



Science Meeting – Scientific Report

***The politics of multilingualism: linguistic governance,
globalisation and Europeanisation***

Université de Genève, 19–20 June 2014

Application Reference N°: 5544

Convenors:

François Grin (Université de Genève)

Peter A. Kraus (Universität Augsburg)

A workshop sponsored by the ESF Research Networking Programme RECODE, in co-operation with the MIME (Mobility and Inclusion in a Multilingual Europe)-Project.

1) Purpose and Organization

The workshop was the second (and final) workshop of the RECODE thematic section devoted to ‘Linguistic Diversity and Political Communication’. It built on the results of the section’s previous workshop, which had been held in Helsinki in 2011. Whereas the main focus of the Helsinki workshop was on linguistic diversity in the context of nation-states, the Geneva meeting concentrated on issues related to the interplay of multilingualism, on the one hand, and the dynamic of transnationalism, globalization and Europeanization, at the other hand.

One of the principal consequences of this dynamic is a substantial alteration of the functions of different languages and their position with respect to one another. Its effects are making themselves felt not only at a global scale and in regional arenas, but also at the national scale of state-level language policies, and at the local level of linguistic practices in multicultural neighborhoods. This raises unprecedented challenges for contemporary societies, which have to engage ever more varied and pervasive manifestations of diversity. Meeting these societal challenges calls for the development of institutional responses, which are in line with the new politics of language and multilingualism. Although there is an abundance of literature on multilingualism and diversity in the modern world (particularly in contemporary Europe), relatively little has been done towards elaborating an integrative view that identifies the key social and political dimensions at hand, and proposes a systematic approach to policy development on this basis. The purpose of the workshop was to do precisely that, by charting some of this little-known terrain, emphasizing the need to be simultaneously relevant at the international, national and local levels.

The workshop was organized through a partnership between RECODE, the University of Geneva, and the EU FP7 collaborative project MIME (‘Mobility and inclusion in multilingual Europe’). The MIME project identifies, assesses, and recommends measures for the management of the trade-offs between the potentially conflicting goals of mobility and inclusion in a multilingual Europe. The workshop convenors were François Grin (Geneva) and Peter A. Kraus (Augsburg). When inviting participants, they tried to make for the necessary minimum of thematic continuity between the meetings in Helsinki and in Geneva. Accordingly, several of the paper-givers and discussants in Geneva had been involved with the Helsinki workshop (concretely, this was the case with Linda Cardinal, Peter A. Kraus, Pasi Saukkonen, and Nenad Stojanovic).

2) Thematic Sessions: Topics and Speakers

The workshop was structured in three thematic sessions. The abstracts of the presentations delivered at the thematic sessions are listed below. Draft papers of the presentations were made available – and still are – for internal circulation from the RECODE web site.

Session 1: Multilingualism and Identity Building

Virginie Mamadouh
Transient Linguistic Landscapes of Activism

The linguistic diversity of Europe is often seen as the main barrier to the development of a pan-European public sphere in the European Union. This is true for collective action, as much as for

parliamentary politics and the media. This paper highlights the challenge of multilingualism for urban movements in a globalizing world. It shows how linguistic issues interact with the geographies of grassroots mobilizations and their multiscale struggles, both in terms of grievances, resources, political opportunities, and ideologies. More specifically the paper explores the political geography of activism against austerity policies in the Eurozone through a study of language use. The protestors' performance produces transient linguistic landscapes with placards, posters, banners, and other languaged signs, that are used in this analysis to examine the Europeanization of collective action. When public space in the local context is clearly dominated by one (state) language, political signs in different languages expose some transnational engagement. Such multilingual signs can be interpreted as an expression of the diversity of the linguistic background of participants (revealing a transnational mobilization), the multilingual repertoires of participants (caused by transnational migration, economic and cultural globalization, and/or European integration) but can also reveal the instrumental need to use a language (potentially) understood by the addressee(s) outside the local and national context. In the case of the Eurozone and the protests related to austerity measures this could be the troika of the Commission, the European Central Bank and the International Monetary Fund, politicians and public opinions in other member states. The study draws on the examination of these transient linguistic landscapes as they are captured on pictures of (Occupy) demonstrations published in media or posted on Flickr, the image hosting website and online community. It aims at contributing to the development of a political geography of the Europeanization of activism in the European Union and to evaluate the impact of the eurocrisis and the ensuing crisis of European governance on the emergence of a European politics.

Linda Cardinal

The Politics of Multilingualism: The Case of Canada

The publication of language data helps understand the linguistic make-up of a polity. For linguistic minorities it can also be a time of anxiety such as witnessed in Wales in 2012 when the publication of the census showed that the number of native Welsh speakers was not growing as expected. The same can be said about the state of the French language in Canada. In 2011, the publication of new census data on languages spoken in Canada revealed that multilingualism was on the rise and that French was regressing.

The paper will argue that the rise of multilingualism in Canada is temporary. Language transfers towards English are more important than what is usually reported in the media. In fact, Canada's multilingualism is a media construction which serves to undermine bilingualism to the benefit of the English language. The paper will put the discussion on multilingualism within the larger perspective of Canada's official language policy. It will show that governmental responses to multilingualism in Canada have led to reinforce the learning of English or French.

Rudi Janssens

The Impact of Mobility and Migration on the Identity-Constructing Policy in Brussels

The Belgian political model is based on monolingual territories and the integrative power of the two traditional 'imagined communities' of Dutch-speakers and French speakers. The institutionalisation of this policy in the 70ties led to a political model without a national language, national political parties, national education nor national media. For Brussels, this resulted in a particular model of bilingualism with two language communities and a situation of partial power sharing. From the 70's onwards, Brussels was subject to a diversified migration leading to the current situ-

ation with a population of which half of them has non-Belgian roots. This results in a highly multilingual and multicultural environment. The current identity-constructing policy based on the confrontation of two language groups however does not meet the expectations of this diverse population. This presentation focuses on the contrasting strategies between the identity-constructing policy of institutionalisation and the framing of the political debate on the one hand and the sense of belonging and grassroots social movements on the other.

Astrid von Busekist

Bowling Together. Some Thoughts on a New Lingua Franca

In this paper I argue that democratic theory and linguistic justice can be reconciled with a *lingua franca* principle against charges of hegemony, domination, exclusion and elitism.

Parity of participation and parity of esteem can effectively be secured by a twofold policy:

1) Unbound diversity & lingua franca

My *lingua franca* is an efficient and pragmatic tool (vs. ideological and identitarian), much like ancient *linguae francae* were imperial but not *imperialistic*, utile and adaptive.

I will try to show that lingua franca talk is compatible with democratic (moral and political) values: equality, the principles of non domination, non exclusion, etc.; because unlike most mother tongues, my *lingua franca* has no center (vs. hegemony), is hybrid (vs. norms), dynamic, and contextual, with very few *a priori* linguistic constraints. This kind of *lingua franca* could either become a universal native language with a fair amount of idiolect / idiosyncrasy; or a “multilingual language”. It is certainly a *sui generis* language.

2) Social Multilingualism (simultaneously or transitionally as a “bridge-policy”).

Individuals and languages are flexible enough to interact despite of language differences, despite of co-presence of different (and even mutually unintelligible) languages. Our understanding of the relationship between linguistic diversity and (quality of) democracy is empirically quite poor. We usually argue (I do at least) that multilingual democracies are more fragile. But studying language policies or multilingualism, our analytical framework should be aimed at maximum participation in public life; a *minima* the value of participation should be taken into account at levels that are morally relevant (intermediary institutions: the workplace, schools, neighborhood politics, where individuals have a real say on their environment, and a real interest in improving their situation).

The former (1) fits the utility principle, the latter (2) fits the identity *and* the utility principle.

Together the two principles may convert the mutually exclusive paradigms in the literature (identity vs. utility) into a comprehensive approach to language diversity.

Konstantin Zamyatin

Russian Language, Language Policy and Nation-Building

The demise of the Soviet bloc opened the possibility for the formation of the current regional system of minority protection in Europe. Russia’s ongoing efforts to reassert its position as a regional power pose a challenge to existing models of diversity management in the countries of the former USSR, because the pressure is exerted under the pretext of protection of the Russian-speaking populations. At the same time, this assertive stance in foreign policy is logical continuation to Russia’s identity politics. In the light of these developments, the changing role of language in efforts at identity-building deserves theoretical evaluation. The purpose of the article is to ex-

plore the place the policy-makers allocate in their nation-building project to the Russian language in order to understand possible impact of the policy on the state of linguistic diversity and multilingualism in Russia and abroad. The approach of the study is to analyze the official policy-defining documents. The drive for strengthening the position of Russian both in Russia and in neighboring countries reveals the intention to use the language instrumentally as the tools for the promotion of national identity.

Peter A. Kraus

From Glossophagic Hegemony to Multilingual Pluralism?

Re-Assessing the Politics of Linguistic Identity in Europe

The paper assesses the politics of multilingualism in contemporary Europe by focusing on the role of options and ligatures in the framing of linguistic identities. Whereas nation-state construction entailed the establishment of monolingual spaces that should make for a convergence of linguistic ligatures and linguistic options, the emergence of new transnational settings at different levels is contributing to an increasing disconnection between language-as-an-option and language-as-a-ligature that affects not only minority, but also majority members. This dynamic may have important implications for how demands for linguistic recognition are articulated by different groups.

László Marác

Towards Norm-driven Linguistic Diversity Management in the Context of Globalization

In this paper, I will discuss the input of linguistic diversity management in the context of complex diversity in the sense of Kraus (2012). Within mainstream sociolinguistics, a number of commentators argue that as a result of globalization processes in linguistically diverse societies the established languages are used as ‘resources’ yielding complex hybrid phenomena. These hybrid phenomena have been described with post-modern terminology, like ‘linguaging’ and ‘translinguaging’ fitting well into the dictionary of globalization. However, the linguistic phenomena these terms cover do not have the status of discoveries. They are in principle variations on well-known and well-studied linguistic phenomena, like code-switching and code-mixing. What is new, due to globalization, and this certainly has to do with the shape and intensity of globalization processes is the complexity of these phenomena itself and their seemingly unlimited combinatory potential in the context of globalization, using all sorts of elements of established languages as resources to mix, switch and sample in the processes of speech production.

I will argue that the linguistic phenomena covered by post-modern linguistic terminology have a limited applicability and scope within a framework of linguistic diversity management: they have little communicative currency and play a role in informal communication only. They can be best characterized as instances of highly individual speech utterances (Phillipson, 2012). By concluding this, it is questionable whether these phenomena have anything to do at all with ‘multilingualism’ as a subject of linguistic diversity management. This does not imply that linguists, ethnographers and anthropologists should not study cases of linguaging and other creative instances of speech production and their impact on social and political processes. These phenomena covered by these post-modern terms reflect however on the human cognitive capacities unfolding the immense creative capacity of the human mind in the first place. Hence, these phenomena of spontaneous speech production should be studied apart from linguistics in a framework of cognitive sciences having less to do with linguistic diversity management or language policy in the context of globalization. The disciplinary anchoring of linguistic diversity management is an open question to be debated. In the MIME framework, linguistic diversity management or language policy

is the result of a rational multi-, inter- and transdisciplinary study of the complex interplays between different ‘fields’ in the sense of Bourdieu (1991). Whatever the outcome of this endeavor to be elaborated in detail may be, the subject of linguistic diversity management are ‘languages’ that are products of long and intensive prescriptive processes of norm implementation and not ‘parts of speech’.

Session 2: Emerging Patterns of Global Linguistic Governance

Robert Phillipson

English, the Lingua Nullius of Global Hegemony

Worrying social trends reveal serious unjust and undemocratic features in ‘democratic’ societies. There are comparable problems in the management of EU affairs, including its multilingualism. The trends correlate with an increased use of English in globalisation, neoliberalism, and greater European integration. One can trace a transition from European colonisation worldwide, ostensibly justified by the Western myth of *terra nullius*, to worldwide penetration of American imperialism as a *cultura nullius*, in McDonaldisation processes in many social functions that accompany military and economic empire. English is now increasingly marketed as a necessity, internalised as though it serves all equally well, a *lingua nullius*. Some European Commission initiatives accord linguistic priority to English, or argue for it as a seemingly neutral *lingua franca*, in effect a *lingua nullius*. This obscures the forces behind the power of English. Its hegemony has serious implications for speakers of other languages and their cultures.

The operation of the supranational EU system, and of EU-funded activities in member states, builds on ‘integration through law’ (treaties) and the evolution of novel forms of linguistic governance. Judgements of the European Court of Justice not only interpret law but are teleological: they extend supranational law and the scope of the common market. A quite different example of the extension of English linguistic hegemony is the way EU administration of post-conflict Bosnia has failed to achieve its goal of creating a viable state, but has established English as a new language of power. Noble human rights aims are aspired to, but international relations are subordinate to the forces behind corporate empire, a project that unites the USA and EU, and that dovetails with a project to establish ‘global English’. The failure to create more just societies and to substantiate deliberative democratic principles confirms the analysis of scholars who assess that ‘international relations’ are pathologically inadequate, and that we have reached the ‘end-times’ of human rights. English in global and EU governance strengthens particular interests that are obscured by the myth of it as a *lingua nullius*. Existential language policy issues should not be consigned to the mercy of the market.

François Grin

Fashionable Sociolinguistic Constructs: Some Implications for Politics and Policy

Globalisation has both a positive and a negative impact on linguistic diversity. The latter is reflected in the rapid demise of numerous small languages; the former in the rising number of occurrences where social actors encounter linguistic and cultural difference. The increased frequency and variety of such “inter-linguistic” contact (a result, among others, of the spread of “complex diversity”) has given rise, in contemporary applied linguistics, to the development of several lines of analysis and discourse that might be called “multilingualist”. While some of these discourses are genuinely attuned to the linguistic challenges that arise under conditions of globalisa-

tion, others end up – perhaps unwillingly – undermining the efforts made to ensure the long-term maintenance of linguistic diversity and, consequently, multipolarity; some of these discourses, for example, weaken the cause of linguistic human rights and the attempts of small (or even not so small) language communities to resist various manifestations of linguistic hegemony. The paper examines, in a critical way, four different concepts encountered in present-day “multilingualist” discourses and shows why they should be avoided, or at least substantially amended, when developing policy responses aiming at the preservation of a genuine, sustainable multilingualism.

Thomas Ricento

The Promise and the Pitfalls of Global English

The interests and aspirations of individuals and governments in both low- and high-income countries where English is a foreign/second/additional/official non-indigenous language are often connected to individual desires to enhance “market” value abetted by governmental desires to promote societal economic development, in part, by attracting foreign direct investment (FDI) dollars. There is a widespread assumption in many non-English dominant countries that by using English as a medium of instruction, or as a core subject in the curriculum, individuals and societies will reap benefits, be they material, psychological, strategic, symbolic, or all of the above. Yet the data to support such assumptions is, at best, equivocal and more often than not the data suggest that, for example, early exposure to English-medium instruction in low-income countries where it is not the language of the home or community is detrimental to academic achievement and attainment of a high level of literacy in any language. Several studies document that higher levels of English proficiency, controlling for other relevant factors, does not independently lead to increased international trade; in fact, societal multilingualism, generally, controlling for other potentially moderating factors, correlates with increased trade, and English per se has no special or unique effect in that regard (Arcand and Grin 2013; Melitz 2008). In this talk, I will consider the arguments and data on the economic ‘promise’ of English as an additional language, along with the arguments and data that demonstrate the drawbacks and limitations of English-medium instruction as a tool for socioeconomic advancement in low-income countries.

References

- Arcand, Jean-Louis and Grin, François (2013). “Language in Economic Development: Is English Special and is Linguistic Fragmentation Bad?” in E. Erling and P. Seargeant (eds), *English and Development: Policy, Pedagogy and Globalization* (Bristol: Multilingual Matters), 243–66.
- Melitz, Jacques (2008). “Language and Foreign Trade,” *European Economic Review*, 52: 667–99.

Session 3: Linguistic Hegemony, Linguistic Insecurity and Linguistic Justice

Glyn Morgan

English as Europe’s Lingua Franca: A Liberal-Democratic Perspective

The paper defends a liberal-democratic argument for English as Europe’s lingua franca. From this perspective, an English lingua-franca is desirable, because it facilitates movement across national and political boundaries; in doing so, a common language functions as a prophylactic against bad government and dysfunctional economic policies. Some proponents of English as

Europe's lingua franca (Van Parijs 2012, for example) maintain that an English-speaking Europe would be “unfair” to non-English speakers. This paper argues that Van Parijs' unfairness arguments are not convincing. Rather than encourage coercive linguistic territorialism - Van Parijs' preferred option - Europe would be better served, so the paper argues, by a liberal accommodationist linguistic policy, where all people are *required* to have English and *allowed* to have whatever other language(s) their territory chooses.

Federico Gobbo

Is the Calvet Language Barometer useful to Measure Linguistic Justice?”

When linguistic justice was proposed by Van Parijs (1992) as a key concept in order to cope with the asymmetries of multilingual context, it raised immediately a lot of debate. After many reprises of the concept by the original proponent (Van Parijs 2004, 2011, 2012), Grin (2011, 2005) observed that the intangible value of a language, being one of the main carriers of culture, is quite often left aside in the indexes that pretend to measure linguistic justice as a whole. The only variable that seems to be well accepted is territory. To sum up the debate, the proof of the pudding is that we all agree on what is linguistic *injustice*, but not on what linguistic justice should be. This lack of agreement is reflected in the mechanics of the proposed methods of evaluation of multilingual contexts. What are we measuring? In particular, justice for whom, e.g., national citizens and/or migrants? Furthermore, at which level of analysis, i.e., local, national, transnational? The answers to this kind of questions lead our choice of the right – or at least appropriate – variables as reliable indexes of linguistic justice. As it happens in other domains of human behaviour, measures are far from neutral, in spite of the fact that they present themselves neutrally being expressed by numbers.

In this paper, I examine the Calvet Language Barometer (CLB) in 2012 in order to test it as a candidate for measuring linguistic justice. I will proceed backwards, as the CLB is aimed to measure the “linguistic altitude” of languages in isolation, not to analyse multilingual context. However, the worldwide gravitational model presented in Calvet (2006, 1999) is naturally compatible with the CLB, so I argue that it can be used for this purpose, at least in principle. The case study of South Tyrol will be presented in order to test the CLB under this perspective, showing at what extent the barometer works, where it does not work, and why. In the conclusions, some preliminary ideas about a genuine multilingual measure of linguistic justice to be done will be presented.

Bibliography

- Calvet, Louis-Jean (1999). *Pour une écologie des langues du monde*. Paris: Plon.
- Calvet, Louis-Jean (2006). *Towards and Ecology of World Languages*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Grin, François (2011). “Using territoriality to support genuine linguistic diversity, not to get rid of it”, in *The Linguistic Territoriality Principle: Right Violation or Parity of Esteem?*. Brussels: Re-Bel. 11, 28-33. www.rethinkingbelgium.eu.
- Van Parijs, Philippe (2012). “On linguistic territoriality and Belgium's linguistic future”, in Popelier, Patricia & Sinardet, Dave & Velaers, Jan & Cantillon, Bea (eds): *Belgium: Quo Vadis? Waarheen na de zesde staatsbervorming*. Antwerpen: Intersentia. 35-60.
- Van Parijs, Philippe (2011). *Linguistic Justice for Europe and for the World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Van Parijs, Philippe (2004). “Europe's linguistic challenge”, *European Journal of Sociology*. 45 (1), 111-152.

Papers had been circulated and read in advance by the participants, so that the debates in the sessions were lively and stimulating, yet still always thematically focused. The paper-givers came from a broad range of disciplines: geography, sociology, politics, linguistics, translations studies, and economics. The discussants represented the areas of history and politics. Thus, the workshop, as all RECODE events, had a pronounced interdisciplinary profile. At the same time, it assembled a cast of contributors whose perspectives on the issues at hand were mutually intelligible and, to some extent, complementary, regardless of all differences of disciplinary backgrounds and normative predispositions. Moreover, the workshop was a particular success in terms of linking some of the key research threads pursued in the RECODE section on linguistic diversity to emerging new networks in the analysis of multilingualism and its politics, such as the MIME consortium.

3) Recurrent Themes and Research Prospects

Regardless of the great variety of topics addressed in the workshop sessions, from the convenors' standpoint there are four main thematic areas that seem particularly relevant for a sound interdisciplinary and comparative assessment of the challenges of linguistic governance in a context of increased transnational mobility and 'diversification of diversity'.

- i Contemporary approaches to multilingualism are often characterized by a striking lack of awareness of the structural features that regulate the use of languages in culturally diverse settings. This seems to be especially the case of the 'linguaging' school in applied linguistics, where language politics disappear in a universe of creative and quasi-spontaneous communicative interactions. But the neglect of power structures and of the unequal access to cultural resources in multilingual settings is also observable among the advocates of English as a Lingua Franca, as well as, somewhat paradoxically, in critical sociolinguistics.
- ii In an unfortunate reciprocity, political scientists tackling linguistic diversity and multilingualism are often not familiar with central debates in sociolinguistics, which would make them more aware of that language is – and languages are – not just an area of political regulation; language is itself a constitutive element of any political field. The approach of political theorists to issues of linguistic justice, for instance, would certainly benefit from the incorporation of central sociolinguistic concepts such as diglossia or language hierarchies.
- iii The challenge of assessing how the articulation of new linguistic identities may or may not be related to the unequal distribution of political power seems particularly relevant vis-à-vis the rise of varieties of English we label as 'global' or 'European'. Whereas for some workshop participants, 'straight-for-English' policies have a 'linguicist' component as they basically serve elite interest and not those of the mass of the population, other participants tend to appreciate a quasi-democratic potential in the appropriation of English and advocate for transforming standard English into branches of regionalized dialects.
- iv Finally, and with regard to issues of linguistic governance articulated 'from below', it is obvious that mobility and transnationalization entail challenges that can hardly be addressed in the context of the often dogmatic monolingualism associated with the period of expansion of national forms of rule, in which the dominant political tendency was to establish close bonds between cultural standardization and social integration. Rather, such

challenges seem to require policy architectures that are as complex as the realities they are supposed to tackle, and offer sophisticated institutional templates for linking ‘transnational’ citizenship and multilingualism.

The papers delivered at the workshop will be the basis for a publication co-edited by the two convenors. Grin and Kraus are preparing a book proposal along the thematic lines sketched out above. Contributors will be asked to address these key issues, as well as to take into account the specific suggestions they received in Geneva, when they revise their papers.

4) Programme of the meeting and full list of speakers and participants

Workshop programme:

The politics of multilingualism: linguistic governance, globalisation and Europeanisation

Thursday, June 19th

<i>Time</i>	<i>Object</i>
9:00	François Grin (Université de Genève) Peter A. Kraus (University of Augsburg) Welcome and introduction
<i>Session 1): Multilingualism and Identity-building</i>	
9:30	Virginie Mamadouh (University of Amsterdam): <i>Transient Linguistic Landscapes of Activism</i>
10:00	Linda Cardinal (University of Ottawa) <i>The Politics of Multilingualism: The Case of Canada</i>
10:30	Break
11:00	Rudi Janssens (Vrije Universiteit Brussel): <i>The Impact of Mobility and Migration on the Identity-Constructing Policy in Brussels</i>
11:30	Pasi Saukkonen (University of Helsinki): Discussion
11:50	General discussion
12:30	Break
14:00	Astrid von Busekist (Sciences Po - Paris): <i>Bowling Together. Some Thoughts on a New Lingua Franca</i>
14:30	Konstantin Zamyatin (University of Helsinki): <i>Russian Language, Language Policy and Nation-Building</i>
15:00	Peter A. Kraus (University of Augsburg): <i>From Glossophagic Hegemony to Multilingual Pluralism? Re-Assessing the Politics of Linguistic Identity in Europe</i>
15:30	Break
16:00	László Marác (University of Amsterdam): <i>Towards Norm-driven Linguistic Diversity Management in the Context of Globalization</i>
16:30	André Liebich (Graduate Institute of international and development studies Geneva) Discussion
	General discussion

Friday, June 20th

Time Object

Session 2): Emerging patterns of global linguistic governance	
9:00	Robert Phillipson (Copenhagen Business School): <i>English, the Lingua Nullius of Global Hegemony</i>
9:30	François Grin (University of Geneva): <i>Fashionable Sociolinguistic Constructs: Some Implications for Politics and Policy</i>
10:00	Break
10:30	Thomas Ricento (University of Calgary): <i>The Promise and the Pitfalls of Global English</i>
11:00	Nenad Stojanović (University of Zürich): Discussion
11:20	General discussion
12:00	Break
Session 3): Linguistic hegemony, linguistic insecurity and linguistic justice	
14:00	Glyn Morgan (Syracuse University / Collegio Carlo Alberto - Turin) <i>English as Europe's Lingua Franca: A Liberal-Democratic Perspective</i>
14:30	Federico Gobbo (University of Amsterdam / University of Turin) <i>Is the Calvet Language Barometer useful to Measure Linguistic Justice?</i>
15:00	Break
15:30	Jean-Claude Barbier (University Paris 1 - Sorbonne) Discussion
15:50	General discussion
16:20	François Grin Peter A. Kraus Summing up

List of participants:

- 1) **Barbier, Jean-Claude** University Paris 1 - Sorbonne
- 2) **Busekist, Astrid von** Sciences Po - Paris
- 3) **Cardinal, Linda** University of Ottawa
- 4) **Gobbo, Federico** University of Amsterdam / University of Turin
- 5) **Grin, François** University of Geneva
- 6) **Janssens, Rudi** Vrije Universiteit Brussel
- 7) **Kraus, Peter A.** University of Augsburg
- 8) **Liebich, André** Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies - Geneva
- 9) **Mamadouh, Virginie** University of Amsterdam
- 10) **Marácz, László** University of Amsterdam
- 11) **Morgan, Glyn** Syracuse University / Collegio Carlo Alberto - Turin
- 12) **Phillipson, Robert** Copenhagen Business School
- 13) **Ricento, Thomas** University of Calgary (*funded by the MIME-program*)
- 14) **Saukkonen, Pasi** University of Helsinki
- 15) **Stojanović, Nenad** University of Zürich
- 16) **Zamyatin, Konstantin** University of Helsinki