

Language & peace

Edited by Christina Schäffner and Anita L. Wenden

Also available as a printed book
see title verso for ISBN details

Language and Peace

War and Society

A series edited by S.P.Reyna and R.E.Downs

Volume 1 Feuding and Warfare: Selected Works of Keith F.Otterbein

Volume 2 Studying War: Anthropological Perspectives Edited by S.P.Reyna and R.E.Downs

Volume 3 Troubled Times: Violence and Warfare in the Past Edited by Debra L.Martin and David W.Frayer

Volume 4 Roots of Violence: A History of War in Chad Mario J.Azevedo

Volume 5 Deadly Developments: Capitalism, States and War Edited by S.P.Reyna and R.E.Downs

Volume 6 Language and Peace Edited by Christina Schäffner and Anita L.Wenden

This book is part of a series. The publisher will accept continuation orders which may be cancelled at any time and which provide for automatic billing and shipping of each title in the series upon publication. Please write for details.

Language and Peace

Edited by

Christina Schäffner
and
Anita L. Wenden



harwood academic publishers

Australia • Canada • China • France • Germany • India •
Japan • Luxembourg Malaysia • The Netherlands • Russia
• Singapore • Switzerland

Copyright © 1995 Ashgate Publishing Company Limited, Aldershot. Published by license under the Harwood Academic Publishers imprint, part of The Gordon and Breach Publishing Group.

All rights reserved.

First published 1995 by Dartmouth Publishing Company Limited, Aldershot

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2005.

“To purchase your own copy of this or any of Taylor & Francis or Routledge’s collection of thousands of eBooks please go to www.eBookstore.tandf.co.uk.”

Second printing 1999 by Harwood Academic Publishers, Amsterdam

No part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher. Printed in Singapore.

Amsteldijk 166
1st Floor
1079 LH Amsterdam
The Netherlands

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Language and peace.—(War and society; v. 6)

1. Sociolinguistics 2. Language and languages—Political aspects

I. Schäffner, Christina II. Wenden, Anita L.
306.4 4

ISBN 0-203-98499-4 Master e-book ISBN

ISBN: 90-5702-480-2 (soft cover)

ISSN: 1069-8043

Contents

Foreword	vii
<i>Leland Miles</i>	
Contributors	ix
Acknowledgements	xii
Introduction	xiii
<i>Anita L. Wenden and Christina Schäffner</i>	
 Part 1: Language, Ideology and Peace	
1 Defining Peace: Perspectives from Peace Research	3
<i>Anita L. Wenden</i>	
2 Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis	17
<i>Teun A. van Dijk</i>	
 Part II: Language and War	
3 Foreign Policy by Metaphor	37
<i>Paul Chilton and George Lakoff</i>	
4 A Comparative Discourse Analysis of Editorials on the Lebanon 1982 Crisis	61
<i>Caroline Vaughan</i>	
5 The 'Balance' Metaphor in Relation to Peace	75
<i>Christina Schäffner</i>	
6 Promising to End a War=Language of Peace? The Rhetoric of Allied News Management in the Gulf War 1991	93
<i>Andreas Musolff</i>	

Part III: Language and Social Discrimination

- | | | |
|----|--|-----|
| 7 | Establishing Linguistic Markers of Racist Discourse
<i>Michael Clyne</i> | 113 |
| 8 | Power and Ideology in Different Discursive Practices
<i>Julieta Haidar and Lidia Rodríguez</i> | 121 |
| 9 | The Role of Language in European Nationalist Ideologies
<i>Jan Blommaert and Jef Verschueren</i> | 139 |
| 10 | Language and the Institutionalization of Ethnic Inequality:
Malay and English in Malaysia
<i>Peter Lowenberg</i> | 165 |

Part IV: Language, Education and Peace

- | | | |
|----|---|-----|
| 11 | Doctor-Patient Communication: Training Medical
Practitioners for Change
<i>José Carlos Gonçalves</i> | 181 |
| 12 | Perceptions of Language in L1 and L2 Teacher-Pupil
Interaction: The Construction of Readers' Social Identities
<i>Luiz Paulo da Moita Lopes</i> | 203 |
| 13 | Critical Language Education
<i>Anita L. Wenden</i> | 217 |
| | Bibliography | 235 |
| | Index | 251 |

Foreword

This book will surprise adventurous readers. Though written by linguists, its potential interest goes far beyond that field. *Language and Peace* could easily be a text or supplementary reading for a broad spectrum of disciplines, including history, political science, psychology, sociology, communications, peace studies, foreign languages, and teacher or leadership training.

All of us can still remember the totalitarian anti-utopia of George Orwell's *1984*, wherein a 'Two Minute Hate Session' was set aside daily for the proletariat to scream hateful taunts at a video representation of the manufactured enemy. The startling result was that language, to a frightening degree, shaped politics and social behaviour.

This work starts at the same point. The central thesis, persuasively argued, is that language, as historically used, has been a significant factor in creating political oppression, and economic and social discrimination. As the editors see it, the challenge for the next century is to begin using language to inspire inclusion rather than exclusion, conciliation rather than conflict, and peace rather than war.

Unfortunately, such a challenge is more daunting than might at first appear. 'Inept' language, even if unintentional and even if used to express inherently noble ideas, can result in misunderstanding, resentment, even violence on the part of those whom we are seeking to pacify. The exhortation 'Watch your language!', often shouted by mothers at their exuberant teenagers, also applies in the most sobering degree to adult leaders of all varieties. As a young alderman in Philadelphia, Ben Franklin learned the hard way that language can be a tricky tool in seeking votes.

Because of this central theme, that language is the interface between thought and action, this book will prove to be a seminal work, inspiring a host of articles and other books on related themes in such areas as rhetoric, mass media, preventive diplomacy, and education. For example, to what extent did Serbian television's use of stereotypes provoke the Yugoslav war? Again, does the media's use of stereotypes, and of connotation rather than denotation, make its language almost part and parcel of its message? Why, as

the contributors to [Part II](#) state, is metaphor such a highly powerful element of the media's language? Because it is 'imagistic'?—that is, because we can 'see' it in our minds?

As for preventive diplomacy, attempted for the purpose of avoiding conflict, anyone who has tried it knows that it requires first and foremost an open mind. Keeping, building, or making peace can only flow from a genuine tolerance of many different views. Such tolerance is the opposite of rigid ideology, with its self-defeating pre-judgements. Hence it follows, as the editors implicitly concede, that language cannot carry the whole burden of making peace. To achieve such an end, the diplomat must have mastered the techniques of conflict resolution. Even more important, his language must flow from a truly open mind, and that is where education comes or should come in.

The volume deals boldly with the relation of education to language and peace. In [Part IV](#), there is a call for a change in the way teachers teach reading. It is advocated that lay persons be empowered to read critically rather than passively, so that they can evaluate the degree of fact and bias reflected in various media interpretations of public issues.

Some future article, building on that base, can explore other facets of an open mind, including awareness of human interdependence and the imagination to perceive issues through *other* people's frames of reference. Even on this point *Language and Peace* makes a powerful point, namely, that if medical doctors could experience their patients' roles, their attitude and language would change radically. The point applies to other professions as well.

Some scholars have argued that peace (or at least arms control, the prerequisite for peace) is an academic discipline. Such argument is delusory. Peace is not a discipline but a problem, in fact, the *ultimate* problem. And all academic fields, including art, poetry, and cinema, can help provide solutions to that problem. This book marks one of the first efforts by linguists to address the problem of peace. Let us hope it will not be the last.

Leland Miles, President Emeritus
International Association of University Presidents (IAUP)
and Chief, IAUP Mission to the United Nations

Contributors

Jan Blommaert is professor of African linguistics at the University of Gent, Belgium. His major interests include pragmatics, ideology research and political discourse in Africa and Europe.

Paul Chilton is presently professor of language and communication in the School of Languages and European Studies at Aston University, Birmingham, UK. Previously, he was at Warwick University and he was also a visiting fellow at the Center for International Security and Arms Control, Stanford (1988–90). His research includes the field of political discourse analysis and international relations.

Michael Clyne is professor and head of linguistics at Monash University, Australia. His major research interests are sociolinguistics, bilingualism/language contact, second language acquisition, and intercultural communication.

José Carlos Gonçalves is professor of discourse and conversation analysis in the graduate programme of languages and linguistics at the Federal University of Pernambuco (UFPE) in Recife, Brazil. His main research interests are in language and the professions and communication at work, mainly from the perspective of discourse and conversation analysis applied to the study of the relationship between language, social contexts and social actions in spontaneous and institutional settings.

Julieta Haidar is professor in the graduate programme in linguistics at the National School of Anthropology and History in Mexico City. Her earlier research focused on the study of native languages, especially Ecuatorian Quechuan. More recently she has concentrated on the analysis of discourse, power and ideology as well as the semiotics of culture.

George Lakoff is professor of linguistics at the University of California at Berkeley, USA. He previously taught at Harvard University and the University of Michigan and is a leading cognitive scientist and one of the founders of the field of Cognitive Linguistics.

Peter Lowenberg has been an associate professor in the Department of Linguistics and Language Development at California State University, San José since 1991. Previously, he was associate professor of linguistics at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. He has published in the areas of language contact in Southeast Asia, language policy and planning, and the testing of English as a world language.

Luiz Paulo da Moita Lopes is associate professor at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro in the Applied Linguistics Programme. He has lectured in England, Venezuela, Chile and around Brazil. His current research interests address issues related to discourse, power and identity in the language classroom.

Andreas Musolff is a senior lecturer in German in the Department of Modern Languages at the University of Durham, UK. His current research focuses on comparative studies of media language in Britain, France and Germany and on historical pragmatics.

Lidia Rodríguez is professor at the Autonomous University of Nuevo Leon in Monterrey, Mexico. She is interested in lexical semantic analysis as well as discourse analysis. Her recent research, based on a corpus of six hundred one-hour interviews, has been dedicated to a study of the argumentation of clearly differentiated social groups.

Christina Schäffner is a lecturer in German in the School of Languages and European Studies at Aston University, Birmingham, UK. Her research interests are political discourse analysis, metaphors, intercultural communication, and translation studies.

Teun A. van Dijk is professor of discourse studies at the University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands. His earlier research interests included literary studies, text grammar, the psychology of text comprehension, and the reproduction of racism through various types of discourse. He has published several books in each of these domains, many of which have been translated into a dozen languages. His present research in 'critical' discourse studies focuses on the relations between power, discourse and ideology.

Caroline Vaughan is Special Assistant to the Director of Specialist Services at the United Nations in New York, USA. She has also taught sociolinguistics at Columbia University, New York and English at the American University of Beirut, Lebanon. Her main research interests are in the fields of comparative discourse analysis and political text analysis.

Jef Verschueren is a research-director for the Fund for Scientific Research, Flanders. His main interests are theory formation in pragmatics, metapragmatics, and intercultural and international communication. He is

founder and Secretary General of the International Pragmatics Association.

Anita L.Wenden is professor in the Department of Foreign Languages, ESL and Humanities, and former Coordinator of the Cultural Diversity Programme at York College, City University of New York, USA. Her research interests include the processes of adult learning and the role of language in the communication of ideology. She has published in the area of learner autonomy and peace education.

Acknowledgements

Acknowledgement is made to the Department of Educational and Psychological Research, School of Education, Lund University (Malmö, Sweden) for permission to reprint *Defining Peace: Spatial and Cross-Cultural Dimensions* from 'Making peace with people and planet: Some important lessons from the Gandhian tradition in educating for the 21st century' by Frank Hutchison in *Peace, Environment, and Education*, vol. 3, no. 3, 1992.

Support for some of the clerical work required in the production of the camera-ready copy was provided by the Aston Modern Languages Research Foundation.

Introduction

ANITA L. WENDEN AND CHRISTINA SCHÄFFNER

Social context

In his report to members of the United Nations on ways of strengthening and making more efficient the organization's capacity for preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, and peacekeeping in post-Cold War times, Boutros-Ghali (1992, pp. 7–8) recommends that UN endeavours be guided by the following aims:

- (1) preventive diplomacy to prevent the eruption of conflict,
- (2) where conflict erupts, to engage in peacemaking aimed at resolving the issues that have led to conflict,
- (3) where conflict has been halted to engage in peacekeeping to preserve peace and to assist in implementing agreements achieved by peacemakers,
- (4) to assist in peacebuilding through rebuilding institutions and infrastructures of nations torn by civil war and by developing bonds of peaceful mutual benefit among nations formerly at war,
- (5) to address the deepest causes of conflict, i.e. economic despair, social injustice and political oppression.

These recommendations are a response to the following contradictory trends which, the Secretary General notes, characterize the post-Cold War era. On the one hand, there are attempts by associations of states to transcend nationalistic rivalries, to work cooperatively and to dismantle discriminatory social institutions that violate the political and social rights of their citizens. Yet, at the same time, groups within nation-states are aggressively pursuing their right to political autonomy, and racial, ethnic, religious, cultural and linguistic differences have become the causes of intergroup conflict within nation-states. Moreover, besides the wars that erupt in response to these

differences, it has become clear that the unmonitored and unchecked advance of technology can have an equally destructive impact on the quality of human life and the integrity of Earth systems in the long term.

It is these contradictory trends characterizing social and political change in our global society which provide the context for *Language and Peace*.

Aims

As the title suggests, the book examines the relationship between language and peace. Specifically, it intends to demonstrate that language is a factor that must be considered, together with political and economic factors, in seeking to understand the structural causes of conflict, i.e. economic despair, social injustice, and political oppression, and the acceptance and use of war as a viable alternative for settling intergroup and international differences.¹

To that end, *Language and Peace* seeks insight into the role that language plays in the interface between ideology and the social institutions and practices that hinder attempts (1) to prevent the outbreak of war, (2) to contain physical violence once it has erupted, and (3) to deal with the structural violence that violates human rights whether or not wars are being waged. It hopes to make explicit what remains implicit in the *Agenda for Peace*: the relationship between ideology and peace. The volume also points to the need for language and peace education to raise awareness about and critically evaluate the ideology embedded in and communicated by language.

Language, politics and social change

Social change, politics, and language (i.e. discourse) are inextricably intertwined. While there is no direct, immediate relation between them, political and social upheavals caused by the socio-economic factors referred to in the *Agenda*, for example, and the regional wars that come in their wake, go hand in hand with discursive transformations. Social and economic changes are usually reflected in discourse, and the interpretation and subsequent influence of such changes are decisively determined by language. Language provides access to our experience of the world. It is an indicator of ways of thinking and acting, even if only indirectly mediated and refracted. Language can also disguise the world. It can channel access to it in a specific way or structure it according to particular and not always honourable aims and purposes. As Halliday says, “our ‘reality’ is not something ready made waiting to be meant—it has to be actively construed; and...language evolved in the process of and as the agency of, its construal...hence language has the power to shape our consciousness;...” (Halliday, 1990, p. 11).

It is the above view of language which underlies the aims of *Language and Peace* and which is implicit in the theoretical discussions, the research, and the educational recommendations found in the various chapters.

Definition of peace

Lexical semantics, the linguistic subdiscipline that is concerned with word meanings, has traditionally defined 'peace' in opposition to 'war'. From a textlinguistic and discourse analytic perspective, however, it has become obvious that not every instance of non-war can be called peace and that those instances which are called peace do not necessarily share identical features. Moreover, word meanings are not fixed or stable entities. They have to be explained relative to specific historical, social and cultural circumstances. The notion of 'peace' implicit in *Language and Peace* is based on this broader perspective. It reflects the understanding of the term proposed by peace researchers.

According to Galtung (1964), 'peace' refers to a reality that extends beyond the absence of war to include the absence of discriminatory and inequalitarian social structures and institutions, in other words, the absence of structural violence. If viewed in these terms, it follows that the achievement of peace entails not only the containment of war but also the development of just and equitable social structures that respect and enhance the human rights of all. The former condition is referred to as 'negative peace' and the latter as 'positive peace'. The term 'comprehensive peace' has been used to indicate the need to include both of these dimensions in a definition of peace.

Critical discourse analysis

The term 'discourse' has varied meanings in linguistics. Sometimes it is synonymous to 'text'; sometimes it is viewed as a label for a sequence of (mutually related) texts. The term can be linked to situations (e.g. the discourse of advertising), to individuals (e.g. the discourse of Gandhi, Martin Luther King), or to topics (e.g. the Cold War discourse, the discourse of racism). In this volume, 'discourse' is used predominantly in an actional and functional manner, i.e. discourse and discursive elements are regarded as manifestations of actions used to perform specific functions.

Originating in the late 1960s, text and discourse analysis are fairly 'modern' (sub)disciplines of linguistics. The main aim of discourse analysis has been to analyse language and the functioning of language in its social context. In this volume, therefore, linguistic or textual forms and structures are analysed, interpreted, and explained in terms of the social, political and cultural context in which they are embedded. Such an analysis goes beyond

the ‘mere’ linguistic structures of the text and takes the social and institutional conditions of the text production and text reception into account. The underlying assumptions are that the study of language is not distinct from the study of society (social structures, processes, agencies) and that structure is not independent of function, process and use (see Kress and Hodge, 1993, p. 202) Thus, language is “irreducibly a social practice” (Kress and Hodge, 1993, p. 202).

Recently, it has become more and more obvious that by relating text/discourse and (contemporary) history, discourse analysis is the link between linguistics and other social sciences and the humanities. Thus, the social function of discourse analysis is stressed. As van Dijk says, “we needed to go beyond mere description and explanation, and pay more explicit attention to the sociopolitical and cultural presuppositions and implications of discourse analyses” (van Dijk, 1993c, p. 131). This means that social, institutional and situational determinants and effects of discourse have to be identified. The terms ‘critical linguistics’ or ‘critical discourse analysis’ refer to such an approach.

Fairclough (1993, p. 135) defines ‘critical’ discourse analysis as “discourse analysis which aims to systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power; and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony.”

Critical discourse analysis (or critical linguistics), thus, deals with power, dominance, hegemony, inequality and the discursive processes of their enactment, concealment, legitimation and reproduction (see van Dijk, 1993c, p 132). Wodak and Matouschek (1993, p. 227) list the following among the most important characteristics and goals of critical discourse analysis:

- (a) Research interest: uncovering inequality, power relationships, injustices, etc.
- (b) Object under investigation: language behaviour in natural speech situations of social relevance is to be investigated (institutions, media, etc.)....
- (f) Social and political practice is aimed at: results of the research should not only imply success in the academic field, but they should also include proposals for practical implementation (school materials, training seminars for teachers, doctors, lawyers, etc.).

For the greater part, the chapters in this volume are instances of critical discourse analysis. They illustrate the approach, characteristics, and goals of this emerging specialization within the (sub)discipline of discourse analysis. The link between the linguistic methodology and the social/political context is self-evident.

Content and organization

Language and Peace is divided into four sections: Language, Ideology and Peace ([Part I](#)), Language and War ([Part II](#)), Language and Social Discrimination ([Part III](#)), Language, Education and Peace ([Part IV](#)).

Language, Ideology and Peace

[Part I](#) of *Language and Peace* provides the conceptual foundation for the chapters that follow. The various dimensions of the concept ‘peace’ as it is understood in peace research are explained. A rationale is presented for exploring the relationship between language and ideology together with a framework of discourse structures that can provide the focus of such research.

Based on insights from peace research, Wenden’s analysis ([Chapter 1](#)) of how the concept ‘peace’ is understood by various peace organizations reveals an expanded meaning of the term that acknowledges the following distinctions:

negative peace	versus	positive peace
absence of war	versus	absence of discriminatory social structures
physical violence	versus	structural violence or absence of conditions that reduce length of life span or quality of life

It is one or other dimension of the expanded view of peace represented by these distinctions that underlies the critical analysis of discourse in [Parts II](#) and [III](#).

In the presentation of his theory of ideology van Dijk ([Chapter 2](#)) includes the following functions of ideology, which suggest the relationship between ideology and peace. That is, ideologies organize, maintain and control specific group attitudes; they influence personal cognition, including the planning and understanding of discourse and other forms of social interaction. In other words, ideologies shape group and individual attitudes which, communicated in discourse and determining other social practices, can either facilitate or hinder the achievement of peace.

The chapter argues that discourse analysis can be seen as ideological analysis, thus suggesting the relationship between language, ideology and peace. That is, language provides the interface between ideology and social practices that impede or facilitate the achievement of peace. Viewing discourse analysis in this way, van Dijk maintains, allows for a critical examination of discourse as the medium through which ideologies (such as those that justify social discrimination and war) are formulated and communicated. His chapter also provides a framework of discourse structures that can guide the critical analysis he advocates. The value of the approach is illustrated in the reports that follow (Parts II and III), each of which utilizes one or more of these discourse structures as a research focus.

Language and War

The social context for the analysis provided by each of the chapters in Part II is war: the making of foreign policy in matters relating to war and national security during the Cold War and in post-Cold War times (Chilton and Lakoff); the 1982 war between Israel and Lebanon (Vaughan); the Cold War (Schäffner); the Gulf War (Musolff). Implied in this focus on war as a means of settling intergroup differences is an understanding of peace as the absence of war. Recognizing the important role played by the media in shaping and transforming political reality and in influencing readers' attitudes about politics, the four chapters in this section have analysed media discourse (e.g. editorials of four national newspapers on the Israeli/Lebanese crisis; leading articles in a British weekly on East-West relations; Western TV media reports on the Gulf War). The analysis of these data reveals language as implicitly representing an ideological stance that accepts and promotes war, i.e. organized and legally sanctioned physical violence, as a viable alternative for the settling of intergroup conflict and/or regulating international relations.

All four chapters focus on the use of metaphor in war discourse. According to van Dijk (Chapter 2) metaphors are rhetorical devices that can be drawn upon in the communication and consolidation of group ideologies. However, metaphors are more than rhetorical devices. As noted by Chilton and Lakoff (Chapter 3), they are ways of conceptualizing (i.e. thinking about) the world. Through metaphorical thinking, familiar concepts are applied to unfamiliar realities, and in matters relating to national security and relations between nations, the outcome of this conceptualization, i.e. the metaphor, provides the basis and justification for the formulation of government policy and its potential execution.

The chapters in Part II, therefore, illustrate the indirect role metaphors and metaphorical thinking play in the maintenance and promotion of social

beliefs regarding the acceptability of war. Three of the chapters focus on specific metaphors, i.e. the state-as-person and the state-as-container metaphor (Chilton and Lakoff), the balance metaphor (Schäffner), the Rescue Scenario (Musolff). One chapter (Vaughan) describes four categories of metaphor used in war discourse, i.e. military metaphors, images of primitivity, images of bipolar divisions, familial images. Together, the four chapters illustrate how metaphors are used to:

- (1) shape, represent and justify foreign policy regarding war and/or matters of national security (Schäffner; Musolff),
- (2) indirectly convey that war is an acceptable means of settling international disagreements (Schäffner; Musolff),
- (3) unquestioningly promote values, sustain attitudes, and encourage actions that create conditions that can lead to war (Chilton and Lakoff; Schäffner),
- (4) serve to create the enemy image essential to provoking and maintaining the hostility that leads to war (Vaughan).

Two of the chapters in [Part II](#) further illustrate how a macro or global analysis of a text can reveal the ideology that guides the making of policy in matters relating to war and national security. Through her analysis of keywords and recurring themes, Vaughan ([Chapter 4](#)) identifies general principles that justified the use of war as a means of settling the Palestinian problem. Schäffner ([Chapter 5](#)) outlines a set of macropropositions which defined the policy of deterrence that led to nuclear proliferation during the Cold War. Thus, [Part II](#) reveals the indirect but key role language plays in promoting values, beliefs, and social practices that justify the use of war as a means of settling intergroup differences and/or regulating international relations.

Language and Social Discrimination

While the focus of the analysis in [Part II](#) is peace between nations (or the absence of it), in [Part III](#) peace is viewed from a national perspective as it may or may not exist between and among social groups. The individual chapters focus on the relationship between language and discriminatory social structures and practices based on race ([Chapter 7](#)), social class ([Chapter 8](#)), ethnicity (Chapters [9](#) and [10](#)). Implied in these chapters is the fact that when basic human rights are violated through discriminatory and inequalitarian institutions and practices, structural violence exists, reducing the length of life and diminishing its quality. In such cases,

while a society may not be at war, it is not at peace. Thus, underlying the research in [Part III](#) is a view of peace as the absence of structural violence.

Again, as in [Part II](#), media discourse is the focus of the analysis, e.g. American racist newspapers, German far-right pamphlets, suburban Melbourne newspapers and a Sydney talkback radio show (Clyne); a televised public debate between the students and administration of the National Autonomous University of Mexico (Haidar and Rodríguez); articles on ethnic conflict from the mainstream daily press in eastern and western Europe (Blommaert and Verschueren); leading English language newspapers in Malaysia (Lowenberg). Discussions regarding collective agreements between Mexican textile industries and the trade union and interviews concerning the crisis experienced in Mexico in 1985 are also analysed (Haidar and Rodríguez). Just as the research in [Part II](#) leads to the conclusion that language supports and justifies the use of war, in [Part III](#), the research illustrates two ways by which language contributes to the maintenance of structural violence, i.e. discriminatory and inegalitarian social structures.

Two of the chapters in [Part III](#) provide insight on how language is used to communicate and consolidate ideologies that sustain social discrimination. Clyne examines linguistic devices that sustain the *us* versus *them* antithesis that is one component of a racist ideology. He lists examples of (1) lexical choices (e.g. dysphemisms, euphemisms, complex symbols, labels of ethnic groups,...) used in overt racist discourse and (2) semantic strategies (e.g. concession, tolerant talk, playing down,...) utilized in covert racist discourse. Haidar and Rodríguez address the question of how meaning is managed in discourse so as to communicate and consolidate social beliefs which maintain and justify inegalitarian social structures. Their analysis illustrates how this is done through (1) conditions which govern the production and reception of discourse (e.g. rules that determine what is permitted or selected as a form of argument/evidence in particular discourses) and (2) discursive devices (e.g. ideological stereotypes, the choice of personal pronouns, modal verbs, and imagery).

While Clyne, Haidar and Rodríguez demonstrate the indirect role language plays in maintaining structural violence, Blommaert, Verschueren and Lowenberg focus on language as a direct instrument of discrimination and oppression. From their examination of the assumptions underlying reports of interethnic conflicts in mainstream newspapers, Blommaert and Verschueren identify the ideology that shapes nationalist movements in Eastern and Western Europe, i.e. the doctrine of homogeneity. Excerpts from their corpus illustrate how, according to this doctrine, culturally diverse societies are viewed as dangerous, i.e. unstable, and the ideal or preferred society is constituted of a 'natural group' defined in terms of a common language, descent, history, culture, and religion. Among these identity markers,

language is key. It is a unifying force necessary for social coherence and the predictor of a natural group. Their data show how this doctrine is manifested in immigrant policies and interethnic strife. In the case of the latter, language is used as an instrument of oppression, with the dominant group using the denial of language rights as a means of controlling or suppressing the subordinate group.

Lowenberg's analysis of lexical shifts (the borrowing of words that are denotatively but not connotatively equivalent) further illustrates how language is used to discriminate and institutionalize inequalities among competing groups. When used to replace English, the official (and supposedly neutral) language of Malaysia, lexical shifts, such as banner words (words or expressions that trigger complex schemata or values and associations), legitimize the exclusion of non-Malays from opportunities enjoyed by Malays. Furthermore, Lowenberg demonstrates, they define non-dominant ethnicities in terms of the nationally dominant Malays, thus neutralizing their ethnic identity.

Language, Education and Peace

While Parts II and III have, in fact, demonstrated that language contributes either indirectly or directly to war and to discriminatory and inequalitarian social institutions and practices (i.e. structural violence), Part IV assumes that it need not play such a role. Demonstrating how discursive practices are the result of educational practices and beliefs (Gonçalves, Lopes), the chapters in this last section argue for an educational strategy that can enable participants in written and spoken discourse to acquire the knowledge and skills to critically assess both text and talk. The purpose of such a strategy would be to make them aware of what they assent to and to empower them to dissent and seek alternative views and/or change discursive practices (Wenden). The implementation of such a strategy would require further research into the linguistic practices that take place in those contexts where professionals provide services (e.g. the medical consultation and the language classroom), and the re-training of professional trainers who apprentice novices (e.g. the trainers of teachers and doctors)—recommendations emerging from both Gonçalves' and Lopes' research.

According to Gonçalves, institutionalized discourse reflects, creates, disseminates and perpetuates asymmetry in social relations, and in his critical conversational analysis of a medical consultation, he illustrates how such asymmetry is manifested in the different topic management styles and conversational strategies utilized by both doctor and patient. These differences, he argues, reflect the conflicting frames of reference and expectations that each one brings to the medical interview and, in the case of

the doctor, the beliefs and practices acquired as a result of his professional training. Noting that such differences can obstruct the restoration of the patient's health, Gonçalves argues for programmes to provide for the re-education of physicians. Such programmes, he recommends, should include opportunities for doctors to (1) study medical discourse, (2) experience the patient's role in the doctor-patient relationship and, then, (3) consider the implications for their practice of the insights derived.

From his ethnographic analysis of teacher-student interaction in secondary schools in Brazil, Lopes concludes that a logocentric view of language underlies the teaching and learning of reading both in first and second language classrooms. Rather than learning to interact with a writer through the application of their own schematic knowledge when faced with written text, novice readers acquire the belief that, somehow, meaning is inherent in the text. Lopes further illustrates how teaching strategies induce the acquisition of such a logocentric view of language. He argues that acquired simultaneously with this view is the belief that language users play a passive rather than an active and critical role in social discourse. To change these teaching strategies, he maintains, it will be necessary to design teacher education programmes that will enable teachers to review and revise their own understanding of language and of reading in particular. Language teaching syllabi that translate these new understandings into classroom practice will also be required.

In the last chapter of [Part IV](#), Wenden outlines a content schema for a language curriculum in critical language education—an educational strategy appropriate both for training teachers (and other professional trainers), and for teaching students. Consisting of the discourse structures that were the focus of the research reported in this volume, the schema is intended to be a guide to language educators who wish to help readers and listeners develop the knowledge and skills necessary to assess critically both text and talk. Moreover, while it is not the intention of this last chapter to argue for language change, implied in such a critical approach to language education is the empowerment of discourse participants to raise for critical discussion and change long-held assumptions and practices, including discursive practices, which hinder the achievement of a comprehensive peace.

Conclusion

In the declaration issued at the outcome of a 1988 meeting of 45 university presidents from nearly two dozen countries held at Tufts University's European Centre (Talloires, France), the participants state:

In a world that is plagued by war, hunger, injustice and suffering, we... join in supporting research and teaching programs that will increase our common understanding of the causes of conflict and their resolution, the relationship between peace and development and the sources of injustice and hunger...(Bedarida, 1988, p. 37)

Dimitru Chitoran, Chief of UNESCO's Higher Education Section, has outlined a similar role for higher education. He advocates the design of curricula and the promotion of research on global problems so as to provide students, particularly future researchers and those destined for positions of responsibility, with the necessary knowledge of problems related to peace, democracy and respect for human rights (Chitoran and Symonides, 1992).

Language and Peace is a response on the part of one group of linguistic scholars to these challenges to higher education. At the same time, illustrating as it does how critical discourse analysis can be applied to investigating the relationship between language and peace, the book reflects the characteristics and goals of critical linguistics cited earlier in this introduction.

However, the book is not intended exclusively for those linguists who do critical discourse analysis. It is hoped that it will provide insight into the crucial role of language in social life and suggest directions for future research that scholars in the wider field of sociolinguistics and peace research will find relevant. It is also intended for language educators and peace educators, aiming to provide them with an understanding of discourse that they can incorporate into their language curricula. Finally, it is hoped that laypersons, who must make sense of the varying interpretations of social issues provided by media reports, will be empowered with an awareness of how discourse subtly and imperceptibly shapes their understanding of these issues, especially those that relate to social and ecological violence, its causes and consequences upon the quality of life on our interdependent but fragile planet.

Notes

- 1 Earlier versions of most of the papers in this volume were presented as part of a special symposium on *Language and Peace* organized for the 10th Congress of the International Association of Applied Linguistics (Amsterdam 1993).

Part I

Language, Ideology and Peace

1

Defining Peace: Perspectives from Peace Research

ANITA L. WENDEN

Introduction

In *Agenda for Peace* (Boutros-Ghali, 1992), a report commissioned by the United Nations Security Council to recommend ways of strengthening the work of the United Nations, the Secretary General states that peace is an easy concept to grasp. Its definition, however, has proven somewhat problematic for peace researchers who have found it easier to define peace in terms of what it is not rather than what it is. Thus, earlier definitions referred to peace as the absence of war (Wright, 1942). Expanding the concept, Galtung (1964, 1969) introduced the notion of *negative peace* to refer to the absence of war and contrasted it with *positive peace* to refer to the absence of structural violence. This latter term refers to inequalitarian and discriminatory social structures which also indirectly inflict violence upon individuals or groups in a systematic and organized way because of the institutions and practices they condone. Slavery was an example of structural violence in the past, and discrimination on the basis of race, ethnicity, or gender is an example of structural violence in our age. According to peace researchers, such as Galtung, a society in which such social structures exist is not at peace even though it may not be at war.

Writing from a feminist perspective, Brock-Utne (1989) expands Galtung's definition. She acknowledges the existence of negative peace (the absence of war) and positive peace (the absence of structural violence). However, she introduces a distinction that separates structural violence that *shortens* the life span from structural violence that reduces *quality of life*. Finally, she points out that there is a distinction between organized violence manifested in a systematic way on an intergroup level and unorganized physical and structural violence manifested on an interpersonal level, within the home, for example.¹ In other words, even if there are no wars going on (*organized physical violence*), peace cannot be said to exist when children or