

UKRAINIAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

J. B. RUDNYCKYJ

LINGUICIDE

Third Revised Edition

WINNIPEG

1976

MUNICH

ЯР. РУДНИЦЬКИЙ

ЛІНГВІЦИД

(МОВОВВИВСТВО)

Третє справлене видання

UKRAINIAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

J. B. RUDNYCKYJ

LINGUICIDE

Third Revised Edition

WINNIPEG

1976

MUNICH

In Sad Memory
of
UKAZ OF EMS
1876

В сторіччя літвіцидного
ЕМСЬКОГО УКАЗУ
1876

1. INTRODUCTORY NOTE

The concept of *linguicide* emerged in the present writers mind in 1966 during his work in the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism in Ottawa. In view of some Canadian measures to restrict non-English language use, like e. g. the Manitoba Act of 1890 abolishing the bilingual Legislature of the province, on the one side, and in view of the steady recession of some minority languages in Canada on the other, the author ventured to advance his concept of "linguicide" in the discussion with B & B Commissioners, and successively at linguistic congresses, as e. g. at the First International Congress of UNESCO on Bilingualism in Nowton in 1961. As the result of those discussions not only the term itself was improved ("linguicide" instead of "linguocide"), but also the concept of *linguicide* was elaborated in more details.

It was first published in English and French in the author's "Separate Statement" in the first volume of the *Report* of the Royal Commission in 1967. Later it was repeated in various versions,* and in 1968, on occasion of the 20th anniversary of Human Rights' Universal Declaration of the United Nations it was published separately by UTHI in Munich.

Finally it was presented in an enlarged version at the International Congress of Sociologists in Toronto, Canada, in 1974. In view of the insufficient number of copies printed at that Congress and in order to satisfy the growing demand, the author decided to publish it in its third revised and enlarged version. He owes his thanks to UTHI in Munich for the publication.

2. LANGUAGE RIGHTS

The concept of language rights is based upon the assumption that every human being has an inborn right to communicate in his own language with his fellow citizens whatever this language may be. Thus, the right

* Winnipeg—Munich, 16. 8. 1975. J. B. R.

to one's language is a basic human right. It is inherent in men as his freedom of speech or of conscience.

Yet, like other human rights the linguistic right is not absolute. As long as it is restricted to his private, personal use, i. e. as long as it remains in the sphere of individual life, no law can restrict this right. In other words, the individual linguistic right is not granted by the state or any other social institution, any statutes, constitution, etc.

As far as the linguistic rights of groups are concerned they are in primary and basic relationship to the law. This is manifested in three main spheres:

First, the language can be legally admitted or restricted, or even forbidden, in public life, e. g. in public meetings, in the mass media, in correspondence, in business life, etc.

Secondly, a language may be legally admitted in the relationships between the citizens of a country, and the administrative offices, before the courts, or in the internal public life of a country generally.

Thirdly, a language can be allowed or forbidden as an instructional language or as a subject of instruction in the whole country or in parts of it.

In all three above mentioned spheres, the admission or the restriction, even prohibition, of a language is considered as a „language law” which regulates the linguistic rights of a population.

There are rare cases in the modern states restricting or prohibiting the use of languages. On the contrary, in several constitutions provisions are made for dominant (official) languages, and even for minority tongues. In most cases these provisions are formulated in special articles of the constitutions concerned, the formulation being presented in general terms as. e. g.,

“Without prejudice to the rights conceded by Federal law to linguistic minorities, the German language is the official language of the Republic.”

Article 8 of the Constitution of Austria.

“The official language of the Union shall be Burmese, provided that the use of the English language may be permitted.”

Article 216 of the Constitution of Burma.

“Arabic is the official language. A law will determine the cases in which the French language will be used.”

Article 11 of the Constitution of Libanon.

“Provisions may be made by law for the exclusive use of either of the said languages (Irish and English J. B. R.) for any one or more official purposes, either throughout the State, or in any part thereof.”

Article 8 of the Constitution of Ireland.

“National minorities in the Federal People’s Republic of Yugoslavia enjoy the right to and protection of their own cultural development and the free use of their own language.”

Article 13 of the Constitution of Yugoslavia.

In Switzerland there are four national languages as against three official ones, viz.:

“L’allemand, le français, l’italien et le romanche sont les langues nationales de la Suisse.

Sont déclarés langues officielles de la Confédération: l’allemand, le français et l’italien.”

Art. 116 de la Constitution Suisse.

In its Article 3 the Constitution of Cyprus of April 6, 1960, regulated the use of Greek and Turkish as “official languages” of the country. Other examples:

“The national languages of the Republic (of Paraguay J. B. R.) are Spanish and Guarani. Spanish shall be the language of official use.

Article 5 of the Constitution of Paraguay.

In similar spirit, recognizing the language of the Indian population, the constitution of Peru was amended in 1975. Yet, in the majority of South American states the official languages are those of the colonizers, e. g.

“The official language (of Venezuela, J. B. R.) is Spanish.”

Article 6 of the Constitution of Venezuela.

“Spanish is the language of the Republic (of Panama, J. B. R.)”

Article 7 of the Panamanian Constitution.

“Spanish is the official language of the state (of Nicaragua, J. B. R.)”

Article 7 of the Nicaraguan Constitution.

Very interesting is the provision for regional languages in the Constitution of India. In Article 347, it introduces the term “regional languages” and its defines their provisions in very general terms, viz.:

“On a demand being made in that behalf, the President may, if he is satisfied that a substantial proportion of the population of a State

desire the use of any language spoken by them to be recognized by that State, direct that such a language shall also be officially recognized throughout that State or any part thereof for such purpose as he may specify.”

The most specific and particular in the formulation of language laws is the Constitution of Roumania. In its Article 82, the following provisions are made for non-Roumanian languages in that country:

“The national minorities are guaranteed the free use of their own languages, tuition of all categories in their own languages, and books, newspapers, and theatres in their own languages. In districts inhabited also by populations of a nationality other than Roumanian, all organs and institutions shall use orally and in writing the language of the respective nationalities as well, and shall appoint officials from among the ranks of the respective nationality or of local inhabitants conversant with the language and the way of life of the local population.” Similarly the Constitution of Malta is very specific in respect to language regulations, viz.:

“Language.

- 5 (1) The National language of Malta is the Maltese language.
- (2) The Maltese and the English languages and such other language as may be prescribed by Parliament (by a law passed by not less than two thirds of all the members of the House of Representatives) shall be the official languages of Malta and the Administration may for all official purposes use any of such languages:
Provided that any person may address the Administration in any of the official languages and the reply of the Administration thereto shall be in such language.
- (3) The language of the courts shall be the Maltese language:
Provided that Parliament may make such provisions for the use of the English language in such cases and under such conditions as it may prescribe.
- (4) The House of Representatives may, in regulating its own procedure, determine the language or languages that shall be used in parliamentary proceedings and records.”

As one of the typical “facultative” regulations of language problems in Europe was the general provision in the Belgian constitution of 1921, stating in its article 23 as follows:

“L’emploi des langues usitées en Belgique est facultatif; il ne peut être réglé que par loi, et seulement pour les actes de l’autorité publique et pour les affaires judiciaires.”

In the 1960s the situation changed and Belgium as a bilingual Flemish-French nation with German minority language was constitutionally established.

As an example of the most recent constitutional ventures in this respect the 1967 Recommendations of the Royal Commission on Biligualism and Biculturalism in Canada including the present writer’s “Separate Statement” and recommendation of the Ukrainian Canadian Council of Learned Societies of 1968 (Subsection 5 in the following text) might be quoted, viz.:

1. “English and French are the two official languages of Canada.
2. Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the Houses of Parliament of Canada and in the legislatures of all the provinces, and both languages shall be used in the respective records and journals of the Houses of the legislatures of the provinces of New Brunswick, Ontario, and Quebec, and either may be used by any person in any pleading or process in or issuing from any Court of Canada established under this Act, and in or from any of the Superior Courts of the provinces of New Brunswick, Ontario, and Quebec. The Acts of the Parliament of Canada and the legislatures of the provinces of New Brunswick, Ontario, and Quebec shall be enacted and published in both English and French.
3. The provisions of subsection 2 shall apply to any additional province in which those persons whose mother tongue is either English or French shall reach or exceed 10 per cent of the population of the province; and to any province which declares that English and French are its official languages.
4. Whenever in any province the English- or French-speaking population of the appropriate administrative unit reaches a substantial proportion, this unit shall be constituted into a bilingual district, and there shall be enacted federal and provincial legislation making judicial and administrative services in such a bilingual district available in both official languages.
5. Notwithstanding anything in this section the Ukrainian language used by 10 per cent or more of the population of an appropriate administrative district of a province or territory shall have the

status of a regional language; the legislation of the provision for THIS REGIONAL LANGUAGE shall be vested in the governments concerned.

6. Nothing in this section shall be taken to diminish or restrict the use, as established by past, present or future law or practice, of any other language in Canada."

Apart from the constitutional recognition of languages, there are also institutional (statutory, administrative, customary, a. o.) provisions for their use in the society with a considerable variety of rights of the language concerned. According to the sphere of recognition and practice those rights might be institutionalized in the political, social, cultural, educational and economic life of the country or part of it.

The Canadian Cabinet Committee on Administrative Reform and Bilingualism in Ottawa may serve as an example. It was established by the Government of Canada in May 1963 with the task of defining in greater detail the objectives which the Government was seeking to achieve in the field of English-French bilingualism in the federal administration. In 1966 a special Secretariat on Bilingualism responsible to the Prime Minister of Canada was established within the Privy Council in Office in Ottawa. On April 6, 1966, Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson solemnly declared as follows:¹

- "The Government hopes and expects that, within a reasonable period of years, a state of affairs in the public service will be reached whereby
- (a) it will be normal practice for oral or written communications within the service to be made in either official language at the option of the person making them in the knowledge that they will be understood by those concerned,
 - (b) communications with the public will normally be in either official language having regard to the person being served . . .
 - (c) a climate will be created in which public servants from both language groups will work together toward common goals, using their respective cultural values but each fully understanding and appreciating those of the other . . ."

Institutional recognition of languages does not necessarily imply the official languages of the country. In Canada, e. g., languages other than English and French have been institutionalized in Churches, private organi-

¹ Cf. *Canada: House of Commons Debates*, Ottawa, April 6, 1966, p. 3915.

zations, part time native schools, and similar. The status of the Ukrainian language at the University of Manitoba in Winnipeg may serve as an example. Before 1949 this language was not taught at the University; in 1949—1967 it was an accredited elective subject; finally in 1967 it became a University entrance requirement and attained all the instructional privileges of the other modern languages.

Institutional provisions for vernacular languages in the United States have been recently analyzed and evaluated in J. A. Fishman's and V. C. Nahirny's excellent survey of language maintenance of non-English tongues in America.²

There are many other languages in the Old and New World for which provisions have been established on the institutional level by traditionally developed customs. As far as the non-official languages are concerned, their safeguarding is based mostly on the determination of the groups concerned to preserve their ethnicity within the official (usually dominant) lingual context and to maintain their cultural identity.

In this respect bilingual (or multilingual) milieux deserve special attention. The maintenance of bilingual reality: an intersituational use of one (official) and another (unofficial) language is greatly influenced by retentiveness of the groups concerned and balance of cultural levels. Institutionalization of the dominated language in bilingual context appears a *condition sine qua non* for preservation of the bilingual reality. Otherwise the bilingual community changes to unilingual — that of the dominant language.

Besides constitutional and/or institutional arrangements, the linguistic rights of a given group may be protected and enhanced by social acceptance, and by creating favourable conditions in the sense of allocating resources or otherwise encouraging the use of the language as a means of communication within the given society.

All those processes lie rather in the political system than in legal guarantees. The structure of the state, its electoral system, political parties, and their political order in general are decisive factors in this respect. The majority-minority relationship however, plays an important role here; the balance of powers is conditioned by democratic order, and recognition

² *Language Loyalty in the United States. The Maintenance and Perpetuation of Non-English Mother Tongues by American Ethnic and Religious Groups.* By Joshua A. Fishman & others. London—The Hague—Paris, 1966. Pp. 318—357.

of basic freedoms of the individual as well as those of the group. "... there is a fundamental difference between legal guarantees, which are only declarative rights, but powers. The difference is that between the book and the sword."³

3. LINGUICIDAL MEASURES AND LINGUICIDE

Apart from protection of a language by constitutional, institutional, and other means, the negative attitudes of governments banning certain languages from public life are known in the history of mankind. It is clear that the use of a particular language may be forbidden for reasons of uniformity, forcible assimilation, attempted deethnization, denationalization, etc. Sometimes it is intended to curtail the development of a dialect vis-a-vis a high prestige language, and it is forbidden in public use, in print, and in schools. As an example, the fact might be quoted that in the latter part of the sixteenth century, the shopkeepers of Fribourg in Switzerland were fined for using French in their commercial relations.⁴

As a rule, the prohibition or restriction of a language is accomplished by administrative orders of the respective governments, following the general negative attitude of the dominant majority to discriminate against the language of minority. Here are some examples taken from the history of Tsarist Russia, where such orders were officially known as "ukases". One such order was issued by Russian Minister of the Interior, Count Peter Valuev, on June 8, 1863; he ordered the Russian censors

"to allow to be printed in the Little Russian language only such works as belong to the realm of belles-letters; and to ban the publication of the books in the Little Russian language, both religious and educational, and books generally intended for elementary reading by the people."⁵

Valuev's edict was soon followed by the Tsar's "Ukase". On June 18, 1876, in Ems, Western Germany, Alexander II signed a secret order, of which the real author was Michael Yuzefovach, deputy superintendant of

³ *The Protection of Minorities*. By J. A. Laponce, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1960, p. 22.

⁴ *The Protection of Minorities* . . . p. 20.

⁵ Cf. *Ukraine. A Concise Encyclopedia*, Vol. 1, Toronto University Press, 1963, p. 682-684.

Kiev School District. The "ukase" forbade the printing in Ukrainian of anything except historical documents in the orthography of the original, and belles-lettres in Russian (socalled "yaryzhka") alphabet; it also forbade the importation of Ukrainian books from abroad, particular from Western Ukraine. This, so called "Emskyj ukase" lasted for two generations and it reached its climax at the end of the last century when Ukrainian composers were compelled to write the texts to their melodies in French . . .

Other linguicidal acts of Tsarist Russia were intended to Russianize the vast empire and bring it to cultural, linguistic and political unity. Well known are the attempts of the Russian Government in 1960s to stamp out Polish by forbidding its teaching in schools.

"A curious example of restriction of the right to print in one's own language is a Russian ukase at the end of the nineteenth century which permitted publication in Luthuanian, but made obligatory, under penalty of imprisonment, the use of Russian characters. An Italian law of 1923 forbade the use of any language other than Italian not only in public notices, legal proceedings, and official correspondence, but also in private advertising. The sight of a foreign character or the sound of a foreign language so alarmed Italian officials that they did not stop at prohibiting billboards in non-Italian languages; they went so far as to prohibit German choral societies and impose the Italinization of foreign-sounding family names."⁶

In Canada the abolition of bilingual schools in Manitoba by an act of the Legislature in 1916 might be termed as a linguicidal measure. The act was bitterly opposed by the French, Ukrainian and Polish speakers, but the reaction was dealt with firmly; the strongest opposition came from the Mennonites, a considerable number of whom emigrated to Mexico in 1919 defending German as an instructional language in their schools. After 50 years of "linguistic Babylonian captivity" French was re-established as an instructional language in some districts in Manitoba, and Ukrainian became an elective subject in the high school curriculum.

Linguicide is not confined to restrictive measures only. There are other kinds of linguicidal acts which cause the partial or complete lingual destruction of a community speaking a given language. Some governments deliberately inflict on ethno-lingual groups conditions of cultural back-

⁶ *The Protection of Minorities . . .* l. c.

wardness refusing help in their organic cultural development. As a result the feeling of "low prestige cultures" or "low prestige languages" develop within the groups concerned and lingual switches to dominant languages occur.

In an address delivered by Professor Walter S. Tarnopolsky, Osgoode Hall Law School, York University, to the Eleventh Ukrainian Canadian Congress, Winnipeg, October 13, 1974, an objective evaluation of human rights linguicide was given:⁷

"We are living in a time which can be described as the era of the rights of man. Human rights and fundamental freedoms were acclaimed in earlier ages, but were never intended to apply to all human beings. Slaves were not considered human beings who had any rights amongst the Greeks, or in the Roman empire. Even in the United States, when the Declaration of Independence in 1776 declared that "All Men Are Created Equal", slaves were not intended to be included.

It is only within the last few decades that we have begun to realize that human rights and fundamental freedoms must be assured to everyone. We are only starting to fulfill the Judeo-Christian proclamation of nearly 2000 years — that we are our brother's keepers. We finally realize that the degradation and deprivation of any person at least partly degrades and deprives every other person. Any person who is unmoved by the suffering or oppression of another is to that extent less a human being himself.

It is because of the indivisibility of liberty, not only within one country but in the world, and because we are living, as Marshall McLuhan has described it, in a "Global Village", that the deprivation of civil liberties in the Soviet Union is the concern of everyone, and not just those of Ukrainian, or Jewish, or Latvian descent.

In recent months, with the exiling of Alex. Solzhenitzyn, the world has been brought before the plight of political dissenters in the Soviet Union, in a dramatic fashion. One cannot minimize the contribution of this brave man. One has to acknowledge that events become important for people only when they involve famous people. Nevertheless, it is somewhat ironic that the western news media should be saying "Now We Know." The fact is that all of us have known long ago.

With the ascension of the Soviet state in the period from 1918 to 1921, hundreds of thousands of people were killed, tortured, imprisoned and exiled — not only students and intellectuals, but working men and women and peasants. During the collectivization and subsequent purges, millions more died. It was almost a travesty when at the XXth Party Congress in 1956 Khrushchov revealed that thousands of good Communist comrades had died.

⁷ Cf. "Human Rights on the USSR, and What They mean to Us as Ukrainian Canadians" by W. S. Tarnopolsky, *UCPBF Review* 1974, pp. 12—17.

There was no mention of the millions who had starved in the Ukraine and other parts of the Soviet Union during the collectivization.

The year 1940—41 witnessed a new wave of Soviet terror in the western Ukraine, when those supposed enemies — Stalin and Hitler — divided up Poland, and the Soviet Union took over the Ukrainian and Byelo-Russian parts of eastern Poland. People suffered and died during the withdrawal of the Soviet armies to the east under the German invasion, and people suffered and died while the Soviet armies drove the Germans out once again in 1944 and 1945.

Then, a new wave of terror followed in the immediate post-war period as the Soviet regime reconsolidated its hold over the area. Some of that was brought to a halt with Stalin's death in 1953. There was some liberalization under Khrushchov, although it was partly counterbalanced by a vigorous anti-religious campaign resulting in the closing of many synagogues and some 10,000 churches throughout the Soviet Union, many of them in western Ukraine. And, although during this time there were no major imprisonments of Russian intellectuals, there was a major move in 1961 against two groups in western Ukraine, one known as the Ukrainian Workers' and Peasants' Union, and the other under the name of the Ukrainian National Committee. Most of these people were not writers or intellectuals, but rather workers, collective farmers, and some professionals.

Within a year of Khrushchov's removal in 1964, a new wave of arrests started. Intellectuals were imprisoned in Moscow and in the Ukraine in the late summer and fall of 1965, and this wave of arrests has not yet ceased.

How is all this possible in a country whose 1936 constitution was proclaimed to be one of the most progressive in the world? It is a constitution in which Chapter X deals with "Fundamental Rights and Duties of Citizens." Article 125 of this constitution guarantees

- a) Freedom of speech;
- b) Freedom of press;
- c) Freedom of assembly, including the holding of mass meetings;
- d) Freedom of street processions and demonstrations.

I have often been asked how I can continue to support bills of rights when I see that in the Soviet Union it has not stopped behavior of the sort I have described. The answer is really very simple. A constitution is merely a piece of paper unless the people intend it to be binding. A bill of rights is not enough. A government which does not respect its own constitution will not respect a bill of rights. Someone once described Latin American constitutions in the following terms:

It is a record of what should be done under ideal conditions. When those ideal conditions have been achieved, the constitution will be respected in its entirety. Until that happy day arrives, more practical solutions must be found to pressing problems.

In the Soviet Union the constitution is even more hypocritical than that. For one thing, Article 125 starts out by saying that the fundamental freedoms are guaranteed only "in conformity with the interests of the working people,

and in order to strengthen the socialist system," Article 127 guarantees "inviolability of the person" and provides that "no person may be placed under arrest except by decision of the court or with the sanction of a procurator."

You will see that these provisions are a lawyer's paradise. The fundamental freedoms are subject to the simple decision that someone is not acting "in the interest of the working people" for the purpose of strengthening the socialist system. Similarly, what "inviolability of the person" is there if an arrest can be sanctioned by a procurator? In other words, even if the constitution were observed, it is worded in such a way as to be a sham.

Moreover, a constitution is supposed to be the fundamental document by which all laws are measured. No law which is in conflict with the constitution is to be valid. However, the articles of the Soviet criminal code have never been interpreted subject to the constitution. Thus we find that most of the dissenters have been condemned for "anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation." They have been condemned pursuant to provisions like Article 62 of the criminal code of the Ukrainian S.S.R. which states:

Any agitation or propaganda with the intent to undermine or subvert the Soviet regime, . . . dissemination with the same intent of slanderous inventions against the Soviet state and its social system, as well as distribution, preparation or possession with the above aim of literature with such content are punishable by the deprivation of freedom for terms from 6 month to 7 years or banishment for terms from 2 to 5 years.

The above actions, if committed by persons previously convicted for serious crimes against the state or for crimes committed in time of war, are punishable by imprisonment for terms from 3 to 10 years.

It is under a broad provision such as this that addresses of Pope John XXIII, the speech of former President Eisenhower at the unveiling of the Shevchenko monument, even arguments based upon the Soviet constitution or the very limited protections of the Soviet criminal code, amount to "anti-Soviet activities." A reading or distribution of such documents is deemed "dangerous activity."

Finally, one must remember that despite the constitution, which is so worded as to be an open invitation to subversion of its aims, despite a criminal code which is deemed to take precedence over the constitution, the Soviet secret police have still not been satisfied and people such as Dr. Horbovyi have been sentenced without a trial of any kind.

The result is that Professor Peter Reddaway of London University estimates that there are perhaps 1000 camps in the Soviet Union each with 1000 or more people. Thus, even with his conservative estimate, there are two and one half times as many people imprisoned in the Soviet Union as in the United States, and seven times as many as in Great Britain. Even if some of these people would be imprisoned for regular crimes in any country, many thousands have been deprived of liberty for what we and the United Nations consider to be fundamental rights of the citizen.

Even apart from all this, even apart from the contravention of the fundamental law of the Soviet Union in the deprivation of the freedom of

dissenters, is the fact of the brutal way of life in these camps. Some of you have been in them and know what are like. In recent years the western world has come to learn of it through the writings of those who were there. I will not go into the details because even prison camp life is not the most base aspect of the way in which the Soviet Union treats its dissenters. Although it has not reached the depths of the Nazi regime in its gas-oven genocide, it has proceeded to destroy human beings by directing its fury against their minds. To be deprived of liberty and to live under the strenuous conditions of Soviet labor camps is one thing, to be confined to an insane asylum and to be subjected to drug and surgical manipulation is even more horrible.

Let me not go on detailing these horrors. For one thing, most of you know more about these matters than I do. The question before us is what can we do about it?

First, our effectiveness will be gauged by the extent to which we can affect government policy, and that depends upon the support we can get from others. In order to induce our government, and other governments, to act, it will be necessary to make the appeal not just on the basis that we are Canadians of Ukrainian extraction, related to the dissenters. As I mentioned at the beginning, liberty is one and indivisible. It is necessary for us to point out that deprivation of liberty and human dignity in one area of the globe necessarily degrades and deprives those of us who are better off. An east-west detente cannot be build upon our condoning the "Gulag Archipelago." However, we will not convince anyone of our genuine concern for the human rights of Ukrainian dissenters in the Soviet Union unless we at the same time join in protest against the treatment of the dissenters of all nationalities in the Soviet Union, including the Russian, the Jewish, the Tatar, the Volgar Germans, etc., and unless we support the rights of emigration of all nationalities in the Soviet Union.

Furthermore, many people will consider us hypocritical unless we show similar concern for the deprivations of other peoples, whether it be in South Africa, in Spain, in Chile or in the Soviet Union. We cannot argue that the human rights of Ukrainians are the concern of everyone, unless we in turn are concerned with the human rights of others, whether in our own country or in allied countries.

On the other hand, we should not hesitate to ask others for this support. Many groups, particularly those on the left, and church groups, have supported grape boycotts, have given assistance to rebel groups in South Africa, have protested against torture in Chile or Greece. I think they are right in doing so. I have participated in some of these. I merely say: Why not protest similar brutalities and similar deprivations of human rights in the Soviet Union? I believe that some groups are hypocritical when they decline.

I once heard a clergyman say on TV that he participated in human rights movements in other parts of the world but not in the Soviet Union, because he thought that there was no chance of affecting Soviet policy. That is not only a cowardly answer, it is just not true. The pressure of world public opinion *was* successful in convincing the Soviet Union to release thousands of Jews, and even Volga Germans. The Soviet Union has even

released leading Russian dissenters, *although not one single Ukrainian*. Recently, Professor Harry Crowe returned from the Pugwash Conference in Austria and told me that he was told privately by Soviet participants that the pressure of world public opinion *is* effective and that we should keep up our work. There is no reason why, for example, the World Council of Churches should not help us as some trade unions have.

This brings me to one of our most difficult problems. Now that we have achieved some success in informing Canadians about prisoners of conscience like Valentyn Moroz, and now that we have obtained the support of our government in expressing the concern of Canadians about his treatment and his state of health, what next? Moroz is still in prison. So are many others. What more can be done? What kind of pressures can we and our government apply to the Soviet Union? Disruption of wheat sales? In the present world wheat shortage that might have some effect. But when next there is a world wheat surplus, would not the Soviet Union turn to other countries and leave our farmers with full bins and empty pocketbooks? What about cultural exchanges? If we attempt to boycott Soviet Ukrainian performers, will the Soviet Union stop sending them? Does that achieve anything? No. I do not believe that blanket boycotts would work. We cannot even totally affect the decisions of all Ukrainian Canadians, much less others. Even if we could, it might be self-defeating...

I have urged that we should galvanize support on the basis of the deprivation of human rights. However, I am firmly convinced that we will not be able to obtain the support of our government for the self-determination of the Ukraine and the other captive nationalities in the Soviet Union. We must remember that the very same U.N. Charter which proclaims human rights and fundamental freedoms, also provides, (in Article 2, para. 7) that the U.N. is not to intervene in the domestic jurisdiction of any state. Although we could argue that self-determination is not just a matter within domestic jurisdiction, and although we could point to the recent covenants on economic and cultural and civil and political rights, the fact is that governments are extremely reluctant to interfere in another state, particularly in encouraging its break-up.

We must remember that until it was independent, very few governments (not including our own), were prepared to support Bangladesh. Our government was not prepared to support Biafra. Even when the overthrow of Communist regimes seemed imminent in East Germany in 1953, in Hungary in 1956, and in Czechoslovakia in 1968, no other government dared provide support for the "Freedom-Fighters." It is unlikely, therefore, that our government would raise the matter of the independence of the Ukraine or the Baltic states either directly with the Soviet authorities or in the United Nations. What I believe is that if the human rights of these peoples were assured, they could achieve self-determination themselves.

On the other hand, we must point out to other Canadians that they are doing a disservice to themselves and to Canada if they compare the position of the political dissenters to that of the Quebec separatists. For one thing, our constitution is respected, and even under the *War Measures Act*

less than 500 people were detained, only 62 were charged, and only some 24, who were directly involved with the kidnappings or bombing, were convicted. If the dissenters in the Soviet Union had same the right as the Quebec separatists then we could start to compare the two cases. Moreover, whereas the Quebec separatists are devoted to taking Quebec out of Canada, many of the dissenters in the Soviet Union have not gone so far. It is important to point out that many of the imprisoned political dissenters have merely demanded rights and liberties, and the cultural autonomy of their nationalities within the context of the Soviet Union.

This is the kind of criticism one could read any week in a French-language newspaper in Canada. Even members of the federal Cabinet have said as much about the pressures on Francophone Canadians. Certainly it is nowhere close to the separatist policies of the Parti Quebecois. There is no possible comparison between a man like Moroz and even Quebec Separatists, much less the F.L.Q. And even if there were, is that an excuse for ignoring his fate?

It is not enough merely to demand government action — above all else, such demands must be based upon accurate information. This is very difficult to obtain under the circumstances. Nevertheless, one or two errors of fact or gross exaggerations tend to detract from 50 other established facts. It is most important that there be established adequate documentation and research centres. The work of such centres will be believed by others, and published in the media, if they can be assured of the competence and independence of such centres. In other words, the research must be conducted under the supervision of recognized experts in the field, and the direction of the centres must be independent of political-cultural-social organizations.

All that I am proposing will not be possible except through united effort. Unfortunately, we have never been especially adept at this in at least three ways: First, unfortunately there are still some Ukrainians who remain anti-Semitic because they feel that in past East European history the Jews sided with the landlords or the ruling cliques against the Ukrainians. They forget that as the most oppressed minority in eastern Europe the Jews had to make accommodations as best they could, and take whatever jobs were available, or start any business they could, in order to survive. On the other hand, there are unfortunately some Jews who remain anti-Ukrainian because they remember that some of their most bitter clashes in eastern Europe were with them. They, too, forget that it was in the interests of the ruling classes to stir up the people, particularly the Ukrainians, against the Jews, and thereby divert their anger from the oppressive landholding classes. Divide and conquer is a very old tactic, and it was used effectively with both the Jews and the Ukrainians.

Fortunately, we are now in a country which follows a policy of multiculturalism, which should unite people of different races, religions, and ethnic backgrounds with a mutual respect for each other's particular way of life. Just as the oppression of the Tsarist Empire once divided us, let the oppression of the Soviet Empire now lead us to a new mutual respect and cooperation, and let this new land, which our peoples have come to and have made their own, provide us with the inspiration to live as good neighbors.

Second, we have occasionally allowed past political divisions to determine present actions to the extent of creating disunity. We should be concerned with the rights of *all* dissenters in the Soviet Union whether they are right, left, or centre — whether they are Nationalists, Cultural Autonomists, Socialists, or Marxists. We should be as concerned with Shumuk as with Dzyuba or Chonovil or with Moroz or Plyushch. On the matter of human rights, apart from racist or fascist groups on the right, or supporters of Communist regimes on the left, we should consider co-operation with all groups who believe in a libertarian democratic society, whether they be socialists, liberals, or conservatives.

Third, we must not dissipate our efforts through too many associations. I think the number we have in Canada is about 85. In a sense this is an illustration of the vigor of Ukrainian-Canadian society. But in another sense, this is an indication of minute dividing points which result in a proliferation of associations. If I were to be active in all the groups to which I belong formally I would have to participate in my parish association, in CYC, in St. Vladimir's Institute, in the Professional and Business Men's Association, in the Canadian Ukrainian Committee, in the Moroz Committee, etc., etc., and even then other groups feel I owe them some time as well. We need some rationalization. And we also need to recognize that people cannot be put to the choice between almost total involvement in Ukrainian-Canadian societies, or none at all. After all, Canada still must have first call. We need people who can spend a great deal of time over and beyond their jobs in political parties, in private associations, in their professional associations, etc. And to make their mark there as well. Doing all four — home, work, general community affairs, and Ukrainian-Canadian interests, usually result in the sacrifice of the first, i. e., the home. Who will keep the shoemaker's children in shoes?

In conclusion, what we must understand, and convince others to understand, is that one of the tests of a civilized society is the way in which it treats its dissenters. In recognition of the fact that there is continual change, that injustices arise just through the economic evolution of a country, even without deliberate intention on the part of those in authority, we have come to recognize that people who are dissenters in one age may be the leaders of thought in a subsequent age.

The tragedy of the human race is that people do not seem to learn from their own past experience. The very same Communist authorities who today repress all dissent, had themselves gone through a period where they were oppressed under the Czarist regime. A people who fail to learn from their own history are condemned to re-live it.

In other words, the question: "Who is my neighbor?" is one that can only be answered today by saying "My neighbor is Valentyn Moroz, Viacheslav Chornovil, Nina Strokata, Israel and Sylva Zalmanson, Andrei Sakharov, Leonid Plyushch, Andrei Amalrik, General Grigorenko, Isadorius Rudaitis, and many, many others. However, we cannot convince other Canadians of this unless at the same time we are prepared to acknowledge that our neighbors include the black people in South Africa, the Asians in East Africa,

political prisoners in Spain, Chile, Hungary or Czechoslovakia. Liberty is one. The force of right can triumph over the right of force, only if we genuinely believe in and strive for the rights of those with whom we disagree."

In summing up it might be stated that any attempt on the part of any society, government or institution to limit or support the exercise of the linguistic rights of one or any of its minority groups may be designated as linguicide. As such the linguicide is carried out by constitutional and/or institutional arrangements, administrative measures, political means, by preferential treatment of the imposed, majority language in allocative decisions, or in general through social and economic pressures.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Without attempting to exhaust general or specific cases of acts aiming at linguistic destruction of ethno-lingual groups in the past and present, we arrive at the following conclusions with regard to language right and language suppression, linguicidal measures, and linguicide:

Linguistic (Language) Rights

The existence of linguistic (language) rights of majority and minority groups in the modern world is an established socio-cultural phenomenon, accepted explicitly and/or implicitly by many countries and societies. Therefore we conclude that:

Each group within a state or a nation has an inborn right to preserve and develop its particular language, and demand that this right be recognized (warranted) by constitutional and institutional-administrative provisions.

Linguicide

Any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy in whole or in part or to prevent the natural development of a language or dialect should be considered as a linguicidal act:

- a) killing members of a community speaking a respective language or dialect (genocide);
- b) imposing repressive measures intended to prevent the natural, organic, development of a language or dialect;
- c) forcibly inflicting on a bilingual community conditions of cultural development calculated to transform it into unilingual groups;
- d) against the will of an ethno-lingual group denying the right of a language to be taught in public schools, to be used in mass media (press, radio, television, etc.);
- e) against the demand of an ethno-lingual group refusing moral and material support for its cultural endeavours and language maintenance efforts.

5. RECOMENDATION

In view of the above it is recommended that in addition to "freedom of speech" the fifth freedom — freedom of language suppression and linguicide be proclaimed and a permanent body at the United Nations Human Rights Commission be established to help to safeguard linguistic (language) rights of the ethno-lingual groups concerned.

Appendix I

*J. B. R's: RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING AMENDMENTS
to the:
Official Languages Act of Canada of 1969.*

RECOMMENDATION 1

Whereas the Official Languages Act in its Section 38 provides for a very general ("antilinguicidal") protection of the "other ethnic languages" of Canada and as such does not offer any affirmative provisions for the legal status of those languages, in particular of the major ones, as e. g. Ukrainian, German, Eskimo-Indian, etc., and

Whereas after the extensive work of the Commission the awareness of the Canadian society with regard to languages other than English and French considerably increased, and

Whereas there is a general trend in the modern world to grant a legal status to various minority languages in the respective countries,

I recommend

that the present Section 38 of the Official Languages Act be extended by the addition of two Subsections which would precede it as Subsection 38 (3), namely:

- 38 (1) Notwithstanding anything in this Act, any language other than English and French used by ten per cent or more of the population of any province or territory shall be declared a REGIONAL LANGUAGE with such provisions as the government concerned may specify and approve in response to public demand.
- 38 (2) Whenever in any province or territory the population whose mother tongue is other than English and French reaches ten per cent or more in the appropriate administrative unit and this tongue has the status of a regional language in the respective or any other territory, this unit shall be constituted into a REGIONAL BILINGUAL DISTRICT with public services in one of the official languages and with admission of the given regional language as specified and approved by the governments concerned.

RECOMMENDATION 2

Whereas the Official Languages Act in its Section 38 deals also with languages other than English and French, and

Whereas this Act as well as the Commissioner of Official Languages shall be concerned with all the languages of the country (official, regional, non-official, etc.), and

Whereas the present designation of the Act and the Commissioner might be interpreted as implying a discriminatory attitude towards the other ethnic languages by ignoring them by the very title of the Act and by the designation of the Commissioner,

I recommend

that both the Official Languages Act and the Commissioner of Official Languages be renamed to "Canadian Languages Act" and to "Commissioner for Language Protection and Linguistic Planning in Canada" respectively.

Appendix II

*RESOLUTIONS of the Manitoba Mosaic Congress
(Plenary Session, October 17, 1970.)*

1. WHEREAS English and French are the official languages of Canada within the public agencies of the Federal Government,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Manitoba Mosaic Congress recommends that the Government of Manitoba study ways and means of preserving the multilingual and multicultural reality of the Manitoba Mosaic.

2. WHEREAS the official Languages Act of 1969 does not determine the status of the languages other than English and French,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Manitoba Mosaic Congress recommends that the question of legal status of languages, other than English and French be studied by Provincial and Federal government for the purpose of determining if additional legislation on the subject should be enacted and that the languages used by ethnic communities in Canada should be regarded as Canadian languages and that they be deemed to be the other languages protected by Section 38 of the Official Languages Act.

3. WHEREAS at present a student is frequently denied the opportunity to study more than one second language,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Manitoba Mosaic Congress recommends that steps be taken to find ways and means of making such language options available to all students in the Province wherever there are sufficient numbers interested and that such Federal grants now available for this purpose be so applied.

4. BE IT RESOLVED that for a class where a second language is taught, that class be entitled and encouraged to study that language in the context of the literature of the language.

5. WHEREAS the Government acknowledges the positive contributions of bilingual civil servants, and

WHEREAS the Province of Manitoba has within its boundaries a vast linguistic diversity,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Manitoba Mosaic Congress recommends that in employing civil servants, the Government of Manitoba take into consideration the qualifications of applicants who have fluency in more than one language.

6. BE IT RESOLVED that the Manitoba Mosaic Congress recommends to the Department of Education that it instruct the staffs of the curriculum development departments audio-visual aids department, teacher training departments to develop programs which would reflect the multi-cultural and multi-lingual reality of Manitoba.

7. BE IT RESOLVED that the Manitoba Mosaic Congress recommends the support of the development of ethnic archives in the Province of Manitoba, in association with the Provincial archives, the Museum of Man and Nature, and the existing ethnic archives, for the use by historians and interested individuals for the purpose of research, displays, and education, and

BE IT RESOLVED that this Congress support the establishment of a central union file for the Province of Manitoba, showing the location of existing material, and that this file be duplicated for deposit in the other Western Provinces, in the hope that these provinces and eventually the Federal Government, will produce a central union file of ethnic material for the whole of Canada.

8. BE IT RESOLVED that the Department of Education take under advisement the revision of existing texts to present a more comprehensive picture of the contribution of all the ethnic groups in Canada to the cultural, economic, social and political life of our province and country.

BE IT RESOLVED that the Manitoba Mosaic Congress recommends the publication of an anthology of creative ethnic literature in both the original language version and that competent translations in both English and French be financially supported by the Government.

10. WHEREAS the Royal Commission on Biculturalism and Bilingualism has made 16 recommendations in its fourth volume,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT all levels of Government and their agencies begin implementing these recommendations.

11. BE IT RESOLVED that MMI recommends that an ethnic library be created within the new Winnipeg Public Library in cooperation with the various ethnic groups in the province — the facilities of such a library be made freely available to all citizens of Manitoba through the present Regional Library System.

12. BE IT RESOLVED that the Manitoba Mosaic Congress recommends that a Cultural Council of Manitoba be established by the Provincial Government to serve the whole community, and that the 15-member steering committee of this Congress act on an interim basis until this Cultural Council be established with the purpose of pursuing the objectives of the Manitoba Mosaic Congress.

Appendix III

J. B. R'S: MEMORANDUM sent in 1975

to:

Canadian National Commission

United Nations

Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization,

UNESCO

One of the linguicidal acts of the Stalin era in the Soviet Union was the proscription of the letter "g", which existed in the Ukrainian alphabet since the 17th century and was used in the Soviet Ukraine up to 1933. This letter is retained by Ukrainians in the Free World, and exceptionally used in the Soviet linguistic publications, including the last monograph on the Phonology of the contemporary Ukrainian (*Suchasna ukrajinska litraturna mova*, Kyiv), where it was stated that the phonem "g" exist in the Ukrainian language, but no recommendation as to reinstating the letter "g" in Ukrainian alphabe is made (pp. 175—176).

During 1941—1969 I have been collecting words with initial "g" in the Ukrainian language and found ca. 1,000 of them, some forming a special dictionary of "g" entries. Enclosed kindly find this dictionary including historical and etymological explanation of each word.

I wish to stress that, in particular, the letter "g" is needed in Western personal and place-names, e. g. *Hegel* (not: "Hehel"), *Chicago* (not: "Chicaho"), *Gimli* (not: "Himli"), etc.

In view of the necessity of preservation of this important traditional letter in the Ukrainian alphabet on the one hand, and in order to rectify the linguicidal abolition of it in 1933, I herewith request UNESCO to undertake steps for reinstatement of the "g" letter in the Ukrainian alphabet, and in particular:

a) to establish an International Committe, composed of Ukrainan and non-Ukrainian linguists;

b) to supervise the scholarly, non-political character of the proceedings of such Committee;

c) to supervise the scholarly, non-political character of the proceedings re implementation of recommendations of the above Committee in the Soviet Ukraine . . .

МОВНІ ПРАВА І ЛІНГВІЦИД

Резюме

В зв'язку з сторіччям Емського указу 1876—1976 проф. Яр. Рудницький zorganizував окреме видання про мовні права та лінгвіцид. Автор висуває природні (індивідуальні) мовні права, що їх не можна обмежувати ніякими законами. Від індивідуальних мовних прав він відрізняє групові, що їх устійнюється, регулюється й забезпечується конституційними або інституційно-адміністративними засобами в модерних державах. Він наводить багато прикладів із конституцій різних держав, що забезпечують вживання різних мов світу. Він подає теж приклади інституційних гарантій різних мов. Крім мовних прав історія людства знає випадки заборонення різних мов, як наприклад, Валувський чи Емський укази. Є теж випадки створення невідрадних соціо-культурних умов для розвитку даної етно-мовної групи, відмова матеріальної чи моральної піддержки в її мовно-культурних змаганнях, що в висліді веде до повільного завмирання мови. Професор Рудницький окреслює такі й тим подібні випадки, як лінгвіцид, чи лінгвіцидні заходи. Він дає точну дефініцію лінгвіциду в п'ятьох точках і вимагає, щоб у 1968 р. проголошено на міжнародному форумі ООН крім свободи мовлення, теж і свободу мов, що виявлялася б у майбутньому в свободі й забезпеченні груп від усяких родів лінгвіциду.

J. Rudnyckyj

SPRACHENRECHTE UND DER LINGUICID

Zusammenfassung

Im Zusammenhang mit den Emser „Ukaz“ vom J. 1876 Professor J. B. Rudnyckyj von der Universität in Winnipeg, Kanada, hat diese Veröffentlichung über menschliche Sprachrechte und Linguicid ausgearbeitet. Der ukrainisch-kanadische Sprachforscher behandelt vor allem die natürlichen, individuellen Sprachrechte, die angeboren und nicht beschränkbar sind. Dabei sind aber Gruppenrechte zu unterscheiden. Diese Rechte sind entweder in konstitutionellen oder institutionell-administrativen Garantien enthalten.

Die Geschichte weist auch Fälle auf, in denen Sprachen verschiedener Völker verboten wurden, z. B. in der Verordnung von Walujew im Jahre 1863 und in der von Jusefowitsch im Jahre 1876 — die die ukrainische Sprache in Rußland verbieten. Es sind auch andere Maßnahmen möglich, z. B. die Schaffung ungünstiger Umstände für die

sprachliche und kulturelle Entwicklung einer Volksgruppe, derzufolge die betreffenden Sprachen im Absinken und zum Untergang verurteilt sind.

Professor Rudnyckyj gibt eine Definition des Linguicides und der linguicidischen Maßnahmen. Er verlangt, daß die Vereinten Nationen eine zusätzliche Proklamation machen, in welcher die Freiheit des Sprechens mit der Freiheit der Sprache und somit die Sicherheit der ethno-linguistischen Gruppen vom Linguicid ihren Ausdruck finden.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism*. Book 1: Official Languages. Ottawa 1967
- B. Mirkin-Guetzévitch, *Les constitution européennes*. T. I—II, Paris 1951.
- A. J. Peaslee, *Constitutions of Nations*. Martinus Nijhoff. Vol. I—IV. The Hague 1968.
- J. B. Rudnyckij, *Language Rights and Linguicide*. Special Issue. UTHI Munich 1968.
- E. Glyn Lewis, *Multilingualism in the Soviet Union*. Aspects of Language Policy and its implementation. Mouton. The Hague 1972.
- Проблемы двуязычия и многоязычия. — АН СССР. — Институт Языкознания. — Изд. Наука. Москва 1972.