gente tem que começar a pensar que as palavras também têm peso, também na linguagem informativa. E que usar uma palavra, e não outra, revela muito. Então é importante estar atento à palavra que está usando, enfim, para poder contar melhor aquilo e ate instigar. Às vezes não, às vezes, dependendo da maneira como o cara escreveu a matéria, ele instiga a pensar: "Pô! Essa relação é muito mais complexa do que eu imaginava!".

A linguagem desperta preconceitos, por isso precisa ser apreendida criticamente nas práticas jornalísticas. Para Luís Santos (2010), professor do

curso de Jornalismo da Universidade do Minho, em Portugal, é isso precisa ser ensinado na formação do jornalista:

> Às vezes há sempre pormenores da língua portuguesa adaptada ao jornalismo, que até se chamam jornalês, que às vezes são potencialmente xenófobos. Por exemplo: por que é que nós, quando estamos a falar de alguma situação que terá ocorrido no meio de uma cidade, dizemos que "um homem da etnia cigana" mas se ele for branco nós não dizemos "um homem de etnia caucasiana"? se é que isto existe, não sei.

Do ponto de vista do empenho do jornalismo no não matar na formação de jornalistas, o que vale a pena reforçar em respeito à linguagem é ensiná-la e pesquisá-la do ponto de vista ideológico.

É importante que as escolas não apenas ensinem o texto jornalístico como uma estrutura piramidal onde o lide tem um papel importante e normas de manuais de redação tem que ser respeitado. Antes disso, ou tão importante quanto isso, é que o aspirante a jornalista entenda que jornalismo é, sobretudo, uma ética que, como tal, congrega em si o principio do não matar e da vida.

Considerações finais

Pensar o jornalismo comprometido com o não matar implica pensar o jornalismo como discurso. Portanto, é desvendar o seu viés ideológico e ensiná-lo não apenas com uma técnica e como uma estética, mas também como uma ética. Essa atitude é possível principalmente se levarmos em consideração que a linguagem é um sistema aberto em que o jornalista pode atuar na desestabilização de sentidos promotores da intolerância, da violência e do matar, produzindo uma informação de incentivo à vida. É nessa nova linguagem e por meio dela que se constituem novos jornalistas, um novo público e novas identidades plasmadas pela tolerância.

A crítica à designação que desvaloriza minorias e estimula o preconceito social, o combate ao preconceito social que age como instrumento de controle e o esforço pedagógico em nome do ensino da linguagem jornalística que constitua instrumento de respeito e preservação da vida humana, na formação de jornalistas, são etapas desse caminho.

As instituições sociais – entre elas, a Escola e a Imprensa – são alicerces para a constituição, preservação e ampliação do poder e participação dos cidadãos nas comunidades em que trabalham, relacionam-se e vivem. É a defesa da vida, assinalando ocasionalmente e de forma séria e ética suas contradições, que deve orientar o trabalho do jornalista. É, por sua vez, es-

se compromisso que constrói cidadãos capazes de, igualmente, inspirarem-se na defesa de outros cidadãos que com eles compartilham os espaços em que trabalham, relacionam-se e vivem, enfim.

Como nos diz a filósofa Hannah Atendt, é a *ação*, o agir voltado não apenas para os interesses pessoais e particulares do agente, mas que tem como foco de interesse comum, que caracteriza a dimensão humana. No seu pensamento, a *ação* corresponderia "à condição humana da pluralidade, ao fato de que homens, e não o Homem, vivem na Terra e habitam o mundo" (1987: 15). Nesse sentido, jornalistas e público têm muito o que aprender. Se a linguagem é alicerce da socialização humana e da vida comunitária, o jornalismo é um dos troncos que lhe dá sustentação. Portanto, é importante que linguagem e jornalismo estejam sintonizados em defesa da vida e articulados ao paradigma do não matar.

Referências

Abbagnano, Nicola (2007). *Dicionário de Filosofia*. São Paulo: Martins Fontes.

Angrimani Sobrinho, Danilo (1995). *Espreme que sai sangue: um estudo do sensacionalismo na imprensa*. São Paulo: Summus.

Arendt, Hannah (1987). *A Condição Humana*. Rio de Janeiro: Forense.

Bakhtin, M. (1999). *Marxismo e filosofia da linguagem*. São Paulo: Hucitec.

Chaparro, Manuel Carlos (1994). *A Pragmática do Jornalismo: buscas práticas para uma teoria da ação jornalística*. São Paulo: Summus.

Chaparro, Manuel Carlos (2005). "A Difícil Tarefa de Fazer Jornalistas," *Comunique-se*, 5 de outubro. Disponível: http://www.comuniquese.com.br. Acesso: 12 de setembro de 2007.

Evans Pim, Joám (2009). "Bases transformacionais para um novo paradigma do não matar," *Dialogia*, 8(2): 185-203.

Foucault, M. (2003). *A ordem do discurso*. São Paulo: Loyola.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Discurso e mudança social*. Brasília: Editora UnB.

Kovach, Bill; Rosenstiel, Tom (2004). *Elementos do Jornalismo: o que os jornalistas devem saber e o público exigir*. São Paulo: Geração Editorial.

Martin-Barbero, J. (1998). "Prefácio," in Baccega, M. A., *Comunicação e linguagem: discursos e ciência*. São Paulo: Moderna, pp. 3-8.

Mello, Heitor Ferraz (2009). "Entrevista concedida a Enio Moraes Júnior," Vídeo, 44 min. São Paulo: Faculdade Cásper Líbero.

Moraes Júnior, Enio (2011). *O Ensino do Interesse Público na Formação de Jornalistas: elementos para a construção de uma pedagogia*. Tese (Doutorado). São Paulo: Escola de Comunicações e Artes, Universidade de São Paulo.

Nogueira, Adriana Tanese; Lessa, Ciça (2003). *Mulheres contam o Parto*. São Paulo: Itália Nova Editora.

Rajagopalan, K. (2003). *Por uma Linguística crítica: linguagem, identidade e a questão ética*. São Paulo: Parábola.

Santos, Luís (2010). "Entrevista concedida a Enio Moraes Júnior," Vídeo: 48 min. Braga: Universidade do Minho.

Traquina, Nelson (2003). *O Estudo do Jornalismo no Século XX*. São Leopoldo: Unisinos.

Traquina, Nelson (2008). *O que é Jornalismo*. Lisboa: Quimera Editores.

Chapter Six

Language, Law, and Nonkilling

Nonkilling can be a change
Does it extend our compassion range?

Comparative Linguistic Law and Nonkilling Linguistics

Joseph-G Turi
International Academy of Linguistic Law

Introduction

Major language legislation in the area of language policy is evidence, within certain political contexts, of contacts, conflicts and inequalities among languages used within the same territory. Objectively or apparently, these languages co-exist often in an uneasily dominant-dominated relationship, thereby leading to a situation of conflicting linguistic majorities and minorities. A nonkilling orientation can appease naturally these conflicts.

The fundamental goal of all linguistic legislation is to resolve, in one way or another, the linguistic problems arising from those linguistic contacts, conflicts and inequalities, by legally determining and establishing the status and use of the languages in question. Absolute or relative preference is given to the promotion and protection of one or several designated languages through legal language obligations and language rights drawn up to that end. The legal language policy of a State is constituted by the all-legal measures on the language field. These legal measures are the linguistic law (or *language law*) of a State.

Canadian linguistic legislation (the Official Languages Act, 1970) is an example of official legislation that applies language obligations and language rights to two designated official languages, English and French. Quebec's linguistic legislation (the Charter of the French Language) is an example of exhaustive legislation that applies, in a different way, language obligations and language rights to the official language, French, to a few more or less designated languages and to other languages to the extent that they are not designated.

Increasing legal intervention in language policy gave birth, or recognition, to a new legal science, comparative linguistic law. Comparative linguistic law (or *language law*) is the study of linguistic law throughout the world (as well as the language of law and the relation between law and language).

To the extent that language, which is the main tool of the law, becomes both the object and the subject of law, linguistic law becomes metajuridical law in the same way that language becomes metalanguage. To the extent that comparative linguistic law recognizes and enshrines linguistic rights in our world, albeit sometimes rather timidly and implicitly, it becomes futuristic law, since it builds on historical roots.

This recognition in itself is remarkable, since the growing recognition or historical enshrinement, in time and space, of linguistic rights promotes the linguistic diversity of our world and therefore the cultural right to be different. Language and culture come together. Therein lies a promise of creativity for individuals, as well as for societies, nations and the international community.

The intervention of States and public authorities (at all levels, national, regional, local, municipal, etc...) is relatively recent and due especially to two relatively recent social phenomena: the democratization of education and the globalization of communications.

Typology of Linguistic Legislation

Linguistic legislation is divided into two categories, depending on its *field of application*: legislation which deals with the *official* (or *public*) usage of languages and that which deals with their *nonofficial* (or *private)* usage. Needless to say, there are grey areas in this classification.

Linguistic legislation can be divided into four categories, depending on its *function*; it can be official, institutionalizing, standardizing or liberal. Legislation that fills all these functions is *exhaustive* linguistic legislation, while other linguistic legislation is *nonexhaustive*.

Most modern countries are linguistically multilingual. However, many modern States are legally unilingual or moderately bilingual or multilingual, by virtue of their official linguistic legislations.

Official linguistic legislation is legislation intended to make one or more designated, or more or less identifiable languages (generally the national ones and, according to circumstances, some minority historical languages) totally or partially, explicitly or implicitly, countrywide or regionally, in a symmetric or asymmetric way, *de jure* official in the domains of legislation, justice, public administration and education, to the exclusion of other languages.

The other languages existing in the State are not official. A language is legally official as far as it implies legal rights and legal obligations in the official domains. An official language then is a legally usage compulsory language for the States and their inhabitants and citizens. Depending on the circumstances,

one of two principles is applied: linguistic *territoriality* (basically, the obligation to use one designated language within a given territory) or linguistic *personality* (basically, the right to choose a language among official languages).

In principle, in the official multilingual States, the obligation to use the official languages stand only the public authorities, while the inhabitants and the citizens have the choice among the official languages. Save exceptions, the majority of people in an officially bilingual or multilingual State are not necessarily bilingual or multilingual. Linguistic legislation is necessary but it is not enough. A linguistic legislation is respected as far as there is a complementary nonkilling orientation. Otherwise, linguistic legislation risks to be a too much drastic or too much symbolic legislation.

Generally speaking, the official language of a State is the most spoken language in the country. This is not the case in many States of Africa and in some States of Asia. In Indonesia, for example, Malay is the official language while the most spoken language is Javanese. The official languages of Bosnia-Herzegovina are Bosnian, Croat and Serb. However, from a purely linguistic point of view, the three languages are the same language.

Making one or more designated languages official does not necessarily or automatically entail major legal consequences. The legal sense and scope of officialising a language depends on the effective legal treatment accorded to that language. Otherwise, an official language without legal teeth is quite simply a symbolic official language. In Bolivia, Section 5 of the new Constitution of 2009 recognizes 38 official languages: Castilian and 37 Indigenous languages. In practise, Castilian is still, for the moment at least, the real official language, even though the recognition of the 37 Indigenous languages is a very significant step towards the recognition of the historical linguistic diversity of the country. Next step vould be the application of a nonkilling mentality according to which these other languages have a legitimate claim at existing and being used by the population.

From a linguistic point of view, the domain of education is the most important domain in the field of an important officially legal language policy (Fleiner, Nelde, and Turi, Eds., 2001). In this domain, if linguistic legislation coincides with a nonkilling orientation, the cultural impact will be very important.

Most modern States have their own official linguistic legislations. In some countries, there are *de facto* official languages. In Morocco by instance, the only *de jure* official language is Arabic, but French remains an important *de facto* official language since it is used in some official documents. Moreover, many important States like the USA (at the federal level), the United Kingdom, Germany (at the federal level), Japan, Australia and

Argentina (at the federal level) do not have any official language, maybe because they don't have important linguistic conflicts. However, we can say that the language in which their constitutions and their fundamental legal texts are written is their de "facto" official language. However, in these countries, de facto official languages are not coercive languages as such. From a purely legal point of view, they are not legal official languages.

Institutionalizing linguistic legislation is legislation which seeks to make one or more designated languages the normal, usual or common languages, in the nonofficial domains of labour, communications, culture, commerce and business. From linguistic point of view, the domain of communications is the most important domain in the field of an important legal language policy. The interventions of modern States on the nonofficial domains are relatively minor and, what is more, rather liberals.

Standardizing linguistic legislation is legislation designed to make one or more designated languages respect certain language standards and linguistic terminology in very specific and clearly defined domains, usually official or highly technical. The intervention of modern States on the domain of linguistic terminology is rather minor, save exceptions. The standardizing process had great success in the past century with Afrikaans, Hebrew, Hindi and Malay languages. This kind of standardization was necessary for practical reasons in some official fields, but it did not prevent different usages of these languages in other fields. A nonkilling orientation is important on this respect.

It is the written form (the language as medium) and not the written linguistic content (the language as message) that is usually targeted by legal rules dealing explicitly with language. The linguistic content (and also the linguistic form) can be the object of legislation that generally is not explicitly linguistic, such as the Civil, Commercial and Criminal Codes or Acts, the Charters of Human Rights or the Consumer Protection Acts. Moreover, while the presence of a language or the "quantity" of its usage can be the object of exhaustive language legislation, language "quality" or correct usage belongs to the realm of example and persuasion where language usage is nonofficial, and to the schools and government where language usage is official.

Liberal linguistic legislation is legislation designed to enshrine legal recognition of language rights implicitly or explicitly, in one way or another. But linguistic law, viewed objectively (as legal rules on language), makes a distinction on linguistic rights, which are subjective so that they belong to any person. There are the right to *the* language (the historical right to use one or more designated languages, belonging to majorities or some historical minorities, in various domains, especially in official domains) and the right to *a* language (the

universal right to use any language in various domains, particularly in nonofficial domains). These linguistic rights, based respectively on the principle of territoriality and the principle of personality, allowing for specific exceptions, are essentially individual from legal point of view (particularly for the linguistic minorities), but naturally individual and collective from cultural point of view. However, the linguistic rights of Indigenous people are considered to be collective ones.[1] This is important since it opens the possibility that in the near future all language rights could be considered both individual and collective also from a legal point of view. It could create a better nonkilling environment.

The important but nonofficial Barcelona Universal Declaration of Linguistic Rights, of June 9, 1996, states that linguistic rights are historical and both individual and collective. It means a better nonkilling environment since the recognition of language rights creates a more sociable human society.

Canadian and Comparative Linguistic Law

Linguistic legislation never obliges anyone to use one or more languages in absolute terms. The obligation stands only to the extent that a legal act of fact covered by language legislation is accomplished. For example, the obligation to use one or more languages on product labels stands only if there is, in nonlinguistic legislation, an obligation to put labels on products.

Generally speaking, linguistic terms and expressions or linguistic concepts (mother tongue, for instance) are the focus of language legislation only to the extent that they are formally understandable, intelligible, translatable, usable or identifiable, in one way or another, or have some meaning in a given language. Thus, anything that is linguistically "neutral" is not generally targeted by language legislation, as can be seen, among others, with Section 20 of the Quebec's Regulation respecting the language of commerce and business.

Section 58 of Quebec's Charter of the French Language stated that, allowing for exceptions, nonofficial public signs had to be solely in French (the practical target of this prohibition was the English language). Therefore, if a word is posted and it is understandable in French, it is legally a French word. In this case, the public sign is legal (for instance, *ouvert*). In other respects, if a

---

[1] Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention of the International Labour Organization of June 27, 1989, enforced September 5, 1991. The Convention has been so far ratified by 22 States, including 14 States from Latin America. The rights protected by the Convention belong to "peoples". Ballantyne, Davidson and McIntyre v. Canada (March 31 and May 5, 1993). Communications Nos. 359/1989 and 385/1989, U.N. Doc. CCPR/C47/D/359/1989 and 385/1989/Rev.1 (1993).

word is posted and it is not understandable in French, it is not legally a French word only if it has some meaning in another specific language and it is translatable into French. In this case, the public sign is illegal (for instance, *open*).

However, this Section has been partially repealed, after the Supreme Court of Canada, in 1988, stated that that Section 58 contravened the freedom of expression and the principle on nondiscrimination and was then incompatible with the Canada's and Quebec's Charters of Human Rights. According to the Supreme Court of Canada, a State can impose a language on nonofficial public signs, but it can't forbid other languages. This decision was partially upheld by the United Nations Human Right Committee, in 1993, which declared that Section 58 was incompatible with the freedom of expression as foreseen by the International Covenant on Political and Social Rights of December 16, 1966, enforced March 23, 1976. Moreover, the European Court of Justice declared, in the *Peeters Case* of 1991, that a State cannot impose an exclusive regional language on the labels of products if the information is made in an "easy understandable language" so to respect the principle of free trade in Europe.[2] The recognition of regional languages encourages a certain linguistic freedom.

In principle, linguistic legislation is aimed at the speakers of a language (as consumers or users) rather than at the language itself (as an integral part of the cultural heritage of a nation) unless that legislation states the contrary or is clearly a public policy law. A public policy law is any law comprising legal standards so fundamental and essential, individually and collectively, in the interests of the community, that they become imperative or prohibitive in absolute terms so that they cannot be avoided in any way.

Legal rules in linguistic matters are less severe than prescriptive grammatical rules. There are four fundamental reasons for this: firstly, the best laws are those that legislate the least, particularly in the nonofficial usage of languages; secondly, language, as an individual and collective way of expression and communication, is an essential cultural phenomenon, in principle difficult to appropriate and define legally; thirdly, legal rules, like socio-linguistic rules, are only applied and applicable if they respect local custom and usage and the behaviour of reasonable people (who are not necessarily linguistic paragons) while grammatical rules are based on the teacher-pupil relationship; fourthly, legal sanctions in the field of language like criminal sanctions (fines or imprisonment) and civil sanctions (damages, partial or total illegality), being generally harsher than possible language sanctions (low marks, loss of social prestige or loss of clients), are usually limited to low and symbolic fines or damages.

---

[2] Peeters Case, European Court of Justice, June 18, 1991, C-369/89.

Jurists are therefore rather prudent dealing with language policy, and rather reticent when interpreting language legislation exclusively as public policy law.

Since the legal sanctions of a public policy law are formidable (partial or total illegality, for instance), many jurists, especially Canada's and Quebec's jurists, prefer not to think of language laws as being exclusively public policy laws, except when their legal context is clearly in favour of such an interpretation, as it could be in some official domains of languages. True, the French *Cour de cassation* declared implicitly, in the *France Quick Case* (October 20, 1986) that French Language legislation was a public policy law. But that did not prevent the *Cour d'appel de Versailles,* in the *France Quick Case* (June 24, 1987) from considering terms such as "spaghettis" and "plum-pudding" to be, for all practical purposes, French terms that is to say to be in keeping with such legislation, because they were "known to the general public."

The fundamental goal of this legislation, then, is to protect both francophones and the French language. A francophone is anyone whose language of use is French, that is to say, from a legal point of view, any person who can speak and understand French, in an ordinary and relatively intelligible manner.

In the *Macdonald Case* (May 1, 1986) and the *Ford Case* (December 15, 1988), the Supreme Court of Canada recognized and enshrined, to all intents and purposes, the distinction between the right to *the* language (principal right, foreseen as such in the Canadian Constitution, explicitly historical owing to the historic background of the country, in the domains of the official usage of languages) and the right to *a* language (accessory right, not explicitly foreseen as such in the Canadian Constitution, *being implicitly an integral part of the human rights and fundamental freedoms category*, in the domains of the unofficial usage of languages). The Court recognized and enshrined the main differences between the official and the unofficial usage of languages.[3]

---

[3] Macdonald v. City of Montreal, (1986) 1 S.C.R. 460; Ford v. Quebec (1988) 2 S.C.R. 712. In the Ford Case, the Supreme Court of Canada declared that "Language is so intimately related to the form and content of expression that there cannot be true freedom of expression by means of language if one is prohibited from using the language of one's choice." (p. 748). As regards to the discriminatory nature of certain provisions of Bill 101 (Sections 58 and 69 of the Act, respecting the exclusive use of the French language for signs and posters and for firm names), the Supreme Court of Canada decided in the Ford Case that the distinction based on "language of use," created by Section 58 of Bill 101, had the effect of "nullifying" the fundamental right "to express oneself in the language of one's choice" (p. 787).
As regards to the nondiscriminatory nature of certain provisions of Bill 101 (Section 35 of the Act requires that professionals have an appropriate knowledge of French lan-

According to the Supreme Court of Canada, the right to *a* language is therefore implicitly an integral part of the explicit fundamental right of freedom of speech. Moreover, in the *Irving Toy Case* (April 27, 1989), the Supreme Court of Canada confirmed that artificial persons also held certain language rights, such as the implicit right to *a* language in the nonofficial domain of commerce.[4]

A relatively complete study carried for the United Nations in 1979, the Capotorti Report, indicated that, although the use of languages other than the official language(s) in the domains of official usage was restricted or forbidden in various parts of the world, the use of languages in the domains of nonofficial usage was generally not restricted or forbidden (Capotorti, 1979: 81, 103).[5] We arrived at the same conclusion, in 1977, when we made an analysis of the constitutional clauses of 147 States in the field of languages (Turi, 1977: 165; 1996). Since then, many States, among others Algeria, Malaysia, South Africa, East Timor, 29 states of USA and especially the ones that are issued from the former USSR and the former Yugoslavia, have made important and often drastic linguistic legislation. This affects a nonkilling mentality. We hope that a nonkiling orientation will ease this kind of legislation.

France has made French the official language of the State in 1992 (the *language* of the Republic, according to Section 2). The Constitutional Council of France has declared unexpectedly the 15th of June of 1999 that the 1992 European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages was incompatible with the French Constitution! This Charter applies only to historical and individual linguistic rights. However, the situation has changed since 2008 when the French Constitution was amended so to recognize the "regional

---

guage), see the Supreme Court of Canada decision in the Forget Case (The Attorney General of Quebec v. Nancy Forget, 1988, 2 S.C.R. 90). Moreover, in this judgement, the Court declared that "The concept of language is not limited to the mother tongue but also includes the language of use or habitual communication... there is no reason to adopt a narrow interpretation which does not take into account the possibility that the mother tongue and the language of use may differ." (p. 100).

[4] The Attorney General of Quebec v. Irving Toy Limited (1989) 1 S.C.R. 927. The Supreme Court gave this definition of freedom of speech: "Indeed, freedom of expression ensures that we can convey our thoughts and feelings in nonviolent ways without fear of censure" (p. 970). For the Court, freedom of speech means, in principle, any content (any message, including commercial messages) in any form (any medium, and therefore, any language), except violence.

[5] It must be pointed out that according to the Capotorti Report, however, not only the right to be different is a human right, but also the right to be assimilated is of the kind of a human right (p. 103).

languages" as being part of the Heritage of the Republic (Section 75-1).

For the moment there are only a few prohibitive pieces of linguistic legislation in the world in the field of nonofficial linguistic legislation. We had in the past some bad examples of this kind of linguistic legislation in francoist Spain and fascist Italy (among others, in public signs, trademarks and firm names). There were also some bad examples in the recent past of some prohibitive linguistic legislation in Quebec and in Turkey (and also indirectly in Indonesia by permitting only Latin characters in the public signs) in the field of nonofficial usage of languages, but this kind of linguistic legislation has been totally or partially revoked.

Turkey prohibited, in some cases, the use of some languages, languages other than the first official language of each country that recognizes the Republic of Turkey, practically the use of the Kurdish language.[6] These prohibitive measures contravened, Section 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which recognizes the right of members of linguistic minorities to use their own language. This Turkish law has been therefore revoked. The International Covenant applies, moreover, to individual linguistic rights (to "members" only, not to "linguistic minorities"), no matter if they are historical or not.[7]

In other respects, we have some good examples of legal linguistic tolerance and freedom in many countries like Finland (with 2 official languages and where the Swedish minority is very well protected), South Africa (with eleven official languages and where the right to *a* language is explicitly recognized), Canada and Australia (for their policy of multiculturalism for example). It makes us relatively optimistic and still absolutely vigilant about the future of comparative linguistic law.

The ideal situation would be the one with more tolerant linguistic legislation and especially with less drastic linguistic legislation. A nonkilling mentality should be the appropriate answer on this respect.

Conclusion

The right to *a* language will become an effective fundamental right only to the extent that it is explicitly enshrined not simply in higher legal norms, but also in norms with mandatory provisions that identify as precisely as

---

[6] Republic of Turkey, Law regarding publications in languages other than Turkish, Law No 2832 (October 19, 1983).

[7] General Comment No. 23 of the UN Human Rights Committee (April 6, 1994).

possible the holders and the beneficiaries of language rights and language obligations, as well as the legal sanctions that accompany them. Otherwise, the right to *a* language will be but a theoretical fundamental right, like several human rights, proclaimed in norms with directive provisions that cover language rights but have no real corresponding sanctions and obligations. In this respect, we have to work to make linguistic legislation a nonkilling one.

While the law inhabits a grey zone, especially regarding the usage of languages, the right to *a* language (and therefore the right to be different) will only have meaning, legally speaking, if it is enshrined (especially for historical linguistic minorities), in one way or another (particularly, in the official usage of languages), in norms with mandatory provisions, as the right to *the* language generally is.

As an historical right (that takes into account the historic background of each country), the right to *the* language deserves special treatment in certain political contexts, even if it is not in itself a fundamental right. As a fundamental right (right and freedom to which every person is entitled), the right to *a* language, even if it enshrines the dignity of all languages, cannot be considered an absolute right under all circumstances. A hierarchy exists that must take into account, in ways which are legally different and not discriminatory, the historical and fundamental linguistic imperative of the nations and individuals concerned, including also the imperative of establishing a legally equitable treatment between languages coexisting in a given political context (Turi, 1989; Su, Turi and Wang, 2006).

It is clear that the States (at all levels) have the right to legally impose as official, in one way or another for practical reasons, not only in the interest the States but also in the interest of the populations, a language or some languages (especially the national ones and some minority historical languages). It is also clear that citizens and inhabitants have the duty to respect legally the official language(s) of their States. However, the modern States must respect the linguistic diversity of our world. This has to be done in an equitable way. Equity is the key word to find acceptable solutions in the linguistic comparative law and nokilling linguistics.

There are thousands languages and dialects in our world (even if about 75% of the population speak 23 languages, one of which is spoken by more than 1% of the word population). According to UNESCO, there are more than 6000 languages in the world. The Bible has been translated in more than 2,000 languages and dialects. There are international, national, regional and local languages and dialects. All languages and dialects are equally dignified. But they are not all equal among them. A natural and sometimes artificial hierarchy is setting up among languages. The most spoken languages in

the word are Chinese and Hindi-Urdu, but the most international languages are English and French, especially English since it is spoken by millions of native and millions of nonnative people.

Lingua francas are necessary for international communications, not for deep cultural expression (in the past, Latin and French, now English-American, and tomorrow maybe Portuguese-Brazilian). The only real "danger" we can see from the lingua francas is that a strong lingua franca could prevent a good teaching and a good learning of third languages as foreign languages. However, the dangers are not coming only from "globalization" but also from "localization" as far as localization becomes "ultra-nationalization". Nonkilling linguistics orientation helps us to be more cautious in this matter.

The recent political trend in favour of linguistic and cultural *diversity* is inspiring if it promotes the right to *a* language. It is not so inspiring if it favours only the right to *the* language. It is really embarrassing that some trends of this recent cultural movement are aimed to defend above all strong languages like for instance French, German, Italian, Spanish Russian and Portuguese. In reality, the languages that should be promoted and protected above all are the ones that are lesser used (less that a million speakers and in some cases some with a few million speakers) or the ones that are in minority situation, as far as their being more vulnerable. It is the historical minority languages that have to be promoted and protected! For his reason, the International Academy of Linguistic Law made, on June 16 2006, a *Call to Unesco* for an International Convention on Linguistic Diversity. Among other goals, *it will help create a better nonkilling situation in our word.*

By ruling, in Section 89 for instance, that "Where this act does not require the use of the official language (French) exclusively, the official language and another language may be used together," Quebec's Charter of the French language recognizes and enshrines the right to *a* language and the right to "the" language. It creates an interesting hierarchical solution within the field of language policy. The problem was that the "exclusive" use of French was too important at the enactment of the Charter. It is not any more totally the case since the exclusive use of French has been very much limited.

The importance of linguistic law, that is, the heavy legal intervention of States in the field of languages, shows that the globalization of communications seems so dramatic that it has to be controlled by promoting and protecting national, regional and local languages and identities, in other words, the linguistic and cultural diversity of the world. In this respect, linguistic law is the realm of "linguistic regionalisation."

Let us hope that it will not become the triumph of "linguistic ultra-

nationalization," when nationalisation means in some public territories both the right to *the* language and the realm of linguistic fundamentalism. In this respect, it will create new walls and boundaries and therefore major and new conflicts among nations. To paraphrase Clausewitz, is language becoming a new way to wage war? Let us hope not. Language must not become the new religion of the new Millennium and will not, if we remain vigilant on this matter and adopt a nonkilling mentality.

For all these reasons and others, we are relatively satisfied that the natural Tower of Babel is stronger than the artificial and technical globalization of communications. However, we are also relatively worried that the Tower of Babel is not necessarily stronger than the possible and dangerous ultra-nationalisation of languages. That means that we have to be alert.

References

Fleiner, Thomas; Nelde, Peter H. and Turi, Joseph-G., Eds. (2001). *Law and Languages of Education - Droit et langues d'enseignement*. Genève: Institut du Fédéralisme de Fribourg; Munich: Helbing & Lichtenhahn.

Capotorti, Francesco. (1979). *Study on the Rights of Persons Belonging to Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities*. New York: United Nations.

Turi, Joseph-G. (1977). *Les dispositions juridico-constitutionnelles de 147 Etats en matière de politique linguistique*. Québec : CIRB-Université Laval.

Turi, Joseph-G. (1996). "Législation linguistique," in Goebl, Hans; Nelde, Peter H.; Stary, Zdeněk and Wolck,Wolfang, Eds., *Kontaklinguistik – Contact Linguistics - Linguistique de contact*, Vol. 1. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 160-168.

Turi, Joseph-G. (1989). "Introduction au droit linguistique," in Pupier, Paul and Woehrling, José. Eds., *Language and Law – Langue et Droit*. Montréal: Wilson et Lafleur, pp. 55-84.

Su, Jinzhi; Turi, Joseph-G. and Wang, Jie, Eds. (2006). *Law, Language and Linguistic Diversity*. Beijing: Law Press China.

Chapter Seven

Language, Human Dignity, and Nonkilling

When we put others first
It's human dignity we perfect
When we quench global "peace thirst"
It's more human lives we protect

Applied Nonkilling Linguistics in the Developmental Composition Classroom

A Working Paper

James Whitton
University of Michigan-Flint

Languages per se are not unfriendly or unpeaceful
It is the meanings made by their users that may be
in language education, teachers could be thoughtful
and help students Nonkillingly language to see.
—Francisco Gomez de Matos (2010)
From "Language Users for Nonkilling"

Applied nonkilling linguistics is a term suggesting a call to action, challenging educators to move beyond the theoretical realm where they can be comfortable with their textbooks and pet theories, and take the nonkilling spirit with them into the classroom. As Edwards (2007: 39) puts it, "Nonkilling implies faith in and hope for every human life that exists, has existed in the past and will exist in the future." It is more than peace, which at its most basic level is simply a lack of war (Galtung, 1965). It goes further than nonviolence, which may be characterized as a means of resistance without force, refusing to be drawn into a violent confrontation (Conflict Research Consortium, 2001). When nonkilling principles are fully realized, there can be no need for nonviolent resistance because there can be nothing left to resist.

Paige (2009: 21) defines a nonkilling society as one characterized by "no killing of humans and no threats to kill; no weapons designed to kill humans and no justification for using them;" one in which "no conditions of society depend upon threat or use of killing force." His pioneering work is based upon this question: *is a nonkilling society possible?* For educators, the question can be reframed as follows: it is possible to create a nonkilling classroom?

In today's world, it might seem difficult to believe that such a concept is even feasible. A June 2011 keyword search by the author among peer-

reviewed articles on the ProQuest database revealed 31,384 titles containing the word "war" and only 6,521 containing the word "peace." To take the comparison a step further, there were 911 articles in peer-reviewed academic journals containing the word "killing" somewhere in the title. And the word "nonkilling"? It only appeared once, in an article by Paige (2007), from *International Peace Studies*. The database even asked if the author was really looking for articles containing the phrase "on killing".

This disparity is not an indictment of academia. It is only a small symptom of a societal preoccupation with violence so deeply ingrained that most people think of it as innate and unavoidable, if they think of it at all. Baseball games are described by sportscasters and journalists as a "battle" for first place. Some religious services feature hymns picturing believers as "soldiers" and glorifying death in combat as if such a sacrifice somehow makes one more worthy of salvation. Many political leaders seem to spend more time fighting one another and jockeying for position than they ever do working for their constituents.

It is easy to come to the conclusion that humans are violent by nature and that such behavior is unavoidable. But a closer inspection tells another story. Although violence is taught in many circles and accepted as an inevitable human condition, it is not in our nature to be aggressive (Rosenberg, 2005). Educators, and particularly those who teach developmental composition, have a chance to tap into their compassionate nature, "advancing a nonkilling mentality" (Friedrich and Gomes de Matos, 2009: 220) in the classroom. Learning the principles of nonkilling linguistics and making the choice to move closer to this essential nature affords developmental composition instructors the opportunity to lead their students in doing the same. Working to promote the positive language usage unique to a nonkilling approach creates an opportunity for instructors to impart some social relevance to their pedagogies. But this same choice can create tension for educators who also desire to protect their students' linguistic rights.

At its most fundamental level, language education ought to foster the linguistic and cultural self-expression of students and the geographic territory in which they live (UNESCO, 1996:. 23). In a nonkilling framework, educators seek to promote language that builds up individuals and the community of learners, for the "collective and individual dimensions" of linguistic rights are "inseparable and interdependent" (UNESCO, 1996: 9). There exists a strong potential, however, for well-meaning language instruction in the composition classroom to in effect censor students and stifle their linguistic freedom. Instructors interested in promoting positive peace need to take great care to consider and recognize this possibility, and

work diligently to protect students' linguistic rights even as they model positive language in their teaching and encourage it in others.

Applying the tenets of nonkilling to early composition instruction creates both challenges and opportunities for educators. This chapter creates a working definition for applied nonkilling linguistics in developmental composition; highlights some of the foundational work that has been done to safeguard the linguistic rights of language learners; explores potential difficulties that exist for educators attempting to promote nonkilling language in the classroom while also trying to respect the linguistic rights of their students; and suggests possible strategies to help instructors deal with this tension and create a safe learning environment through the use of positive language and promotion of classroom harmony in linguistic diversity.

Modeling Positive Language in the Developmental Composition Classroom

Teachers of developing writers at the postsecondary level face many obstacles in dealing with the internal forces that impact students' ability to perform and gain the skills necessary to succeed in their educational endeavors. But when external forces such as violence, hatred, social and economic scarcity are added in, it may appear as though the task is next to impossible. A great deal of time and effort has been expended in the scholarly study of the connection that exists between violence and academic achievement. A strong negative correlation between the witnessing of violent acts of all sorts and students' academic performance has been established and affirmed time and time again (see, for example, Margolin and Gordis, 2000; Bowen and Bowen, 1999; Feshbach and Feshbach, 1987; and Henrich, Schwab-Stone, Fanti, Jones, and Rushkin, 2004) in the literature.

But not nearly as much time or energy has been devoted to the exploration of potential factors that can help override such negative external forces. Scholars have tended to emphasize the negative in their research, perhaps because of societal tendencies toward violence that are "socially learned and culturally reinforced" (Paige, 2009: 29). In his essay "On the Meaning of Nonviolence," Johan Galtung (1965: 239-240) wonders why this predilection exists: "Why do so many societies have a large and elaborate establishment for the detection of negative deviance and its proper punishment, and a minute establishment (the institutions of orders, awards, and citations) for the detection and reward of positive deviance?".

Galtung's (1965: 240) term "negative deviance" may be thought to closely correlate with another term widely in use in academic circles today: the "deficit model". In education, students that find themselves in developmental composition courses often find themselves victimized by the deficit model, products of a system that seems to zero in on what they can't achieve rather than focusing on what they can. To nonkilling scholars such as Friedrich and Gomes de Matos (2009: 224), the challenge is to create an environment in which the "deficit approach to language use…is replaced with support for the further development of [students'] skills and appreciation for the skills they already possess".

Shun Eva Lam (2006: 216) points out that while the deficit model has been "refuted many times over in the educational field, it is still insidious in the ideologies and practices pervasive in society", and describes a "cultural deficit model" in which "difference is construed as an aberration of mainstream norms". Clearly there are cultural and societal pressures as well as educational challenges facing developmental writers working from a so-called "deficit". The challenge of the nonkilling educator is to counteract these external social and cultural elements and create in students a desire for something better, a "positive deviance" or a realization in them and by them of their own potential and worth; and by extension, a greater appreciation for the value of every human life. This realization is at the very foundation of the nonkilling stance.

Applied nonkilling linguistics in the developmental composition classroom is a theoretical perspective informing pedagogy and delivery. While it is important for instructors in these courses to help students gain the skill sets they need to succeed in academia, it is just as crucial to use this platform to educate them on the positive power of language and the potential it has for promoting peace. Instructors in developmental composition cannot simply ignore the external factors that so often weigh on the minds of their students and that arguably contribute to or cause so many of their difficulties inside the classroom. Educators in basic writing courses need to be diligent in caring for the whole student, and work to create some level of shared understanding. The simplest and most natural way to create a human connection is through the use of language; for language is a basic human need that we all have in common with one another, a way of "organizing the expression of our experiences" (Napoli, 2003:. 181).

The uniquely human ability to use language sets us apart from all other creatures and grants us the ability to share knowledge with one another (Lindemann, 2001). There is an innate power in the written and spoken word, power that can be used for good or for evil. In many cases developmental composition students have grown up witnessing the use of language

to harm rather than to help them, and for this reason some may not even be aware of the potential that it also possesses as a way to break down barriers and build connections. Awareness of the positive power of language is a foundation that all students need to have in order to make the most of their educational experiences and their lives beyond the classroom.

Developing writers need these courses to give them that foundation in a practical sense. But this does not mean that an instructor's only responsibility is to the skill set. There are some other key issues that beg to be addressed as well, issues of a more social nature, and there are few other settings in the college or university that afford such an opportunity to do so. Nonkilling educators can invite students to learn about the world and consider their own place in it even as they give them their very first glimpse of academia. In addition to working to educate students in the academic skills they need to acquire and develop to be successful, nonkilling composition instructors can also create real social value in the courses they teach through their use of language.

Reading and writing assignments in a nonkilling developmental composition course should be designed with this goal in mind. Content should challenge learners' notions and assumptions and encourage them to think more broadly about language in general and their own use of language in particular. Planning content in a way that imparts some social relevance can help teachers understand students and the environments they come from. And the way content is delivered is just as important. Modeling positive language in everything they do is absolutely necessary if teachers are to gain any headway promoting nonkilling linguistics. The challenge for educators is to embody the nonkilling philosophy and not just to teach it.

Once again, this starts with the educator modeling such behaviors in an intentional manner. One can never reach students even with the best intentions and the most captivating ideas without providing a useful example of language usage for them to study and learn from. To pioneers in the field such as Gomes de Matos (2003: 18), the contention is that "languages should be taught/learned and used for humanizing purposes on the basis of such values as human rights, justice, and peace". The term "humanizing" in this context has very specific implications for educators; according to Friedrich and Gomes de Matos (2009: 233), "humanizing has to do with both acknowledging language as a system shared by human beings as well as investing in making language humane". Educators who are committed to focusing their efforts on the humanizing use of language explore the positive power that language can have both academically and in a broader social sense.

There are many things teachers can do to promote a positive and peaceful environment in class, but one of the biggest and most important has to be their use of language. Positive language is defined by Urban (2007: 88) as communication that's free of complaining, put-downs, swearing, arguing, or expressions of anger. Some examples of positive language in the classroom might include expressions of appreciation, compliments, congratulations, or encouragement. Making an intentional effort to use positive language in whole-class discussions as well as in individual assessment can help to provide a working model of the potential for humanizing nonkilling language choices. The responsibility of the educator in this context goes even further than simply modeling positive language for students. Gomes de Matos (2003: 18) suggests that instructors should also select and make regular use of peace-promoting vocabulary, provide positive feedback on assigned work returned to students, and establish the right kind of tone when mediating conflict.

Any effort by teachers to model consistent nonviolent communication that students can come to expect and appreciate requires the integration of thought and language. This framework challenges teachers to make better use of what Rosenberg (2005: 18) calls our "compassionate nature", but it also allows any willing educator to become someone whom students can more readily look upon look upon as trustworthy and an ally. Baglieri and Knopf (2004: 527) point to even broader-ranging implications:

> When teachers model positive language and attitudes toward difference, students are also affirmed in the development of their peer relationships. A classroom discourse that dialogically and pedagogically explores and embraces differences nurtures relationships within the classroom community and leads students toward a broader appreciation of difference.

Positioning the differences (social, economic, even linguistic) among students as a positive and getting them to buy into this notion of "appreciation" may not be easy for a college-level instructor, especially given that most students have lived their whole lives under the false assumption that this type of difference, to borrow a phrase from Shun Eva Lam (2006: 216), is "an aberration of mainstream norms". This paradigm shift requires an instructor to not only grapple with Galtung's (1965) concept of "positive deviance", but to embody that concept.

It is easy for educators to get lost in the effort to define their social roles. Sometimes it seems necessary to choose between two alternating perspectives in putting together content for courses; teachers are alternately pictured as fa-

cilitators (Canterford, 1991) and gatekeepers (Elbow, 1983; Lutz and Fuller, 2007), as if they must choose one role or the other. Elbow (1983) believes that good teaching requires conflicting mentalities, a mindset divided between the obligations to students and to the institution. He sees the objective of the writing teacher as somehow learning to embrace these contrary ideals.

In a nonkilling classroom, the obligations to students, to the educational institution and to society at large are all one and the same. The obligation to knowledge is synonymous with concern for students; preoccupations with academic standards are indissoluble from the social benchmarks students are striving toward. A nonkilling classroom can be at once revelatory in its commitment to excellence, and yet completely nurturing in its concern for student well-being. Friedrich and Gomes de Matos (2009) argue that nonkilling linguistics allows all of our peace-making faculties to be employed, including learning and taking advantage of humanizing uses of language and utilizing words to build up rather than break down. Applying nonkilling linguistics principles to writing instruction affords the opportunity for instructors to fill the roles of both gatekeeper and facilitator at once and to create positive connotations for each of these roles. But in focusing on the use of positive language and encourage students to do the same, educators must take great care not to infringe upon language learners' native linguistic rights even as they pursue an education in the majority language of their territory and of the academy (UNESCO, 1996: 24).

Protecting Linguistic Rights of Language Learners

In many instances, students who lack access to the language of the academy are limited in their ability to fully participate in their educational experiences. They arrive in the college composition classroom with many years' worth of negative memories behind them as far as their academic language instruction is concerned. They are shepherded in to developmental education courses with the intent of helping them gain greater understanding of academic English, far and away considered a lingua franca in the world at large (Seidlhofer, 2005; Mauranen, 2003) and in the classroom as well (Mauranen, 2003); and they are assessed typically through standardized testing that determines initial placement and the subsequent track they will take (see, for example, *Developmental Writing Program*, n.d.; *Developmental Writing*, 1999; and Butcher, n.d.).

Developmental composition instructors have an opportunity to promote "positive deviance" in their students and to help them become more invested in their education by giving them real access to the language of the

academy. Fairclough's (1992) notion of the democratization of discourse, or the "removal of inequalities" between teachers and students in access and linguistics rights, can be a trait of the nonkilling developmental composition classroom. Working toward the democratization of discourse means promoting "equality of opportunity" (Murphy, 2007:195) and linguistic diversity even while teaching a "standard" academic English: for instruction in the target language should never come at the expense of this diversity (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1994). It does not mean that instructors have to regard themselves as "equals" to their students in the academic sense; only that nonkilling educators should work to ensure their students have the access they need to develop their skills and to grapple with the language of academia.

The academy is not in itself good or evil; the notion of English as a *lingua franca* (ELF) in the academy, for example, is one of many concepts that in themselves are not "unfriendly or unpeaceful," as Gomes de Matos (2010) might say; but in its application in language education, this concept can be used to help or injure. English as a *lingua franca* has been the subject of much debate. But even to those who are most critical of ELF, there is a feeling that some value does exist in a student gaining greater fluency in this "contact language" (see Seidlhofer, 2005: 339; and Mauranen, 2003: 514), for the sake of functioning in the world and developing future job prospects, among other reasons. Even Skutnabb-Kangas (2001) acknowledges that learning the dominant language is something most students are likely to recognize is in their best interest.

The right to learn the dominant language and the right to retain one's mother tongue or dialect do not have to be mutually exclusive; there is no reason why this should be so. Learning a new language or mastering the dominant dialect is something that can and should happen positively and additively (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2001), not in a manner that threatens to harm linguistic diversity. Good teaching simplifies learning for the learner. Composition instructors helping students to see the differences between informal and formal language can in doing so also remove a crucial impediment that may otherwise prevent them from ever understanding that difference and mastering language transfer (Wheeler, 2005). Applying nonkilling linguistics should add to students' ability to communicate meaningfully without making a negative impact on or otherwise altering their linguistic choices. The objective is to "add Standard English to our students' linguistic toolboxes" (Wheeler, 2005: 110) without "killing" their own native dialect.

An educator building a nonkilling classroom challenges students to "cultivate and sustain an awareness of their responsibility as peace patriots through their use of language" (Gomes de Matos, 2003:18). Being a peace

patriot means standing up for the linguistic rights of others as well as one's own. There are certain fundamental rights that we all have in common, and these rights should be not only protected but also highlighted in a nonkilling classroom. Language is "collectively constituted within a community", yet "it is also within this community that people make a personal use out of it" (UNESCO, 1996: 9). Keeping with this theme, UNESCO adopted the Declaration of Linguistic Rights to stress the importance of collective as well as individual rights, because "individual linguistic rights can only be made effective if the collective rights of all communities and all linguistic groups are respected by everyone". A developmental composition course is the perfect laboratory setting to witness what can happen when students are introduced (often for the first time in their lives) to the positive impact that language can have and to be encouraged to think critically about their own language rights and those of their peers. Teachers in these classes have a unique opportunity to marry educational fundamentals with broader social principles and create a safe place for learners to explore both at once.

This idea of a safe place to learn is not something that belongs only to developing writers, of course. Over the years, scholars have spent a great deal of time and effort discussing and debating the issue of fundamental linguistic rights, the rights that every single person has with respect to their language usage. When UNESCO adopted its Declaration of Linguistic Rights in 1996, the goal was to promote linguistic equality, a concept that can benefit all people in the way it encourages greater mutual understanding among language groups. It is important to realize that for most people, the default tendency is to approach their own linguistic backgrounds from an assumed position of superiority or inferiority. For most people, it seems natural to distrust anything different even on a linguistic level, because this distrust is a mindset that has been ingrained in them throughout the generations. Recognizing linguistic equality means opening our eyes to the error inherent in any such mindset.

In its immediate application, the primary objective of UNESCO's Declaration was to speak to the rights of second language learners and those whose mother tongue was the minority language where they lived and who wished to receive an education in the majority language. But these same principles apply equally well to students in first language academic English classrooms with all of the different linguistic backgrounds they come from and the dialects spoken in their homes and workplaces. There are very few English speakers who fully adhere to the formal rules and patterns of standard academic English once they leave the school setting, especially in spoken language, according to Norrish (1997), who notes that "the devaluation

of home-grown language forms" in the classroom creates "models of English phonology and syntax that not many teachers who use the language as a medium to teach curriculum subjects, or even local teachers of English would adhere to, except in very careful speech" (n.p.).

Any expectation by educators of students coming from diverse dialectical backgrounds to somehow conform to the language of the academy in their verbal communication and in their existence outside of class is not only misguided, but also may be inadvertently causing harm. In many cases, the distance between informal and standard English is great enough to prevent students from attaining critical literacy by the time they reach college age. It is essential for teachers to respect the rights of students to maintain their own native dialect even as they work toward proficiency in standard written English, and to help them see the distinction between informal and formal language usage and the difference in applicability of both linguistic patterns.

Language can be used as a means to build understanding or to destroy (what?). The nonkilling developmental composition classroom can be a place where language is used in a positive and empowering manner both by students and educators. It is important to recognize and to understand the impact that language can have, and to make intentional choices that promote the peaceful use of language by all participants. Teachers in these settings ought to lead by example and not by coercion or any other typically accepted means of establishing order: for the nonkilling condition cannot be produced through the use of terror (Paige, 2009: 21).

The Linguistic Society of America in 1996 drafted and ratified a statement on language rights similar in some ways to UNESCO's Declaration. In explaining its decision to draft this statement, the Society noted that many public debates regarding linguistic rights stem from "misconceptions" about language (LSA, 1996). In part, the statement reads:

> [T]he Linguistic Society of America urges our nation to protect and promote the linguistic rights of its people. At a minimum, all residents of the United States should be guaranteed the following linguistic rights:
>
> a) To be allowed to express themselves, publicly or privately, in the language of their choice.
> b) To maintain their native language and, should they so desire, to pass it on to their children (LSA, 1996).

This notion of "misconception" is related to what the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC, 1972: 1) called the "myth of a standard American dialect" in an early draft of a resolution on

students' dialects. In its final form adopted in 1974 and reaffirmed in 2003, the resolution goes even further:

> Many of us have taught as though there existed somewhere a single American "standard English" which could be isolated, identified, and accurately defined. We need to know whether "standard English" is or is not in some sense a myth. We have ignored, many of us, the distinction between speech and writing and have taught the language as though the *talk* in any region, even the talk of speakers with prestige and power, were identical to edited *written* English (p. 3).

The difference between spoken English in all of its dialectal varieties (especially in informal social settings) and standard written English is crucial to understand because…. The right of students to their own language is indisputable. The goal of the composition instructor, then, is not to remove anything from the linguistic toolboxes (Wheeler, 2005: 110) of our students, but to help them to develop and refine their use of academic English as a "tool" and not as a weapon (Friedrich and Gomes de Matos, 2009: 223). The question, then, becomes: how can an instructor work to promote peace-building vocabulary and encourage the use of positive language without also stifling linguistic freedom? Put another way, how can nonkilling educators ratify the concept of students' right to language while also creating a positive environment and a safe place to learn?

Balancing Nonkilling Language and Linguistic Freedom

To effectively lead a class in discovering the positive impact of language and harnessing nonkilling principles, nonkilling educators should model these principles in their own use of language and in their standards for language use in the classroom. This does not necessarily have to require censorship; in fact, teachers as nonkilling linguists can be advocates for the linguistic rights of their students. There are ways to focus on this role that can be at once academically instructive and socially relevant. Discussing language rights in an explicit way, for instance, exposes students to the broader social issues connected to language rights, providing a meaningful backdrop for their instruction in academic writing that goes further than simply attempting to "correct" native linguistic patterns.

This backdrop can be useful in writing assignments as well. Encouraging students to think about and recount experiences when they may have had their language rights compromised, for example, provides a useful segue into a larger discussion on the importance of linguistic freedom and diversity, and the rela-

tionship between the need to master standard academic English and the desire to maintain one's own language or dialect, even within the framework of a nonkilling classroom. The balance between academic learning and linguistic freedom is of the utmost importance. Education in the nonkilling sense should be "at the service of linguistic and cultural diversity" (UNESCO, p. 23) and foster a sense of unity in diversity among students in the classroom.

But it may require quite a high-wire act on the part of educators to focus both on linguistic rights and instruction in standard academic English at the same time; this goal isn't something that can be achieved without a great deal of effort. The mechanical end of the job is enough to fill the work day all by itself. A teacher might be preoccupied with educating students on the correct way to structure a sentence or the strategies they can use to build cohesive paragraphs, for example; these and other skills are important and should be attended to. Especially at the developmental level, educators are teaching our students the very foundation that they will need to function even in the most basic manner throughout their college careers.

In many cases what students grow up learning and using on a daily basis and what they are exposed to in the composition classroom can be worlds apart linguistically. Students must be prepared not only to succeed in the educational setting, but also to thrive in life outside of school. Part of this is mechanical and related to academic skills, and another part is socially based. And it all has to do with language and the way we use it. For this reason, a nonkilling classroom must find that balance between the positive use of language and the freedom of self-expression.

In any course like this there are going to be writing tasks designed to evaluate how students are digesting their readings; those assignments should have a positive social component to them as well. Educators have a responsibility to the institution (Elbow, 1983), but this responsibility doesn't end at the outer edge of campus. Students in early composition classes are learning how to read and write critically, and these academic constructs are important, but this only a part of the work of the nonkilling instructor. The "mechanical" end of instruction and the acquisition of skill sets in students are objectives that cannot and should not be neglected. But at the same time, informing instruction should be a great concern for a different kind of learning, a broader education that all can benefit from. This is the part where teachers and students join together as partners in a common learning environment.

A curriculum of peace is the foundation for this classroom. It helps to foster a mentality of harmony and unity, one that carries over into the speaking and the written work of the students as well as the teacher. It is

more than just an effort to speak positively, although this is important as well. It includes content designed to spur discussion and productive debate. Teachings on communicative peace and specific terminology related to peace linguistics (see Friedrich and Gomes de Matos, 2009) are essential in order for this type of environment to thrive.

Developmental educators should welcome the opportunity to get out and take risks, to innovate and to seek solutions rather than simply settle for less in their pedagogies. Students have the right to expect the best out of their teachers, especially in a course sequence this vital. There are innumerable reasons why students might wind up in a basic writing course when they arrive on campus at the university or two-year college. Many of them have to do with combinations of factors related back to their primary and secondary schooling and with their home lives through the years. Social learning and socialization intersect in such intimate ways with other areas (Fry, 1992) that it may take someone an entire lifetime to get it all unraveled.

Some developmental composition students may arrive the first week of class already convinced that they can't write and that they'll never be able to really express themselves effectively using the written word. Whatever the reason or reasons might be for this feeling, it is the responsibility of the instructor to work to reverse it and to get students set on a course of achievement, not just for a single assignment or even for a semester, but for the long term. If learning academic English is a necessity for success later in life as so many say it is, even more important is the need for socialization and meaningful interaction on a personal level, the interaction that leads to peacefulness.

According to Bonta (1996: 405), peacefulness on a societal level can be characterized in the following ways:

- A relatively high degree of interpersonal harmony
- Little or no violence among adults, between adults and children, or between the sexes
- The existence of workable conflict resolution strategies that help avoid violence
- A commitment to avoiding violence with other peoples
- Strategies for raising children to adopt and continue these nonviolent ways.

These principles also apply on a classroom level. Achieving that level of harmony in an educational setting might seem to necessitate having a rather homogeneous group of students to begin with. But one does not arrive at a peaceful condition thanks to pure chance alone. In many cases the most pro-

ductive and positive gatherings of students and educators are comprised of very different individuals from a wide range of backgrounds. The secret is not to try and run from this mixture, but to face it head on and to turn it into a positive.

'Make Problematical the Previously Unthinkable': Unity in Linguistic Diversity

The developmental composition instructor faces a greater challenge than ever in the effort to provide students with an education that is relevant to their lives today. In a world so predisposed to violence, it is easy and perhaps even effortless to dismiss the notion that today's students can ever be reached. Teachers are challenged to depart from this cultural deficit model and instead consider what they might be able to do to have a lasting positive impact on students. If the nonkilling perspective affirms the value of even one human life, then it also must acknowledge the potential in an individual to make an enduring contribution to lives of others.

On a functional level, composition instructors work to equip students to fully develop their communicative abilities and to learn to use language in a positive manner in their lives. But in a broader and perhaps a more distant sense, there is an even greater goal to focus upon: by using applied nonkilling linguistics, teachers can do more than just help students become proficient writers. With the right emphasis and an understanding of their role, nonkilling educators can awaken students to some important social issues, in effect also giving them something meaningful to write about. This lends a sense of urgency to their writing, something that can only motivate student writers to work at their craft even as it also provides them with a new way to recognize the possibility of finding a solution to these issues. Teachers who succeed at making writing about more than just receiving a grade equip their students with a love of language and an understanding of its power to effect positive social change.

The term *applied nonkilling linguistics* is more than some clever subterfuge to disguise any old course in basic composition. Teachers that take this mantle and attempt to do something special with it have the opportunity to unlock in their students a new understanding of positive peace and what it means to them. Positive peace is more than just the absence of war; it is cooperation and togetherness, a newly found faith in the world and a hope for the future (Dill, 1944; Galtung, 1965). The nonkilling objective is grounded in the pursuit of this kind of peace, the kind that is not temporal or fleeting. In the language classroom, positive peace is characterized by an adherence to linguistic human rights, creating an environment where all

learners can identify with their own dialect or mother tongue in a positive way (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1994), even if that mother tongue is substantially different from the language being taught in the classroom.

The biggest challenge educators face regarding the nonkilling stance may be internal. To be effective as nonkilling linguists and to truly communicate the message to students and educational institutions, instructors must first see past these challenges to recognize the possibility that lies beyond. Paige (2007) puts it this way:

> To recognize possibility is not to guarantee certainty, but to make problematical the previously unthinkable. If taken seriously, the possibility of nonkilling societies will lead to the research, education-training, institution-building, democratic action, public policy development, and creative cultural expression needed to bring them about.

"To make problematical the previously unthinkable," to composition instructors means placing full faith in the belief that a nonkilling classroom, if difficult to imagine, is nonetheless attainable. If negative perspectives of language truly result from systematic cultural teaching as Paige (2009) argues, then any positive perception instructors might hope to create must also be built in a systematic and consistent fashion. In this way, a developmental composition pedagogy dedicated to striving for the nonkilling spirit does place more of a demand on the teacher, because it adds a new component to the role that the teacher must play. There are some in the profession who have debated the job of an educator and where the writing teacher's responsibility begins and ends (see, for example, Elbow, 1983; Linkon, 1992; Fulkerson, 2005; Brookover, 1943). There are those who may wish to draw neat little boxes around some list of course objectives or end outcomes such as the ability to frame an argument in an organized fashion or to write a thesis sentence. And these are valuable skills that deserve the attention of our students. But there is so much more that can be accomplished if the teacher is willing to put in the extra effort.

Again, there might never be another laboratory environment on campus quite as conducive to this type of exploration as a developmental composition classroom. But in order to be effective, applied nonkilling linguistics as a concept and a philosophy is something that everyone in the class has to be committed to, and that must begin with the teacher. The goal of changing students' perception of the world and of bringing them into a fuller, more empathic understanding is more attainable than one might think; teachers only need to "start to promote and reinforce what works rather than ex-

clusively denounce what does not" (Friedrich, 2007: 18), recognizing possibility instead of focusing so much on the obstacles complicating the way.

The nonkilling framework challenges students just as much as it does instructors, calling upon them to "recognize possibility" in themselves and to work to exceed their own preconceived limitations. It may not be typical for a teacher in a developmental level course to ask or expect so much out of students. Yet that might be exactly what many students need, to be challenged and taken outside the boundaries of what they are used to in their academic experience. The developing writers that end up in basic writing courses in most cases have never been expected to produce much of anything as far as the written word is concerned, and even in their own minds their expectations are sometimes dulled by the time they arrive on campus. But this is no reason to expect less of them. The health of a community of learners, like society at large, is directly related to the balance between the expectations of the people and the extent to which those expectations are being met (Zinn, 2010). Nonkilling educators and their students cannot allow any worries about measuring up or going too far to prevent them from taking risks. Those who remain too cozy in their comfort zone settle for mediocre in their fear of not being great.

Taking the nonkilling approach to language and literacy education is a challenge for educators; but it also provides a useful vehicle with which to deliver a more satisfying and meaningful experience to students, encouraging their free expression and creativity as well as intellectual growth. It is an approach that can alter the teacher's outlook at least as much as it does that of students. And by promoting the positive use of language while also upholding fundamental language rights, applied nonkilling linguistics can help bring the most benefit to all involved in the educational process. Those who wish to make a difference in the lives of their students—the educators who got into the profession with the intent and the goal of helping people—should not shrink from this challenge.

Applied nonkilling linguistics in the developmental composition classroom is a marriage of two separate but related ideals, each of them powerful and critical in its own right. To educate young people and to equip them with critical and social literacy is a thing of astonishing import. Challenging students to think about their world critically from the nonkilling perspective can potentially lead them into a whole new direction away from the social and economic forces that to this point may have dictated their path. If the functional literacy instruction in this course is crucial, then the social literacy education is fundamental. Teachers who are committed to doing what they can within their sphere of influence to impact the world in a positive way

will go above and beyond to help their students see the world as a place where they can find peace, and communicate peacefully.

Edwards (2007: 39) asserts that nonkilling "implies humility because it expresses respect for life in all its strength and in all its profound fragility in this mortal world". Such humility characterizes the servant-educators who choose to dedicate their lives and careers to the advancement of principles that have the best interests of their students at heart. This strength and fragility is a delicate balancing act; and it is also an elegant contrast, like the shadows that fall when the sun sets at evening. Human life is immeasurably valuable and complex, and the human mind and its capacity to communicate are some of our most marvelous gifts.

The nonkilling educator should do everything possible to excite a sense of interest in larger issues and to awaken latent social literacy that exists in every human. Applying the principles of nonkilling to the developmental composition classroom will enable teachers to be more effective in their instruction; more approachable in their demeanor; more inspiring in their leadership; and more generous in their servitude. Any composition instructor who has taken the nonkilling message to heart and who is committed to doing his or her part to help promote positive and sustainable peace globally needs to start locally. Educators can make an impact in their instruction by giving lessons in humility, tolerance, and respect even while also addressing functional issues like the effort and the ability to attain critical literacy.

Applied nonkilling linguistics is, indeed, a call to action. For scholars, the challenge is to take up that call and approach their academic work from the nonkilling perspective, turning theory into practice. It is all too simple for anyone to come up with grand ideas on ways to use language to promote peace; but without actively working to apply these ideas in the classroom laboratory, all the theory in the world doesn't do any good. Many students today arrive on campus having experienced first-hand the potential language has for destruction. It is the responsibility of developmental writing instructors to expose students to the power that language has for good, to equip them with a new kind of social and critical literacy, and to help them gain a deeper understanding of their own potential as ambassadors for peace.

References

Baglieri, S. and Knopf, J. (2004). "Normalizing Difference in Inclusive Teaching," *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 37(6): 525-529.

Bonta, B. (1996). "Conflict Resolution among Peaceful Societies: The culture of peacefulness," *Journal of Peace Research*, 33(4): 403-420.

Bowen, N. and Bowen, G. (1999). "Effects of Crime and Violence in Neighborhoods and Schools on the School Behavior and performance of adolescents," *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 14(3): 319-342.

Brookover, W. (1943). "The Social Roles of Teachers and Pupil Achievement," *American Sociological Review*, 8(4): 389-393.

Butcher, R. (n.d.). *PREP-010 Course Syllabus for Developmental English.* Available online at: <http://www.coffeyville.edu/syllabi/devenglish_rbutcher.pdf>.

Canterford, B. (1991). "The 'New' Teacher: Participant and Facilitator," *Language Arts*, 68(4): 286-291.

Conference on College Composition and Communication (2006). *Students' Right to Their Own Language*. Available online at: <http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Groups/CCCC/NewSRTOL.pdf>.

Conflict Research Consortium, University of Colorado (1998). "Non-Violent Struggle," in *International Online Training Program on Intractable Conflict*. Available online at: <http://www.colorado.edu/conflict/peace/treatment/nonviolc.htm>.

Dill, J. (1944). "The Psychological Approach to the Transition from War to Peace," *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 21(1): 111-120.

Eastern Kentucky University (n.d.). *Developmental Writing Program at Eastern Kentucky University*. Available online at: <http://devedtraining.eku.edu/english>.

Edwards, C. (2007). "The Basis of the Nonkilling Belief," *Asteriskos: Journal of Internationaland Peace Studies*, 3/4: 33-39.

Elbow, P. (1983). "Embracing Contraries in the Teaching Process," *College English*, 45(4): 327-339.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Malden: Polity Press.

Feshbach, N., and Feshbach, S. (1987). "Affective Processes and Academic Achievement," *Child Development*, 58(5): 1335-1347.

Friedrich, P. (2007). "English for Peace: Toward a framework of peace sociolinguistics," *World Englishes*, 26(1): 72-83.

Friedrich, P. and Gomes de Matos, F. (2009). "Toward a Nonkilling Linguistics," in Evans Pim, Joám, Ed., *Toward a Nonkilling Paradigm*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling. Available online at: <http://www.nonkilling.org/>.

Fry, D. (1992). "'Respect for the Rights of Others is Peace': Learning aggression versus nonaggression among the Zapotec," *American Anthropologist*, 94(3), 621-639.

Fulkerson, R. (2005). "Composition at the Turn of the Twenty-First Century," *College Composition and Communication*, 56(4): 654-687.

Galtung, J. (1965). "On the Meaning of Nonviolence," *Journal of Peace Research*, 2(3): 228-257.

Gomes de Matos, F. (2003). "Applied Peace Linguistics," *Reading Today*, 21(2): 18.

Gomes de Matos, F. (2010). "Language Users for Nonkilling," in *Nurturing Nonkilling: A Poetic Plantation*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling. Available online at: <http://www.nonkilling.org/pdf/nurturing_nonkilling.pdf>.

Henrich, C.; Schwab-Stone, M.; Fanti, K.; Jones, S. and Ruchkin, V. (2004). "The Association of Community Violence Exposure with Middle-School Achievement: A prospective study," *Applied Developmental Psychology*, 25: 327-348.

Lindemann, E. (2001). *A Rhetoric for Writing Teachers*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Linguistic Society of America. (1996). *Language Rights*. Available online at: <http://www.lsadc.org/info/lsa-res-rights.cfm>.

Linkon, S. (1992). "From Experience to Analysis: Using student discomfort in the feminist classroom," *Transformations*, 3(2): 57.

Lutz, J. and Fuller, M. (2007). "A Case Study of a Composition and a Professional Writing Classroom," *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 16(2): 201-232.

Margolin, G. and Gordis, E. (2000). "The Effects of Family and Community Violence on Children," *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51: 445-479.

Mauranen, A. (2003). "Academic English as a lingua franca: a corpus approach," *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(3): 513-527.

Murphy, M. (2007). "Experiences in the internationalization of education: Strategies to promote equality of opportunity at Monterrey Tech," *Higher Education*, 53(2): 167-208.

Napoli, D. (2003). *Language Matters: A guide to everyday questions about language*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Norrish, J. (1997). "english or English? Attitudes, local varieties, and English language teaching," *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*, 3(1). Available online at: <http://www.zait.uni-bremen.de/wwwgast/tesl_ej/ej09/a2.html>.

Paige, G. (2009). *Nonkilling Global Political Science*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling. Available online at: <http://www.nonkilling.org>.

Paige, G. (2007). "'To Leap Beyond Yet Nearer Bring': From war to peace to nonviolence to nonkilling," *International Peace Studies*, 2(1). Available online at: <http://www.gmu.edu/programs/icar/ijps/vol2_1/Paige.htm>

Rosenberg, M. (2005). *Speak Peace in a World of Conflict: What you say next will change your world*. Encinitas: PuddleDancer Press.

Seidlhofer, B. (2005). "English as a lingua franca," *ELT Journal*, 2(1): 339-341.

Shun Eva Lam, W. (2006). "Culture and Learning in the Context of Globalization: Research directions," *Review of Research in Education*, 30: 213-237.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1994). "Mother Tongue Maintenance: The debate," *TESOL Quarterly*, 28*(3)*: 625-628.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2001). "The Globalisation of (Educational) Language Rights," *International Review of Education*, 47(3/4): 201-219.

St. Louis Community College-Meramae (1999). *Developmental Writing at St. Louis Community College-Meramec Fall, 1999*. Available online at: <http://www.sebsteph.com/Professional/sebsportfolio/syllabi/meramec020/020main.htm>.

UNESCO (1996). *Declaration of Linguistic Rights*. Available online at: <http://www.linguistic-declaration.org/versions/angles.pdf>.

Urban, Hal (2007). "The Nuts and Bolts of Effective Teaching: 10 things I learned about promoting high standards in both academics and character and having fun in theprocess," *Journal of Research in Character Education*, 5(1): 83-91.

Wheeler, R. (2005). "Code-Switching to Teach Standard English," *English Journal*, 94(5):108-112.

Zinn, H. (2010). "Nonviolent Direct Action," in Adolf, Antony, Ed., *Nonkilling History: Shaping Policy with Lessons From the Past*. Honolulu: Center for Global Nonkilling. Available online at: <http://www.nonkilling.org/pdf/nkhistory.pdf>.

Chapter Eight

Communicative Dignity and a Nonkilling Mentality

An interview with and suggestions by Francisco Gomes de Matos

Patricia Friedrich
Arizona State University

Francisco Gomes de Matos is Professor Emeritus of Linguistics at Federal University of Pernambuco where he taught languages and linguistics until his retirement in 2003. He is currently President of the Board of Associação Brasil America, whose mission is to "Contribute for the personal and professional development of individuals, in innovative, productive and enjoyable ways, through educational, cultural and linguistic activities." He is also a member of the Dom Helder Câmara Human Rights Commission at the Federal University of Pernambuco.

Gomes de Matos is a pioneer in the fields of Peace Linguistics and Nonkilling Linguistics. Much before the current interest in the intersection of language, society and peace, he was already working on two seminal pleas, one for a Universal Declaration of Linguistic Rights (1984) and another for Communicative Peace (1993). He was actually one of the international scholars whose work inspired the Universal Declaration of Linguistic Rights (Barcelona, 1996) to be ratified by UNESCO and then by the UN Nations. In a publication such as this one, I would be amiss not to offer a glimpse at the work and thought of this fascinating and key scholar of all things language and peace.

You have written often about human dignity, and you have conveyed your ideas in linguistically interesting and innovative ways. Can you say something about that?

Dignity is conveyed by actions, especially *inter*actions. I am interested in focusing on the communicative dimension of dignity. In this age of increasing interest in/research on Phraseological studies, a plea is made here for linguists, communication scholars, psychologists, language educators, lexicographers and other professionals to probe the phraseologies of Dignity in as many languages as possible.

What is the rationale behind the phraseologies you create?

As language users, we resort to and create phraseologies of many kinds, for multiple purposes. A systematic, computerized treatment of dignity-promoting phraseologies across cultures would greatly enhance our vision of world dignity.

What are some questions that readers, teachers and learners can ask themselves about dignity and human communication?

Here is a checklist (for you to add to reflect on, apply, etc) of some Key-questions: In an interaction (friendly chat, discussion, debate, etc), do you know how to...

1. Express your opinion/view respectfully? How do you introduce your ideas?
2. Disagree respectfully? How? What dignifying expressions do you use?
3. Refer to your interlocutor's opinion/view positively? (As a "contribution", for instance?)
4. Harmonize apparently conflicting views? How?
5. Avoid the overuse of "I," "me," "my" instead of cooperatively/empathically prioritizing "you and me," "you," "your," "our," "let's", ...
6. Apologize when you unintentionally say something that might hurt your listener's feelings? How?
7. Acknowledge an infelicitous, inappropriate, inaccurate idea of yours by saying things like "Sorry. I admit I'm wrong.... or I apologize for.... or, still, "Let me correct what I hastily said about....?"
8. Propose alternate interpretations/solutions (to a problem, for instance), rather than impose a view point? How do you do that? What do you typically say in a situation like that? Do you usually achieve the intended conciliatory effect?
9. Deal with controversial issues constructively, positively, optimistically, rather than negatively, pessimistically? How convincing do you usually sound?
10. Optimize your communicative dignity? What strategies do you use that reflect your belief in/acceptance of Human Rights and Peace?
11. Communicate for the good of all involved in the interaction? Do you apply communicative peace in your formulation of issues, problems and solutions thereof?
12. Observe and learn from communicators' effectiveness as dignifiers? How?

This Checklist is open-ended, so the reader can contribute to it and systematize ideas and findings about communicating dignifyingly. Help yourself and those near you make a wise transition from a *me* first society to a *you and me* society.

You often create neologisms to enhance users' ability to engage in peaceful, dignifying dialogue. Can you tell us a little more about that? Can you speak of

any term in particular or give us an example that can be used with students?

The formation of nonkilling(ly) is easy to describe; you can consult an unabridged dictionary for nouns in *non*. My favorite source is *The Random House Webster's College Dictionary*. To motivate you morphologically, here's a stanza created for this item. It could become an activity to do, for example, with students to challenge them linguistically and also in their ability to think in Nonkilling ways:

> When *non* and *killing* are juxtaposed
> specific view of *nonviolence* is proposed
> When as an adverb *nonkilling* is used,
> by *peace*, *nonkillingly* is wisely infused

In the Nonkilling literature, the noun form *nonkilling* is of high frequency. I felt there was a morphological gap: *nonkiller*. I also started using the adverb formed my suffixation with -ly, with Glenn Paige's warm support. If we exercise our right to be linguistically creative, then, to *nonkill* could join that family. It would be a more concise paraphrase of the phrase *not to kill*. Students and teachers can think of other gaps that they can fill with peace-fostering, Nonkilling terms.

In the CGNK's website section *Nonkilling and Language Usage*, see my brief piece "Saying something in a Nonkilling way" too. This is a call to paraphrasing syntactic constructions nonkillingly. Here is that piece:

> Let's not say "I'm killing time "
> Let's say "I'm having a good time" or "I'm using my time for fun"
> (find other alternate constructions and challenge students to do the same)
> Let's never say "I would kill for you"
> Let's say "I would die for you"
> The Brazilian Army General Candido Rondon is quoted as having said (when asked about the killing of native-Brazilians in the state of Amazonas, northern Brazil): "Let's die, if we must, but to kill? Never!"

Do metaphors have a place in this paradigm?

Our paraphrasing reflects our cognitive ability to metaphorize. Have you ever thought of compiling a list of your favorite constructions for expressing the *nonkilling* approach to life? Look at current texts in a variety of knowledge domains and look for uses of *life*-affirming, *life*-preserving, *life*-protecting, *life*-sustaining constructions in the languages you use. Watch for an increase in the uses of *nonkilling* constructions in texts, especially those of a psychosociopolitical nature.

How about syntax?

When mapping the syntax of Nonkilling, consider the perception of construction as a combination of form+meaning+use as cogently expressed by linguists, among whom Diane Larsen-Freeman. The core question to ask ourselves, as *nonkillers*, would be: Do we succeed as creators of form-meaning-use constructions aimed at a communicatively nonkilling world? How? This questioning should provide more food for thought and research.

Do you see your suggested activities for Applied Nonkilling Linguistics as related to Language Planning?

Yes, especially those actions which may serve preventive communicative purposes and also those activities which call for a more rigorous self-control of linguistic resources (from lexicogrammar through phraseology to longer stretches of discourse). In a sense, applying Nonkilling linguistically is an attempt—a challengingly creative one, I should add—to exercise humanizing self-control over one's potentially peaceful uses of language(s). That uses of language(s) have been planned is part of the History of Linguistics, but the planning of peaceful uses of languages for the good of Humankind is a new frontier .... In such spirit, linguists engaged in Nonkilling Linguistics are a special kind of language planners, inspired by a sustainable commitment to helping improve communicative life everywhere.

Can you point at some of your texts—or texts by your colleagues—that establish a dialogue with the kind of nonkilling approach taken in this book?

The chapter Nonkilling Linguistics, by Patricia Friedrich and Francisco Gomes de Matos may provide insights into some of the dimensions mentioned in this interview and other aspects dealt with in this book (reproduced in this volume). Your book *Language, Negotiation, and Peace: The use of English in conflict resolution* (Continuum Press, 2007) is also recommended, especially for its innovative sociolinguistic perspective on Peace Linguistics. Additionally, in the CGNK webpage are my pieces on "Using Nonkilling in depth: Why?" and "To be nonkillingly yours." They may provide additional food for reflection and refl*action* on the topic suggested in the first part of this interview.

There are also my pieces on Applying alliterations for Nonkilling-Advocacy-Action. Therein, I characterize alliteration as a powerful cognitive-communicative process which should be probed cross-educationally and cross-culturally. In my book *Nurturing Nonkilling: A Poetic Plantation* (CGNK, 2010) the use of rhyming for poetic nonkilling purposes can be

seen in my piece on "Poets for Nonkilling."

My chapter on Learning to Communicate Peacefully, written for the *Encyclopedia of Peace Education*, edited by Monisha Bajaj might also be of interest to those looking for lessons on peace and communication.

My poem "What is Language?" that appears as an Appendix to the chapter "Language, Peace, and Conflict Resolution," in Deutsch, Coleman and Marcus' *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution* (2006) can be used as a text for reflection or a sample for students to model their own creative texts after.

In the CGNK section Nonkilling and Language Usage, these pieces may be of interest: "Teaching vocabulary nonkillingly;" "How to veto violent vocabulary: On the most destructive words in English (rhymed reflections);" "Needed: a History of Lethal words in English." In my book *Nurturing Nonkilling*, you might like to read "Language users for Nonkilling," and "Nonkilling sense, Communicators for Nonkilling." The semantic relationship among Peace, Nonviolence and Nonkilling is presented in my piece bearing those three core-concepts, also in my book Nurturing Nonkilling (see above).

Can you offer any other sources that speak specifically of communication and its potential for (non)killing?

To see examples of how communicative life may be killed, access the section on Human Rights from a Nonkilling perspective. Therein you will find Human Social Rights (examples given of how a person/a group/a community may be killed communicatively).

The killing effect of communication can also be seen in Human Intercultural Rights, where 16 examples are given of how intercultural killing may be perpetrated. Also suggested: The Right to Dignity, in which examples are provided of killing human dignity.

You have been writing many poems about language and peace, language and a nonkilling paradigm. Can you explain that? Can you give us an example?

Because I see them as interactive, interconnected, interwoven, and ideally integrated. Think of the different collocations (word co-occurrences) in which language and peace make their togetherness felt visibly in English, for instance: we can speak of Language in Peace/Language for Peace/Language through Peace/Language with Peace/Language toward Peace....and conversely we can also refer to Peace in Language/Peace for Language/Peace through Language/Peace with Language/Peace toward Language and if we keep probing the collocation possibilities we would add Peace inside Language, Peace about Language (conversely: Language about Peace), and so on...

So you see, there would be many perspectives, ways of looking at the dynamics of Language-Peace. Another reason why I keep writing poems centered on Language+Peace is that I see poetry as a powerful tool for expressing how language can be used at the service of Peace (inner, collective, universal...) and also how peace can be made (presumably...) memorable by manifesting it linguistically in poetic forms.

Similarly, I have been writing on Language and Nonkilling, because that meaningful, multi-shaped mental marvel called language is being used by Humankind constructively, but, sad to say, also *d*estuctively and educationally a case can be made for human beings learning how to communicate peacefully, nonviolently, nonkillingly and also learning how to avoid - if possible, prevent - harming, hurting, *killing* others communicatively.

The emphasis given to Speech Acts in pragmatic studies has led me to create this stanza, as applied to Nonkilling, by way of summary:

> Experiencing a repertoire of Nonkilling speech acts
> can help us *nonkillers* gradually to become
> and turn Life-supporting actions into humanizing facts
> and educate Humankind to see a diverse world as *one*.

How can societies benefit from a nonkilling mentality, especially in what language is concerned?

Nonkilling Societies could benefit from research on sociolinguistic actions that are painful, sometimes lethal, to human beings, for instance, messages of threat to one's life. A sociolinguistically destructive element is that of humiliation, usually discussed from a strictly psychological perspective. Nevertheless, we should also ask what the social impact of humiliation is like. How can Sociolinguistics shed light on the suffering experienced by humiliated persons or groups? Is there a preventive side to Nonkilling Sociolinguistics? In public or collective communication settings, how can the dehumanizing practice of humiliation be avoided, controlled, prevented? In Nonkilling Sociolinguistics applied to Education, could there be a preventive component? What would it consist of?

Given the focus of Sociolinguistics on variation and on how language varieties and variants are reacted to by language users, how could alternative ways of expressing one's sociolinguistic Nonkilling competence become part of well-established research programs in universities and other research centers? Granted the plausibility of a Nonkilling Sociolinguistics, which prioritized language users' communicative health, how could Nonkilling sociolinguists benefit from interaction with other professions in the health professions?

May these reflections be a plea for concentrated attention of some of those

issues. The connection between Language and Society should be built peacefully, nonviolently, nonkillingly. Applied linguists and other appliers of the Sciences of Language have an essential role to play in this respect. In my book *Nurturing Nonkilling*, see "Reading the world nonkillingly." Also read "All about actions for Life: an -ing adjective list." In the same source, reflect on the 22 examples given in the piece "Global citizens for communicative nonkilling."

Does a nonkilling approach benefit research in psycholinguistics?

The connection between Language and Mind can be expanded with the addition of Peace, Nonviolence, Nonkilling, thus inspiring reflections and research on the interaction of peaceful or Nonkilling language uses and the human mind. Similarly, the interaction between Nonkilling Language use and cognitive processes could be probed.

One more suggestion for study by Nonkilling psycholinguists: how can a Nonkilling worldview be placed at the service of building a better world, a world in which there is more peace, justice, dignity, equality, compassion.

Any insights into humor?

The suggestions made here are the outcome of Imaginative Education applied to nonkilling. No published source with that specific aim is available ...yet ...as far as I know. Since humor permeates human life and is a universal of human play, a case can be made for creative uses of nonsense for nonkilling purposes. Here is an example of nonkilling-based humor:

An imaginary, (im)possible dialogue would take place, in which citizen A would ask citizen B two questions. Here is the transcript of that interaction:

> A - When can human communication kill?
> B - When a nonkilling pill we can't find.
> A - A Nonkilling pill?!! What would it do?
> B - It would prevent the activation of a destructive mind.

Included in the repertoire of research initiatives aimed at nonsense uses of Nonkilling language could be Nonkilling jokes, Nonkilling word play, Nonkilling parodies, Nonkilling comedies, etc. How about creating examples, and thus having serious fun? Remember: as language users we can make sense, no sense and *non*sense, too.

Do you have any suggestions of research questions for those readers eager to attempt to incorporate a nonkilling approach to their theory building and practice?

An expansion of the suggested key-questions presented above could be:

How can the interaction of Language and Mind be illuminated by a nonkilling worldview? How could we reinterpret the widely discussed Sapir-Whorf Linguistic Relativity Hypothesis from the perspective of nonkilling? To what extent Nonkilling language use would influence Nonkillers perception of the world, of human beings, animals, Nature?

Anything you would like to add?

I would actually like to close with a poem:

Since words our attitudes, beliefs and feelings help convey
Let's reflect on to whom, what, how, where, when, and why we say
Let's question our messages if not created in a nonkilling way
and do our best to use our semantic competence wisely every day.

Note: An effort was made to present, already in the text of the interview, enough information to allow the reader to seek out the sources mentioned by Dr. Gomes de Matos. For further details, please contact the editor or consult the CGNK website.

Contributors

Contributors

Lauren Chamberlain received her M.A. in Social Justice and Human Rights from Arizona State University in May 2012, specializing in peace education, violence prevention, and immigrants' rights. Prior to returning to graduate school, Lauren worked as an elementary school educator for six years, teaching kindergarten, first grade, and K-8 behavior intervention. She received her Master's of Education in Curriculum and Instruction in 2006, and earned her undergraduate degree in Peace and Conflict Studies from UC Berkeley in 2004. Lauren lives in Phoenix, Arizona.

José Marcelo Freitas de Luna has received an undersgraduate degree in Letters from the Universidade Federal da Paraíba; and M.A in English Language and Literature from the Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, with partial work done at the University of Birmingham in England. He has done post-graduate work in University Administration at Universidade Católica de Goiás and internship in Ottawa, Canada and in International Technical Cooperation at FEA/USP. He received his doctorate in Linguistics from Universidade de São Paulo (1999 having completed partial work at the University of Cambridge, in England. He is a faculty member in the Masters Program in Education at the Universidade do Vale do Itajaí. His publications are mostly in the areas of Language, Education and University Administration.

Patricia Friedrich is an Associate Professor of Linguistics/Rhetoric and Composition at Arizona State University, having received her PhD from Purdue University. She is the author of Language Negotiation and Peace (2007, Continuum), Teaching Academic Writing (ed. 2009, Continuum), and over twenty-five book chapters and articles in such periodicals as *World Englishes* and *Harvard Business Review*. Her research focuses on the intersection of language and socio-political phenomena, especially language and peace, language and dominance, and the spread of English.

Francisco Gomes de Matos is Professor Emeritus of the Universidade Federal de Pernambuco in Recife, Brazil. He has taught in Canada, Mexico and the U.S. He holds degrees in languages and law from UFPE and in linguistics from the University of Michigan and the Catholic University of São Paulo. Dr. Gomes de Matos is a co-founder and President of the Board of the Associação Brasil América in Recife and Member of the Dom Helder Camara Human Rights Commission, UFPE also in Recife, Brazil. Among his publications are, *Nurturing Nonkilling: a Poetic Plantation* (2009, Center for Global Nonkilling) *Learning to Communicate Peacefully* (2008, available online from the *Encyclopedia of Peace Education*), and "Nonkilling Linguistics" (co-author) in *Toward a Nonkilling Paradigm* (2009, Center for Global Nonkilling). Gomes de Matos is the author of two pioneering pleas: *For a Universal Declaration of Linguistic Rights* (1984) and for *Communicative Peace* (1993).

Murilo Jardelino da Costa has an M.A. is Letters and Linguistics awarded by the Universidade Federal de Pernambuco (UFPE). He is a researcher in the areas of language and language teaching and member of the Brazilian Institute for Nonkilling. He is a Professor of Linguistic Theory at both Universidade Nove de Julho (UNINOVE) and Faculdade São Bernardo (FASB), in São Paulo.

Enio Moraes Júnior has a doctorate in Communication Science from the Escola de Comunicações e Artes (ECA) at Universidade de São Paulo (USP). His research involves education, technology and media. A journalist, Moraes Junior is a faculty member for the Journalism degree at Escola Superior de Propaganda e Marketing (ESPM), in São Paulo.

Maryam Saroughi is a Ph.D. student at George Mason University in Fairfax. Her research interests include: social identity, engagement and academic achievement for students from diverse communities

Joseph-G. Turi is professor, jurist, lawyer (Québec Bar), guest speaker and international consultant, particularly in the field of national and international linguistic and cultural policies as well as in Quebec, Canadian and Comparative linguistic law. Former senior civil servant in the Government of Québec (constitutional, legal and linguistic services). Author of more than a hundred scientific and cultural articles. Secretary General of the International Academy of Linguistic Law (Head Office in Montreal), which organizes every 2 years a great international conference on language and law. Honorary President of the Dante Alighieri Society of Montreal.

James C. Whitton graduated from the University of Michigan Flint in 2011, earning a Master of Arts in English Language and Literature. He taught English composition at UM Flint, and at Delta College. He was researching how to create a curriculum for developmental composition that would be based on the standards of peace linguistics. He believed that all students could benefit by learning how to communicate effectively in their writing. In March of 2012, Jim was killed in an automobile accident. He leaves behind an adoring family, including wife Lisa, children Audrey and JD, brother Matthew, sister Julie, and parents Donna and James. In his 33 years, Jim touched so many in positive ways.

Shelley Wong is an Associate Professor at George Mason University in Multicultural / ESL / Bilingual Education. Over the years has taught English as a Second language in adult school, high school, community college, university intensive English programs, and teacher education programs in California, Ohio, New York, and the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area. Her research interests include Dialogic approaches to teaching and research; sociocultural approaches to literacy, academic achievement for racial, cultural and language minority students, critical discourse analysis.

Epilogue

Nonkilling Linguistics: can we effectively apply?
Yes! With this principle let's committedly comply:
Let's turn forms of linguistic aggression, hate and hostility
into human-improving acts of nonkilling peace and serenity