

appropriately, especially in the case of requests for information/help. So, let the rain and snow come (or heat, in the southern hemisphere!), curl up in a warm (or cool) place, have a refreshing drink, and read away!

Along with the new year, we at Terralingua have made some administrative changes. All matters pertaining to membership in Terralingua should now be sent to me, Ms. A. Fallen-Bailey, at the addresses included in the boxed text above. However, we request that you still send fees/donations directly to our Secretary/Treasurer, Mr. D. Harmon, to the address included above, since he handles the financial side of things. We have made this change in order to streamline our processing, maintenance and use of the membership data base.

With these two issues of *Langscape* we have also changed to using a "pdf" format (Adobe Acrobat, with the Reader available at <www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/readstep.html>), for sending the newsletter, in our continuing attempts to make receipt of this newsletter as easy as possible, no matter what hardware and software you or I have. Please let us know whether this works better for you - or not, as the case may be! Thank you for your compliments, continued support and commitment.



TERRALINGUA IN THE MEDIA

From: Luisa Maffi <maffi@nwu.edu>

Volume XLVI: 4, 1999, of the British journal *Media Development* contains a series of articles on the theme "Language and the right to communicate", which report on, amongst other things, the May 1999 hearing of the People's Communication Charter in The Hague, The Netherlands (see *Langscape* #12, June 1999). The lead article, "What fate awaits the world's languages?" is by Terralingua Vice-President Tove Skutnabb-Kangas. The article summarizes the state of the world's languages, compares linguistic diversity and biodiversity and the threats they are under, and discusses the issue of linguistic genocide and linguistic human rights, especially in education, as a tool for supporting linguistic diversity (and thus, indirectly, biological diversity). Terralingua is mentioned as an organization developing and supporting these concepts, and an invitation to join is included. Other articles cover the Hague hearing, as well as a variety of linguistic situations from Argentina, Rwanda, South Africa, Canada and Papua New Guinea.



Nicole Parizeau <nicole@wholeearthmag.com>

We are providing access information for Terralingua and its quarterly newsletter in an forthcoming issue of *Whole Earth*, as part of a section on endangered languages.

Best wishes,

Nicole Parizeau, Senior Editor
Whole Earth
1408 Mission Avenue
San Rafael, CA. 94530. U.S.A.

Tel.: (415) 256-2800, ext. 226
FAX: (415) 256-2808
E-mail: nicole@wholeearthmag.com



NEWS AND CORRESPONDENCE

Report on the 98th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association (A.A.A.), Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A., 17-21 November, 1999

By Luisa Maffi

I participated in the meeting as one of the paper presenters in the session "Protecting Indigenous Intellectual Property Rights in the Next Millennium: longitudinal approaches, tools that work", co-organized by Mary Riley and Kathy Moran (see below).

A.A.A. meetings are the largest of their kind in the U.S.A., covering all sub-fields of anthropology and a vast range of specialties, so I had the opportunity to attend various other sessions – at least, compatibly with a schedule in which a high number of the sessions I was interested in were in conflict with one another time wise! This was especially the case with linguistic anthropology and ecological anthropology sessions, both of which I would have liked to follow, but it was almost impossible.

I ended up favoring ecological anthropology because I find this field to currently be perhaps the most interdisciplinary and closest to Terralingua interests within anthropology. One linguistic session I did attend was also environment-oriented. It was "Place Names Through Time", organized by Terralingua member Karen Sue Rolph-Morales and devoted to studies of indigenous place names in the Americas and their ecological and cultural significance. All papers (by Jane Hill, Bill Bright, Gene Hunn, Tom Thornton, and Karen Sue Rolph-Morales) were excellent, but I was especially intrigued by Karen Sue's. It was titled "Environmentally meaningful toponyms: using G.I.S. in the Peruvian Andes". It reported on Karen Sue's initial findings from her continuing doctoral research, in which she is using Geographic Information Systems (G.I.S.) technology to track correlations between language change in a Quechua-speaking community in Peru and agro-ecological changes. Her initial correlations between shift to Spanish and use of non-indigenous, so-called "improved" crops are really striking. She will be using sophisticated statistical methods to try and establish causal links between the phenomena she is observing. I am really looking forward to hearing more about her work. I believe it will be an innovative and significant contribution to our understanding of the links between language, knowledge, and the environment.

I will not attempt to summarize all the ecological anthropology sessions I attended, but will mention one in particular because it sparked an interesting debate. It was titled "Taking Time to Communicate: anthropology and conservation in Southeast Asia and the Pacific", organized by Jamon Halvaksz and Paige West. From the title, I was expecting to hear reports about cases of collaboration (or at least successful communication) between anthropologists and conservationists, but in fact the *leitmotif* was rather the difficulty or failure of such communication – in other words, the difficulty or failure of integration of human and environmental concerns in the study areas in question. This left me rather depressed and frustrated, and later I brought up this concern at the business meeting of the Anthropology and the Environment (A. & E.) section of A.A.A., to which I belong. I suggested that, if this is so – at least, from the vantage point of the cases that were presented – maybe anthropologists should be thinking about how to improve the situation, by trying to foster dialogue and find common ground with conservationists. As you will see from other news in this issue of *Langscape*, it seems that the time is ripe for major advances from a biocultural (including language) diversity perspective. I argued that anthropologists need to both seek to go out and multiply efforts to work successfully with conservationists, and to draw the conservationists toward anthropology by highlighting and showcasing the relevance of anthropology to the conservation field (and by the same circumstance educate conservationists about anthropological concerns the conservation field should open up to).

This suggestion was received positively, and there already is discussion about high-visibility anthropologists/ conservationists panels or similar events at the next A.A.A. meeting, as well as possibly at the meetings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (A.A.A.S.), which both anthropologists and conservationists customarily attend. At the same time, there is also discussion about promoting interdisciplinary training for anthropology and conservation biology students, and so forth. (I later learned that at least one such program already exists in the U.S.A., at University of Michigan. Interested people may wish to check it out). This discussion is continuing at various levels, including on the EANTH-L (ecological/environmental anthropology) electronic list, and hopefully will bring about significant developments. (Incidentally, EANTH-L may be of interest to *Langscape* readers. It generally has useful discussions, such as, recently, on the notion of sustainability. To subscribe, send a message to <listserv@listserv.uga.edu>. Leaving the subject line empty, type <subscribe eanth-l> in the body of the message.)

The other main set of sessions I attended was devoted to human rights. I noticed with some satisfaction that the number of such sessions seemed to be higher than at other A.A.A. meetings in which I have participated, and attendance at these sessions was good. Especially significant was a two-part session devoted to "Human rights and the anthropology of trouble", organized by Barbara Johnston and Ellen Messer, which covered a variety of topics such as the legal rights of indigenous peoples under international law; indigenous rights to land, language, and political representation; rights of non-citizens; prisoners' rights; women's and children's rights; right to food; environmental rights; the relationship between human rights and democratization. A valuable overview of a number of areas in which anthropologists interested in human rights have made a contribution. On the other hand, comments were made (including by yours truly) about the need for closer links between anthropologists and human rights experts working in or with international human rights organizations.

Following up on this, at the open forum held by the A.A.A. Committee on Human Rights, I suggested to the Committee's co-chairs (Dr. Robert Hitchcock of U. of Nebraska in the U.S.A., and Dr. Lucia Ann McSpadden of the Life and Peace Institute in Sweden), that at the next A.A.A. meeting they might seek to convene a high-profile panel of human rights anthropologists and other human rights experts, to foster concrete discussion and development of indigenous peoples' and minority rights, linguistic rights, cultural rights, and so forth, where anthropologists' contributions should be greater than it has been so far. This suggestion, too, was received very positively, and I'll be following up on it with the Committee.

Related to both sets of issues discussed above, at the business meeting of the National Association for the Practice of Anthropology, N.A.P.A. – another A.A.A. section to which I belong – suggestions were solicited for workshops that N.A.P.A. might organize in the future. I proposed two: one on "making the jump" from academia to conservation N.G.Os., the other on "making the jump" from academia to international organizations. N.A.P.A. seeks to foster the practice of anthropology outside academia, as well as to identify related gaps between academia and the "real world". I do hope my suggestions may be taken into account – I would be among the first to sign up for both workshops!

Finally, on the last day of the A.A.A. we had our Indigenous Intellectual Property Rights session. The papers given were:

- "Indigenous Peoples' Rights, the Rôle of the State, and Various Development Programs in India"
(Annapurna Devi Pandey)
- "When Promotion and Protection Conflict: indigenous knowledge and traditional plant resources of the Secwepemc First Nation (Kelly Bannister)
- "The Silver Hand Program for Alaska Native Arts and Crafts: brand or boon?" (Julie Zimmer)
- "Struggle Over Preserving Traditional Cultural Property in a Southwestern Pueblo" (Triloki Nath Pandey)
- "The Growth and Evolution of Intellectual Property Rights Legislation in Guyana and the Amerindian"
(Mary Riley)
- "Indigenous Property Rights, National Policies, and Development in Honduras"
(Catherine Tucker)
- "Maya I.C.B.G.: a case study in protecting and promoting indigenous intellectual property rights"
(Elois Ann Berlin, Brent Berlin, and John Stepp)
- "Modern Intellectual Property Law Evolving to Protect the Internet May Afford Protection for Traditional Knowledge" (Thomas May)
- "Building the Tools: toward the integrated protection of indigenous languages and knowledge as part of indigenous heritage" (Luisa Maffi)
- "Current I.P.R. Frameworks in Practice for the Use of Indigenous Knowledge in Drug Discovery" (Katy Moran)

Michael Brown was the discussant.

Most papers followed the stated goals of the session, i.e., "by taking a longitudinal, case-study approach, examine the tools and techniques which have been effective in defining, maintaining and successfully upholding indigenous claims to land, resources and intellectual property", as well as "reflect on how the existence and application of these tools... have impacted the cultures these tools were meant to protect and empower". Case studies described some of the most advanced indigenous intellectual property protection systems set up by indigenous groups, academic researchers, and bioprospecting companies, as well as new national legislations and relevant legal developments in the intellectual property field.

On the other hand, two of the papers raised cautions vis-à-vis the issue of protection of traditional knowledge. The paper by Bannister discussed the question of the long-term consequences of documenting and divulging traditional knowledge (such as through academic research and publication), since intellectual property law does not actually protect the content of a compilation or database. Therefore, the substance of the traditional knowledge documented and divulged enters the public domain and is open to use by others. Bannister argued that researchers need to make all efforts to try and anticipate the long-term consequences of such processes, and deal with the ethical dilemmas they raise, by working in close partnerships with the holders of the traditional knowledge they study and seeking all possible means to avoid or redress harm that may derive for traditional knowledge holders from disclosure of their knowledge. In my own paper, I sought to broaden the scope of the discussion by pointing out that, while intellectual property protection mechanisms are (justly) meant to protect indigenous and traditional peoples from misappropriation, misuse, and abuse of their knowledge, they will not per se protect traditional knowledge (and the languages that encode that knowledge) from erosion. Therefore, I advocated greater attention to the broader framework of human rights, and particularly cultural rights, in which any discussion of indigenous intellectual property rights should find its place. The full text of my talk is appended below.

The comments by the discussant as well as from the floor highlighted the open issue of the tensions between protection of intellectual property and maintenance of a rich public domain, and posed questions about the extent of validity of overarching international instruments versus local initiatives. There is no doubt that these are some of the major dilemmas in this field, and will be for years to come. But, as I argued in my talk, this is precisely why I believe anthropologists should be actively involved in debates and policy development around these matters, since issues of universality vs. relativity, individuality vs. collectivity, as well as of cultural dynamics and cultural change are at the core of their discipline.



Building the Tools: toward the integrated protection of indigenous languages
and knowledge as part of indigenous heritage

by Luisa Maffi
(Northwestern University/Terralingua)

(Given at the 98th. Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association Chicago, 17-21 November, 1999, in the session "Protecting Indigenous Intellectual Property Rights in the Next Millennium: longitudinal approaches, tools that work", 21 November, 1999).

As the title of my paper shows, I'm here to talk about protection not just of indigenous knowledge, but also of indigenous languages. I am starting from the assumption, which I believe you'll share, that language (and thus indigenous languages) has a lot to do with knowledge (and thus indigenous knowledge). I hold the view that 1) language is central to our conceptualization and understanding of the world, and for acting on it; that 2) human culture is a powerful adaptation tool, and language at one and the same time enables and conveys much cultural behavior; and that 3) while not all knowledge, beliefs, and values may be linguistically encoded, language represents the main instrument for humans to elaborate, maintain, develop, and transmit such ideas. And, as we all hopefully know, indigenous languages around the world are at risk today just as much as indigenous knowledge is. Therefore, if we're interested in the protection of indigenous knowledge, I believe we would be well advised to be concerned about protection of indigenous languages as well, as the main vehicles of such knowledge.

Now, indigenous peoples haven't been waiting for anthropologists to come up with this neat idea. All over the world indigenous peoples have been living their languages, and increasingly are explicitly conceptualizing them, as part and parcel of their cultural heritage (along with traditional knowledge, beliefs, values, ritual, folklore, crafts, biodiversity). They see their cultures and languages as intimately linked to their lands and territories. And they look at the maintenance and continued development of their languages as an integral part of their cultural vitality. Here are some examples. For the Maaori, their language is a part of their *taonga* "treasures", which is how they refer to their cultural heritage. For Native North Americans, their languages are part of the Sovereignty Bundle. These conceptualizations are not only statements of principles, but also have significant legal consequences. For the Maaori, the inclusion of language among the *taonga* has meant being able to successfully place a language claim before the Waitangi Tribunal in charge of investigating cases related to the application of the Treaty of Waitangi between the Maaori and the British Crown, arguing that in not providing active support to the Maaori language, the Crown had not fulfilled its duty of protecting Maaoris' possessions. For Native Americans, use of their languages is a significant element, as proof of cultural cohesion, vis-à-vis the granting of full tribal status by the federal government.

Examples could be multiplied. For Australian Aborigines, "indigenous cultural and intellectual property" is officially defined as including designs, traditional food resources, traditional and contemporary cultural expressions, rituals, legends, folk tales, knowledge of flora and fauna, and language. The South African Bill of Rights links the right to culture to language, by stating that "every person shall have the right to use his language and to participate in the cultural life of his people". And so forth.

Given this convergence between indigenous and anthropological views on the relationships between language and knowledge, it is then worth examining current international processes concerned with indigenous peoples' rights, to see whether and where mechanisms may be developing for the *integrated* protection of indigenous heritage. This session is devoted to I.P.R., but the point I want to make is that the protection of indigenous heritage will require more than I.P.R. alone. Whatever amount of protection I.P.R. systems may provide for indigenous heritage (and there are serious limitations), it is protection against misappropriation, abuse, and misuse of this heritage – most definitely a just cause, but not one that will per se protect heritage from erosion. Protection from erosion must then be the ultimate goal – lest all the indigenous I.P.R. mechanisms we're now busy trying to establish be made void by the disappearance of the very cultural traditions whose expressions they are meant to protect. What is crucially needed is a general framework within which indigenous peoples' rights can be conceptualized and specific provisions coherently coordinated. In this connection, indigenous peoples and others have repeatedly expressed the conviction that, ultimately, a *sui generis* system will have to be put in place for the protection of indigenous peoples' rights.

In light of this, it is interesting to consider the emerging (if as yet uneasy and fragile) confluence of different bodies of international law (human rights, labor rights, environmental protection, I.P.R., cultural heritage protection) around issues concerning the rights of indigenous peoples. The main institutions and instruments here include:

- The U.N. Working Group on Indigenous Populations (W.G.I.P.), which in 1994 completed the elaboration of the Draft U.N. Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, through extensive consultation with indigenous representatives from all over the world. The Declaration is currently under examination by the Sub-Commission on the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities – the hope being that a final version will be approved before the end of the Decade of Indigenous Peoples in 2004. Although as a declaration (rather than a convention or agreement) it is part of non-legally-binding "soft law", it is so far the most comprehensive and advanced instrument for the protection of indigenous peoples' rights, including key aspects related to indigenous knowledge and languages. It can represent a very influential international standard – provided, of course, that it isn't maimed by those member states (valiantly led by the United States) that are bent on minimizing its impact (beginning with the battle over the "s" in "peoples", whose presence or absence can determine whether the indigenes in question will or will not be recognized the right of self-determination). Another very significant document produced by W.G.I.P. is the 1995 Final Report of the Special Rapporteur (Dr. Erica-Irene Daes) on Protection of the Heritage of Indigenous People, which contains a set of Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of the Heritage of Indigenous Peoples.

- The International Labour Organization (I.L.O.), which in 1989 passed the Convention on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples, no. 169 (successor to the related 1957 I.L.O. Convention 107). I.L.O. 169 is the only legally binding international instrument that recognizes indigenous and tribal rights to customary law and customary practices, with special reference to control over land and resources and collective land ownership. In addition, it contains provisions concerning the maintenance and development of indigenous and tribal identities, traditions, values, and languages. However, it also contains a disclaimer as to any legal implications of the use of the term "peoples" vis-à-vis self-determination. Furthermore, so far it has only about 17 signatories, and thus has very limited ability to enforce indigenous and tribal peoples' rights internationally.
- The Secretariat of and Conference of the Parties (C.O.P.) to the 1992 Convention on Biological Diversity (C.B.D.). The C.B.D. (especially its Articles 8j, 10c, 18.4), covers aspects concerned with the respect, preservation and promotion of "knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities embodying traditional lifestyles relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity" (Art. 8j), as well as with establishing appropriate agreements for the development and utilization of such "knowledge, innovations and practices" and the equitable sharing of benefits deriving from this use. It has been signed by over 185 countries, and thus has come to represent a major tool for the protection of the specific indigenous rights it covers. Indigenous peoples are actively participating in the implementation process being conducted by the C.O.P.
- The World Intellectual Property Organization (W.I.P.O.), the specialized U.N. agency in charge of promoting the development, revision, harmonization, and application of international norms and standards on intellectual property rights (I.P.R.), as well as of administering a number of I.P.R.-related treaties. Since 1998, W.I.P.O. has undertaken activities relevant to indigenous peoples' rights through its newly established Global Intellectual Property Issues Division. The Division has the task, amongst others, to identify the "needs and expectations" of potential "new beneficiaries" of I.P.R. "Indigenous peoples, local communities and holders of traditional knowledge" were identified as the first group of such potential new beneficiaries of the I.P.R. system. W.I.P.O. has held two Roundtables (in 1998 and 1999) with representatives of member states, indigenous peoples, and N.G.Os., as well as carrying out a series of fact-finding missions, pilot projects, and studies on indigenous knowledge and its protection. However, it is apparent that W.I.P.O. is moving away from the politically charged notion of "indigenous peoples" toward the less contentious one of "holders of traditional knowledge" as I.P.R. beneficiaries (witness the change in title of the Roundtable). Some member states are putting pressure on W.I.P.O. to limit the extent to which the special needs of indigenous peoples for the protection of their traditional knowledge will be taken into account by means of an evolution of I.P.R. systems. Rather, they aim to restrict the scope of such protection so that current I.P.R. can be applied in a purely economic context, especially in terms of issues relevant to the World Trade Organization (W.T.O.) and the Trade-Related Intellectual Property (T.R.I.P.S.) agreements.
- Finally, U.N.E.S.C.O. (the U.N. Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), under whose international mandate both language and cultural heritage issues fall. Concerning language, apart from some academically-oriented work on language endangerment, U.N.E.S.C.O. has recently formed a Division of Languages within the Education Sector, which promises to take on a more proactive rôle vis-à-vis indigenous and minority languages – in education as well as other contexts – and vis-à-vis linguistic diversity and linguistic rights generally. A Draft Universal Declaration of Linguistic Rights, an N.G.O. initiative, was handed over to U.N.E.S.C.O. in 1996, as the first – if still imperfect – attempt at a comprehensive universal codification of linguistic human rights, both individual and collective. However, this Draft was not considered favorably by a majority of U.N.E.S.C.O. member States, and so far there has been no official follow-up on it – although U.N.E.S.C.O. has issued several statements to the effect that linguistic rights are high on its agenda, while renewed N.G.O. efforts are underway to promote the Declaration. As for cultural heritage, U.N.E.S.C.O. has long been concerned with the protection and preservation of "world" cultural heritage – such as with the 1972 Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (which provides for the protection of outstanding cultural and natural sites as the "patrimony of humanity"), and the 1989 Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore (which likewise

considers folklore as part of the universal heritage of humanity – although a “Global Assessment” of this Recommendation, now with a focus on “Local Empowerment and International Co-operation”, was carried out by U.N.E.S.C.O. in June 1999 in collaboration with the Smithsonian Institution). Note that on issues of folklore (as well as of copyright) U.N.E.S.C.O. has also been collaborating with W.I.P.O. The two organizations jointly presided over the development of the 1982 Model Provisions for National Laws on the Protection of Folklore Against Illicit Exploitation and Other Prejudicial Actions, and in 1997 jointly held the World Forum on the Protection of Folklore. U.N.E.S.C.O. has now begun to move toward consideration of cultural heritage issues as they relate to cultural rights, including those of indigenous peoples. U.N.E.S.C.O.’s Culture Sector has on its agenda the protection of cultural rights (including linguistic rights) as human rights. Significantly, in its 1995 report *Our Creative Diversity* [U.N.E.S.C.O. Publishing 2nd ed. 1996], U.N.E.S.C.O.’s World Commission on Culture and Development (W.C.C.D.) points out that cultural rights are *collective* rights, rights that refer to the freedom of “a group of people to follow or adopt a way of life of their choice” – a freedom which, furthermore, “by protecting alternative ways of living encourages creativity, experimentation and diversity, the very essentials of human development”. Also in 1995, a working group established with U.N.E.S.C.O.’s support elaborated a Draft Declaration of Cultural Rights, as a basis for U.N.E.S.C.O.’s further work on theoretical and normative development of cultural rights.

I have gone to some length describing U.N.E.S.C.O.’s activities because they bring out a focus on cultural rights, which I believe deserve greater attention in the context of protection of indigenous peoples’ heritage rights than has been devoted so far (but for an excellent introduction see *Cultural Rights and Wrongs*, ed. by Halina Niec, U.N.E.S.C.O. Publishing, 1998. [See entry in final section below]). This lack of attention is not surprising, since cultural rights are the least developed of the fundamental human rights recognized in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and then spelled out in the 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (I.C.C.P.R.) and International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (I.C.E.S.C.R.). The two Covenants make only modest (if legally binding) provisions concerning cultural rights. In its Article 15, I.C.E.S.C.R. simply states that

The State Parties to this Covenant recognize the right of everyone:

- a) To take part in cultural life;
- b) To enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its applications;
- c) To benefit from the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author.

Article 27 of the I.C.C.P.R. stipulates that

In those states in which ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities exist, persons belonging to such minorities shall not be denied the right, in community with the other members of their group, to enjoy their own culture, to profess and practise their religion, or to use their own language.

Note that, in the terminology of international rights instruments, the rights of “everyone” are individual rights, although it is clear that participation in cultural life is only possible within a collective dimension (as the I.C.C.P.R. article spells out in the case of minorities). The tension between the individual and collective dimension of cultural rights, and the question of whether and under what circumstances collective rights might override individual rights, is only one of the unresolved issues that have been hampering the development of cultural rights. One pragmatic reason for this underdevelopment is actually shared across cultural, social, and economic rights. These rights have sometimes been played down as being of lesser status than civil and political rights, and their legal character has even been questioned. Civil and political rights are negative rights (they require states to refrain from certain actions); economic, social, and cultural rights are positive rights (they require states to take a proactive role involving funds, time, and processes). This also implies a qualitative difference in states’ obligations vis-à-vis implementation of these two sets of rights. Many states have simply been reluctant to take up such positive obligations and to stand up to international scrutiny in regard to the application of these rights. Other unresolved issues have to do with dilemmas that are quite familiar to anthropologists, such as the very definition of “culture”. It is clear from the two previously mentioned articles that there is an oscillation between concepts of culture as the highest intellectual and artistic achievements of a group, culture as the process of scientific and artistic creation, and the

more anthropological sense of culture as a total way of life (a system of knowledge, beliefs, values, and practices and the material and spiritual activities and products of such activities by which a group distinguishes itself from others). Also familiar to anthropologists is the issue of the intrinsically dynamic character of culture, and the problems this poses in terms of defining the content of cultural rights. Yet another anthropologically informed dilemma is whether cultural rights do have a universal dimension or are culture-specific, and whether international standards for cultural rights can be developed while respecting cultural diversity.

With all these complexities – or perhaps precisely *because* of these complexities – it is becoming apparent that the development of the concept of cultural rights has a chance to contribute in a crucial way to enhancing the universality of human rights by rooting them in different cultural traditions. It also seems that the development of cultural rights should be a major factor in the formation of the overall integrated framework for the protection of indigenous peoples' rights I advocated at the beginning, and of the *sui generis* system that indigenous peoples and others have been calling for. The protection of indigenous languages and knowledge, as well as other aspects of cultural heritage, would naturally fall under this rubric. Both the integrity and the dynamic nature of cultural heritage might find recognition. Many of the instruments and processes I have described might be further elaborated and harmonized under this umbrella. And, last but not least, if there is a domain of human rights in defining which anthropologists might (and I believe should) have a most significant role, cultural rights are it. The Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action adopted by the 1993 World Conference on Human Rights explicitly calls for a "concerted effort to ensure recognition of economic, social, and cultural rights", while also advocating action to ensure "the full and free participation of indigenous people in all aspects of society, in particular in matters of concern to them". There are signs that international processes may be opening up to the prospect of (to a large extent) morally defined indigenous heritage rights, according to a global ethics built out of respect for cultural diversity and distinct world views. As anthropologists we should be among those raising to the challenge.

I would like to leave you with this thought, as well as with one final remark. Perhaps working toward the establishment of a more general framework for the protection of indigenous heritage might also give us an opportunity for deeper cross-cultural reflection on the nature of knowledge, and of the quest for knowledge, as well as on the relationships between rights and duties. I have suggested elsewhere that for indigenous peoples not knowledge alone but rather wisdom may be a goal. And in discussing the Western discourse of "rights", the legal scholar Lyndel Prott ["International standards for cultural heritage". In *World Culture Report: culture, creativity and markets*, pp. 222-236. U.N.E.S.C.O. Publishing 1998] it is pointed out that it is worth asking ourselves whether thinking in terms of "rights" may actually be our best or only option. She observes: "Many traditional communities think in terms of the *obligations* of the human community to earth and the other species on it. Perhaps the idea may be the beginning of a new normative framework for the preservation of heritage".

Note from Luisa Maffi: "The document "Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of the Heritage of Indigenous Peoples" mentioned in my paper was produced on behalf of the Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. The U.N. reference number of the document is: E/CN.4/Sub.2/1995/26. See below for the text of this document.



From: Helga Lomosits <indigena@worldonline.fr>
Organization: *Indigena*

Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of the Heritage of Indigenous Peoples
(U.N. Document E/CN.4/Sub.2/1995/26)
(22 Nov., 1999)

Principles

1. The effective protection of indigenous peoples' heritage will be of long-term benefit to all humanity. Cultural diversity contributes to the adaptability and creativity of the human species as a whole.

2. To be effective, the protection of indigenous peoples' heritage should be based broadly on the principle of self-determination, which includes the right and the duty of indigenous peoples to develop their own cultures and knowledge systems.
3. Indigenous peoples should be recognized as the primary guardians and interpreters of their cultures, arts and sciences, whether created in the past or developed by them in the future.
4. International recognition and respect for indigenous peoples' own customs, rules and practices for the transmission of their heritage to future generations, and for the sharing of their heritage with others, is essential to these peoples' enjoyment of human rights and dignity.
5. Indigenous peoples' ownership and custody of their heritage must continue to be collective, permanent and inalienable, as prescribed by the customs, rules and practices of each people.
6. The discovery, use and teaching of indigenous peoples' knowledge, arts and cultures is inextricably connected with the traditional lands and territories of each people. Control over traditional territories and resources is essential to the continued transmission of indigenous peoples' heritage to future generations and its full protection.
7. To protect their heritage indigenous peoples must control their own means of cultural transmission and education. This includes their right to the continued use and, wherever necessary, the restoration of their own languages and orthographies.
8. To protect their heritage indigenous peoples must also exercise control over all research conducted within their territories, or which uses their people as subjects of study.
9. The free and informed consent of the traditional owners should be an essential precondition of any agreements which may be made for the recording, study, use or display of indigenous peoples' heritage.
10. Any agreements which may be made for the recording, study, use or display of indigenous peoples' heritage must be revocable and ensure that the peoples concerned continue to be the primary beneficiaries of commercial application.
11. The heritage of indigenous peoples is comprised of all objects, sites and knowledge, the nature or use of which has been transmitted from generation to generation, and which is regarded as pertaining to a particular peoples, clan heritage of an indigenous people also includes objects, knowledge and literary or artistic works which may be created in the future based upon its heritage.
12. The heritage of indigenous peoples includes all moveable cultural property as defined by the relevant conventions of U.N.E.S.C.O.; all kinds of literary and artistic works such as music, dance, song, ceremonies, symbols and designs, narratives and poetry; all kinds of scientific, agricultural, technical and ecological knowledge, including cultigens, medicines and the phenotypes and genotypes of flora and fauna; human remains; immovable cultural property such as sacred sites, sites of historical significance, and burials; and documentation of indigenous peoples' heritage on film, photographs, videotape or audio tape.
13. Every element of an indigenous peoples' heritage has traditional owners which may be the whole people, a particular family or clan, an association or society, or individuals who have been specially taught or initiated to be its custodians. The traditional owners of heritage must be determined in accordance with indigenous peoples' own customs, laws and practices.

Transmission of heritage

14. Indigenous peoples' heritage should ordinarily be learned only by the means customarily employed by its traditional owners for teaching the specific knowledge concerned. Each indigenous people's rules and practices for the transmission of heritage and sharing of its use must be recognized generally in the national legal system.
15. In the event of a dispute over the custody or use of any element of an indigenous people's heritage, judicial and administrative bodies should be guided by the advice of indigenous

elders who are recognized by the indigenous communities or peoples concerned as having specific knowledge of traditional laws.

16. Governments, international organizations and private institutions should support the development of educational, research and training centres which are controlled by indigenous communities, and strengthen these communities' capacity to document, protect, teach and apply all aspects of their heritage.

17. Governments, international organizations and private institutions should support the development of regional and global networks for the exchange of information and experience among indigenous peoples in the fields of science, culture, education and the arts. This may include electronic networks where feasible and appropriate.

18. Governments, with international co-operation, should provide the necessary financial resources and institutional support to ensure that every indigenous child has the opportunity to achieve both fluency and literacy in his/her own traditional language.

Recovery and restitution of heritage

19. Governments, with the assistance of international organizations, should assist indigenous peoples and communities in recovering control and possession of their moveable cultural property and other heritage.

20. In co-operation with indigenous peoples, U.N.E.S.C.O. should establish a programme to mediate the recovery of moveable cultural property from across international borders, at the request of the traditional owners of the property concerned.

21. Human remains and associated funeral objects must be returned to their descendants and territories in a culturally appropriate manner, as determined by the indigenous peoples concerned. Documentation may be retained, displayed or otherwise used only in such form and manner as may be agreed upon with the peoples concerned.

22. Moveable cultural property should be returned wherever possible to its traditional owners, particularly if shown to be of significant cultural, religious or historical value to them. Moveable cultural property should only be retained by universities, museums, private institutions or individuals in accordance with the terms of a recorded agreement with the traditional owners for the sharing of the custody and interpretation of the property.

23. Under no circumstances should objects or any other elements of an indigenous people's heritage be publicly displayed, except in a manner deemed appropriate by the peoples concerned.

24. In the case of objects or other elements of heritage which were removed or recorded in the past, the traditional owners of which can no longer be identified precisely, the traditional owners are presumed to be the entire people associated with the territory from which these objects were removed, or where the recordings were made, or the direct descendants of that people.

National programmes and legislation

25. National laws should guarantee that indigenous peoples can obtain prompt, effective and affordable judicial or administrative action to prevent, punish and obtain full restitution and compensation for the acquisition, documentation or use of their heritage without proper authorization of the traditional owners.

26. National laws should deny to any person or corporation the right to obtain patent, copyright, or other legal protection for any element of indigenous peoples' heritage without adequate documentation of the free and informed consent of the traditional owners to an arrangement for the sharing of ownership, control and benefits.

27. National laws should ensure the labelling and correct attribution of indigenous peoples' artistic, literary and cultural works whenever they are offered for public display or sale. Attribution should be in the form of a trademark or an appellation of origin, authorized by the peoples or communities concerned.

28. National laws for the protection of indigenous peoples' heritage should be adopted following consultations with the peoples concerned, in particular the traditional owners and teachers of religious, sacred and spiritual knowledge, and wherever possible, should have the consent of the peoples concerned.

29. National laws should ensure that the use of traditional languages in education, arts and the mass media is respected and, to the extent possible, promoted and strengthened.

30. Governments should provide indigenous communities with financial and institutional support for the control of local education, through community-managed programmes, and with use of traditional pedagogy and languages.

31. Governments should take immediate steps, in co-operation with the indigenous peoples concerned, to identify sacred and ceremonial sites, including burial sites, and protect them from unauthorized entry or use.

Researchers and scholarly institutions

32. All researchers and scholarly institutions should take immediate steps to provide indigenous peoples and communities with comprehensive inventories of the cultural property, and documentation of indigenous peoples' heritage, which they may have in their custody.

33. Researchers and scholarly institutions should return all elements of indigenous peoples' heritage to the traditional owners upon demand, or obtain formal agreements with the traditional owners for the shared custody, use and interpretation of their heritage.

34. Researchers and scholarly institutions should decline any offers for the donation or sale of elements of indigenous peoples' heritage, unless they have first contacted the peoples or communities directly concerned and ascertaining the wishes of the traditional owners.

35. Researchers and scholarly institutions must refrain from engaging in any study of previously-undescribed species or cultivated varieties of plants, animals or microbes, or naturally-occurring pharmaceuticals, without first obtaining satisfactory documentation that the specimens were acquired with the consent of the traditional owners, if any.

36. Researchers must not publish information obtained from indigenous peoples or the results of research conducted on flora, fauna, microbes or materials discovered through the assistance of indigenous peoples, without identifying the traditional owners and obtaining their consent to publication.

37. Researchers should agree to an immediate moratorium on the Human Genome Diversity Project. Further research on the specific genotypes of indigenous peoples should be suspended unless and until broadly and publicly supported by indigenous peoples to the satisfaction of United Nations human rights organs.

38. Researchers and scholarly institutions should make every possible effort to increase indigenous peoples' access to all forms of medical, scientific and technical education, and participation in all research activities which may affect them or be of benefit to them.

39. Professional associations of scientists, engineers and scholars, in collaboration with indigenous peoples, should sponsor seminars and disseminate publications to promote ethical conduct in conformity with these guidelines and discipline members who act in contravention.

Business and industry

40. In dealings with indigenous peoples, business and industry should respect the same guidelines as researchers and scholarly institutions.

41. Business and industry should agree to an immediate moratorium on making contracts with indigenous peoples for the rights to discover, record and use previously undescribed species or cultivated varieties of plants, animals or microbes, or naturally occurring pharmaceuticals. No further contracts should be negotiated until indigenous peoples and communities themselves are capable of supervising and collaborating in the research process.

42. Business and industry should refrain from offering incentives to any individuals to claim traditional rights of ownership or leadership within an indigenous community, in violation of their trust within the community and the laws of the indigenous peoples concerned.

43. Business and industry should refrain from employing scientists or scholars to acquire and record traditional knowledge or other heritage of indigenous peoples in violation of these guidelines.

44. Business and industry should contribute financially and otherwise to the development of educational and research institutions controlled by indigenous peoples and communities.

45. All forms of tourism based on indigenous peoples' heritage must be restricted to activities which have the approval of the peoples and communities concerned, and which are conducted under their supervision and control.

Artists, writers and performers

46. Artists, writers and performers should refrain from incorporating elements derived from indigenous heritage into their works without the informed consent of the traditional owners.

47. Artists, writers and performers should support the full artistic and cultural development of indigenous peoples, and encourage public support for the development and greater recognition of indigenous artists, writers and performers.

48. Artists, writers and performers should contribute, through their individual works and professional organizations, to greater public understanding and respect for the indigenous heritage associated with the country in which they live.

Public information and education

49. The mass media in all countries should take effective measures to promote understanding of and respect for indigenous peoples' heritage, in particular through special broadcasts and public-service programmes prepared in collaboration with indigenous peoples.

50. Journalists should respect the privacy of indigenous peoples, in particular concerning traditional religious, cultural and ceremonial activities, and refrain from exploiting or sensationalizing indigenous peoples' heritage.

51. Journalists should actively assist indigenous peoples in exposing any activities, public or private, which destroy or degrade indigenous peoples' heritage.

52. Educators should ensure that school curricula and textbooks teach understanding and respect for indigenous peoples' heritage and history and recognize the contribution of indigenous peoples to the creativity and cultural diversity of the country as a whole.

International organizations

53. The Secretary-General should publish an annual report, based upon information from all available sources, and in particular information requested from U.N.E.S.C.O., the World Intellectual Property Organization (W.I.P.O.) and indigenous communities, on problems and solutions experienced in the protection of indigenous peoples' heritage in all countries.

54. The Secretary-General should also prepare a note, in co-operation with indigenous peoples' organizations, on progress made and problems still to be overcome for the protection of indigenous peoples' heritage, for consideration by the World Summit for Social Development in 1995.

55. In co-operation with indigenous peoples, W.I.P.O. should bring these principles and guidelines to the attention of the member States of all of the intellectual and industrial property unions which are under its administration, with a view to promoting the strengthening of national legislation and international conventions in this field.

56. Indigenous peoples and their representative organizations should enjoy direct access to all relevant negotiations administered by W.I.P.O. and the World Trade Organization, to share their views on measures to improve the protection of their heritage through international law.

57. In collaboration with indigenous peoples, U.N.E.S.C.O. should develop a list of sacred and ceremonial sites that require special measures for their protection and conservation, and provide financial and technical assistance to indigenous peoples for these purposes.

58. In collaboration with indigenous peoples, U.N.E.S.C.O. should also establish a trust fund with a mandate to act as a global agent for the recovery of compensation for the unconsented or inappropriate use of indigenous peoples' heritage, and to provide assistance to indigenous peoples to strengthen their institutional capacity to protect their own heritage.

59. United Nations operational agencies, as well as the international financial institutions, and regional and bilateral development assistance programmes, should give priority to providing financial and technical support to indigenous communities for capacity building and exchanges of experience focused on local control of research and education.



From: Dionne Stout, Tamara [NCR] <Tamara.DionneStout@EC.GC.CA>
Via Preston D. Hardison <prestonh@home.com>

I.P.R. - W.T.O. - Proposal on Protection of I.P.Rs. Relating to Traditional Knowledge (T.K.)
(28 Oct., 1999)

World Trade Organization, WT/GC/W/362; 12 October, 1999 (99-4318)
General Council Original: Spanish

Preparations for the 1999 Ministerial Conference - Proposal on Protection of the Intellectual Property Rights Relating to the Traditional Knowledge of Local and Indigenous Communities

Communication from Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Nicaragua, and Peru. The following communication, dated 4 October, 1999, has been received from the Permanent Mission of Peru.

Background

Both the continuing evolution of intellectual property and the introduction of this subject into the Uruguay Round of multilateral trade negotiations in 1996 have been based on a view of economic and technological development that recognizes intellectual property as a necessary ingredient and essential requisite for achieving the developmental goals of global trade. The W.T.O. Members, including the signatories of this communication, confirmed this recognition by adopting and undertaking to comply with the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (T.R.I.P.S.).

The system of intellectual property protection as recognized today is the result of a continuous evolutionary process driven by the desire to achieve accelerated commercial and technological development. Over time, the scope of intellectual property has been expanded by recognizing new subject matter of protection. This broadening has taken place by the inclusion of special (*sui generis*) systems of protection or through the widening of the traditional categories of protection so as to cover new subjects. In recent decades, the laws of W.T.O. Members as well as international instruments have recognized as new subject matter of protection, for instance, plant varieties (in 1950 and 1960), biological material, plants and animals (in 1970 and 1980), layout designs (topographies) of integrated circuits (1980), computer software (in 1980 and 1990) and databases and compilations of data (in 1980 and 1990).

Seen from an historical perspective, the evolution and widening of intellectual property through the recognition of new rights and subjects of protection was prompted by the legitimate needs of industries and producers whose economic interests depended on recognition of their creations and innovations as protectable subject matter. The needs and expectations of these sectors were in due course accepted by the governments of the Member States concerned and eventually recognized and formalized at the international level.

Nevertheless, the entire modern evolution of intellectual property has been framed by principles and systems which have tended to leave aside a large sector of human creativity, namely the traditional knowledge possessed by local and indigenous communities. In many cases, this traditional knowledge is linked to the use and application of genetic, biological and natural resources, or the management and conservation of such resources and the environment, in ways that have economic, commercial as well as cultural value. More broadly, traditional knowledge also comprises artistic and cultural expressions which have a fundamental value for their holders, as they are the cement binding their individual and collective identity, as well as the guarantee of their continued survival.

Traditional knowledge consists largely of innovations, creations and cultural expressions generated or preserved by its present possessors, who may be defined and identified as individuals or whole communities, natural or legal persons, who are holders of rights. The economic, commercial and cultural value of this traditional knowledge for its possessors warrants and justifies a legitimate interest that this knowledge be recognized as subject matter of intellectual property. This expectation on the part of those concerned that their traditional knowledge should be given legal recognition has found expression in an increasing number of national, regional and international forums, and is quite as legitimate as the expectations which in the past justified the recognition of the new subjects of intellectual property that were mentioned above by way of example.

On the threshold of a new round of international trade negotiations, these needs and expectations cannot be ignored or disregarded. They deserve full consideration in the framework of the future development of intellectual property at the global level. The future development of intellectual property must be based on mutual recognition of the creations and intangible goods generated by the various sectors concerned in the different W.T.O. Members. For many W.T.O. Members, the cultural and economic value of traditional knowledge is just as important as that of modern technological innovations for other Members.

Traditional knowledge has been under study in some W.T.O. members for a number of years with a view to establishing *sui generis* legislation at national and/or regional level. Nevertheless, international recognition of traditional knowledge as protectable subject matter would afford its holders the legal possibility of obtaining enforcement of their rights outside their own countries, thus enabling them to share in the economic benefits derived from that knowledge. Such recognition would also lead to a reduction in the misappropriation and unauthorized exploitation of such knowledge, and diminish the risk of erosion or destruction of these intangible goods and of the cultures that have generated them.

An international legal framework should enable the legitimate holders of traditional knowledge to exercise effective control over access, use, reproduction, imitation, exploitation and transmission and other commercial activities relating to traditional knowledge or expressions and manifestations thereof, and ensure that these rights are accompanied by effective means of enforcement at least equal to those already provided for in the T.R.I.P.S. Agreement.

International recognition of traditional knowledge as protectable subject matter would also provide additional means of dealing at international level with, among other things, aspects related to the protection of innovations under Article 27.3(b), of the T.R.I.P.S. Agreement and the obligation to respect, preserve and maintain knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities provided for in Article 8(j) of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

Proposal

For the foregoing reasons, the above signatory Members propose that the Seattle Ministerial Conference establish, within the framework of this Round, a mandate with the following purposes:

To carry out studies, in collaboration with other relevant international organizations, in order to make recommendations on the most appropriate means of recognizing and protecting traditional knowledge as the subject matter of intellectual property rights. On the basis of the above-mentioned recommendations, initiate negotiations with a view to establishing a multilateral legal framework that will grant effective protection to the expressions and manifestations of traditional knowledge.

To complete the legal framework envisaged in paragraph (b) above in time for it to be included as part of the results of this round of trade negotiations.

Indigenous Peoples' Secretariat (Canada) on
the Convention on Biological Diversity
Place Vincent Massey, 9th Floor
351 St. Joseph Blvd.
Hull, PQ. K1A 0H3. Canada.

Tel.: 819.953.5819
FAX: 819.953.1765
E-mail: tamara.dionnestout@ec.gc.ca



From: GRAIN Los Banos <grain@baylink.mozcom.com>
Via Preston D. Hardison <prestonh@home.com>

Proposed Régime for the Protection of Traditional Knowledge Published

BIO-I.P.R. docserver (bio-I.P.R.@cuenet.com) – I.N.D.E.C.O.P.I. Press Notes, Lima (28 Oct., 1999).

I.N.D.E.C.O.P.I. will establish a new intellectual property registry to give commercial value to traditional knowledge. The proposal is submitted for public debate until 20 December, 1999.

I.N.D.E.C.O.P.I., together with the Ministries of Agriculture, P.R.O.M.U.D.E.H. [Ministry for the Promotion of Women and Human Development] and Fishing, published today in the official journal, *The Peruvian*, a working document containing legislative proposals to establish a Régime for the Protection of Collective Knowledge of Indigenous Peoples and a Régime on Access to Genetic Resources. Both proposals grant intellectual value to the knowledge of thousands of communities existing in the country and to genetic resources, thereby opening the possibility of securing economic benefits from the commercial use of these resources.

Both proposals are hereby submitted to the public for discussion until 20 December, 1999. Over this period, comments of interested parties will be collected and incorporated into a final text which will be sent to the Council of Ministers and, finally, to Congress.

The working document was prepared by a technical group from I.N.D.E.C.O.P.I. following a consultative process in which 16 public and private institutions participated, including communities themselves.

Project on communities

One of the objectives of this project is the creation of new intellectual property rights (I.P.R.) in the framework of international treaties to which Peru is committed. Through these new rights, the traditional knowledge of thousands of indigenous peoples will be registered and therefore can be recognised whenever it is used commercially by researchers or pharmaceutical laboratories, be they national or foreign.

Additionally, the formation of this new I.P.R. registry will allow not only specifically entitled groups to benefit from the commercial use of their traditional knowledge, but all communities. For this, the document proposes the establishment of an Indigenous Peoples' Development Fund (F.O.N.D.E.P.I.). The Fund will be administered by the communities themselves under the supervision of I.N.D.E.C.O.P.I. and will support the development of indigenous peoples by financing projects. A percentage of all sales resulting from the commercial use of traditional knowledge will go the Fund.

Project on genetic resources

Access to genetic information will be regulated through an administrative procedure. The objective is to give the State a fair share of the benefits derived from access to these resources, which are the heritage of the State. The working document proposes the formation of a National Committee on Genetic Resources (C.O.N.A.R.G.E.) as competent authority to grant access to genetic resources and to sanction illegal activities in this respect. The document also proposes the formation of a Genetic Resources Conservation and Development Fund (F.O.N.D.E.R.E.G.), which shall promote the conservation and commercial use of these resources,

within the established legal framework. Mechanisms to compensate communities and the State for the commercial use of knowledge and genetic resources [table].

-- *First payment* --

Collective Knowledge

- * Free agreement between parties
- * Goes directly to the Community

Genetic Resources

- * 5% of the value of the transaction between the provider of the resource and the recipient
- * Goes to the Genetic Resources Conservation and Development Fund (F.O.N.D.E.R.E.G.)

-- *Second payment* --

Collective Knowledge

- * 0.5% of sales, resulting from commercial use
- * Goes to Indigenous Peoples' Development Fund (F.O.N.D.E.P.I.)

Genetic Resources

- * 2.5% of gross profit margin from commercial use
- * Goes to FONDEREG

-- *Administrator of Fund* --

Composition

Administrative Committee

- * Indigenous Peoples and
- * Specialised national entity

National Committee on Genetic Resources (C.O.N.A.R.G.E.)

- * Ministry of Fisheries
- * I.M.A.R.P.E.
- * Ministry of Agriculture
- * I.N.R.E.N.A.
- * I.N.I.A.

-- *Technical Secretariat* --

P.R.O.M.U.D.E.H. leads I.N.R.E.N.A.

National Competent Authority

- * I.N.D.E.C.O.P.I. (forms new registry)
- * C.O.N.A.R.G.E. (to be formed)

About this listserver - BIO-I.P.R. is an irregular listserver put out by Genetic Resources Action International (G.R.A.I.N.). For general information about G.R.A.I.N., kindly visit our Web site at <www.grain.org/> or write to us at <grain@bcn.servicom.es>.



From: Luisa Maffi <maffi@nwu.edu>

Indigenous Raise Debate in Geneva

(10 Nov., 1999). These are two reports on the Roundtable on Intellectual Property and Traditional Knowledge held by the World Intellectual Property Organization of the U.N. (W.I.P.O.), November 1-2, 1999, in Geneva. I participated in the previous Roundtable on Intellectual Property and Indigenous People in July 1998 (see my report in *Langscape* Sept. '98). As you will see, the reports that follow take a rather negative stance on the proceedings, especially vis-à-vis issues related to the World Trade Organization (W.T.O.) and the Trade-Related Intellectual Property Agreements (T.R.I.P.S.). This latter concern seems

fully justified, as it appears that some member states (to begin with the U.S.A.) are putting heavy pressure on W.I.P.O. to drastically limit the extent to which the special needs of indigenous peoples for the protection of their traditional knowledge will be taken into account by means of an evolution of I.P.R. systems. This is also reflected in the disappearance of the expression "indigenous peoples" from the Roundtable's title this year. On the other hand, comments I received from some of the participants in this year's Roundtable suggest that the meeting in and of itself was basically well intentioned, and that W.I.P.O.'s Global Intellectual Property Issues Division that is directly in charge of these Roundtables is making efforts to gain genuine understanding of the issues involved. Yet pressure by member states is indeed strongly in the direction not of an evolution of I.P.R. to accommodate indigenous peoples' needs, but rather of restricting the field as much as possible so that current I.P.R. can be applied in a purely economic context, without consideration for the human rights aspects and the collective dimension of I.P.R. issues for indigenous peoples (and with the U.S.A. still contesting the "s" in "peoples"--a crucial distinction vis-a-vis self-determination!). My commentators expressed the concern that this whole enterprise may end up not getting very far, not out of lack of goodwill from the people at W.I.P.O., but because certain member states still maintain a strong negative stance vis-a-vis indigenous issues. (Luisa Maffi).



From: <wgtrr.ocees@mansfield.oxford.ac.uk>

Traditional Knowledge Under Commercial Blanket

(9 Nov., 1999)

Published by *South-North Development Monitor* (S.U.N.S.), #4545 (5 November, 1999). Source: Third World Network, Geneva (www.twinside.org.sg/). The S.U.N.S. Bulletin is edited by Mr. Chakravarty Raghavan (suns@igc.apc.org).

GENEVA, Nov. 4 (by Someshwar Singh) – It is all in the name of progress. Centuries-old cures, customs and practices, derived from man's harmonious interaction with nature, must now open up to the world of dollars and cents, thanks to the new international trade régime rules on intellectual property, the T.R.I.P.S. Agreement..

A two-day round-table on intellectual property and traditional knowledge, organized by the World Intellectual Property Organization (W.I.P.O.) ended here Tuesday. Many experts, government N.G.O. representatives assembled to discuss how to bring the essentially "informal" domain of traditional knowledge into the "formal" intellectual property system. While most developing countries are struggling with implementing new laws which may face a backlash of public outcry as essential drugs prices, for instance, start sky-rocketing, W.I.P.O. describes the forthcoming deadline for implementing T.R.I.P.S. agreement in glowing terms.

"A hallmark of the new, worldwide relevance of intellectual property is the upcoming entry into force, on January 1, 2000, of the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual property Rights (T.R.I.P.S.) for developing country members of the World Trade Organization".

Despite the fact that many groups representing the "traditional knowledge" sector have reservations about being forced to put a price on ideas that they have nurtured for generations, and the fact that for years – in fact, even now – the modern, technologically advanced sectors are virtually usurping ideas and practices without adequate or no compensation, W.I.P.O. says "constructive engagement" will bring progress. "As has happened so often in the past regarding newly discovered or developed forms of protectable subject matter (computer programs, integrated circuits, data bases, for example), constructive engagement with legitimate, if newly articulated needs for protection of human creativity and innovation will enable the formal intellectual property system to contribute effectively to economic growth and social and cultural progress".

Financial stakes are high. For example, in 1995 the estimated market value of pharmaceutical derivatives from indigenous peoples' traditional medicine was US\$43 billion world wide. Under current intellectual property law, there is no obligation for companies which use the traditional medical knowledge of Aboriginal Peoples to provide any compensation to recognize their equity in the commercial application of this knowledge.

Moving beyond the confines of "folklore", which was typically discussed in copyright and copyright-plus terms, traditional knowledge (T.K.) would be broad enough to embrace traditional knowledge of plants and animals in medical treatment and as food, for example. By so doing, the focus shifts from copyright to those of patent law and biodiversity rights. This shift is, in part, an explanation for the suggestions for *sui generis* solutions to the protection of T.K. A W.I.P.O. background paper, in fact, notes that "a particular contemporary impetus for the formulation of Indigenous positions on the protection of traditional knowledge has been the current debate concerning the review of Art. 27.3 (b) of the plant variety provision of the T.R.I.P.S. Agreement".

A number of developing countries (India, Kenya on behalf of the African Group and some of the Latin American countries) have formulated proposals at the W.T.O., in terms of the review of Art. 27.3(b) and current preparations to the Seattle meeting and the review of the relevant provisions of the T.R.I.P.S., rules for the protection of rights of indigenous peoples and their folklore and knowledge. But some leading industrialized countries such as Canada have tried to shift consideration of this to the World Intellectual Property Organization (W.I.P.O.) on the grounds of N.G.Os. having better access to it, even as the industrial countries try to use the secretive W.T.O. talks to strengthen the rights of their corporations in patenting.

The W.I.P.O. background paper also carries excerpts from a statement on the above review by a federation of Indigenous Peoples groups on 25 July, 1999. In fact, it adds that the statement provides a convenient encapsulation of much of the debate on traditional knowledge. The statement begins with the observation that "Humankind is part of Mother Nature, we have created nothing and so we can in no way claim to be owners of what does not belong to us. But time and again, western legal property régimes have been imposed on us, contradicting our own cosmology and values". It expressed concern that Article 27.3 (b) "will further denigrate and undermine our rights to our cultural and intellectual heritage, our plant, animal, and even human genetic resources and discriminate against our indigenous ways of thinking and behaving".

The statement draws the distinction between private proprietary rights and "indigenous knowledge and cultural heritage (which) are collectively and accretionally evolved through generations... The inherent conflict between these two knowledge systems and the manner in which they are protected and used will cause further disintegration of our communal values and practices".

"Obviously," says W.I.P.O., "the statement is largely taken up with issues of access to genetic resources and its promulgators appreciate that notwithstanding their misgivings, the T.R.I.P.S. system has become an established part of the intellectual property firmament". It adds, "However, they plead for a legislative structure which 'builds upon the indigenous methods and customary laws protecting knowledge and heritage and biological resources' and which prevents the appropriation traditional knowledge and integrates 'the principle and practice of prior informed consent, of indigenous peoples' as communities or as collectivities".

A case study of the Philippines, prepared by Mr. David Daoas, Chairperson of the country's National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (also contained in the W.I.P.O. background paper) recounts the many threats posed to traditional systems that sustained health care, environment, agriculture, arts, music and dance. An archipelago of more than 7,000 islands, the Philippines is home to 126 ethno-linguistic groups, most retaining their traditional identity by virtue of non-submission to foreign domination. It is ironic, notes the study, that the Philippines, a rich source of traditional medicine, is a big market of foreign drugs that are often not affordable to the marginalized sectors of society such as the indigenous peoples. "Traditional practice is replaced, worse, it is being commercially exploited in the international market".

From the traditional knowledge on the medicinal values of herbs, pharmaceutical companies have further researched and are now gaining millions worldwide. Recently, the *talong* or eggplant, *ampalaya* or bitter gourd and *makopa* or rose apple were "discovered" to remedy diabetes and are now owned by a U.S. firm (*Baguio Midland Courier*, 19 Sept., 1999). The study notes that the introduction of modern architecture replaced traditional architecture to extinction, while traditional music and designs are being exploited and recognised in fashion centres such as Paris.

"The American occupation at the turn of the 20th century witnessed the drastic change in the Philippine landscape and its population", the study notes. "Devastation of natural resources

was all over with the massive logging and large-scale mining. A legacy perpetuated by Filipinos themselves toward the end of the millennium".

At first, the study adds, "the consciousness of struggle was on warding off physical intrusion into ancestral domains and commercial exploitation of natural resources. The outrage was focused on the wanton display and commercialization of traditional arts and artifacts. Sadly, indigenous peoples themselves helped facilitate the export of materials from indigenous cultural communities". The indigenous peoples were duped, says the study, at the beginning of the century with the introduction of centralized government. "Unlike armed invasion, centralized government is totally a new concept to indigenous peoples. A foreign invasion which amassed indigenous peoples' wealth not with the use of arms but with legalities".

What T.R.I.P.S. would do, it appears, is spread that canvass of legalities worldwide – with the incentive of a few dollars more! For instance, the recent passion for environmental sensitivity in Western countries has resulted in a heightened interest in natural products, the W.I.P.O. paper notes. Australia has a burgeoning "bush tucker" industry guided by the Australian Native Bushfood Industry Committee.

Research into these products has been guided by the knowledge of indigenous peoples. Pharmaceutical, biotechnology and personal care companies, such as The Body Shop, have focused their attention and their advertising upon plants and animals which have been demonstrated by indigenous peoples to have beneficial qualities. This has saved those companies considerable expense in obtaining that knowledge through their own research. A dramatic example of this, notes the W.I.P.O. paper, is the Merck agreement.

In 1991, Merck, a transnational pharmaceutical company, entered into a bio-prospecting agreement with the Costa Rican Association Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidad (I.N.Bio.), a non-profit organization. Under the agreement, which has been criticised by a number of public interest N.G.Os., over a two year period, Merck received 10,000 plant samples. The samples were supplied with information about their traditional use.

Merck has paid a reported US\$1.35 million for the 10,000 samples, and has agreed to pay a royalty of between two to three percent. If one of the 10,000 samples becomes a billion dollar drug, then Merck has agreed to pay US\$20 to US\$30 million in royalties. Conceivably, the royalties from the 10,000 samples could earn Costa Rica well in excess of US\$100 million per annum. In the debate about the protection of T.K., the implied beneficiaries of this protection are traditional peoples. But the truth of the equation is actually quite clearly spelt out in an industry viewpoint, also contained in the background W.I.P.O. paper, which in one of its transparency presentation pages has this clear assertion "NO PATENTS NO BENEFITS."

The W.I.P.O. paper says discussion of protection of T.K. assumes the necessity for this protection and also assumes that the primary beneficiaries of this protection will be indigenous peoples and community groups. However, the state as guardian of its people's cultural heritage also has an interest in the preservation of the traditional knowledge which exists within it.

The various African laws which seek to protect folklore stress its significance as part of the national heritage. "Multiculturalism has begun to replace nationalist uniformity as the new orthodoxy. An incidental beneficiary will be the national state, first from the vigour of cultural health and secondly, from the commercial exploitation of traditional knowledge".

A corollary to the assumption of the necessity to protect T.K., the paper adds, is the assertion of the right of indigenous peoples and traditional communities "to determine the appropriateness of the use being made of their culture". Thus, Dr. Erica-Irene Daes declared that "each indigenous community must retain permanent control over all elements of its own heritage. It may share the right to enjoy and use certain elements of its heritage under its own laws and procedures, but always reserve a perpetual right to determine how shared knowledge is used".

Today, in Australia, indigenous peoples regard the protection of T.K. as an issue of self-determination. For other countries with a less unfortunate colonial history, the issue of who controls the protection and conservation of T.K. might be less politicised. Among the political issues which have been raised in Australia are whether Eurocentric intellectual property law can be trusted with the subject of traditional knowledge. Similarly, it has been

suggested that "a suspicious eye should be cast over any assertion of legal or moral authority by non-indigenous people to adjudicate disputes between traditional and non-traditional artistes".

According to a W.I.P.O. background paper, for W.I.P.O.'s work programme the scope of enquiry extends to all of the tradition-based creativity and innovation of human beings, irrespective of existing terminology or definitions, and the term "traditional knowledge" (T.K.) is used to refer inclusively to all relevant subject matter.

As the United Nations specialized agency responsible for the promotion of intellectual property (I.P.), W.I.P.O. undertook a series of fact-finding missions (F.F.Ms.) "to identify and explore the intellectual property needs and expectations of new beneficiaries, including the holders of indigenous knowledge and innovations, in order to promote the contribution of the intellectual property system to their social, cultural and economic development". These missions were intended to enable the "study of current approaches to, and future possibilities for, the protection of intellectual property rights of holders of indigenous knowledge, innovations and culture".

From the F.F.Ms., W.I.P.O. has learned that T.K. is a rich, diverse source of creativity and innovation. The F.F.Ms. revealed that traditional knowledge systems are frameworks for continuing creativity and innovation in most fields of technology, ranging from traditional medicinal and agricultural practices to music, design, and the graphic and plastic arts. W.I.P.O. also learned from the F.F.Ms. that the I.P. issues related to T.K. cut across the conventional branches of I.P. law, such as copyright and industrial property. In many cases, T.K. holders do not separate "artistic" from "useful" aspects of their intellectual creations and innovations; rather, both emanate from a single belief system which is expressed in daily life and ritual.

The F.F.Ms. also revealed that numerous indigenous and local communities have protocols for protection of T.K. and T.K.-based innovations under customary law. In general, the F.F.Ms. showed the richness and diversity of T.K. on a global scale, both in terms of its inherent creativity and as potential matter for I.P. protection.

W.I.P.O.'s exploratory work has shown that T.K. is a rich source of creativity and innovation. To promote better understanding and promote wider consensus, it would like to address basic conceptual problems and test practical solutions to the protection of T.K. Thus, its future work plan includes a number of activities involving exchange of information and consultation activities on identification and documentation of protectable subject matter, pilot projects and national and regional levels on the use of existing I.P. system to protect T.K., exploration of customary law governing custodianship, use and transmission of T.K. and its relationship to the formal I.P. system.

Proposals of mechanisms for the protection of T.K. have ranged across two axes. Along one axis are suggestions to improve the private law rights of the creators or custodians of T.K. These suggestions range from proposals to modify existing copyright law through to the creation of *sui generis* traditional T.K. rights. Along another axis are suggestions to deal with the protection of T.K. as a public law right. These suggestions range from the formation of a public protection authority, through domain public payment proposals, to the empowerment of indigenous peoples' protection agencies.

Reservations, however, have also been voiced by a number of commentators, the W.I.P.O. paper points out. For example, Rosemary Coombe questions the applicability of private law concepts to cultural expressions. Another paper that was cited questions whether property concepts are cognizable under customary Aboriginal law. Daes explains,

"...indigenous peoples do not view their heritage as property at all – that is something which has an owner and is used for the purpose of extracting economic benefits – but in terms of community and individual responsibility. Possessing a song, story, or medicinal knowledge carries with it certain responsibilities to show respect to and maintain a reciprocal relationship with the human beings, animals, plants and places which the song, story or medicine is connected. For indigenous peoples, heritage is a bundle of relationships rather than a bundle of economic rights".

There is room for conflict between the emerging I.P. régimes for T.K. and the Draft Declaration on the Rights of the Indigenous Peoples (with another meeting just ended in Geneva without final agreement – one of the issues of discord being whether it should have "people" or "peoples").

Article 12 of the Draft Declaration recognised the right of indigenous peoples to "practice and revitalise their cultural traditions and customs, including the right ... to maintain, protect and develop the past, present and future manifestations of their cultures, such as .. artifacts, designs, ceremonies, technologies and visual and performing arts and literature, as well as the right to the restitution of cultural, intellectual, religious and spiritual property taken without their free and informed consent or in violation of their laws, traditions and customs".



Indigenous People Criticise W.I.P.O. Approach

Published by the *South-North Development Monitor* (S.U.N.S.), #4545 (5 November, 1999).

GENEVA, 3 Oct. (by Martin Khor) – Leaders of indigenous people's organisations attending a W.I.P.O. Roundtable meeting on intellectual property and traditional knowledge have criticised the W.I.P.O. approach in attempting to impose an intellectual property rights régime on traditional knowledge. They called on W.I.P.O., governments and other multilateral organisations to explore other ways to protect and promote indigenous and traditional knowledge outside of the traditional I.P.R. régime.

Several indigenous people's representatives who participated in the W.I.P.O. roundtable in Geneva (1-2 November) were critical of many of the papers presented and of what they perceived to be W.I.P.O.'s attempt to co-opt indigenous knowledge into the global patent and I.P.R. system. They spoke up often at the meeting to voice their viewpoints.

More than a hundred indigenous people's organisations separately issued a statement calling on governments to amend the T.R.I.P.S. Agreement, Article 27.3 (b), to mandatorily ban the patenting of all life-forms, all naturally occurring processes, and of traditional knowledge on the use of biological resources. Near the end of the W.I.P.O. Roundtable, the Indigenous Peoples Caucus, representing the indigenous peoples present at the meeting, issued a Statement that was orally presented by Victoria Tauli-Corpuz of the Tebtebba Foundation, an international indigenous people's research centre based in the Philippines.

"We are concerned over the way in which this present Roundtable is organized", said Tauli-Corpuz. "It seems that this was primarily organized to reinforce the mandate of W.I.P.O. to promote and implement the dominant intellectual property rights régime and to assert that intellectual property rights is the only viable path to protect traditional knowledge. However, we have heard many interventions from this meeting saying that intellectual property rights as embodied in the existing international conventions and the T.R.I.P.S. of W.T.O. may not be the adequate and appropriate mechanisms to protect indigenous and traditional knowledge".

Tauli-Corpuz said that W.I.P.O., governments and other international organisations should "maintain an open mind and be more daring" in exploring ways and means to protect and promote indigenous and traditional knowledge outside the dominant I.P.R. régimes.

"W.I.P.O. should not insist in imposing that the I.P.R. régime it is implementing, particularly patents, is what should be used to protect traditional knowledge. Other forms of protection should be explored and developed in partnership with indigenous peoples and other traditional knowledge holders. Any effort to negotiate a multilateral framework to protect indigenous and traditional knowledge should consider indigenous practices and customary laws used to protect and nurture indigenous knowledge in the local, national, and regional levels".

Tauli-Corpuz reiterated the call of indigenous peoples all over the world against patenting of life forms and life-creating processes, referring to the statement of over a hundred indigenous people's groups opposing patenting of life in T.R.I.P.S., which she said was consistent with several proposals put forward by developing countries during the W.T.O. preparatory process for Seattle.

Tauli-Corpuz said the indigenous people took exception to a statement at the Roundtable by a representative of a European transnational corporation that there is no incompatibility between the C.B.D. and the T.R.I.P.S. Agreement.

"We believe there is a serious conflict on the rights and obligations of member-states between the two treaties, particularly between Article 8 (j) of the C.B.D. and Article 27.3.(b) of the T.R.I.P.S. Agreement. Article 8 (j) calls on governments to respect, preserve, and maintain knowledge, innovations, and practices of indigenous and local communities in biodiversity conservation and encourage equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of such knowledge. On the other hand, Article 27.3.(b) of T.R.I.P.S. legitimizes private property rights in the form of intellectual property over life and processes entailed in modifying life forms. But these are rights for individuals, corporations, and states, not for indigenous peoples and local communities. Governments are asked to change their national intellectual property rights laws to allow for patenting of micro-organisms and non-biological and micro-biological processes".

Tauli-Corpuz added that many developing country governments recognize this incompatibility and in fact they already tabled proposals on this which can be found in the Revised Draft of the W.T.O. Ministerial Text. She referred to a paragraph of the draft stating that Article 27.3.(b) should be amended to take into account the C.B.D. and the need to clarify that all living organisms and their parts cannot be patented; and to ensure the protection of innovations of indigenous and local farming communities and the continuation of traditional farming practices.

She also reiterated that any discussion on traditional and indigenous knowledge should always refer to the articles on the Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, particularly Articles 24, 25, 26, and 29 which clearly established that rights to indigenous knowledge, innovations, and practices (referred to as intellectual and cultural heritage) cannot be discussed in isolation from indigenous peoples' rights to their territories and resources.

"We see a problem in the fact that while on one hand the U.N. is evolving international standards for the protection of indigenous peoples, and efforts are made to protect traditional knowledge through the C.B.D. and FAO International Undertaking, on the other hand there are other international agreements such as the W.T.O. Agreements which are undermining these".

The statement called on W.I.P.O. to undertake studies on the most appropriate means of recognizing and protecting traditional knowledge, medicinal plants, seeds, and expressions of folklore of indigenous peoples and local communities.

On W.I.P.O.'s technical assistance, the statement proposed that indigenous peoples who are the knowledge holders should become the main trainers, and that indigenous peoples organizations and communities should be provided resources from W.I.P.O. to undertake their own capacity-building efforts to protect and promote their knowledge.

"Prior Informed Consent should be the common thread among all the proposals being brought forth to protect indigenous knowledge, whether these are intellectual or non-intellectual property rights protection. P.I.C. is defined to mean that indigenous peoples and local communities will be consulted, informed and their full consent obtained before any appropriation or research of their knowledge is undertaken", the statement added.

"There should be a list of all the knowledge, genetic resources, medicinal plants, seeds, etc., which have been stolen from indigenous peoples and some form of indemnification may be given to those who own and developed this knowledge. This can be put into a fund which will help further build indigenous peoples' capacities. The arts and artifacts which were also stolen should be repatriated to the original owners.

"We call on the W.I.P.O. to establish a mechanism within its structures that will allow for more meaningful participation of indigenous peoples. Other specialized of the U.N. are already undertaking dialogues with indigenous peoples towards the formulation of policy guidelines on indigenous peoples. Since W.I.P.O. claims it is the body which has a key rôle in traditional knowledge, then it should also formulate its own guidelines".

About this listserver - BIO-I.P.R. is an irregular listserver put out by Genetic Resources Action International (G.R.A.I.N.). For general information about G.R.A.I.N., kindly visit our web site <www.grain.org/> or write to us at <grain@bcn.servicom.es>.



In spite of international efforts, biopiracy continues... - Luisa.

From: Julio Cesar Centeno <Jcenteno@Telcel.net.ve>

Negociacion Conocimientos Yanomami Sin Su Consentimiento

(10 Nov., 1999)

El Ministerio del Ambiente, en representación de la República de Venezuela, se hace partícipe de un inusitado despojo del conocimiento ancestral de las comunidades Yanomami. - Julio César Centeno, Ph.D.

El Ministerio del Ambiente de Venezuela firmó un contrato con la Universidad Federal de Zurich, Suiza, en el que otorga derechos de acceso a los recursos genéticos y a recursos "intangibles" del territorio Yanomami. Los "intangibles" incluyen los conocimientos y prácticas ancestrales de las comunidades indígenas.

La Organización de Pueblos Indígenas del Amazonas (O.R.P.I.A.) ha denunciado que este compromiso fue contraído sin la debida notificación a las poblaciones Yanomami, y sin su consentimiento. El contrato es un inusitado saqueo de los conocimientos ancestrales de los Yanomami y de la biodiversidad genética de su territorio.

El contrato cuenta con un permiso firmado por Horacio Biord, mientras fungía temporalmente como Director Encargado de la Dirección de Asuntos Indígenas (D.A.I.) del Ministerio de Educación. Aparentemente, el convenio también cuenta con el aval del Herbario de la Universidad Central de Venezuela.

Regalias, Patentes y Beneficios por Comercializacion

El contrato explícitamente le otorga al colegio Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule (E.T.H.) de Zürich, Suiza, una concesión para el acceso a los recursos genéticos y sus productos derivados "...con fines de investigación, prospección biológica, conservación, aplicación industrial y aprovechamiento industrial, entre otros".

El contrato también incluye el acceso y aprovechamiento, en los mismos términos, de los componentes intangibles. Estos se definen de la siguiente manera: "Todo conocimiento, innovación o práctica, individual o colectiva, con valor real o potencial, asociado al recurso genético o sus productos derivados, o al recurso biológico que lo contiene, protegido o no por regímenes de propiedad intelectual".

La entrega es total. En ninguno de los documentos anexos al contrato se menciona la posibilidad de registrar patentes de comercio e industrialización. Pero el contrato final sí incluye esta posibilidad. Los posibles beneficios se reparten entre la Universidad Federal de Zurich y el Ministerio del Ambiente de Venezuela. El Ministerio se ha conformado con el 20% "...de los derechos de regalías por patentes, comercialización e industrialización de los productos o sustancias que se deriven de las investigaciones y descubrimientos del uso de los recursos genéticos otorgados en concesión al E.T.H.". El 80% restante es para los Suizos.

Los indígenas fueron excluidos de las negociaciones de sus propios conocimientos y prácticas ancestrales. Fueron también excluidos en la repartición de los beneficios que pudieran derivarse. El contrato deja unilateralmente a juicio del E.T.H. la decisión final sobre el otorgamiento a los indígenas de un porcentaje de los beneficios derivados del contrato de concesión, a través de posibles negociaciones directas con los indígenas, sin la participación del estado venezolano. De esta manera, el Ministerio del Ambiente, en representación de todos los venezolanos, se hace partícipe de un grotesco e inusitado despojo del conocimiento ancestral de las comunidades Yanomami. La negociación establece además una profunda desigualdad en la distribución de los beneficios comerciales o industriales que pudieran derivarse del aprovechamiento de la biodiversidad existente en el territorio Yanomami.

Los Yanomami se encuentran localizados en el corazón del Amazonas, en donde los índices de biodiversidad se encuentran entre los más altos registrados en el mundo. Su cultura se ha desarrollado en estrecha vinculación con su entorno natural, acumulando conocimientos y refinando sus relaciones con las selvas que les sirven de hogar durante cerca de 20.000 años. Venezuela es uno de los ocho países más ricos en diversidad genética del mundo. Esta diversidad se encuentra estrechamente vinculada a los bosques naturales del país. Una de las zonas más ricas en biodiversidad es precisamente el Alto Orinoco.

La Co-ordinadora de Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazónica (C.O.I.C.A.) ha establecido que los conocimientos tradicionales de los pueblos indígenas no pueden ni deben ser patentados. C.O.I.C.A. es una organización que agrupa a los pueblos indígenas de los ocho países que comparten el territorio Amazonas. Los Yanomami venezolanos no sólo no fueron ni informados ni consultados sobre el contenido y alcance de la investigación. Sus legítimos derechos sobre sus propios conocimientos ancestrales, y sobre los recursos genéticos en sus territorios, fueron ignorados.

Para añadir injuria, el insólito contrato incluye un pago de 30% de su costo "para las comunidades indígenas involucradas cuyo conocimiento está siendo utilizado". El costo del contrato se establece en 30.000 francos suizos, unos 18.000 dólares. Ese pago es además negociable, por lo que podría al final convertirse en el motor de una lancha, o cualquier otra cosa.

A la Directora de Vegetación del Ministerio del Ambiente, Delfina Rodríguez, quien agilizará la autorización del contrato por parte de ese ministerio, extrañó el rechazo de las organizaciones indígenas. Según ella "el contrato recoge una cantidad de beneficios, incluso económicos, para los Yanomami".

Marco de Referencia

Unos 15.000 Yanomami viven en la Reserva de la Biósfera Alto Orinoco de Venezuela, con una superficie de 8.3 millones de hectáreas, aproximadamente del tamaño de Portugal. Los Yanomami venezolanos representan más de la mitad de toda esta etnia. Otros 10.000, aproximadamente, viven en un territorio contiguo, al otro lado de la frontera, en Brasil. Las investigaciones se realizan entre los Yanomami venezolanos a través del colegio Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule (E.T.H.) de Zürich, Suiza. El trabajo sirve de tesis para optar al título de Doctor de la Universidad de Zurich por parte Jürg Gertsch.

El Congreso Nacional aprobó una nueva Ley de Biodiversidad el año pasado. Pero, coincidentemente, el presidente Caldera la devolvió a la Procuraduría "para su estudio". En el período intermedio se agiliza la entrega de los permisos necesarios para realizar esta investigación, cuando el país carece de legislación adecuada sobre la materia. Los planteamientos fundamentales del proyecto de Ley de Biodiversidad fueron ignorados.

El contrato lo firma Rafael Martínez Monro, Ministro del Ambiente, en representación de la República de Venezuela, sólo días antes de la toma de posesión del presidente Hugo Chávez, quien arriba al poder con el claro mandato de la inmensa mayoría de los venezolanos para que erradique la corrupción e impulse una transformación a fondo del estado y sus mecanismos de gobierno. El Ministerio del Ambiente se caracterizó por ser uno de los brazos más corruptos de la administración del presidente Rafael Caldera. En representación del E.T.H. aparece la firma de su vice-presidente, Albert Waldvogel.

Que Es Lo Que Se Busca?

El objetivo central del trabajo es, curiosamente, comprobar "...si los indígenas Yanomami utilizan plantas medicinales". Lo que es obvio para cualquier investigador con un mínimo de experiencia con el pueblo Yanomami, se presenta como una complicada teoría científica que es necesario demostrar, de suficiente profundidad como para que su demostración merezca un doctorado de una de las universidades más prestigiosas de Europa, la Universidad de Zurich.

Stephen S. Tillett, Curador del Herbario de la Facultad de Farmacia de la Universidad Central de Venezuela, y defensor del proyecto, señala "Nunca he estado de acuerdo con la hipótesis de que los yanomami carecen de plantas medicinales". Añade: "Yo estoy de la opinión de que hay varios otros grupos étnicos en vísperas de extinción que serían mucho más apropiados estudiar...pero yo no soy el tutor" (sic.).

El uso de plantas medicinales por parte de los Yanomami no es ningún secreto, ni es una teoría que necesite demostración científica. Es un hecho cultural asociado a sus creencias, estrechamente vinculadas a que para nosotros es "magia". Los Yanomami viven en un mundo muy diferente al nuestro, estrechamente vinculado a otro mundo sobrenatural. El efecto curativo de una "medicina" occidental y el bebedizo de una planta "mágica" es, en ese mundo, algo que bordea en lo absurdo. La distinción entre "medicina" y "magia" es mas un problemas de los "diablos blancos", los que se empeñan en rígidas definiciones "científicas". También dicen que lo que no este escrito en ese idioma "científico" de ellos es porque no existe. Por eso dicen que el mundo sobrenatural de los Yanomami tampoco existe.

Pero aun imponiendo nuestra visión y nuestros valores, en donde la separación entre medicinas, magia y curación de enfermedades pretende ser mas "clara", el uso de plantas medicinales por los Yanomami es un hecho reportado en la literatura especializada (Fuentes 1980; Brewer Carías 1991; Estrella 1996, entre otros). Evidente para quien los haya conocido, especialmente cuando el juicio tama en consideración su propia visión del universo.

Pero la investigación también contempla otros aspectos "secundarios". Para confirmar el uso de planta medicinales por los Yanomami, el estudio incluye la comprobación fitoquímica del potencial medicinal de esas plantas. Algunos de los análisis fitoquímicos y biológicos se harían en la Facultad de Farmacia de la Universidad Central de Venezuela. Los demás en Suiza.

El proyecto incluye, además:

- El análisis de "... la distribución de las plantas medicinales, los venenos y las plantas mágicas entre los Yanomami".
- Una determinación de la distribución de los recursos botánicos medicinales en el territorio Yanomami.
- Una evaluación cuantitativa de esos recursos.
- Un análisis de las estrategias culturales de los Yanomami para el manejo de estos recursos.

El proyecto incluye, en realidad, una compilación de la farmacopea Yanomami en Venezuela.

Los conocimientos ancestrales del pueblo Yanomami sobre plantas medicinales, venenos y plantas mágicas, son también parte del estudio. Con este propósito se incluyen entrevistas de los investigadores con los Yanomami "...sobre el uso y cuidado de plantas medicinales".

Ley de Biodiversidad

Es evidente que Venezuela debe agilizar la aprobación de una ley para la administración, protección y aprovechamiento de su biodiversidad. Es uno de los países mas ricos en recursos genéticos del mundo. Una ley que reconozca y administre con destreza el valor económico y estratégico de esa diversidad genética. Una ley que además proteja a la Nación de decisiones apresuradas, interesadas o negligentes sobre la materia.

Debemos además reconocer derechos fundamentales de las comunidades indígenas, en términos compatibles con principios elementales de dignidad y de justicia, así como con los acuerdos internacionales que Venezuela haya suscrito y que esten directa o indirectamente relacionados con los derechos de los indígenas.

Sin embargo, la falta de instrumentos legislativos adecuados no justifica que el gobierno llegue a acuerdos como este, sin consultar con los indígenas y sin reconocerles sus derechos mas elementales. Fueron ignorados en la fase de preparación y negociación del proyecto, cuando el gobierno acuerda con un ente extranjero el acceso a sus propios conocimientos tradicionales, con fines potencialmente comerciales, sin ser consultados al respecto.

El Gobierno autoriza la presencia de investigadores extranjeros en territorio indígena, investigándolos a ellos mismos y a los recursos naturales de su lugar de vida, con fines potencialmente comerciales, mientras que les niega a esos mismos indígenas el derecho a compartir directamente los beneficios que estas actividades puedan generar.

La dignidad indígena fue insultada al establecerse en el contrato la repartición de una "limosna", equivalente a unos 5 mil dólares, para "...los que colaboren con la investigación". Una actitud chantajista y generadora de divisiones en la comunidad indígena.

El Ministerio del Ambiente se apoderó del valor tanto de los recursos genéticos como de los conocimientos tradicionales de la población Yanomami, al incluir en el contrato que es el Ministerio el que puede recibir compensaciones económicas por concepto de regalías, y compartir los beneficios que puedan derivarse de la comercialización de productos.

A los Yanomami, por el contrario, se les niega un reconocimiento similar, el derecho a recibir regalías por los beneficios económicos que puedan derivarse de sus propios conocimientos tradicionales, o por el aprovechamiento comercial de productos por ellos identificados, probados en sus propios cuerpos para diferentes fines. Este derecho ha sido explícitamente relegado a un plano secundario y posterior, sujeto a la buena voluntad de los Suizos. Una buena voluntad que queda severamente cuestionada por la forma en que se adelanta y acuerda esta negociación, sin la participación de los indígenas.

Se han negociado los conocimientos de los Yanomami sobre la selva a la que pertenecen, con la que mantienen inusitados vínculos y relaciones ancestrales. Sus conocimientos sobre las selvas que les dan vida, que consideran su hogar, que protegen sus espíritus y los de sus muertos. Las selvas que tanto quieren, que ni siquiera las consideran suyas. Las perciben más como las selvas de sus hijos y de sus nietos. Ellos sólo están administrándolas, temporalmente. Es lo más valioso que le van a dejar a sus descendientes.

Las riquezas de estas selvas no son ni pueden ser de otros. Menos de los diablos blancos.

Julio Cesar Centeno, Ph.D.
P.O. Box 750
Merida - Venezuela.

Tel.: + 58-74-714576
FAX: + 58-74-713814
E-mail: Jcenteno@Telcel.net.ve
Web: www.ciens.ula.ve/~jcenteno/



From: GRAIN Los Banos <grain@baylink.mozcom.com>
Via Preston D. Hardison <prestonh@home.com>

North-South Divide Splits T.R.I.P.S. Council

By the International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (I.C.T.S.D.). Published by Bridges Weekly Trade News Digest, Vol. 3, Number 42 (25 October, 1999). Source: I.C.T.S.D. and Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy (I.A.T.P.) (Bridges can be found on the I.C.T.S.D. Web page <www.ictsd.org/html/newsdigest.htm> and the I.A.T.P. Web page <www.newsbulletin.org>.

The W.T.O. Council on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (T.R.I.P.S.) met from 20-22 October, 1999. Inter alia, the agenda for the meeting included a review of the provisions of Article 27.3(b) of the T.R.I.P.S. Agreement.

Article 27.3(b) of T.R.I.P.S. calls for W.T.O. Members to protect intellectual property over plant varieties either by patent or by an effective *sui generis* system, or by a combination of the two. Developing countries have until January 2000 to comply with T.R.I.P.S. obligations to protect the rights of developers of new plant varieties. As part of the Uruguay Round, W.T.O. Members agreed to review Article 27.3(b) in 1999 – in advance of developing countries' implementation deadline. Developing countries are under pressure to adopt the 1991 International Convention for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (U.P.O.V. 1991) as the mechanism to fulfil their 27.3(b) obligations (see *Bridges Weekly Trade News Digest*, Volume 3, No. 15 & 16, 26 April, 1999).

At the meeting, the U.S. and India each submitted a major paper concerning Article 27.3(b). The U.S. recommended their own patent-based model to other Members, arguing that an effective intellectual property protection system has been beneficial in stimulating research and development. The U.S. warned other Members that any *sui generis* model for plant variety protection not modelled on U.P.O.V.-1991 would need to be looked at on a case-by-case basis.

India's paper focused on aspects of traditional knowledge and the problems associated with handling intellectual property in this area due to its strong oral tradition, as opposed to many developed countries' focus on text-based intellectual property. With respect to the forthcoming review of Article 27.3(b), India advised developing countries to wait before implementing *sui generis* systems, as the only model offered so far was that of the developed countries.

India's views were for the most part supported by a Kenyan paper and by a group of developing countries that included Pakistan, Egypt, Brazil, Ecuador, Peru, and Paraguay.

Siding for the most part with the U.S., the E.U. argued that there is no conflict between T.R.I.P.S. and Members' commitments under the U.N. Convention on Biodiversity (C.B.D.). The C.B.D. obliges its signatories – to which the U.S. is not a party – to respect, preserve, and maintain knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities. The E.U. disagreed with India that traditional knowledge was within the scope of Article 27.3(b), and pointed out that the World Intellectual Property Organisation (W.I.P.O.) was currently working on this area.

The E.U.-U.S. side was supported for the most part by developed countries, including Switzerland, Canada, Japan, Australia, and Korea.

Overall, Members agreed to continue the Article 27.3(b) review process in 2000, with the T.R.I.P.S. Council Chair holding periodic informal meetings with delegates in an attempt to broker broad-based agreement. Many proposals relating to negotiations on T.R.I.P.S. have been included in the latest draft of the W.T.O. Seattle Ministerial Declaration. Amongst these is a 12 October proposal from Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Nicaragua and Peru on protection of I.P.Rs. relating to the traditional knowledge of local and indigenous communities. The proposal advocates for negotiations to establish a multilateral legal framework "that will grant effective protection to the expressions and manifestations of traditional knowledge".

Also in the news, India is reported to be considering contesting a U.S. patent on a plant-based treatment for diabetes. The U.S. granted a patent in July to a U.S.-based pharmaceutical company for a diabetes remedy based on eggplant, bitter melon and jamun. Indian officials say the remedy has been used as a treatment in diabetes in India for years, and has been well documented in a number of Indian texts on medicinal plants. The Indian Minister of State and Agriculture and Water Resources Shri Sompal called the U.S. patent an "onslaught on the traditional knowledge and practices prevalent in the developing countries," and called on the W.T.O. to institute rules protecting indigenous products and knowledge from poaching by foreign companies. ("India may contest U.S. patent on diabetic remedy", E.N.S., 27 August, 1999. I.C.T.S.D. Internal Files).

About this listserver – BIO-I.P.R. is an irregular listserver put out by Genetic Resources Action International (G.R.A.I.N.). For general information about G.R.A.I.N., kindly visit our Web site at <www.grain.org> or write to us at <grain@bcn.servicom.es>.

Reprinted under the Fair Use <www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/17/107.html> doctrine of international copyright law.



From: Luisa Maffi <maffi@nwu.edu>

U.N.E.P. and Biocultural Diversity

(23 Nov., 1999). I'm still recovering from the A.A.A. meetings, but I wanted to send some information that seems very relevant to one of the topics that were discussed (or rather lamented) at the meetings: the lack of communication between ecological anthropologists and biodiversity conservationists. At the meetings I suggested that, this being the case, it might be a good idea to try and do something about it by actually starting a dialogue between these parties – among other things, by organizing a highly visible panel at the next A.A.A. meetings (whose topic is, fittingly, "The public face of anthropology"). I hope there will be a follow-up on this – and I'll be happy to pitch in on it. Meanwhile, as a way of providing some

encouragement, here's some news that seems to indicate that, if we do make serious efforts to communicate, maybe someone will listen.

I'm enclosing below a news item I received from Nick Ostler (President of the Foundation for Endangered Languages, FEL) entitled "Environmental destruction a threat to languages: U.N. Environment Programme", in which U.N.E.P. officials are reported to be making the case for integrated protection of biocultural (and specifically linguistic) diversity. (This piece appeared in the F.E.L. newsletter *Ogmios* #12, 1999). I was doubly pleased to read the piece "Environmental destruction a threat to languages: U.N. Environment Programme" – doubly because:

1) It's obviously great to find out that the foremost international environmental organization is taking the view that protection of the environment should go hand in hand with protection of cultural and linguistic diversity – a view which, as you may know, I have been working hard to promote for the past several years, in my own writings and through the activities of my N.G.O., Terralingua: partnerships for linguistic and biological diversity;

2) I have pretty good reasons to believe I'm the ultimate source of the U.N.E.P. statement (reported in the mentioned news piece) that "There is remarkable overlap between the mappings of the world's areas of biological megadiversity and areas of high cultural and linguistic diversity". Here's how. U.N.E.P. has just published the book *Cultural and Spiritual Values of Biodiversity* ed. by Darrell Posey (see below). In that book, I am co-ordinator and co-author of the chapter "Linguistic Diversity" (the other authors being Tove Skutnabb-Kangas and Jonah Andrianarivo), which extensively propounds that very argument. Furthermore, in one of my sections in that chapter, referring to Dave Harmon's cross-mappings of biological and linguistic diversity, I say: "Harmon (1996a)* has shown remarkable overlaps between the world's biological and linguistic diversity..."

* (Harmon, David 1996. "Losing species, losing languages: connections between biological and linguistic diversity". *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 15: 89-108).

I noted with total amazement that Klaus Toepfer, executive director of U.N.E.P., makes special mention of this chapter in his foreword to the book, stressing the importance of cultural diversity and the consequences of language loss. So the likelihood that the U.N.E.P. statements below were prompted by this book and by the linguistic diversity chapter in particular seems rather high... The book's foreword is extremely supportive overall – which, along with the news piece below, does suggest that the case for biocultural diversity may indeed begin to be heard in high places... The true test, of course, is mobilization of money and other resources, pressure on member states to conform, etc., etc... A long way still, but this is an incredible step forward. It is both rewarding and humbling to see this happen, after several years that my Terralingua colleagues and myself have been making this argument extensively, both in writing and in all possible public fora we could get ourselves to – and above all, I hope this may spell greater action aimed at the joint conservation of biological, cultural, and linguistic diversity.

Following the news item, you'll find the information on Darrell's book.

All the best, Luisa Maffi.

i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i

Nick Ostler kindly sent us the electronic version of the piece in question (from *Ogmios* #12, 1999):

"Environmental destruction a threat to languages: U.N. Environment Programme", 7 Sep., 1999 ((c) 1999 *The Nation*.) Distributed via *Africa News Online* by Africa News Service.

Nairobi – The diversity of languages is being eroded by the unabating destruction of the environment, the United Nations Environment Programme has said. U.N.E.P. says the loss of linguistic diversity represents a huge loss in intellectual resources, necessary for solving the world's abounding problems such as poverty.

"Each culture and language is a unique tool for analysing and synthesising the world," Dr. Klaus Toepfer, the executive director of U.N.E.P. says.

"To lose such a tool is to forget a way of constructing reality, to blot out the perspective evolved over many generations," he said.

According to U.N.E.P.'s biodiversity programme manager, Mr. Bai-Mass Taal, there are close to 7,000 documented languages worldwide. Of these, up to 5,000 belong to indigenous people who represent the most culturally and linguistically diverse peoples of the world. And of all the languages presently spoken, 2,500 are in danger of extinction, a threat now recognised as a worldwide crisis, Mr. Taal said in commemoration of the fifth International Day of the World's Indigenous Peoples on August 9.

The International Day for the World's Indigenous Day was launched in 1994 by the United Nations to raise awareness on the plight of this marginalised group of people, and their untapped traditional wisdom. The U.N. also inaugurated the international decade for indigenous peoples which runs to 2004.

According to Mr. Taal, these two initiatives were intended to give indigenous peoples, such as the Ogiek, a voice in national socio-economic and political affairs, and therefore give them choices and greater opportunities in life. Mr. Taal told journalists there were 300 million indigenous peoples scattered in more than 70 countries worldwide who live in the environmental hotspots of the world. These areas, their homes, are threatened by over-exploitation of their great biological diversity, and habitat destruction.

"There is remarkable overlap between the mappings of the world's areas of biological megadiversity and areas of high cultural and linguistic diversity," U.N.E.P. says. "Unfortunately, these are the areas where biodiversity loss has been the most dramatic," he said.

He says the destruction of forests and other natural ecosystems has ejected indigenous peoples from their homes, forcing them to migrate to urban areas and other places where they could eke a living. Their dispersal this way breaks down community structures and cultures which promote the use of indigenous languages. The decimation of indigenous languages breaks down a vital channel for passing on indigenous knowledge and wisdom, an under-developed repository for traditional, herbal remedies, for example.

As global socio-economic factors disrupt traditional ways of life, indigenous peoples are abandoning traditional behaviours, indigenous knowledge and their languages which are the repositories and means of transmission of knowledge on preserving biodiversity and promoting sustainability", U.N.E.P. says. The loss of language and culture destroys self-worth, limiting the potential of the affected peoples and complicating efforts aimed at addressing vices such as the breakdown of family structures, substance abuse, school failures and dropouts.

i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i

Following up on this, Darrell Posey sent the following comments:

"Nicholas,

Thanks for sending the article along...it is a good sign. I hope the *Cultural and Spiritual Values of Biodiversity* book, in which I insisted in putting as the lead chapter that of Luisa and Tove, might have had something to do with U.N.E.P.'s waking up to these important issues. Best wishes, D.A.P."

i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i

Finally, Luisa Maffi sent the following message, pointing out that it is ever more apparent that the main source of the statements in the news piece above must have been Darrell Posey's book *Cultural and Spiritual Values of Biodiversity* (and the linguistic diversity chapter therein):

Dear Terralingua Colleagues,

This is to let you all know that Darrell Posey's edited book, *Cultural and Spiritual Values of Biodiversity*, is finally out. As you know, the book is published for the United Nations Environment Programme, as a complement to U.N.E.P.'s 1995 Global Biodiversity Assessment. It is almost as massive, and certainly no less impressive! Over 730 large-size pp., some 300 contributors if I counted right – beside everything else that it represents, the book is most certainly a monument to Darrell's commitment and perseverance!

The foreword by Klaus Toepfer, executive director of U.N.E.P., is extremely supportive – which, along with the news piece Nick Ostler of the Foundation for Endangered Languages forwarded to us a few days ago, does suggest that the case for biocultural diversity may indeed begin to be heard in high places... The full reference is:

Posey, Darrell (ed.). 1999. *Cultural and Spiritual Values of Biodiversity*.
London/Nairobi: Intermediate
Technology Publications/U.N.E.P.

The table of contents is as follows (note that for each chapter only the chapter co-ordinator is mentioned, but each chapter has a number of contributors):

Ch. 1 - Introduction: Culture and Nature – The Inextricable Link (Darrell Posey)
Ch. 2 - Linguistic diversity (Luisa Maffi)
Ch. 3 - Indigenous Peoples, Their Environments and Territories (Andrew Gray)
Ch. 4 - Voices of the Earth (Ranil Senenayake)
Ch. 5 - Ethnoscience, T.E.K., and its Applications to Conservation (L. Jan Slikkerveer)
Ch. 6 - Valuing Biodiversity for Human Health and Well-being: traditional health systems (Gerard Bodeker)
Ch. 7 - Traditional Agriculture and Soil Management (Kristina Plenderleith)
Ch. 8 - Mountains: the heights of biodiversity (Edwin Bernbaum)
Ch. 9 - Forests, Culture, and Conservation (Sarah Laird)
Ch. 10 - Aquatic and Marine Biodiversity (Paul Chambers)
Ch. 11 - Ethical, Moral, and Religious Concerns (Jeff Golliher)
Ch. 12 - Rights, Resources, and Responses (Graham Dutfield)
Conclusion – Maintaining the Mosaic (Darrell Posey)

This is preceded by various prefatory matters and followed by several appendices, including indigenous declarations and faith statements on religion and ecology.

Of most direct concern for Terralingua is, of course, the linguistic diversity chapter, whose contributors are Luisa Maffi, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, and Jonah Andrianarivo. To order the book, contact I.T.P. at 103/105 Southampton Row, London WC1B 4HH. U.K.



From: Luisa Maffi <maffi@nwu.edu>

U.N.E.S.C.O./I.C.S.U. and Biocultural Diversity

Dear all,

Following up on my previous message re. U.N.E.P. and its embracing the bio-cult-ling diversity perspective, here's another victory for that perspective. I finally managed to read the text of the "Science Agenda – Framework for Action" put out last July by the U.N.E.S.C.O.-International Council for Science (I.C.S.U.) conference "Science for the 21st. century: a new commitment" (Budapest, 26 June-1 July, 1999) – a big-time document that is already being widely commented upon. Paragraph 86, under section 3.4 "Modern science and other systems of knowledge", reads:

86. Governmental and non-governmental organizations should sustain traditional knowledge systems through active support of the societies that are keepers and

developers of this knowledge, their ways of life, their languages [my emphasis], their social organization and the environments in which they live, and fully recognize the contribution of women as repositories of a large part of traditional knowledge.

More evidence that the argument some of us have been making for the past several years is beginning to be heard internationally! Other paragraphs also speak about the relationship between modern science and traditional knowledge. I find major contradictions within the document regarding how to conceive of what "science" is to begin with, but I do think this is a significant step forward. Now, of course, the proof is in the local pudding, so to speak: i.e., in what action will be taken by national governments, regional and local institutions, etc., to actually promote and support this perspective. Only means more work for us...

(The document can be found at <www.U.N.E.S.C.O.org/science/wcs/eng/declaration_e.htm> [note: it's declaration_e.] and <www.U.N.E.S.C.O.org/science/wcs/eng/framework.htm>).



From: Aroha Mead <meada@tpk.govt.nz>:

Kia ora,

There were a number of us who worked very hard to include appropriate language on the indigenous knowledge and intellectual property issues in the U.N.E.S.C.O. Declaration and on the Framework for Action. It was a process that began a considerable time before the Budapest Conference took place and involved continued input into the drafting of the original documents. This effort was followed up through the effective lobbying at the Budapest Conference itself and through the direct participation of indigenous representatives ourselves in the final drafting committee of the U.N.E.S.C.O. Conference. We also convened a workshop on the ethics of accessing traditional knowledge and this workshop provided the final text which made its way into the Declaration on Science.

Luisa Maffi's response: thank you very much for this information. There's nothing like e-mail for piecing puzzles together quickly! I had not read any reports on what went into preparing the conference and the ensuing documents, so didn't know there was indigenous contribution – which, needless to say, I'm now delighted to learn about! To do justice to this, I'll forward the first part of your message to the lists to which I sent the previous one. Again, many thanks for your contribution!



From: subscriptions@wigsat.org (subscriptions)
Via: Endangered Lang. List

U.N.E.S.C.O./I.C.S.U. and Biocultural Diversity

I would like to mention the work of the gender advocacy group at the World Conference on Science in Budapest, which worked hard at and was very successful in having references made to women's activities and contributions – including the value of traditional knowledge. The groups involved were U.N.I.F.E.M., the Once and Future Action Network, the Gender Advisory Board of the U.N. Commission on Science and Technology for Development and Women in Global Science and Technology. The latter group was responsible for the phrase "...fully recognize the contribution of women as repositories of a large part of traditional knowledge". I can say this because we contributed that line to the U.N.I.F.E.M./U.N.E.S.C.O. contributed document revisions.

For more information on gender activities in S. & T. and indigenous knowledge, I invite you to visit our Web sites at <www.wigsat.org/ofan/ofan.html>, <www.wigsat.org> or <gab.wigsat.org>.

Sophia Huyer
Executive Director

Tel.: (905) 349-9962
FAX: (905) 349-2066

Women in Global Science and Technology
623 Brimley Road
Grafton, Ontario K0K 2G0. Canada.

E-mail: shuyer@wigsat.org



From: Herman Scholz <zanibar@hotmail.com>

Letters from Borneo

(23 Nov., 1999)

[Published with the permission of the author. Relevant portions from several letters from Herman have been interspersed amongst the main text; such portions are indicated with italics and brackets].

Dear Luisa,

It must be ages since my last letter to you. After our annual 4x4 expedition, I went on a holiday! Only imagine, a holiday! Well, there was just one way I could afford it: my boss was out for a few days, and when he called the office I casually told him that I was thinking of having a few days off. He said: "go ahead", and so I did, and a month later I came back - it is the Borneo way. Hopefully, for once, we have no business at the moment.

I was in Sarawak, in Niah, where Tom Harrison and his wife Barbara, in the early days of Malaysia, discovered the oldest human skull in Asia. Since then, nothing had been done again on this exciting site. Barbara also discovered an ancient burial site with plenty of boat-shaped coffins and mural drawings.

[From a later message: "the skull had been discovered in February 1958. Tom Harrison (that seems to be the proper spelling of his name) was then Curator of the Sarawak Museum, and Director of the excavations. The death boats date from the early centuries A.D. (I have all the information from the latest issue of Borneo Magazine, which I happened to buy, incidentally, just before I went to Niah, and I thought it already lost in some of the caves - I finally found it)].

The site is praised, and sold, as a massive tourism attraction. I was not the only one who walked unsuspectingly and innocently into the trap: the caves are quite big, of course, but if you are not extremely fond of caves, or bats, they have nothing extraordinary in store for you. But the paintings, for sure you want to see the paintings and the so-called "death-boats". So you walk across the whole mountain, through eerie underground passages teeming with bats. I don't mind, but if I don't have to I avoid it. You walk a mile or so underground, to reach the paintings that are more than two miles from the entrance. The walk in the forest is beautiful, though. Eventually you reach the "painted cave", which is actually a wide, natural arch. The burial site has been fenced, for what reason it is unclear - to prevent further burials, or to prevent tourists from getting too close? For if you are looking for the death boats, you have gone there in vain. They have long ago been taken away to the Sarawak Museum (where they exhibit one, letting me wonder who has the rest of them all). What splinters remain are neatly piled up with other rubbish as for a bonfire. You need some imagination to distinguish 4000-year old wood from coffins amongst the more modern debris. As for the paintings, well, they have faded away. One is not sure about their age, but however long they have been there, one thing is for sure: they have faded over the last fifty years, and they are hardly discernible any more. What to do? Walk back 2 miles through jungle and caves.

I visited some longhouses in the area and talked to young and old Iban, only to find out that they have utterly and completely forgotten about everything on their culture except their name. They still live in longhouses, sure, and they still drink a lot, but for different reasons nowadays, and in quite uncontrolled a way. I was staying in Batu Niah, a small village, and on Saturday afternoon the place was full of drunken, mostly young Ibans. It is heart rending. I look at the old people, taut, strong, well built (and with beautiful tattoos) despite their age, and compare them to youths of twenty years or so: chubby, plump (with "modern" tattoos rather like graffiti all over their body), with a puffy red face, no future in their eyes.

They are lost in a world which is not theirs any more. They were told their life is no good: you have to go out and earn money, that is the way to progress and development. When they realised that this was not really so, and came home, Malaysia had taken away their forests.

Our annual 4x4 expedition was somewhat similarly depressing. We drove, on one leg, from Niah to Mulu, and from there to Limbang. We were the first expedition to drive all the way around Brunei Darussalam. I then realised how small the famous and so much acclaimed Mulu National Park is: it is nothing but a tiny island in an ocean of palm oil plantations, and barren waste land. Besides this discouraging fact, the area is of a most singular beauty. Endless expanses of undulating hills (dotted with the occasional reminders of a tree) lost in a blue haze at the horizon. It must have been so beautiful. We also met with Punan people, once the nomadic inhabitants of the forests.

Once, I talked to a young man, and he told me that only four years ago, the government asked them to plant rice. This is the most extraordinary euphemism I have ever heard! [...]these people [...] were known and respected throughout Borneo for their knowledge of the forest, the healing herbs and drugs, its hidden places, animals, poisons, charms and myths. The Punan followed the migration of animals, they had no other permanent shelter than the eternal forest itself - until man gave eternity a time frame. They would not eat rice, but process sago. When the government asks people to plant rice, the following is meant: land "reverts" to the government, which, in turn, gives logging concessions, and then, perhaps, reserves the land for plantations. People are not supposed to live in logging concessions (it is dangerous), besides the fact that people should not be nomadic anyway (I wonder whether there is actually a law making a nomadic life illegal. Could be.). People have to settle. And since there won't be any more forests to find the sago palm, they necessarily have to plant rice, which in turn means that they have to adopt slash and burn farming, because the area is hilly. But slash and burn is definitively illegal. Hopefully, legal enforcement is not very forceful in upstream development areas (!), and one can also use horrendous amounts of fertiliser in palm oil plantations, which in turn pollutes the already murky and silted rivers. Against modern intoxication there are no traditional herbs, in many senses, but the ambulant clinics that occasionally visit Punan settlements distribute Panadol very liberally. Malaysia becomes a third world country. Very fast. Especially in those upstream development areas (another of these propagandistic euphemisms, but my all-time favourite is definitively: governmental forms of desirable development).

Meanwhile, in Sabah: the government has made a "Gift to the Earth", and set aside 27,000 hectares of the Kinabatangan Floodplain, one of the most interesting and biologically diverse sites in the world. That was announced, with much pomp and the necessary dignitaries, at the annual W.W.F. conference, which was held here in Sabah recently. The announcement was made with so much noise that the destruction of the rest of the place drowned. It was quietly divulged that 85% of this unique floodplain, which stretches over more than 3000 square km (no exact figures available here, of course) have been set aside for purposes other than conservation. There is also no danger that these 85% ever revert to conservation, because they have been cleared already, and palm oil plantations have begun to appear here and there. They are owned by ministers in West Malaysia, and by some Singaporean Chinese. And they provide employment for the illegal immigrants, and many more illegal immigrants. Business must be kept going. I try not to be sarcastic, and use euphemisms when I write for the newspaper.

[From a later message: I am sure there is something going on! Governments realise slowly, but surely that without sustainable development no business can go on forever. Of course, it is all about money, especially in third world countries (sorry, developing countries). Sabah is an outstanding example right now: next year will be the "Sabah Visit 2000 Year", and everybody is thinking of how he could make money from his cultural background, or his plot of forest (this, however, is more of a fashionable movement promising fast cash than anything sustainable). Besides, for whatever reason, the government was recently astonishingly open about the income the forest has generated so far, and how much it will generate in the future. It is but a small percentage of the good old days, and this only if sustainable forest management is being continued (they started in the mid-seventies here already!). W.W.F.'s annual conference was also a success, and I went to the closing forum held by Dr Claude Martin: "Let us Give our Children a Living Planet", which was all about sustainability].

I have resigned from my job here as a tour-guide, etc. I am going to take over the management of the Monsopiad Cultural Village [see Herman's article in *Langscape* #12]. Did I mention somewhere that I would have some time to do what I want to do next year? I give myself one

year to get the village up and running, which should be possible by all means, especially if we get the tourism loan and the volume in visitors. In the meantime we also start the research – have started already: we go and talk to the old people and record their stories. They are dying, it is morbid, but later we can concentrate on the transcription. We are not enough here, and everybody is doing a few things at a time, which is not very good for either, business or research purpose. Going back to my previous occupation as a hotel manager, kind of. Perhaps it needs to be, and the prospect of doing something new is giving me quite some incentive. I am so fed up sitting here at the office all the time and not being able to do what I want and need to do.

[From a later message: At the village, we are going to have a ceremony (real one) for the skulls – that is for the spirits in the skulls, of course. The old man, the "owner of the skulls", Douisa, wants to call as many Bobohizans as possible together, before the turn of the millennium. The date has not yet been set, also the name of the ceremony is not yet clear. It will be one of these occasions when it is a ceremony that has been held, in more or less regular intervals of 5 to 10 years, for the past few hundred years. But this time it will be the last time this ceremony will ever be held for its original purpose. Douisa wants everything taped and on video. I will see how this turns out, and if you'd like, and can let have you some minutes of true, mystical Borneo, with Bobohizans (a dying breed) chanting in an archaic language, and talking Kadazan (which is being substituted by Malay), of an environment that is no more. Saddening].

During my holiday I was travelling with a Swiss author. He wrote some controversial books – that is, I don't find them so controversial. He writes a lot about the unexplained (kind of "X Files" [an American science fiction television show]), with a hint of esoteric mysticism, and he gave me a book with the recordings of a medium. It has a lot to do with healing – especially the self-healing powers of people, and it relates very much to the Bobohizan here. In actual fact, it contains amazing parallels. The interesting aspect is that the medium in the book is a white woman – a German TV. announcer to be precise, who unexpectedly and quite despite herself slipped into this role, as it may happen in the west, or east. I don't want to go too much into the mystical aspect of the whole, at least not for the moment. I know that spiritual healing works, and that is enough of an explanation for me. Here, one does not become a medium by accident, but by long years of practice. I want to concentrate on the recording of the wisdom, spiritual as well as physical.

Busy as I am, I think this is going to be my last message for this millennium. I want to get my Christmas and New Year greetings out early anyway. I don't want to be caught up in the rush. Besides, I am a tiny little bit superstitious, and if the big bug really hits us, I might not be able to send messages any more. I also save all my information on diskettes. But when recently someone asked me what I would do in the case all the computers would suddenly not work any more, I exclaimed: "I'd be so happy!" much to the astonishment of everybody. Why, are we not slaves of our computers, and is not everything in life already too much linked to computers? Well, on second thoughts, and considering that I am quite hopeless in accounting without the convenience of a computer worksheet, I would not mind if P.Cs. were still o.k. And Herman on a good old typewriter without backspace, delete and F7 (spell-check) keys?

All the best regards from Borneo. We are still alive and kicking, and if need be we will be screaming, too, well into the next millennium. I'll keep you updated.

Herman.



From: Dina Natalia Berenstein <dnb@ruc.dk>

Protest Letter in Support of Maaori Radio Dispatched

Terralingua's Maaori appeal was sent off in November of last year. The text follows...

Ms. Sharon Crosbie, Chief Executive
Radio New Zealand
P.O. Box 123

Wellington, New Zealand.

28 November, 1999

Dear Ms. Sharon Crosbie,

I am writing to you on behalf of Terralingua. Terralingua is an international non-governmental organisation dedicated to investigating the links between linguistic and biological diversity. Simultaneously, we are interested in sustaining the world's diversity both as regards languages as well as our habitat.

We have been alarmed upon receiving the information that your radio station, Radio New Zealand – the country's national station – has ceased broadcasting news in the Maaori language. We are aware that there are some twenty other Maaori radio stations and that these stations thus may undertake the task of providing listeners with news in Maaori. Furthermore, we understand that news bulletins possibly were not the most appropriate form of Maaori-language broadcast for your station, partly due to the dense and complex nature of the language used in news reports. Nevertheless, we believe that the Maaori language deserves a relevant place on New Zealand's national radio station. It is the language of your indigenous population and has therefore great historical as well as cultural significance. By neglecting the Maaori language you are neglecting your country's heritage as well as failing to show appreciation of your country's present diversity. By eliminating indigenous languages from your broadcasts, your radio station gives the impression of only caring to cater for the majority population, a position we doubt you would wish to be associated with.

We recognize that you no longer broadcast news in Maaori, therefore what we would like to know is which other programmes have taken the place of this Maaori-language news, and more importantly, which Maaori-language programmes? We do appreciate that there have been programmes about the Maoris and their language on the radio, though we would like to stress that such programmes, for quite obvious reasons, cannot be regarded as a sufficient substitute for programmes in Maaori. In this regard we would also find it relevant to know what your plans are in the long run in contributing to the revitalisation of the Maaori language through radio programming.

Please remember that a national radio station is for all nationals and should reflect such. Thank you very much for your kind consideration to our remarks.

Yours sincerely,

Dina Berenstein
Grassroots Relationships/Humanitarian Appeals Committee, on behalf of the Terralingua Board of Directors.



From: Martha Ratliff <martha_ratliff@wayne.edu>
Via Endangered Lang. List

C.E.L.P. at the L.S.A.

The annual open meeting of the Committee on Endangered Languages and their Preservation was held at the Linguistic Society of America meeting this January. Agenda items included discussion of (1) the U.N.E.S.C.O. language survey and U.N.E.S.C.O. research grants, (2) our web page on LINGUIST, (3) the future of field report sessions at L.S.A. meetings, (4) the disposition of our small budget, and other issues committee members care to raise. For your information, I also copy below my annual report to the L.S.A. Executive Committee.

iiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiii

To: The Executive Committee of the Linguistic Society of America

Subject: Report of the 1999 Committee on Endangered Languages and their Preservation

From: Martha Ratliff (W.S.U.), Chair, representing the 1999 C.E.L.P. Committee

Jonathan Bobaljic (McGill)	George Huttar (Nairobi, Kenya)
Catherine Callaghan (O.S.U.)	Alana Johns (Toronto)
Wallace Chafe (U.C.S.B.)	Peter Ladefoged (U.C.L.A.)
Megan Crowhurst (U.N.C.)	Nicholas Ostler (Bath, England)
Daniel Everett (Porto Velho, Brazil)	Jerrold Sadock (Chicago)
Joseph Grimes (Waianae, Hawai'i)	

Date: December 1, 1999.

[...]

3) Establishment of E.L. page. In order for the committee to be able to respond to requests for information on the documentation and preservation of endangered languages and related issues, this year we acted on a suggestion made to the committee two years ago by Helen Aristar Dry and Anthony Aristar, co-moderators of the LINGUIST list, to set up a Web page on endangered languages. The header of this page reads "This page is run in conjunction with the Committee on Endangered Languages and their Preservation of the L.S.A.", with links to both the C.E.L.P. page and to the L.S.A. home page. There will be a corresponding link from the C.E.L.P. page to the endangered languages page.

The shell for this page can be seen at <www.linguistlist.org/el-page/>. Subpages have been designated on the following topics:

- Support Organizations
- Community Organizations
- Fieldwork Training (academic programs, course materials, non-academic programs)
- Conferences and Calls for Papers
- Online Resources (mailing lists, online conferences, corpora)
- Publications and Reviews
- Fieldwork Tools (word lists, questionnaires, grammar and dictionary templates, software)
- Field Linguists by Area (South America, the Pacific, . . .)
- Funding Opportunities
- Fieldwork Opportunities

In response to an e-mail call to the list of linguists interested in endangered languages which the C.E.L.P. maintains and a posting on LINGUIST, half of these subpages have been claimed by volunteers who have agreed to serve as their "curators". The curators will forward to LINGUIST new information appropriate to their subpage category for posting as they discover it. We still need to identify curators for the other pages. Our assumption is that the next chair of C.E.L.P. (and subsequent chairs) will continue to serve as a "super-curator" for the page, and will be in contact with the moderators of LINGUIST about changes to the page that seem appropriate with the passage of time.

[...]



From: Leena Huss <leena.huss@multietn.uu.se>
Via endangered-languages-l@carmen.murdoch.edu.au

Minority languages in Sweden

I would like to inform you that the Swedish Parliament agreed on 2 December, 1999, to the ratification of the Council of Europe *Framework Convention on the Protection of National Minorities* and the Council of Europe *Charter for Regional or Minority Languages*. The officially recognized national minorities of Sweden will be the Jews, the Roma, the Sami, the Swedish Finns and the Tornedalians, and the languages recognized will be Finnish, Meänkieli (also called "Tornedalian Finnish"), Romani, Sami, and Yiddish. The ratifications will come into force on 1 April, 2000. Sami, Finnish and Meänkieli will have special status as official languages for some (four for Sami, five for Meänkieli and Finnish) of the northern municipalities. This is a significant re-orientation on the part of the Swedish State, as

Sweden has in the past concentrated its efforts on immigrant languages and largely ignored its historical minorities.

...and via the Editor

It might interest you that two language laws, the first ones in Swedish history, will be put into practice on 1 April, 2000. They cover the use of Sami, Meänkieli (Tornedalian Finnish) and Finnish in four (for Sami) and five (for the other two languages) municipalities in Northern Sweden where these languages have historical roots. Two municipalities will actually become quadrilingual: Swedish, Finnish, Meänkieli and Sami! People may use these languages in contacts with municipal authorities and the languages are also to have special protection within child care and care of elderly people. The schools are to give information about these linguistic minorities to all children, and instruction in the languages (as subjects, not as means of instruction, mind you!) is to be strengthened. This is a result of the fact that Sweden has finally ratified the Council of Europe Charter for Regional or Minority Languages and the Frame Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. In all Sweden, Finnish, Romani and Yiddish will have a special position as non-territorial languages. This is a great break-through in Swedish minority politics!

Best wishes from a very spring-like Uppsala,

Dr. Leena Huss
Centre for Multiethnic Research
Uppsala University
Box 514
S-75120 Uppsala. Sweden.

Tel.: +46-18-471 2361
FAX: +46-18-471 2363
Web: www.multietn.uu.se/



From: Maximilian Hartmuth <maximilian.hartmuth@gmx.net>
Via Endangered Lang. List

Georgia signs the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities

My name is Maximilian Hartmuth (Vienna, Austria). I just found the following article in my mail box and thought it might be relevant to this forum. (It was distributed by the Council of Europe on the Balkan and M.I.N.E.L.R.E.S. Lists, see below).

STRASBOURG, 21 January, 2000 – Georgia [has] signed the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities. Ambassador Lana Gogoberidze, Permanent Representative of Georgia to the Council of Europe, signed this text in the presence of Walter Schwimmer, Secretary General of the Organisation.

Opened for signature on 1 February, 1995, this text is the first legally binding multilateral instrument for the protection of national minorities. It is already in force in Albania, Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Malta, Moldova, Norway, Romania, Russia, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", Ukraine, the United Kingdom as well as Armenia. It has also been signed by Greece, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal and Sweden.

The Framework Convention sets out the principles to be respected and implemented by the States Parties. They thereby undertake:

- to combat discrimination;
- to promote full and effective equality, between national minorities and the majority;
- to promote the conditions necessary to preserve and develop the culture and safeguard the identity of national minorities, their language, religion and tradition;

- to afford persons belonging to national minorities freedom of peaceful assembly, freedom of association, freedom of expression and freedom of thought, conscience and religion;
- to ensure the right to access to and use of the media, in the field of linguistic freedoms;
- to allow the use of the minority language in private and in public, as well as in dealings with administrative authorities;
- to recognise the right to use one's name in the minority language;
- to recognise the right to display information of a private nature visible to the public in the minority language;
- to make efforts to display topographical indications in the minority language, in the field of education;
- to provide opportunities for learning a minority language and for receiving instruction in this language;
- to recognise the formation of educational and training establishments;
- not to hinder transfrontier contacts;
- to foster transfrontier and international co-operation;
- to encourage participation in economic, cultural and social life;
- to promote participation in public affairs;
- to prohibit forced assimilation.

Implementation

The Convention includes a monitoring mechanism whereby the Committee of Ministers, assisted by an Advisory Committee composed of independent experts, evaluates the adequacy of the Convention's implementation. The States Parties will be obliged to present, within one year after the entry into force of the Convention, a report containing full information on legislative and other measures taken to give effect to the Convention. Moreover, each Party shall thereafter submit a report every five years and whenever the Committee of Ministers so requests. The reports of the States and the conclusions of the Committee of Ministers will be made public.

Non-member states may also be invited to accede to Framework Convention.

Press Contact:

Christiane Dennemeyer
Council of Europe Press Service

Tel.: +33 3 88 41 25 63
FAX: +33 3 88 41 27 89

E-mail: PressUnit@coe.int

Nicola Markes-Goerlach
Council of Europe
Directorate General of Human Rights
Minorities Unit
F-67075 Strasbourg-Cedex. France.

Tel.: 00 33 - (0)3 90 21 44 33
FAX: 00 33 - (0)3 88 41 27 93

E-mail: nicola.markes-goerlach@coe.int

For more information, see dct.coe.int/info/emfci001.htm

M.I.N.E.L.R.E.S. - a forum for discussion on minorities in Central & Eastern Europe.

Submissions: <minelres-l@riga.lv>.

Subscription/inquiries: <minelres@mailbox.riga.lv>. List archive: <

www.riga.lv/minelres/archive.htm>.



ANNOUNCEMENTS

From: Anaïd Donabédian <Anaid.Donabedian@inalco.fr>

CALL FOR PAPERS

[Langues De Diaspora](#)

La revue *Faits de Langue* (Ophrys, Paris-Gap) consacre son prochain numéro aréal aux "Langues de diaspora", dans une approche linguistique au sens large. Dans le cadre de la problématique définie ci-dessous, des contributions sous forme d'articles d'environ 15 pages sont attendues, de préférence en français. Calendrier: Première version des articles: février 2000 Mini-colloque et discussion à Paris en mai 2000 (présence fortement souhaitée) Version définitive des articles: novembre 2000 Parution: 1^o trimestre 2001 Responsable du numéro: Anaid Donabedian

Problématique générale: Les langues de diaspora, au même titre que les problématiques aréales, présentent des constantes sociolinguistiques et descriptives dont l'étude peut se révéler féconde pour la linguistique générale. En effet, les langues de diaspora, compte tenu de leurs conditions d'évolution spécifiques (la dispersion entraînant la multiplicité des bilinguismes, toujours dans une situation de langue dominée, le morcellement de la norme, une perte de compétence, parallèlement à un investissement identitaire fort susceptible de générer un volontarisme linguistique) peuvent, au-delà de ces conditions qui les rassemblent, présenter des constantes au plan descriptif. En outre, conformément au projet multidisciplinaire de *Faits de Langues*, elles nous conduisent au carrefour de la linguistique descriptive, de la sociolinguistique (bilinguisme), de la socio-anthropologie (identité collective et pratique linguistique), de la didactique (transmission), et de la psychanalyse (conflit de langues et construction de l'identité). Néanmoins, l'originalité de ce numéro au regard des publications déjà existantes sur cette question sera sa dominante linguistique descriptive.

La notion de langue de diaspora: notre hypothèse de départ impose de délimiter ce que nous entendons par langue de diaspora, et notamment de distinguer clairement les langues en situation de migration de celles de diaspora. On substituera donc aux définitions historiques, géographiques et anthropologiques de la diaspora le critère sociolinguistique suivant: une langue est ici considérée comme langue de diaspora (et non langue en diaspora) dès lors qu'elle est parlée exclusivement par des locuteurs dispersés dans plusieurs Etats non contigus, et que dans aucun d'entre eux la transmission de la langue n'est assurée comme langue dominante. Ce critère, auquel devrait probablement s'ajouter un critère chronologique permettant d'avoir le recul suffisant, permet de délimiter un ensemble cohérent de langues, à la fois par le rapport de la communauté des locuteurs à la langue (à la fois un investissement identitaire potentiellement fort, et une préoccupation concernant sa pérennité) et des conditions de transmission spécifiques, aptes à influencer sur les processus de changement linguistique dans le temps. Par conséquent, un premier inventaire présente le romani, l'assyro-chaldéen, le kurde, l'arménien occidental, le grec pontique, les langues juives et peut être le tibétain (liste non exhaustive).

Enfin, des articles portant sur des langues ne répondant pas strictement à notre définition pourraient permettre d'(in)valider l'hypothèse et de mettre en évidence a contrario certains phénomènes. Le propos du volume et son organisation: outre le volet sociolinguistique dicté par le titre, une partie importante du volume devra être consacrée à des contributions descriptives, mettant en évidence les phénomènes de contact à différents niveaux, ou, lorsque plusieurs variantes peuvent être observées pour la même langue, les phénomènes de cohérence et de variabilité interne en fonction de données sociolinguistiques. L'hypothèse que nous chercherons à vérifier dans ce volume est que les langues de diaspora constituent, tout comme les créoles, comme une sorte de "laboratoire linguistique", dont les manifestations précises restent à mettre en évidence. Pour progresser vers cet objectif, les grands axes envisagés sont donc (dans un ordre qui sera à définir):

1. Mélanges de langues en diaspora: modes de mixage et limites. Le volet lexical de cette partie sera important en ce qui concerne les mélanges conscients, et les phénomènes annexes qui leur sont corrélés (emprunts balisés et non balisés, purisme, néologie, tabous linguistiques, etc.), mais des phénomènes morphologiques ou syntaxiques doivent également être envisagés même s'ils sont moins immédiatement perceptibles (accent sur l'aspect descriptif);
2. Le métalangage sur la langue: rapport à la norme et semilinguisme, le discours sur la compétence à l'intérieur de la communauté des locuteurs (accent sur l'aspect socio-anthropologique, psychanalytique);
3. Langues en contact et typologie linguistique: peut-on déceler des différences d'évolution dans les sous-communautés de locuteurs ayant des contacts linguistiques avec des langues typologiquement très différenciées? Dans cette optique, peut-on

déceler une inflexion des phénomènes du fait de la situation de diaspora? (accent sur l'aspect descriptif);

4. Langues en déclin et déclin et volontarisme linguistique, langue et identité en diaspora, modes de transmission (l'accent sur l'aspect sociolinguistique et didactique). En fonction des propositions d'articles, ces axes pourront être infléchis et réorganisés.

Dr. Anaid Donabedian-Demopoulos
Responsable de la Section d'Armenien
France.

Home: 57 Bd Jourdan, 75014, Paris.

Institut National des Langues et
Civilisations Orientales (I.N.A.L.C.O.)
Lille
75343 Paris Cedex 07. France.

Tel.: 33 (0)1 44 16 11 10
FAX: 33 (0)1 44 16 10 612, rue de

E-mail: Anaid.Donabedian@inalco.fr



From: V. de Rooij <vderooij@pscw.uva.nl>
Via <linganth@cc.rochester.edu>

CALL FOR PAPERS

New Africa Web Site and Discussion List

The *Journal of Language and Popular Culture in Africa* is a new, free, on-line journal published at the L.P.C.A. (Language and Popular Culture in Africa) Web site. *The Journal of Language and Popular Culture in Africa* will publish data-centered studies on all aspects of African popular culture mediated by language. The Journal welcomes contributions from all relevant disciplines (anthropology, (socio-)linguistics, folklore, sociology, history, literature, etc.). Publication of the first issue of the Journal is scheduled for late Spring 2000. Please send your manuscripts to:

Journal of Language and Popular Culture in Africa
Vincent A. de Rooij, Editor in Charge
Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology
University of Amsterdam
O.Z. Achterburgwal 185
1012 DK Amsterdam. The Netherlands.

All submissions will be reviewed by members of the L.P.C.A. Advisory Board or by other experts. For more information on the Journal's Editorial Policy and details on how to submit, consult the J.L.P.C.A. home page at <www.pscw.uva.nl/lpca/jlpca/info.html>.

The L.P.C.A. Web site

Language and Popular Culture in Africa (L.P.C.A.) is a Web site that aims to document and further the study of expressions of popular language and culture in Africa. L.P.C.A. makes available texts that serve as the medium of African popular culture and are at the same time part of this culture. If you want to make relevant materials available through the L.P.C.A. Web site, please contact us by e-mail or regular mail at the addresses below.

For more information on the L.P.C.A. site and how to contribute, see our home page:
www.pscw.uva.nl/lpca/index.html

LPCA-L discussion list

If you want to stay informed of new additions to the L.P.C.A. Web site, or if you want to discuss issues related to the Web site's mission, you may want to subscribe to the LPCA-L discussion list (created on 8 October 1999). To subscribe, send the following command in the body of your e-mail message to <LISTSERV@NIC.SURFNET.NL>:

SUBSCRIBE LPCA-L <your name>

and be sure to omit everything else from your message (e.g., signatures).

Vincent A. de Rooij
 Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology
 University of Amsterdam
 O.Z. Achterburgwal 185
 1012 DK Amsterdam. The Netherlands.

E-mail: vderooij@pscw.uva.nl



From: fazila <fbhimji@ucla.edu>

CALL FOR PAPERS

A.A.A. 2000 Panel

Pam Bunte and I are organizing a session for the next A.A.A. meeting on Language Socialization in Multilingual Communities. Interested contributors may send their abstracts to me via e-mail or regular mail, preferably by February 20, 2000 [**final deadline for abstracts is April 1**].

Panel Topic – *Language Socialization in Multilingual Communities: the rôle of language ideologies in developing social identities.*

We are looking for papers for a panel for the A.A.A. 2000 meeting on language socialization that address identity and language ideologies in "natural interaction" between children and caregivers or educators in multilingual or bilingual environments. Multilingual communities have a range of linguistic and cultural repertoires available to them which are influenced by local theories of language use that in turn help construct identity. Papers might focus on how language socialization practices are influenced by and influence these theories.

Fazila Bhimji
 1616 Martel Ave.
 Apt. #3
 Los Angeles, CA. 90046. U.S.A.



From: Briony Williams <briony@cstr.ed.ac.uk>

CALL FOR PARTICIPATION

Workshop on "Developing language resources for minority languages: re-usability and strategic priorities"

30 May, 2000 (14:30–20:00)
 Athens, Greece

(Preceding L.R.E.C.2000 conference; <www.cstr.ed.ac.uk/SALTMIL/lrec00.html>)

Organisation: Centre for Speech Technology Research, University of Edinburgh, Scotland.

There will be a one-day workshop on the theme of "Developing language resources for minority languages: re-useability and strategic priorities" on the afternoon of May 30th 2000, in Athens, Greece (preceding the 2nd. International Language Resources and Evaluation Conference, L.R.E.C.2000). The aim of the workshop is to bring together those who are developing language resources for minority languages in order to build contacts and share experience. The workshop will include the first meeting of the I.S.C.A. "S.A.L.T.M.I.L." S.I.G. ("Speech and Language Technology for Minority Languages").

Workshop Scope and Aims

The minority or "lesser used" languages of the world (e.g., Basque, Welsh, Breton) are under increasing pressure from the major languages. Some of them (e.g., Gaelic) are endangered, but others (e.g., Catalan) are in a stronger position. However, the situation with regard to language resources is fragmented and disorganised. Some minority languages have been adequately researched linguistically, but most have not, and the vast majority do not yet possess basic speech and language resources (such as text and speech corpora) which are sufficient to permit commercial development of products.

If this situation were to continue, the minority languages of the world would fall a long way behind the major languages, as regards the availability of commercial speech and language products. This in turn will accelerate the decline of those languages that are already struggling to survive, as speakers are forced to use the majority language for interaction with these products. To break this vicious circle, it is important to encourage the development of basic language resources.

The workshop is a small step towards encouraging the development of such resources. The aim is to disseminate information on existing projects and possible future strategies, as well as forming personal contacts and sharing best practice. This will make it easier for isolated researchers with little funding and no pre-existing resources to begin developing language resources that are maximally useful.

The workshop will also incorporate the first meeting of the I.S.C.A. "S.A.L.T.M.I.L." S.I.G. ("Speech and Language Technology for Minority Languages").

Talks will include the following:

- 1) A general overview of the situation of minority languages. (Donncha O'Croinin, Rep. of Ireland)
- 2) Strategic priorities for the development of language technology in minority languages. (Kepa Sarasola, Basque Country)
- 3) Funding for research into language technology for minority languages. (Bojan Petek, Slovenia)

Those who wish to attend are asked to indicate their interest to Donncha O'Croinin (doc@ite.ie) in order to receive their own copy of the final programme and registration details.

Organizers

Briony Williams	University of Edinburgh, Scotland
Donncha O'Croinin	Linguistics Institute of Ireland, Dublin, Republic of Ireland
Climent Nadeu	Universitat Politecnica de Catalunya, Catalunya, Spain
Kepa Sarasola	University of the Basque Country, Basque Country
Bojan Petek	University of Ljubljana, Slovenia.



From: Jeff ALLEN <jeff@elda.fr>
Via Endangered-Lang. List

2nd. International Language Resources and Evaluation Conference (L.R.E.C. 2000)
29 May - 2 June, 2000
Athens, Greece

The year 2000 marks the beginning of a new era for Human Language Technology and Language Engineering. The European Commission and the U.S. National Science Foundation have announced Multilinguality as one of their main action points. The 2nd. international Language Resources and Evaluation Conference (L.R.E.C. 2000), the second of a series of leading biennial events representing cross-sectoral research and development in speech, text, multimedia and multi-modal processing, is committed to promoting the language engineering initiatives of these and similar organizations.

L.R.E.C. 2000, scheduled to take place in Athens, Greece, has accepted nearly 300 papers for presentation at the main conference. About 10 pre- and post-conference satellite workshops will also take place. Many commercial and research systems for speech and natural language processing will be demonstrated at the L.R.E.C. 2000 Exhibition in parallel with the conference

sessions. From 500 to 700 conference delegates are expected to attend this conference, with half coming from the corporate and industrial sectors and half coming from the academic field.

For more information with regard to L.R.E.C. 2000, please contact:

L.R.E.C. 2000 Conference Secretariat	Tel.: (+301) 6800959
Institute for Language and Speech Processing	FAX: (+301) 6856794
6, Artemidos & Epidavrou Str.	E-mail: LREC2000@ilsp.gr
15125 Marousi	Web: www.elda.fr/lrec2000.html
Athens. Greece.	

For more information about the European Language Resources Association (E.L.R.A.), please contact:

Khalid Choukri, E.L.R.A. C.E.O.	Tel.: (+33) 1 43 13 33 33
55-57, rue Brillat-Savarin	FAX: (+33) 1 43 13 33 30
75013 Paris. France.	E-mail: choukri@elda.fr
	Web: www.icp.grenet.fr/ELRA/home.html



From: Martin Haspelmath <haspelmath@eva.mpg.de>

CALL FOR CONTRIBUTORS

World Atlas of Language Structures

Bernard Comrie, Matthew Dryer, David Gil and Martin Haspelmath are editing a World Atlas of Language Structures. The atlas will show structural features of languages – phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic and others – in much the same way as linguistic data are displayed in dialect atlases. The atlas will encompass about 100 structural features, each shown on a two-page global map, and accompanied by a two-page description and discussion of the feature. Each feature would be mapped for at least 150 languages, preferably 200 or more, with a satisfactory geographical and genetic distribution. Each feature will thus constitute a chapter, which is the product of original research by an individual author or set of co-authors. In addition to the printed version of the atlas, a fully searchable CD-ROM version will be produced. Further information on the atlas project can be found at <wings.buffalo.edu/soc-sci/linguistics/dryer/atlas>, and at <www.eva.mpg.de/~haspelmt/atlas.html>.

At present, we have commitments from authors for about 80 of the 100 chapters. In this call, we are soliciting contributions for about 20 additional chapters.

Potential authors are encouraged to propose whichever chapters are most consistent with their research interests, with the following obvious qualification: that the features to be mapped not overlap significantly with those to which other authors have already committed themselves. (A list of the chapters already proposed is available at the above-mentioned URLs). Authors are not expected to engage in any actual cartography themselves; instead, for each feature, they will submit a database containing a list of languages and their associated feature values, which will then be put onto maps by the publishers.

Time Frame:

29 February, 2000: Deadline for submission of chapter proposals. Proposals will be 1-2 pages long, and should contain a brief description of the feature (and the feature values) to be mapped in the chapter. Multiple proposals are acceptable.

1 April, 2000: Notification of acceptance or rejection of chapter proposals.

31 December, 2000: Deadline for submission of first drafts. These will consist only of the database with the languages and associated feature values.

31 December 2001: Deadline for submission of final drafts. These will consist of the database plus the two-page text discussion.

Address for submission of proposals:

Martin Haspelmath
Max-Planck-Institut fuer Evolutionaere Anthropologie FAX: +49-341-9952 119
Inselstr. 22 E-mail: haspelmath@eva.mpg.de
D-04103 Leipzig. Germany.

Further addresses for inquiries:

Bernard Comrie, Max-Planck-Institut fuer Evolutionaere Anthropologie E-mail:
comrie@eva.mpg.de
Matthew Dryer, State University of New York at Buffalo, U.S.A. E-mail:
dryer@acsu.buffalo.edu
David Gil, Max-Planck-Institut fuer Evolutionaere Anthropologie E-mail: gil@eva.mpg.de



From: bruce richman <brucerichman@hotmail.com>

CALL FOR ABSTRACTS

Alternatives to Chomsky a New Paradigm for Language Studies for a New Millennium

4 September, 2000

Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey, U.S.A.

(In association with the Language Origins Society 2000 meeting)

The main obstacle we have today to clearly understanding the nature and origins of language is the overly formalistic, anti-empirical, anti-historical influence of Chomsky's paradigm for conducting linguistic study.

It has become very clear in recent years that Chomsky's generative calculus model of linguistics has no relevance at all to anything about actual language. It has also become clear that the main generative notion of the innateness of language is based on flimsy, non-existent evidence.

Despite this, and despite the fact that many people in many different fields are now actually studying real language in realistic, empirical ways, and despite the fact that many people intuitively understand the emptiness of generative claims and practices, it still remains true that, to the world at large, Chomsky's theories are somehow considered an important "scientific breakthrough".

So, the time has come that those of us who want to start a new paradigm for language studies, who want to begin an empirical way of studying real language, should simply explain why the entire Chomskyan method must be thrown away. We are planning to invite 7 or 8 people from a wide range of fields to speak at our one-day seminar which will be held on Monday, September 4, just prior to the regular meetings of the Language Origins Society. (L.O.S. 2000 will continue on through Saturday, September 9.)

If you are interested in participating please send a brief abstract of what you would like to present to Bruce Richman at <brucerichman@hotmail.com> or the following address:

3805 Woodridge Rd. Tel.: 216-381-7510
Cleveland Hts., Ohio 44121. U.S.A.



From: Nicholas Ostler <nostler@chibcha.demon.co.uk>

CALL FOR ABSTRACTS

Endangered Languages and Literacy

21-24 September, 2000

Charlotte, North Carolina, U.S.A.

Fourth International Conference hosted by the Foundation for Endangered Languages. When a language is endangered, it is because the community who use it may cease to do so the foreseeable future. This is often because new generations of the community are not acquiring the language, or if they do, are not using it so much as speakers in the past.

Literacy, the ability to read and write a written form of the language, has often been viewed a necessary first step in maintaining and promoting use of the language. The introduction of literacy is predicated upon the development of an acceptable written form of a language, a step considered by many essential for:

- the production of grammars, dictionaries, and teaching materials;
- the preservation of traditional oral literature in communities where the younger generations lack the
 - patience to learn the texts orally.

However, efforts to develop a written language and instill literacy may encounter cultural obstacles and have unforeseen consequences. For example:

- the development of literacy may, over time, fundamentally alter or interrupt the oral transmission of a
 - community's knowledge and beliefs;
- the members of the community may resist efforts to introduce literacy due to cultural beliefs about, for
 - example, the spiritual or mystical nature of oral communication;
- the introduction of literacy may create divisions within the community between the literate and the illiterate
 - that ultimately may have social or economic implications.

Even within communities that are receptive to the introduction of literacy, the development of an acceptable written language may pose challenges:

- there may be difficulties selecting one of several dialects upon which to base the written language;
- there may be problems adapting existing alphabets, syllabaries or other writing systems to the sound
 - system of the language;
- the availability of typewriter or computer fonts may force unacceptable compromises in the orthography
 - for the language;
- the language may lack acceptable vocabulary or syntactic structures to replace in the written
 - language suprasegmental, kinetic, and paralinguistic components of oral, face-to-face communication.

Modern technologies, however, have brought additional choices to endangered language communities. For example, with tape recorders, compact disk recorders, video recorders, television, radio, and computers, it possible to make "talking" dictionaries, grammars and books, thereby eliminating the need for a written language and literacy. But these technologies are not without their own limitations:

- the costs of acquiring and maintaining desired technologies may be prohibitive;
- the community may lack members with the expertise to employ the desired technologies, or the resources
 - to train members in the technologies or hire outsiders;
- the community may not be willing to accept/use the chosen technologies.

All these issues, and more, are relevant to our conference this year.

The workshop will provide a forum for researchers and activists working for the maintenance of indigenous languages that face an uncertain future. (It is the fourth in a series of annual workshops and conferences hosted by the Foundation for Endangered Languages).

The Foundation for Endangered Languages is a registered charity in England and Wales. F.E.L. conferences, besides being opportunities to discuss the issues from a global viewpoint, are working meetings of the Foundation, defining our overall policy for future years. Participants at the conference therefore need to be members of the Foundation. There are full facilities to join on arrival, but all proposers are strongly urged to join as soon as possible, and so take full part in the Foundation's activities in the lead-up to the conference.

The dates will be 21-24 September, 2000. In keeping with the theme of this year's meeting, the workshop will take place near the homeland of Sequoyah, the father of Cherokee literacy, at University of North Carolina at Charlotte, in the United States. There will be a preliminary volume of proceedings distributed at the Conference.

Presentations will last twenty minutes each, with a further ten minutes for discussion. All presentations should be accessible largely in English, but use of the languages of interest, for quotation or exemplification, may well be appropriate.

Organizers:

Blair Rudes (chair)	University of North Carolina at Charlotte
Nicholas Ostler	Foundation for Endangered Languages, Bath, England
Christopher Moseley	B.B.C. Monitoring Service
Karen Johnson-Weiner	St. Lawrence University, Canton, New York, U.S.A.
Hassan Ouzzate	Ibn Zohr University, Agadir, Morocco.

Programme Committee:

Margaret Allen, McKenna Brown, Karen Johnson-Weiner, Tony McEnery, Eugene McKendry, Christopher Moseley, David Nash, Nicholas Ostler, Hassan Ouzzate, Jon Reyhner, Mari Rhydwen, Blair Rudes, Jane Simpson, Tasaku Tsunoda, Anthony Woodbury, Akira Yamamoto.

Abstract Submission

Abstracts should not exceed 500 words. They can be submitted in one of two ways: hard copy or electronic submission. They should be in English. One copy should be sent to:

Blair A. Rudes	Tel.: 1-704-547-4230
Department of English	FAX: 1-704-547-3961
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte	
9201 University City Boulevard	
Charlotte, North Carolina 28223-0001. U.S.A.	

A. Paper submission

This should have a clear short title, but should not bear anything to identify the author(s).

On a separate sheet, please include the following information:

NAME : Names of the author(s)
 TITLE: Title of the paper
 E-MAIL: E-mail address of the first author, if any
 ADDR: Postal address of the first author
 TEL: Telephone number of the first author, if any
 FAX: FAX number of the first author, if any

The name of the first author will be used in all correspondence.

If possible, please also send an e-mail to Blair Rudes at <BARudes@e-mail.uncc.edu> informing him of the hard copy submission. This is in case the hard copy does not reach its destination. This e-mail should contain the information specified in the section below.

B) Electronic submission:

Electronic submission should be in plain ASCII text e-mail message, giving the following details:

NAME : Name of first author
 # TITLE: Title of the paper
 # E-MAIL: E-mail address of the first author
 # ADDR: Postal address of the first author

TEL: Telephone number of the first author, if any
 # FAX: FAX number of the first author

and in a separate section: # ABSTR: Abstract of the paper.

Important Dates:

Abstract submission deadline March 21

Notification of Committee's decision April 21
 Authors submit camera-ready text July 21
 Conference Sept 21-24

Nicholas Ostler Tel.: +44-1225-85-2865
 Linguacubun Ltd. FAX: +44-1225-85-9258
 ("technology for the languages of the world") E-mail: nostler@chibcha.demon.co.uk
 Batheaston Villa, 172 Bailbrook Lane
 Bath BA1 7AA. England.



From: Rebecca Wheeler <rwheeler@cnu.edu>

CALL FOR RESPONSES

What Every Educated Person Should Know About Language and Why

Context: information/abstract gathering query from the L.S.A. Undergraduate Program Advisory Committee which is proposing this topic as a symposium for the 2001 Annual Meeting.

Background: despite the results of more than half a century of paradigm-changing work, the American public remains fundamentally uninformed about the nature of language. Linguistics, the field which has contributed the most to what we know, has reached a somewhat limited audience through graduate programs, undergraduate majors and Introductions to Language and Linguistics. And yet, despite this linguistic presence at both the undergraduate and the graduate levels, the insights from linguistics regarding the nature of language barely make the light of pedagogical day when it comes to reaching not only students and teachers in the public schools, but also the broader American public.

If public misconceptions about the nature of language, as evidenced in the Oakland Ebonics furor or in continuing public machinations about "proper grammar" and "slovenly grammar" are any indication, our efforts at the undergraduate and graduate levels aren't getting the word out. While authors such as Pinker, Tannen, McWhorter, Smitherman, Trudgill, and Wardhaugh write compellingly and comprehensibly for a broader lay audience (not to mention Baugh, Fillmore, Labov, Nunberg, Rickford, Shuy, Wolfram, etc., who connect to the press) surely, we linguists need to re-craft and perhaps re-conceive our message so to get our insights out more broadly.

Query, Call: in this context, I am calling for response to the question, "what should every educated person know about language and why?". That is, what are the core insights of our field regarding the nature of language, insights which capture the fundamentals of language? Will these insights help unbind the dogged misconceptions that beleaguer our students and populace when it comes to language?

Immediate Purpose: my purpose is to assemble a panel of discussants on this topic under the aegis of the L.S.A.'s Undergraduate Program Advisory Committee for next year's annual meeting.

Long-Term Purpose/Application: such insights would ultimately coalesce into educational materials (courses and workshops), adaptable to all levels of education – primary, secondary, high school, college, and graduate teacher education. These educational materials might or might not be distinct in content from current college level offerings in Language Awareness and Introductions to Language. The point is to re-think and hone what fundamentals about language we want to put out into the broader world.

Deadline: please submit your descriptions/abstracts/comments in e-mail form (no longer than 1000 words) and in hard copy, to me by **Tuesday, March 28, 2000**. Hard copy address is:

Rebecca S. Wheeler
Assistant Professor
Department of English
1 University Place
Christopher Newport University
Newport News, VA. 23606-2998. U.S.A.

E-mail: <rwheeler@cnu.edu>



From: Luisa Maffi <maffi@nwu.edu>

Further Information on U.N.E.S.C.O.'s Declaration on Science

In the last issue of *Langscape* (#13, p. 49), we included a message on U.N.E.S.C.O.'s Declaration on Science and the Use of Scientific Knowledge. This message continues that news and is culled from the magazine *Go-Between* #76 (Aug.-Sept. 1999, p. 6), published by the U.N. Non-Governmental Liaison Service (N.G.L.S.):

i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i

Conference on Science and Technology

The World Conference on Science, and international forum held to map the course of science into the new century, has adopted a Declaration on Science and the Use of Scientific Knowledge that commits governments to use science for the benefit of the entire planet.

Conference participants stressed the benefits of science for development. Although these are obvious, "[m]ost of these benefits are unevenly distributed, as a result of structural asymmetries among countries, regions and social groups and between the sexes", the Declaration said.

By issuing the declaration, governments agreed [that] there was a need to promote equitable access to science and to involve women more. "It is essential that the fundamental rôle played by women in the application of scientific development of food production and health care be fully recognized, and efforts made to strengthen their understanding of scientific advances in this area", the declaration said. At the same time, it pointed out that science could also reduce the quality of life through environmental degradation, exclusion, or the invention of sophisticated weapons of war. This is why it stressed the need for ethical principles that respect human rights and the dignity of human beings.

The framework for action that underpins the declaration expects governments to commit adequate funds for education and research, which Federico Mayor, Director General of U.N.E.S.C.O., suggests could be around 0.3% to 0.4% of a country's G.D.P. At present, the heaviest investors earmark between 2.5% to 3%. In addition to a commitment of public funds, the action plan calls for pooling research and skills, especially on environmental issues.

U.N.E.S.C.O. used the conference venue to launch its first *World Social Science Report*, the latest in a series of world reports published in recent years on education, the natural sciences, communication and culture, the organization's fields of competence. The report builds on an earlier *World Science Report* and extends its scope from the natural to the social sciences by studying the state and evolution of societies.

An international H.G.O. consultation was organized parallel to the conference to enable fullest possible N.G.O. participation. Some 60 mainly international N.G.Os. attended the consultation, which focused on elaborating suggestions to improve the conference's two main documents, the draft Declaration and Framework for Action.

The two co-rapporteurs of the N.G.O. meeting took up the two seats reserves for N.G.Os. in the conference's Drafting Group. This enabled some of their recommendations to be worked into the conference's final documents. However, the more pointed and controversial N.G.O.

recommendations (such as a commitment to the precautionary principle applying new technologies of the development of a scientific oath) did not survive in the final versions. The meeting was still seen as positive, and N.G.Os. praised U.N.E.S.C.O.'s efforts to involve them fully in the conference proceedings without shunning controversy or intense discussion on the vital issues at stake.

The conference was held in Budapest (Hungary), 26 June - 1 July, and was organized by U.N.E.S.C.O. and the International Council for Science (I.C.S.U.). Some 2,000 participants from 150 countries attended, including representatives of educational research establishments, scientists, industry, inter-governmental organizations, N.G.Os. and 100 government ministers responsible for scientific affairs in these countries.

Contact: Michael Millward, Chief, Section of Non-Governmental Organizations and Foundations, U.N.E.S.C.O., 7 place de Fontenoy, F-75700 Paris, France. Tel. +33-1/45 68 18 77; FAX +33-1/47 34 20 98; e-mail <m.millward@unesco.org>; Web site <www.unesco.org/science/wcs>.



From: SDNP-India <sdnp@envfor.delhi.nic.in>

Knowledge-based Networking in India

The United Nations Development Programme (U.N.D.P.) and the International Development Research Centre (I.D.R.C.) of Canada, in collaboration with Ministry of Environment and Forests (India), has launched the portal site of Sustainable Development Networking Programme, India (SDNP-India) at <sdnp.delhi.nic.in>, mirrored at <members.tripod.com/sdnp_india>. The Web site has had over 40,000 visitors since May 1999, which is very encouraging.

S.D.N.P. India aims to facilitate the process of sustainable development, promote good practices and strengthen the democratic processes through a mechanism of information exchange between the government and research organisations, N.G.Os., business establishments and the civil society over the electronic and hybrid media.

The Web site provides access to a host of on-line databases, environmental legislation, case studies, publications, news clippings and electronic discussion groups on a gamut of issues from agriculture to climate change to population, health and human rights. A database of international organisations working on sustainable development issues is being maintained on the Web site and has been indexed by subject area. The links section of the Web site provides a gateway to over 1500 other sites concerning environment and sustainable development.

We have started to host information on Environment and Sustainable Development *in local Indian languages* too, so as to enhance the reach of the programme. [Editor's emphasis].

The Web site also provides a platform to initiate debates and discussions, highlight developmental issues and initiate environmental actions at all levels through a host of services such as building bridges, development job opportunities, query desk, dev-online, event reporting service, Web-site hosting and training on information and communication technologies.

More information about these services is available at the S.D.N.P. Web site or by sending an e-mail to <sdnp@envfor.delhi.nic.in>. I take this opportunity to welcome you to the SDNP-India Web site, and to assist us in making it a comprehensive source of information on sustainable development. We look forward to your suggestions, criticisms and contributions towards both the site, and how we can further promote knowledge-based networking in India.

Vikas Nath	Tel.: + 91 11 436 2140
Programme Officer	FAX: + 91 11 436 1147
Sustainable Development Networking Programme (India)	E-mail: sdnp@envfor.delhi.nic.in
Room 1023 Paryavaran Bhawan	Web: sdnp.delhi.nic.in
C.G.O. Complex, Lodhi Road	Mirror site: members.tripod.com/sdnp_india
New Delhi 110003. India.	



From: whalen@lenny.haskins.yale.edu

Endangered Language Fund 1999 Grants

The Endangered Language Fund is pleased to announce its grant awards for 1999. The Fund is a non-profit organization dedicated to the scientific description of endangered languages, support for maintenance efforts, and dissemination of the results of those two effort to the scholarly community and the native communities. These twelve grants received almost \$20,000 [total] in funding, made possible entirely by the support of our members. Please visit our Web site at <www.ling.yale.edu/~elf>.

Elena Benedicto (Purdue University) – Indigenous Women as Linguists. The goal of this project is to form a team of Mayangna women in linguistic techniques, so that they can later use that knowledge in the bilingual programs of Nicaragua. This is an indigenous effort to provide educational materials which brings the generations together in a single project.

Marianne Milligan (University of Wisconsin, Madison) – Menominee Phonology and Morphology. Only a few speakers of Menominee remain, and they show varying degrees of fluency. The Menominee have expressed interest in revitalizing their language, but there is a lack of materials and speakers to contribute to the effort. The present work on the phonology and morphology of Menominee will provide some of the material for a language curriculum.

Jonette Sam (Pueblo of Picuris) – An Integrated Approach to Language Renewal at Picuris Pueblo, New Mexico. This grant allowed four members of the Language Committee of the Pueblo of Picuris to attend the 6th Annual Stabilizing Indigenous Languages Conference in Tucson, AZ., this past June. The discussions of such topics as language camps, language in sports and other community recreation, language at work, language in religion and culture, language and the media, and language in community historical and cultural research proved very valuable.

Carolyn J. MacKay and Frank R. Trechsel (Ball State University) – A Linguistic Description of Pisa Flores Tepehua. This variety of Tepehua, spoken in Veracruz, Mexico, is a member of the Totonacan language family, a group of linguistic isolates in Mesoamerica. The texts and elicited words will be used for a dictionary, grammatical descriptions, and, ultimately, interlinear translations of the texts.

Yogendra P. Yadava (Royal Nepal Academy) – A Study of the Dhangar Language. Dhangar is the only member of the Dravidian language family spoken in Nepal. The present work will provide basic linguistic description which will be necessary for any serious language maintenance program. This will include the beginnings of work on linguistic affiliation, grammar, sociolinguistic perspectives, literacy and databased texts and lexicon.

Delphine Red Shirt (Guilford, CT.) – Winyan Isnala: my mother's story. From her early days in North Dakota, Red Shirt's mother was a source of wisdom, and recordings of their telephone conversations and visits over the past several years included much of the history and lore of the Lakota people. Between the time of the submission of this grant and its being awarded, Red Shirt's mother passed away, making the transcription and editing of those texts even more urgent. The grant from E.L.F. will help make that possible.

Yaron Matras (University of Manchester) – A Description of the Domari Language of Jerusalem. Domari is an Indic language spoken by a socially isolated and marginalized community in the Old City of Jerusalem. All the fluent speakers of Domari are over 40 years of age, most in their 60s, with Arabic taking its place. Very little description of the language exists, and Matras will begin a more complete description based on 20 hours of recordings already collected, supplemented by further field work.

James T. Collins (National University of Malaysia) – Documenting and Describing the Tola' Language. Many previously ill-described areas of Borneo are inhabited by autochthonous Dayak groups, speaking a number of diverse languages and dialects. The language to be studied, Tola', is an undescribed Malayic variant spoken in four villages. Building on previous wordlists, Collins will begin work on a grammar and on a survey of language use and attitudes.

Hongkai Sun (Chinese Academy of Social Sciences) – Recording the Last Fluent Speakers of Anong, a Language of Yunnan (P.R.C.). The Anongs are a branch of the Nu nationality, numbering 7,300 but with only 50 or 60 fluent speakers of the ancestral language. Sun plans to augment his fieldwork from the early 1960s, aiming to collect 12,000 words for the dictionary, preserve the oral literature as far as possible, analyze the linguistic structure, make recordings, and assess the state of the language.

Silverio Jimenez (Mexico City) – The Nahuatl from Milpa Alta. The Nahuatl spoken in this area of Mexico is relatively conservative in its changes from the Aztec times. Although Nahuatl is Jimenez's heritage language, his own experience of learning only Spanish while growing up is indicative of the endangered state of this language. He will be using modern technology to help document that past, as embodied in the language and the stories of the elders.

Veronica M. Grondona (University of Pittsburgh) – Material development for Bilingual Education among the Mocovi. Mocovi is a Waikuruan language of approximately 4,000 speakers in Argentina. Increased contact with Spanish has led to a decline the use of Mocovi, and many speakers are migrating out of the area to look for better work opportunities. Grondona intends to use the material from her 1998 Ph.D. dissertation as a basis for developing bilingual education materials. Grondona will assist native speakers of Mocovi in the development of these materials.

David VanBik (Haka, Chin State, Burma) – Lai (Haka Chin)-English Dictionary. In Burma, minority languages such as Lai are not allowed to be taught in the schools, and Burmese is increasingly dominant in the linguistic landscape. The availability of a dictionary from Lai into English will increase the value of the minority language by giving its speakers access to a world language without going through the national language. VanBik has already completed an English-Lai dictionary; the Lai-English version will be of more practical use to the native community.

[See below for E.L.F. call for proposals for 2000.]



From: whalen@haskins.yale.edu

Request for Proposals – Endangered Language Fund Grants, 2000

The Endangered Language Fund is pleased to announce its Request for Proposals for 2000. The Fund is a non-profit organization dedicated to the scientific description of endangered languages, support for maintenance efforts, and dissemination of the results of those two effort to the scholarly community and the native communities. The grants we award are made possible by the support of our members. Please visit our Web site at <www.ling.yale.edu/~elf>.

The Endangered Language Fund provides grants for language maintenance and linguistic field work. The work most likely to be funded is that which serves both the native community and the field of linguistics. Work which has immediate applicability to one group and more distant application to the other will also be considered. Publishing subventions are a low priority, although they will be considered. The language involved must be in danger of disappearing within a generation or two. Endangerment is a continuum, and the location on the continuum is one factor in our funding decisions. Eligible expenses include travel, tapes, films, consultant fees, etc. Grants are normally for one year periods, though extensions may be applied for. We expect grants in this round to be less than \$3,000 in size.

NOTE: at least two awards will be made for work on languages in the state of Oklahoma. Language communities there and researchers working on those languages are particularly encouraged to apply.

How to apply

There is no form, but the information requested below should be printed (on one side only) and FOUR COPIES sent to:

The Endangered Language Fund

Dept. of Linguistics
 Yale University
 P. O. Box 208236
 New Haven, CT. 06520-8236. U.S.A.

The street address for express mail services is:

The Endangered Language Fund
 Department of Linguistics
 320 York Street
 Yale University
 New Haven, CT. 06520. U.S.A.

Applications MUST be mailed in. NO e-mail or FAX applications will be accepted. Please note that regular mail, especially from abroad, can take up to four weeks. If you have any questions, please write to the same address or e-mail to <elf@haskins.yale.edu>.

Required Information:

Cover page— The first page should contain:

Title of the Project
 Name of Language and Country in which it is Spoken
 Name of Primary Researcher
 Address of Primary Researcher (include telephone and e-mail if possible.)
 Social Security Number (if U.S. citizen)
 Place and Date of Birth
 Present Position, Education, and Native Language(s).
 Previous Experience and/or Publications that are Relevant.

Include the same information for collaborating researchers if any. This information may continue on the next page.

Description of the Project:

Beginning on a separate page, provide a description of the project. This should normally take two pages, single spaced, but the maximum is five pages. Be detailed about the type of material that is to be collected and/or produced, and the value it will have to the native community (including relatives and descendants who do not speak the language) and to linguistic science. Give a brief description of the state of endangerment of the language in question.

Budget:

On a separate page, prepare an itemized budget that lists expected costs for the project. Estimates are acceptable, but they must be realistic. Please translate the amounts into U.S. dollars. List other sources of support you are currently receiving or expect to receive, and other applications that relate to the current one.

Letter of Support:

Two letters of support are recommended, but not required. Note that these letters, if sent separately, must arrive on or before the deadline (20th. April, 2000) in order to be considered. If more than two letters are sent, only the first two received will be read.

Limit to one Proposal

A researcher can be primary researcher on only one proposal.

Deadline

Applications must be received by **20th. April, 2000**. Decisions will be delivered by the end of May 2000.

Acknowledgment of Receipt

Receipt of application will be made by e-mail if an e-mail address is given. Otherwise, the applicant must include a self-addressed postcard in order to receive the acknowledgment.

If a Grant is Awarded

Before receiving any funds, university-based applicants must show that they have met the requirements of their university's human subjects' committee. Tribal- or other-based

applicants must provide equivalent assurance that proper protocols are being used. If a grant is made and accepted, the recipient is required to provide the Endangered Language Fund with a short formal report of the project and to provide the Fund with copies of all publications resulting from materials obtained with the assistance of the grant.

Further enquiries can be made to:

The Endangered Language Fund
Dept. of Linguistics
Yale University
P. O. Box 208236
New Haven, CT. 06520-8236. U.S.A.

Tel.: 203-432-2450
FAX: 203-432-4087
E-mail: elf@haskins.yale.edu
Web: www.ling.yale.edu/~elf



From: whalen@lenny.haskins.yale.edu
Via Endangered Languages List

N.S.F. Funding

Those on the list who work at U.S. institutions and are interested in links between the language and the environment may want to look into the initiative on biodiversity at the National Science Foundation (www.nsf.gov/cgi-bin/getpub?nsf0022). It is probably too late to establish a full proposal for this year, but there are "incubation" grants for conferences and exploration that could be applied for.

Doug Whalen, DhW., The Endangered Language Fund.



From: Catherine N. Ball <cball@gusun.georgetown.edu>
Via Linguist List

Biodiversity and language: funding opportunity

In LINGUIST 11.111, Doug Whalen notes that "The parallels between homogeneity in biological populations and in language systems is a topic that is less commonly explored".

Those who are interested in this topic might have an angle on a funding opportunity at the National Science Foundation which I have delayed announcing to the list, because I couldn't think of a good "hook" for linguists:

Biocomplexity Special Competition: integrated research to understand and model complexity among biological, physical and social systems. (The full announcement is at <www.nsf.gov/cgi-bin/getpub?nsf0022>).

There is quite a lot of money being devoted to this initiative at N.S.F., and I hope that some linguists will take advantage of it. The proposal deadline is March 1 for "Incubation Activities that enable groups of researchers who have not historically collaborated on biocomplexity research to develop projects via focused workshops, virtual meetings, and other types of development and planning activities". For regular research proposals, the deadline is also March 1, but a letter of intent is being requested by January 31. If you miss this year's competition, there is expected to be another one next year; but an incubation activity this year should be a good head start for a regular research proposal the following year.

Cathy Ball
Program Director, Linguistics
National Science Foundation.

E-mail: cball@nsf.gov



From: Luisa Maffi <maffi@nwu.edu>

Funding Opportunity – Anthropologists' Fund for Urgent Anthropological Research

This Fund was launched in late 1993 to support basic ethnographic research on threatened or disappearing cultures and languages of indigenous peoples. It is entirely supported by individual contributions. It is expected that the research funded will make a fundamental contribution to anthropological knowledge and will also serve, where appropriate, as an aid to indigenous peoples in their struggle to control their own destinies.

Administration: the Fund awards grants to the Royal Anthropological Institute (R.A.I.) of Great Britain and Ireland to support their Fellowships in Urgent Anthropology. Fellowships are arranged in association with Goldsmiths' College, London, England, and are for a minimum of one year and a maximum of two years. Current grants are of US\$15,000 – 20,000. Academic oversight of accepted projects is provided by senior members of Goldsmiths' College. Fellowships are awarded without discrimination of ethnic or national origin, residence, etc.

Objectives of Fellowships: the primary goal is to make a contribution to anthropological research. However, basic ethnographic research has proven to be of material aid and help to indigenous peoples whose cultures and languages are threatened or disappearing. Thus, grantees are encouraged, where appropriate, to:

- a) report to the people concerned on relevant records made in the course of the study of their culture and history, so as to help them make use of valued aspects of these in the construction of their futures;
- b) foster respect, where this has been eroded, for their culture and language and their preservation, including the development of local interest in collecting oral histories and traditions and the incorporation of these in the education system;
- c) collect data on the traditional patterns of land use and rights and make them available for the people;
- d) facilitate the study of local medical practices and their incorporation into the modern health delivery systems;
- e) report violations of human rights to pertinent human rights organisations.

Fellowships Awarded: starting in 1995, Fellowships have been awarded to the following people: Dr. Roxanne P. Hakim, King's College, Cambridge; Dr. Stuart Kirsch, U. of Michigan; Dr. Hua Cai, U. of Paris – Nanterre; Dr. Bartholomew Dean, U. of Kansas; Veronica Strand, D.Phil., U. of Wales – Lampeter. A bibliography of publications arising from the Fellowships can be obtained from Dr. G. N. Appell at the address listed at the end of the message.

Applications: can be obtained from the Head of Department of Anthropology, Goldsmiths' College, University of London, New Cross, London SE14 6NW, U.K. Applicants must have a doctoral degree or have completed the requirements for the degree.

Anthropologists' Fund for Urgent Anthropological Research
P.O. Box A
Phillips, ME. 04966. U.S.A.



From: Nicholas Ostler <nostler@chibcha.demon.co.uk>

Opportunity for E.L. Funding?

University Of Edinburgh – Tweedie Exploration Fellowship

Tweedie Exploration Fellowships may be awarded for archaeological, theological, sociological or linguistic exploration and research in the lesser known regions of the world, with preference for Asia and Northern Africa. It should be noted that archaeological excavations are specifically excluded.

Recent projects to which the Tweedie Exploration Fellowship has given financial support include an investigation into the manipulation of place-names and construction of national identity in Soviet Armenia, and research into constructions of gender with regard to the Indian Hizra.

Candidates must apply by letter, making sure that they include the following information:-

1. Detailed project of investigation
2. Evidence of their experience for such work and their capacity to undertake the particular research proposed
3. Total costing of the project with an indication of what financial assistance they hope to obtain from other sources
4. The sum applied for from the Tweedie Exploration Fellowship fund
5. The names and addresses of two referees.

Prospective applicants are advised that the Fellowship will not normally be awarded for a second time to the same candidate. Applications should be planned as single-season projects, and candidates returning for a second application should be at pains to make a good case for their unusual request. The Fellowships are tenable along with other emoluments.

It is expected that a sum of the order of UK£2,500 will be available in 2000. This will preferably be awarded to one candidate but may be shared. Letters of application should be sent not later than 15th. January, 2000, to the Administrative Officer, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Edinburgh, 55 George Square, Edinburgh, EH8 9JU. Scotland. Awards will be decided in March 2000.

[I thank Eugene McKendry for bringing this to my notice. Please note that all correspondence should be with the address above. F.E.L. is simply acting as a messenger here.]

Nicholas Ostler, President
 Foundation for Endangered Languages
 Registered Charity 1070616 (England, Wales).



Editor's Note: although the deadline for this funding opportunity is past for this year, the message is included so that you can plan for next year's application.



Via: Luisa Maffi <maffi@nwu.edu>

University of Nebraska "Human Rights Initiative"

In 1997 the College of Arts and Sciences at the U. of Nebraska - Lincoln (U.N.L.), declared Human Rights and Human Diversity a Special Interdisciplinary Initiative. This initiative builds on U.N.L.'s existing programs in International Studies, Ethnic Studies, Women's Studies, Judaic Studies and Conflict and Conflict Resolution Studies.

The Human Rights and Human Diversity Initiative at the U.N.L. is a cluster of activities for faculty and graduate students, centered on the notion of international human rights and human diversity. Approved by the College of Arts and Sciences last year, the interdisciplinary program provides funding for guest speakers as well as supporting graduate student internships and research. In the near future it is planned that graduate students will be able to take a degree in a participating department and add a specialisation in human rights. Some fellowships and assistantships will be available.

This Initiative has received two grants from the Ford Foundation, and in January of this year hosted Bishop Desmond Tutu of South Africa for a major speech on human rights. Some monographs based on guest speakers' addresses are available.

For more information on this new course of study, please use the following address:

Dr. Robert K. Hitchcock, Dir. of International Studies
Human Rights and Human Diversity
c/o Dept. of Anthropology
U. of Nebraska - Lincoln
Lincoln, NE. 68588-0368. U.S.A.

E-mail: rkh@unlserve.unl.edu
Web: www.unl.edu/HumanR



From: Dr. François Grin

A - Maaori and Language Policy Analysis

In April 1997 I was asked by New Zealand/Aotearoa authorities (Treasury) to prepare a report on minority language revitalisation, in the form of a three-part analytical report. My colleague François Vaillancourt from the University of Montréal joined me in this venture. The report was submitted in successive parts and extensively commented on by anonymous experts appointed by Treasury. We worked many of these comments into our report, whose revised version was finally submitted in January 1998.

It is important to point out that even though the rationale underlying this report is to investigate policy options for the revitalisation of Maaori, it is not about the Maaori case *per se*: it is a semi-formalised analytical framework for the applied analysis of language policy (Part I), followed (Part II) by an application to four cases of fairly well-documented language policies (two in Wales, one in the Basque Country, one in Ireland). Only Part III elaborates on the possible "transposition" of the analytical framework and empirical findings to the Maaori situation.

The documents now available are the following:

- 1) The full report by Vaillancourt and myself was finally posted on the Web by Treasury (I have been told that it has taken a couple of letters by citizens to the Ombudsman for the report to be released!). The URL is www.treasury.govt.nz. I believe the full text is downloadable with PDF, but since this the report is about 250 pages long, it may be a bit cumbersome. However, there are alternatives:
- 2) Part II (the four case studies on the cost effectiveness of minority language policies) has just been published here at E.C.M.I., as issue No. 2 in our "E.C.M.I. Monographs" series. This 120-page little book can be ordered free of charge (like all E.C.M.I. publications) using the on-line order form at www.ecmi.de, or by writing to us at E.C.M.I., Schiffbrücke 12, D- 24939 Flensburg, Germany. Just as with other E.C.M.I. publications, it should also, in due course, be downloadable in PDF.
- 3) A re-structured version of Part I (that is, the general, analytical model of language policy analysis, but without the algebraic footwork) should soon be available as a separate article somewhere. It is being presented on Friday, 3rd December, at the 7th International Conference on Minority Languages (7I.C.M.L.). The I.C.M.Ls. are convened every three years, and the 1999 edition takes place in Bilbao, Euskadi. The paper, which might be published among conference proceedings or submitted elsewhere for publication, is also by Grin and Vaillancourt, and its title is "Language Policies and Policy Evaluation".
- 4) At this time, we have no plans to transmogrify part III of our Report ("Application to Te Reo Maaori") into some other form of publication. Our first reason is that the analytical and empirical information of scientific relevance (if any!) is contained in Parts I and II; the second reason is that Part III is essentially concerned with formulating tentative recommendations, making it a pure policy rather than an academic text - and the relevance of

specific policy questions changes quickly; the third reason is that neither Vaillancourt nor myself consider ourselves experts on Maaori or on Aotearoa.

B – On-Line Information about the European Centre for Minority Issues (E.C.M.I.)

Along different lines, in relation to Terralingua, some of the information posted on the E.C.M.I. Web site may be of interest to Terralingua members, and you are encouraged to visit us at <www.ecmi.de>.

In addition to the information currently available (of which our site map will give you a bird's-eye view), our Activity schedule for 2000 will be posted soon (it is being finalised right now); another potentially interesting item, which will be included soon, is our new "Visiting Scholar" programme. This modestly funded programme is designed to allow scholars who are engaged in common research with E.C.M.I. staff members to come and spend a few weeks in Flensburg, use our library facilities, and otherwise interact with us on a daily basis. The first recipient was Prof. Vic Webb from Pretoria, who spent two weeks with us last August. A one-page description of the E.C.M.I. Visiting Scholar Programme will be prepared and posted soon.

Finally, E.C.M.I. is opening two positions: (1) Director of the E.C.M.I. (see profile on Web site); and (2) Research Associate (with specialisation in international law, minority rights, etc., and preferably a focus on south-eastern Europe). The deadline for applications is 31 January, 2000.

C – New Book on the Labour Market Value of Language Skills

As part of my "Swiss" activities, I have just published a book (in French) on the rates of return to second-language skills. It uses fresh Swiss data and, to my knowledge, it is the first one of its kind, in that it focuses on the value of languages other than the locally dominant one. In the case of Switzerland, this means German, Italian and English in the French-speaking part of the country; French, Italian and English in the German-speaking part of the country; and French, German and English in the Italian-speaking part of the country (for a variety of reasons, the particular context of the small Romanche-speaking areas was not investigated). This work is therefore distinct from U.S. studies on the value of English for Hispanic immigrants, for example). The data were gathered through a telephone survey of a representative sample of 2,400 adults in gainful employment across the country, also yielding statistically useful information about competence levels in L2s, channels of acquisition, etc.

The book has been receiving some press coverage in Switzerland, because its findings feed into the continuing (and heated) debate about which second language to teach first: a national language (as has been the case up to the present) or English? Given the structure of labour market rates of return to L2 skills, the answer is far from obvious, and may arguably be different depending on gender. Other findings, about the relative effectiveness of school and non-school channels of L2 acquisition, have caused some (occasionally angry) reactions! The full reference of the book is:

Grin, François, 1999: *Compétences et récompenses: la valeur des langues en Suisse*. Fribourg: Editions Universitaires Fribourg (Suisse). I.S.B.N. 2-8271-0843-7. 261 pages. Price: CHF 39.-

It can be ordered through any bookstore; the publisher's address is:

Editions Universitaires
Pérolles 42
CH - 1705 Fribourg. Switzerland.

FAX: (+41-26) 426-4300
E-mail: eduni@st-paul.ch

~~~~~  
Dr. François Grin, Acting Director  
European Centre for Minority Issues (E.C.M.I.)  
Schiffbrücke 12  
D - 24939 Flensburg. Germany.

Tel.: (49-461) 141-4911  
FAX: (49-461) 141-4919

and Senior Lecturer, University of Geneva, Switzerland.



From: Jeffrey Harlig <harligj@Indiana.Edu>  
Via: endangered-languages-l@carmen.murdoch.edu.au

Article on Use of Technology

I have recently scanned in (with permission) an article discussing the use of a computerized distributed learning and discussion system for Inuit students throughout the Baffin Bay region. If you are interested in reading about it, you can see it at <home.bluemarble.net/~consult/baffin.htm>.

Caveats:

1. It was O.C.R.ed and I proofed it only lightly;
2. There are four large pictures in it that take a long time to download. I suggest you start reading the text and scroll back to see the illustrations later;
3. I'm basically skeptical about claims that modern technology can preserve indigenous culture, but if it works, it works!



From: Henriette Gezundhajt <acla@aclacaal.org>

Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics  
(www.aclacaal.org)

The Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics will hold its 2000 conference as part of the Congress of the Social Sciences and Humanities at the University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta from 25-27 May, 2000. Themes include globalization as well as technology and second language acquisition. Other colloquia themes may also be included.



From: Christopher Newton <newton@humanitas.ucsb.edu>

Workshop on American Indigenous Languages (W.A.I.L.)  
14-16 April, 2000  
Santa Barbara, California, U.S.A.

The linguistics department at the University of California, Santa Barbara announces its third annual Workshop on American Indigenous Languages, a forum for the discussion of theoretical and descriptive linguistic studies of indigenous languages of the Americas.

Talks will be on any topic in Native American linguistics and will be 20 minutes long, followed by 10 minutes for discussion. For further information contact the conference co-ordinator at <wail@humanitas.ucsb.edu> or (805) 893-3776, or check out our Web site at <linguistics.ucsb.edu/events/wail/wail.html>.



From: GFW <westphal@umbc.edu> (8 Dec., 1999)

New Regional Office

The Latin American Association of Linguistics and Philology (A.L.F.A.L.) announces its new Regional Office for the U.S.A. and Canada, c/o G. F. Westphal, Dept. of Modern Languages &

Linguistics, University of Maryland, Baltimore County, MD. 21250 (Fax 410-455-1025). A.L.F.A.L. holds its international meeting every three years (the last one at the Universidad de Santiago de Chile in August of 1999), and publishes its conference proceedings and the journal *Linguistica*. The official languages of A.L.F.A.L. are Spanish and Portuguese. Memberships are US\$45 for three years, plus a one-time registration fee of US\$30. Please send an e-mail to <westphal@umbc.edu> for an application form.

G. F. Westphal  
A. T. de Castilho  
Delegado Regional  
Presidente de A.L.F.A.L.

E-mail: westphal@umbc.edu  
E-mail: ataliba@uol.com.br



From: Luisa Maffi <maffi@nwu.edu>

The Evolution of Language

3-6 April, 2000  
Paris, France

E'cole Nationale Supérieure des Télécommunications ([www.infres.enst.fr/confs/evolang/](http://www.infres.enst.fr/confs/evolang/)).

Organised by Professor Jean Aitchison (Oxford University); Dr. Jean-Louis Dessalles (E.N.S.T. Paris); Professor Jim Hurford (Department of Linguistics, University of Edinburgh); Dr. Chris Knight (Department of Sociology, University of East London); Professor Luc Steels (Sony CSL and Vrije Universiteit Brussel).

Local organisation by Jean-Louis Dessalles (E.N.S.T. Paris); Laleh Ghadakpour (C.R.E.A.); Frederic Kaplan (Sony C.S.L.); Luc Steels (Sony C.S.L. and Vrije Universiteit Brussel); François Yvon (E.N.S.T. Paris).

This will be the third conference in a series concerned with the evolutionary emergence of speech. From a wide range of disciplines, we seek to attract researchers willing to integrate their perspectives with those of modern Darwinism. The aim is to bring together linguists, computer scientists, anthropologists, palaeontologists, ethologists, geneticists, neuroscientists, and other scientists who are concerned with the question of the origin and evolution of language.

Confirmed invited speakers:

Frans B. M. de Waal (Emory University); Bernd Heine (Universitat zu Koln); Ray Jackendoff (Brandeis University); Paul A. Mellars (University of Cambridge); Sue Savage-Rumbaugh (Georgia State University); Herbert Terrace (Columbia University); Michael Tomasello (Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology).

Some of the issues that will be discussed are origin of language; origin of telic abilities; origin of syntax; origin of symbolic representation; semantic abilities; evolutionary significance of language; compatibility with natural selection; language and the origin of culture; chronology of the spread of humankind and its relationship to language; the continuity/discontinuity of the language faculty with non-human communication systems; dynamics of language evolution; evolution of telic systems; evolution of the lexicon; evolution of grammar structures.

If you are planning to attend the Conference, please send an e-mail to <evolang@infres.enst.fr>. You will be kept informed through e-mail of further useful information.



From: Marianne Ignace <m\_rignace@bc.sympatico.ca>  
Via S.S.I.L.A. #102

Language Foundation Planned in Canada  
(26 Dec., 1999)

My name is Chief Ron. E. Ignace. I am the chair of the National Chiefs' Committee on Languages for the Assembly of First Nations (Canada). I would like to inform you of our agenda and to enlist all the support I can. The Committee's objective is to have our languages legally recognized by way of legislation and to set up a Language Foundation (as a Royal Commission), which can be capitalized to C\$100 million, of which C\$50 million is to be raised privately. We are establishing a committee called "Friends of Aboriginal Languages"; we hope, with the support of our National Chief, to enlist Senators, M.P.'s, business leaders, sports personalities, musicians, and other individuals who are interested and concerned.

The A.F.N. Chiefs in Assembly have declared 2000 a year dedicated to Aboriginal languages. The A.F.N.'s next National Assembly, which will be held in Montreal, is dedicated to Languages. There will be fund-raising activities leading up to and during the Assembly. All proceeds will be targeted at the communities which are the cradles of the languages, and to facilitate inter-generational transfer of the languages. I would appreciate your support.

If you have any questions or suggestions you can e-mail me at the address below or telephone 613/241-6789 (Louise LaHache, language sector, A.F.N.).

Chief Ron. E. Ignace

E-mail: <m\_rignace@bc.sympatico.ca>



From: Osahito Miyaoka <omiyaoka@ling.bun.kyoto-u.ac.jp>  
Via Linguist List

Japan Supports Research on Languages of the North Pacific Rim  
(26 Dec., 1999)

A major research project is now under way in Japan, funded by the Ministry of Education, to support systematic and swift measures to preserve endangered languages of Pacific rim minorities where research has been lagging, at the same time retaining a long-term perspective.

Priority will be placed on languages whose continued existence is in question and will focus on four areas: (1) gathering and sorting records from previous linguistic surveys; (2) undertaking new field work (3) recording, organizing, and analyzing linguistic data; and (4) publishing the results (dictionaries, grammars, textbooks, etc.) and entering this information into databases.

In the fiscal year beginning in April 2000, three-year projects will be launched on planned research topics (around 35 in all) and research proposals will be publicly solicited. Projects will take the form of focused linguistic surveys and research (Type A) or cross-disciplinary research (Type B) on theory, methodology, and information processing, intended to back up Type A efforts. A total of seven topics have been selected according to region and research content:

- A01: South Pacific Rim
- A02: North Pacific Rim (including the Ainu language)
- A03: East and Southeast Asia
- A04: Japan (includes Japanese spoken abroad)
  
- B01: Methods for surveying endangered languages
- B02: Dynamic research on language extinction and preservation
- B03: Survey research support through information processing

Applications for both types will be accepted again in the autumn of 2000. Overseas linguists can join the project by forming a group with a Japanese researcher who works on the same (or a close) language. For further information (in English) visit <www.elpr.bun.kyoto-



linguist is not to save this language but to describe it purely for linguistic purposes. I have had the purpose of working with Aonik'o 'a'yin to prepare lessons of it similar to the books I had already prepared for the Chubut Mapuche language. Besides my college training, I am an innate language learner which is fundamental tool in this task. I have been looking for support to carry on this urgent and important task, but our authorities are blind to this need. There is not much time to save Aonik'o 'a'yin; to say it in an illustrative way, if it is 11.58, then at 12.00 o'clock Aonik'o 'a'yin will die. If actions are carried on this tongue may be saved, otherwise it will have disappeared for ever in the equivalent of two minutes.

I work in a high school to earn my living to support my family (five of us). Although I am really committed to these tongues, I cannot leave my work to devote all the time to rescue these two languages, but time is absolutely necessary to achieve the goal successfully. I have given a proof of my commitment, having worked for thirteen years without any support. How could Aonik'o 'a'yin disappear? How could efforts not be made at least to save it from dying? I am asking for the possibility of support to carry on a project to save Aonik'o 'a'yin and the varieties of Mapuche language of Chubut. I would present a project and assure it through a University contact, for instance, the one where I am working for my thesis.

I am looking forward to hearing from you. Thanks so much.

Lic. Antonio Díaz-Fernández.



**ANNOTATED LISTING OF INTERESTING / USEFUL SOURCES**

From: Luisa Maffi <maffi@nwu.edu>

Cultural Rights and Wrongs

*Cultural Rights and Wrongs: a collection of essays in commemoration of the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.*

Editor: Halina Niec'

Publisher: U.N.E.S.C.O. Publishing, Paris, France, and the Institute of Art and Law, Leicester,

U.K. 1998. 200+ pp.

I.S.B.N.: (U.N.E.S.C.O.) 92-3 103555-X; (I.A.L.) 0-9531696-3-4

[From the introduction]: "Bearing in mind the significance of the multitude of celebrations around the globe of the fiftieth anniversary of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, U.N.E.S.C.O.'s Culture Sector deemed it particularly appropriate to honour the *Declaration* as the first international document of proclaim cultural rights for human beings. *Our Cultural Diversity*, the Report of the World Commission on Culture and Development (1995), called on cultural rights specialists in legal and other social sciences to present their views on the current recognition and implementation of cultural rights throughout the world. With the ever-increasing pace of globalisation, whether one chooses to consider cultural right in artistic, ecological or sociological contexts, it is apparent that there is a growing need for mutual respect for and understanding of other cultures. Culture is an intrinsic part of a y group or individual. Hence, questions of collective or group rights continue to be at the forefront of international law and politics when addressing cultural rights.

The Editor of this book, in compiling its roster of contributors, did so with the intention of drawing together legal and scholarly representatives of a variety of cultures from across the world...".

Authors included in this book are Rodolfo Stavenhagen; Emmanuel Decaux; Darrell Addison Posey; Elizabeth Evatt; Dean B. Suagee; Folarin Shyllon; Vrajendra Ray Mehta; Alice Erh-Soon Tay; Kishore Singh; Lyndel Prott; Halina Niec'.



From: Mike Groseth <MJG@OUP-USA.ORG>

New O.U.P. Titles in Sociolinguistics & Anthropological Linguistics

*Beyond Ebonics: linguistic pride and racial prejudice*

Author: John Baugh, Stanford University.

Publisher: Oxford University Press; Feb. 2000; 176 pp.

I.S.B.N.: 0-19-512046-9

Price: US\$29.95

The media frenzy surrounding the 1996 resolution by the Oakland School Board [California, U.S.A.] brought public attention to the term "Ebonics"; however, the idea remains a mystery to most. John Baugh, a well-known African-American linguist and education expert, offers an accessible explanation of the origins of the term, the linguistic reality behind the hype, and the politics behind the outcry on both sides of the debate. Using a non-technical, first-person style, and bringing in many of his own personal experiences, Baugh debunks many commonly held notions about the way African-Americans speak English, and the result is a nuanced and balanced portrait of a fraught subject. This volume should appeal to students and scholars in anthropology, linguistics, education, urban studies, and African-American studies

*Language, Education, and Culture*

Tariq Rahman, Quaid-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan.

Publisher: Oxford University Press; July 1999; 336 pp.

I.S.B.N.: 0-19-579146-0

Price: US\$26.95

Pakistan has had many conflicts involving language. The various language movements have sometimes led to rioting and always to assertions of ethnic identity. This book presents a comprehensive analysis, supported by statistical evidence, of the intimate linkages between language, politics, and ethnicity in Pakistan.

*Linguistic Diversity*

Daniel Nettle, Merton College, Oxford.

Publisher: Oxford University Press; July 1999; 184 pp.

I.S.B.N. & price: 0-19-823857-6 (paper) US\$19.95

0-19-823858-4 (cloth) US\$65.00

There are some 6,500 different languages in the world. This book investigates why diversity arose, how it relates to the origins and evolution of language and culture, and whether the uneven distribution of human languages may be linked with patterns of human geography and history. Daniel Nettle draws on work in anthropology, linguistics, geography, archeology, and evolutionary science to explain linguistic diversity.



From: Jussi Niemi <Jussi.Niemi@Joensuu.FI>

Recent Volumes in Language Studies, University of Joensuu

Series Editor: Jussi Niemi (jussi.niemi@joensuu.fi; cc.joensuu.fi/linguistics).

Sales: Joensuu University Library, FAX +358-13-251 2691, <joepub@joensuu.fi>

*Language Contact, Variation, and Change.*

Editors: Jussi Niemi, Terence Odlin, Janne Heikkinen

Publisher: University of Joensuu 1998, Studies in Languages 32.

Contents:

Endre Brunstad – Purism towards English: a comparative analysis of language planning in the Nordic language communities;  
 Wolfgang U. Dressler – What is the Core of Morphology?;  
 Zsuzsa Duray – Sociolinguistic Considerations of Extralinguistic Factors Determining Language Death in the Nganasan Minority Community of Russia;  
 Sirkka-Liisa Hahmo and Tette Hofstra – Echoes from Early Bilingualism Round the Baltic Sea: germanic influences on the Balto-Finnic lexicon;  
 Panu Hallamaa – Fieldwork among Speakers of Endangered Languages: methodology, reality, and social advocacy;  
 Helena Halmari – Case Assignment and Adverbials in Finnish-English Bilingual Sentences;  
 Anu-Reet Hausenberg – Language Affinity and Language Contacts in the History of Settlement of Northeast Europe;  
 Jan Heegaard – Variational Patterns in Vowel Length in Kalashamon;  
 Pekka A. Hirvonen – The Finnish-American Language Shift;  
 Ossi Kokko – Loss and Maintenance of Linguistic Features in Language Attrition;  
 Ago K,nap – Radically Renewing Uralistics and the Siberian Contact Area of the Uralic Languages;  
 Minna-Liisa Mathalt – Strategies of Interpretation;  
 Terence Odlin – An Army, a Navy and Ebonics;  
 Esa Penttilö, Marja Nenonen, and Jussi Niemi – Cultural and Biological Bases of Idioms: a crosslinguistic study;  
 Helka Riionheimo – Morphological Attrition and Interference in Language Contact: sketching a framework;  
 Ilkka Savijörvi – Cognate Languages in Contact: Ingria – where four Baltic-Finnic languages meet.



From: whalen@lenny.haskins.yale.edu

Two Interesting References from Cambridge U. Press.

*Cultural and Language Diversity and the Deaf Experience.*  
 Author: Ila Parasnian, 1998.  
 Price: US\$19.95 paper (now discounted at US\$15.96).

An analysis of deaf people as a culturally and linguistically distinct minority group within American society.

*Environment and Ethnicity in India, 1200-1991.*  
 Author: Sumit Guha, 1999.  
 Price: US\$59.95 cloth (now discounted at \$47.96).

Demonstrates how the ideology of indigenous cultures, developed in recent years out of the notion of a pure and untouched ethnicity, is in fact rooted in nineteenth-century racial and colonial anthropology.



From: Thomas Dietz <TDietzVT@AOL.COM>

Sustainable Development

On 9 November, 1999, the National Academy of Sciences released a new report entitled *Nature and Human Society: the quest for a sustainable world*. It is the result of a three-year study by the Board on Sustainable Development that included social scientists. The participants consider it a major contribution to the discussion of sustainability. The report will be available on the Web at <www.nap.edu>, so you can judge for yourself.

iiiiiiiiiiiiiiii

N.R.C. Report on Sustainability

The National Research Council has issued *Our Common Journey: a transition toward sustainability*. It is seen by many as a major statement. There was a substantial social science contribution: Bob Kates and Bill Clark co-chaired the study and Lourdez Arizpe, John Bongaarts, Granger Morgan, John Robinson, Vern Ruttan, Tom Schelling were on the panel. I think debate and discussion about it will be useful. It's available on the Web at <www.nap.edu>.

Thomas Dietz  
 Chair, U.S. National Research Council Committee on  
 Human Dimensions of Global Change  
 Arts & Sciences Distinguished Scholar  
 Professor of Sociology, Environmental Science & Public Policy  
 George Mason University  
 members.aol.com/tdietzvt/Dietz\_home\_page.html  
 Fairfax, Virginia 22030. U.S.A.

Tel.: 703-993-1435  
 FAX: 703-993-1446  
 Web:



From: Luisa Maffi <maffi@nwu.edu>

Book on Culture, Heritage and Environment in Australia

*Culture and Heritage: indigenous languages.*  
 Authors: Henderson, John Keith and Nash, David.  
 Publisher: Australia State of the Environment Technical Paper Series – Natural and Cultural Heritage. 1997,  
 Central Queensland University Publishing Unit and Environment Australia,  
 Rockhampton, Queensland, Australia. 38 pp.

1. Introduction
2. The state of Australia's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander languages
3. Indigenous creoles
4. Language use
5. Collaborative research on Aboriginal places
6. Aboriginal place names – use over time
7. Areas of major concern to be monitored
8. A summary of current pressures, state, and responses.



From: Barbara Brower <browerb@geog.pdx.edu>  
 Via E-ANTH List (4 Oct., 1999)

Cultural Embeddedness of Indigenous Knowledge

Has anyone suggested *New Lessons from Nature's Geography: biogeographical landscapes and conservation in developing countries* (K. Zimmerer and K. Young, eds., University of Wisconsin Press, 1999), as a useful route to culture/nature communication? Geographers have more practice than anthropologists, maybe, at looking simultaneously at cultural and "natural" pattern and process. This book has a bunch of chapters that work back and forth across those domains. As an anthropologist-turned-geographer – because of interests in environment-society interactions that anthropology didn't seem to handle as well – I'd recommend the intrinsically interdisciplinary perspectives of my adopted field.

Barbara Brower  
 Editor, *Himalayan Research Bulletin*

Geography Department  
 Portland State University  
 Portland, OR. 97207-0751. U.S.A.



From: Nicholas Ostler <nostler@chibcha.demon.co.uk>

F.E.L. III Proceedings Available – *Endangered Languages and Education*

The proceedings of the Foundation for Endangered Languages' last conference in Maynooth are now available, entitled *Endangered Languages and Education*. It is a 128-page volume, containing an index of authors, languages and families, plus seven sections of papers. Copies are now available, at 12 pounds UK apiece, or US\$20 (including surface postage and packing), from the address below. For air mail dispatch, please add 50%.

You can pay by: a cheque/check (in £ sterling) payable to "Foundation for Endangered Languages"; a check (in US\$) payable to "Nicholas Ostler"; proof of having sent an equivalent sum in your own currency to the society's account, "Foundation for Endangered Languages", Account #: 50073456, The Co-operative Bank (Sort code: 08-90-02), 16 St. Stephen's Street, Bristol BS1 1JR, England; or by credit card (Visa, MasterCard, EuroCard), enclosing Card number, expiry date (month | year), name (as on card), and address (as on card). All proceeds which come in soon enough will go to support our next round of grants.



From: David Harmon <gws@mail.portup.com>

Brenzinger Volume on African Endangered Languages

*Endangered Languages in Africa*

Editor: M. Brenzinger

Publisher: U. of Leipzig [?]; 1998, 284 pp., 4 maps. 7 graphs, numerous tables.

I.S.B.N.: 3-89645-305-X

Price: DEM 98,-

This book contains the conference proceedings of the "Symposium on Endangered Languages in Africa", held at the University of Leipzig from 29 July to 1 August, 1997. The volume consists of papers dealing with the situation of languages in Africa threatened by extinction in general, as well as case studies concerning specific languages.

Contents:

Matthias Brenzinger – Endangered Languages and Language Endangerment in Africa: introduction;  
 Richard J. Hayward – The Endangered Languages of Ethiopia: what's at stake for the linguist?;  
 Gabriele Sommer – Reconstructing the Past: historical linguistics, contact-induced change,  
 language shift

and re-lexification;

Gerrit Dimmendaal – Language Contraction Versus Vther Types of Contact-induced Change;

Mauro Tosco – People Who Are Not the Language They Speak: on language shift without language  
 decay

in East Africa;

David L. Appleyard – Language Death: the case of Qwarenya (Ethiopia);

Zealelem Leyew – Some Structural Signs of Obsolescence in K'emant;

Roger Blench – The Status of the Languages of Central Nigeria;

Bruce Connell – Moribund Languages of the Nigeria-Cameroon Borderland;

Andrew Haruna – Language Death: the case of Bubbure in Southern Bauchi Area, Northern Nigeria;

Raimund Kastenholz – Language Shift and Language Death among Mande Blacksmiths and  
 Leatherworkers

in the Diaspora;

Herman Batibo – The Fate of the Khoesan Languages of Botswana.

You may order the book through our Web site using the button ORDERS (receiving an order form there for printout) on the left side, below our African cuckoo symbol or "free hand", by writing a short e-mail letter. Shipping by surface mail (appr. 5-6 weeks) is included in the book price of DEM 98,- (appr. US\$50,-); shipment by air mail would be DEM 18,- in addition to the book price. Payment via credit card would be cheaper than bank transfer, and we could ship the book immediately. Using the above FAX order form will be safer than mentioning your credit card data via e-mail/Internet.

Ruediger Koeppe, Publisher  
Ruediger Koeppe Verlag  
Wendelinstrasse 73-75  
Koeln. Germany.

Tel.: ++49 (0)221 - 49 11 236 und 49 11 237  
FAX: ++49 (0)221 - 499 43 36  
E-mail: r.koeppe@ndh.netD-50933  
Web: www.koeppe.de



From: Gillian Caglayan <G.Caglayan@deGruyter.de>  
Folk Linguistics

*Folk Linguistics*

Authors: Nancy Niedzielski and Dennis R. Preston.

Publisher: Mouton de Gruyter. Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 122.  
1999; 375 pages.

I.S.B.N.: 3-11-016251-2

Price: DM 238,- /approx. US\$149.00 (cloth).

Folk Linguistics provides an overview and analysis of what non-linguists believe about language across a wide range of topics – dialectology, sociolinguistics, language acquisition (first and second), and even the more "theoretical" concerns of phonology, syntax, and semantics. It provides a rationale for the importance of such study, not only in its own ethnographic right but also in its importance to general and applied linguistics. The core of the book presents authentic (and carefully transcribed) conversations with a broad social spectrum of people from the northern Midwestern United States. The analysis focuses not only on the differences between nonlinguists' and linguists' views of language but also on the kinds of knowledge nonlinguists have about language and what folk theory of language stands behind such belief. The section on dialects contains the most recent findings in the subfield of folk linguistics known as "perceptual dialectology", and the sections on folk views of language education (particularly of minorities) are extensive. Of special interest to general linguists will be an entire section devoted to folk views of "grammaticality", including a lengthy folk discussion of the passive. In general, although linguists will be most familiar with the arrangement of topics here, anthropologists, social psychologists of language, folklorists, and others who deal with the intersection of language and social life will find a wealth of authentic data here and the beginnings of a more general account of not only the details but also the cognitive underpinnings of the ethnoscience of language.

*For further information please contact the publisher:*

Mouton de Gruyter  
Genthiner Str. 13  
Berlin. Germany.

FAX: +49 30 26005 22210785  
E-mail: orders@degruyter.de

Journals and titles published by Mouton de Gruyter can be ordered via World Wide Web at <www.degruyter.com>.



From: Prior Gareth <edonoghue@BlackwellPublishers.co.uk>  
Via Linguist List

On-line Access to the Latest Linguistics Research via the World-Wide Web

