Dialogue among Civilizations: A New Domain for Language Challenges

Nasim Ghanbari *

Persian Gulf University, Bushehr, Iran

Abstract

Dialogue among civilizations (DaC) has been referred as a solution to save the world community. But the question is how to decide about the language of different guests in this global dialogue. Three major ideas have been proposed in this regard. While the first advocates the English language monopoly and discusses its old dominance, the second proposes a newly-built world language which is none of the existing languages, but is a commonly understandable one. The last, which is the main concern of this paper, suggests a multilingual round table. Here, these three ideas are investigated and their feasibility, acceptability and also their repercussions with regard to DaC will be studied. Finally, this study suggests that accepting a multilingual approach in a world dialogue that invites all cultures and civilizations to the contribution will do the best.

Keywords: dialogue among civilizations (DAC), linguicide, Englishization, neutral language, linguistic human rights, English monopoly

INTRODUCTION

Dialogue is a new way of talking to each other. It is rather an opening of horizons than an exchange of arguments. It is an open conversation towards the end of a discussion. The word originates from the Greek language and signifies 'through' (dia) and 'sense of the word' which is the meaning (logos). This specific methodology of mutual understanding leads to the discovery of new ground and furthermore to the opening of new horizons. The participants in this dialogue are called ignored or slept civilizations. One of the salient assumptions of this worldwide dialogue is that all civilizations have shared their building block thoughts. Exploring different cultures and civilizations, a lot of similarities are found which indicate that we should emphasize shared parts though differences should not be thrown away since these differences make the world community meaningful.

Language as the axis of every verbal communication has a noticeable role in this global dialogue, but again language like any other issue when is put in a supranational framework faces many complicated choices. A very important issue is that what will be the language of the sides of the dialogue .Three solutions have been put forward each based on a series of observations of the existing world linguistic situation. English

* **Correspondence:** Nasim Ghanbari, Email: btghanbari@gmail.com

language dominance, a neutral and artificial language and letting diverse languages to manifest themselves are three main proposals in front of linguistic challenges of DAC. The assumption behind the first choice (i.e. letting English to continue its prevalence) is in contradiction with the very spirit of the dialogue which knows no geographic, cultural or social boundaries. DaC is the reawakening of other civilizations and giving them the right to manifest their unique voice .Although today English has got many world opportunities and from Eastern Asia to Latin America, English is well recognized and has speakers, there are clear evidences that English is losing its amazing dominance (Crystal, 1997).

The notion of an International Auxiliary Language (IAL) without any specific national backing and prejudice is the second proposal for a possible linguistic solution for DAC. Three quarters of a century ago the League of Nations voted on a resolution to adopt Esperanto as the IAL. It drew much attention because in a world full of harsh linguistic competitions it provided a neutral atmosphere for all to express themselves and understand each other's minds. Great claims have been made regarding accepting such a neutral language. Some have claimed that when such a language has been decided upon, then the illiterate masses can gain an education through the new medium and thinkers will have the means of communicating with other similar minds anywhere on the planet (Gaskel, 1997). Later on it is shown how the IAL supporters faced the realities of the present world linguistic situation.

Multilingualism as the last proposal here suggests that neither the monopolist configuration of the world nor ignoring the really diverse linguistic communities can be effective. Rather, in contrast to the old false belief which considers multilingualism as the source of misconception and misunderstanding among human beings, the diversity of languages like the diversity of civilizations should be brought in to the international arena of DAC.

DIALOUGE AND CIVILIZATIONS

History of the world has always had two different faces. Monopolism and imperialism accompanied by cruelty, violence and squashing other so-called weak nations has had a long tradition. The other face, not so much old, has been the exchange of ideas, knowledge, technology and exploring new cultural and mental worlds. The second face as an unwritten history is indeed the backbone of dialogue among civilizations and cultures, however, there have been threatening hindrances facing this newly formed global round table. Globalization by intentionally ignoring the diversity of identities and ethnicities has been a permanent threat for the multicultural world. Also, some of the monopolist-beaten minds, following the track of Huntington, call for the opposition of cultures and justify this as the deterministic path of the history.

Language as a means of transmitting civilizations internal life can fulfill a strong role in approaching cultures together. The dialogue based on the power of language can effectively reduce the conflict among the influential civilizations of the world. Although a variety of other factors are involved, language has kept its superior place in the DAC.

Some civilizations have had a permanent influence on the world civilization. Namely, Greece, Rome, China, Persia, Egypt, India have all been the powerful civilizations. Though today some have lost their previous glorious positions, but their mentalistic influence over the following formed civilizations cannot be ignored.

To know a short history of some of these influencing civilizations would be helpful. First the civilization of ancient Greece is discussed. It flowered more than 2500 years ago. Greece is a peninsula in southeastern Europe .The people of the region attempted to explain the world through laws of nature. They made important discoveries in science. They developed democracy where people governed themselves rather than being governed by a king. The Greeks also valued beauty and imagination. They wrote many stories and plays that continue to be performed today. In fact the ancient Greek developed a great deal of what we take for granted today. This is why Greece is often known as the cradle of western civilization.

About 387BC a city on the Italian peninsula began acquiring land and building an empire. That city was Rome. For more than one thousand years Rome controlled the western world. Rome conquered many of its allies by force. Rome managed to unify most of the modern nation of Italy by 265BC. Exploring Chinese civilization as a powerful one which flourished in the east, we see that it began along the HuangHe River. It travels for 3000 miles across China. During summer floods, the river spread enough silt on the land to create miles of fertile farmland. About 4000BC, farming communities developed along the lower part of HuangHe .The Chinese civilizations grew from these farming communities. The hard work of Chinese farmers allowed powerful civilizations grew. Finally, the other powerful civilization in the east was the Persia, a kingdom east of the Greek peninsula. The Persians created a vast empire that eventually stretched from Asia Minor (modern Turkey) to Babylon (modern Iraq).The heyday of Persian civilization was the time of violent struggles with the other western empire, Greece. There were harsh battles between those two great empires and it was during these clashes that a great deal of exchanges between the two civilizations occurred.

The above brief history of great world civilizations as the foundation of present-day civilizations directs to the possible historic grounds for the dialogue between them. Language is entangled with human civilization .as both a means and a sign of human growth and maturity. Such nexus between language and civilization can be an appropriate start for establishing empathy through dialogue. Next section investigates the above closeness through exploring the language family concept.

LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGE FAMILIES

In 1930 John Firth, the first person to hold a chair in linguistics, had said that there were approximately 1500 languages in the world .Current estimates are higher than any of these –around 4500 languages. Before considering these statistical information this salient point should be added that basic language surveys are non-existent or incomplete in many parts of the world even in developed societies, census information-

especially that touching upon language ability and use is notoriously unreliable, subject to a wide variety of hindrances(e.g. political, geographical, psychological, and so on). Many of the actually existent languages in the past are not counted and the reason for this evident underestimation can be related to these languages vulnerability to social, political and economic changes.

It is interesting to mention that many scholars who have shown interest in threatened varieties have been animated largely by antiquarian and literary motives. Among the wonders of the linguistic phenomenon on the earth, diversity of names is very striking. In fact, multiple names arise for a number of reasons .The names of different subgroups, tribes, or clans may all become attached to the language they share. Also, different groups of foreigners whether adjacent language communities, explorers, invaders or scholars of different nationalities may have their own names for the same people and language. These 4500 recognized living languages are arranged in families of related varieties, though in many cases the classification is unclear or debatable. For example, centuries ago it was well recognized in Europe that French, Spanish, Portuguese and other Romance varieties were all related; indeed parent language (i.e. Latin) continued to exist.

Around the beginning of the 19th century the notion of a common ancestor flourished. Central here was the increased access to Sanskrit as a result of trade and colonial expansion and the realization of its importance. As an example of these efforts was the Salmasius (claude de Saumaise: 1588-1653) who in 1643 published his "Dehelleruistica" in which, Latin, Greek, Persian and the Germanic languages were seen to descend from a lost common ancestor. Thirty years later, the list of descendants was extended to include the Italic, Slavic and Celtic groups. Table 1 below shows that collectively, the Indo-European varieties can claim 3800 million speakers.

Considering the present amazing dispersal of languages and then seeing them converge under major language families signifies and supports a very crucial point that all languages have had the same origin at the beginning of human life on earth, what is implied metaphorically in the story of Castle of Babel brought in Genesis. All human beings had one common language .Although this conclusion is not accepted as easily as it may seem the least implication of the language families supports the unbelievable interrelationships among languages that at the first glance may look so different.

Although these historical perspectives help us a lot to understand present world linguistic situation better, it cannot suffice the need for clarification of the undermined positions of many languages and dominance of some others. A very important and determining factor in the present distribution of languages and harsh linguistic competitions around the globe is the concept of language policy which is briefly discussed below.

Table 1. Major world languages (Edwards, 1994)

Language	Language family	Speakers (million)
Arabic	Afro-Asiatic	175
Bengali	Indo-European	150
Bihari	Indo-European	65
Chinese	Sino-Tibetan	1000
English	Indo-European	1400
French	Indo-European	220
German	Indo-European	100
Gujarati	Indo-European	35
Hausa	Indo-European	40
Hindi	Afro-Asiatic	700
Italian	Indo-European	60
Japanese	Atlantic/Isolate	120
Javanese	Austronesian	65
Korean	Indo-European	60
Malay	Indo-European	160
Marathi	Indo-European	50
Persian	Indo-European	55
Punjabi	Indo-European	70
Polish	Indo-European	40
Portuguese	Indo-European	160
Russian	Indo-European	270
Spanish	Indo-European	280
Swahili	Indo-European	30
Tagalog	Niger-Congo	270
Tamil	Austro-Asiatic	280
Telugu	Dravidian	30
Thai	Tai	50
Turkish	Atlantic	55
Ukrainian	Indo-European	55
Urdu	Indo-European	50
Vietnamese	Austro-Asiatic	50

LANGUAGE POLICY

Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas (1999) consider language policy as a barometer of identities at the sub-national, national and supranational levels. They also show how education system and society at large encourage or subdue languages and identities. Language policy issues are invariably entangled with non-linguistic matters. Military collaboration, peacekeeping missions, commercial transactions are some important and influential fields that language policy issues are actively involved. As an example of the determining role of language policy in supranational level is the EU with its 15 members, for which language is not only the medium but a central concern, to decide on the what languages can be determined as official and working in supranational institutions and some agreed languages for the member states to communicate with.

Language policy is a super-ordinate category within which fall operational concerns such as language planning and it is in a multilingual and multidialectal world that language planning comes in between and bears the political and economic choices and

the value judgments of the planners. DaC with the aim to establish a global community void of any discrimination and inequality faces the present linguistic situation. Regarding the suprastatal domain of DaC and also considering language planning issues three afore-mentioned choices become the major topics. Keeping the old prevalent English as the medium of multilateral transferring of ideas, an artificial language like Esperanto seems to be an appropriate alternative for the hopefully unbiased round table of DAC. And finally from a realistic point of view, multilingualism or what Tsuda (2001) calls ecology of language paradigm is proposed.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND DAC

Crystal (1997, p.75) in his English *as a global language* wrote:

> The story of English throughout the period is one of the rapid expansion and diversification, with innovation after innovation coming to use the language as a primary or sole means of expression; it's not possible to identify cause or effect. So many developments were taking place at the same time that we can only point to the emergence by the end of the nineteenth century, of a climate of largely unspoken opinion which had made English the natural choice for progress.

As the above quotation claims using English is the only path that can be trodden towards progress or development. Englishization or using English as a global language is his ultimate goal expressed in the book. But one important point neglected here is that such use of English ignores the fact that global inequalities are increasing and the innovations of the global system are having catastrophic ecological and cultural effects. Generally every phenomenon in this world while having positive aspects may suffer from negative ones; and moving toward a global language is not an exception. In this part both positive and negative aspects of using one language as the world language, say English are investigated.

Taking a look at the history of languages, it is easily found that languages have gone in and out of fashion as a preferred tool of international communication. Languages like Egyptian rose to preeminence among nations, vanished by the end of the Middle Ages; Greek was spoken all the way from Athens to the banks of Amu Darya in Central Asia, now is confined to the southern extremity of Balkan peninsula; Latin whose role in the development and distribution of western cultures to other parts of the world is undeniable, once reigned supreme over European territory south of Danub and west of Rhine, not to mention the North Africa, it even survived the fall of Rome by well over a millennium and was actively used by scholars as a pan-European language as late as the eighteenth century ,today is no longer used for communication (except in Vatican) and appears to be rapidly disappeared from school curricula. Even Arabic that once was the language of almost all Islamic countries, today is mostly used in performing rites and rituals.

When considering English as an international language or as a universal language, we are in fact talking of an abstract concept. Actually, there are a number of Englishes

present in the world. The all-embracing concept of the English- using speech community entails a strong generalization, since this speech community includes a number of sub-communities which may be divided in various ways. The first broad division maybe in terms of the English-speaking nations of the world, for example, American English, Australian English, British English, Canadian English, Indian English, Jamaican English, and so forth. If we use ethnic criteria, we have, among others, Chicano English and Anglo-Indian English. On the other hand, if we are fond of color categories, we may use labels such as Black English, Brown English, White English, and Yellow English. The ways to cut the cake are limitless, and one can use a number of linguistic or functional criteria to do so. The examples mentioned above show that no language can be the fixed language of the world during all eras. It rises one day and would be supplanted by another language some days later. English which is used today is also different among users of different nations.

English clearly dominates in the world today. It is the acknowledged lingua franca of science, technology, and business. The positive aspect of the dominance of English lies in the extent to which it fosters universal access, as it does. For example, in being universal language of air and sea traffic control. The true linguistic emancipation would be achieved when everyone in a speech community had the freedom to understand everyone else. The positive implications of the dominance of the English can be outlined as the acceptance of international responsibilities, the setting of useful standards, and the function as a medium between arcane professional language and individual nonprofessional access. An example of international responsibility is the need to provide access to information for those who need it. Kaplan (1983) for example articulated the responsibility of the English teaching profession to teach non-native speakers of English the key words to stored information, without which no matter how well one speaks the language, such information may be unavailable. As a dominant international language, English is in a position to set useful language standards for levels of clarity and organization. For example, Mauranen's (1993, p.16) comparison of Finish and English text showed English to be more user-friendly and less elitist in its reader expectation. She described English as "marketing discourse" and Finish as poetic and concluded the following:

> One might speculate that in a homogeneous context like the Finish one, it is natural for writing conventions to remain relatively implicit, whereas in culturally more heterogeneous contexts, like those in dominant English speaking countries, it becomes imperative to develop writing habits that are more explicit and leave less room for interpretations that are taken for granted.

In a nutshell, she believes that greater explicitness is a useful standard in an international context. The teaching of genres can be seen as another instance of setting useful standards, as in the use of English for air traffic control. Finally, it can serve as a bridge or liaison between scientists and the lay public, just as critical discourse analysis represents an effort to bring persuasive writing into the purview of common society so that all can understand when they are being manipulated.

Englishization or using English as a global language in addition to its positive aspects has some destructive, negative sides which are considered as great threats to other languages and even to English itself. Just consider this: the total number of languages in the world is large: say between 4,000 and 4,500. However, considering the total world population this seems to be a small number. If we divide this number by 4,500 languages, we have approximately one language for about every 168 million people, but that is not exactly how human languages are distributed. Among these languages some have gained more publicity and users and some gained less and among those who are more popular, English is the most prominent one. The primary reasons for such development and expansion are not essentially linguistic, but political, social, and technological. One reason which could be the main reason of such a phenomenon is colonization which led to linguistic imperialism. The importance of this fact can be understood from John Dryden's(English poet) compliance in 1693," we have yet no prosodia, not so much as a tolerable dictionary or a grammar, so that our language is in a manner barbarous" (cited in Baugh and Cable 1978, p. 225).

The positive aspects of English as a global language changed it to be linguistically imperial, and the most visible threat that pursue an empire is the danger of being toppled down, the same thing that happened for the languages mentioned above: one day being extremely used and the other day being disappeared. The negative aspect of the dominance of English lies in the extent to which it denies access, guarding the status quo and maintaining existing power structures. The meaning of the term power depends on the number of people it affects. In individual social relationships, power is contrasted with solidarity and is reflected in politeness forms (Brown & Gilman, 1960; Chaika, 1994). In a speech community power is contrasted with impotence, which may even affect the ability to learn a dominant L2 (Schumann, 1978).

At the level of linguistic dominance, the power to advance is contrasted with the power to hold back. The latter has come to be described as linguistic imperialism. Philipson (1992) categorizes linguistic imperialism as a subtype of linguicism, which is defined as "ideologies and structures where language is the means of affecting or maintaining an unequal allocation of power and resources" (p.55).It is defined by Popham (1996) more forcefully as: "While the engine of colonialism long ago ran out of steam, the momentum of its languages is still formidable, and it is against their tyranny that the smaller languages fight to survive" (p.39). A clear example of this momentum is the percentage of research papers that are published in English in the world. At least half of these millions of papers are published in English. Kontra (1997, as cited in Bolton & Kachru, 2006) says "the international language English not only opens the gates, but closes them too. It closes the gates of information flow in all cases, where what does get translated into English is partial, inadequate, etc."

This imperialism has caused many troubles and ended in many harsh and severe protests, such as that of Gandhi's in India (1929/1949) or that happened in Kenya, Ngugy (1986). The other examples are in France where Haut Conseil de la Francophonie (1986) saw the worldwide spread of English as leading to linguistic uniformity and

hereby threatening cultural and creative values. Indeed, in all Europe, English is seen by many as a threat to the languages and cultures of the European Community (European Parliament Working Document, 1983/1984), as it is in Mexico and Quebec. According to Phillipson (1992) another consequence of linguistic imperialism is that one hears only the positive things about the lingua franca and none of the negative. He describes what standard native English is not as the following: for children whose mother tongue is not English, English is not the language of their cultural heritage, not the language of intense personal feelings and the community, not the language most appropriate for learning to solve problems in cognitively demanding decontextualized situations, etc. English does not necessarily have teaching material that are culturally appropriate, nor experts with the appropriate linguistic and cultural understanding for all learning contexts.

In multi-ethnic, multilingual situations, English does not do what is claimed for it, often quite the opposite. The other consequence of linguistic imperialism can be found in ESL education as a hidden curriculum (Auerbach & Burgess, 1985) which attempts to inculcate uniformity and western cultural values in the guise of language education rather than empowerment of the individual. In this field, language education politically motivated English-only movements in the U.S. and Christian groups masquerading as English programs (e.g., Summer Institute of Linguistics) are more blatant examples of English linguistic imperialism.

The most controversial aspect of using English as a Global Language, to which lots of criticism are made, is its role in language demise or linguicide. According to the principles of DAC, the means of dialogue is language and it is the right of each language to gain attention from the side of participants .No language is prior to other languages. It means that not to attach protection to majority while the minority is achieving rights. And this is the very spirit of DAC. Try to distribute rights for all not just for a seemingly prominent one. The linguistic choice of English as the language of the world global dialogue isn't in line with the original assumptions of DaC with multilingual participants. The next choice addresses the notion of a common neutral language.

ESPERANTO: THE PRACTICE OF EQUAL LINGUISTICS RIGHTS

Regarding the shortcomings of the monopolist view of the world linguistic situation, the second alternative concerns the creation and application of a common language which is none of the existing languages. Besides the global gathering of DAC, in fact, the problem of international communication in modern world assumes remarkable importance in international institutions, particularly in the UN, where representatives of the world countries discuss very sensitive issues such as peace and security.

Although the appearance of such a notion is mostly considered as a strong reaction to the imposed prevalent English in international arenas, there are other factors contributing to its emergence. As an example, the cost for translation and interpretation in to the six official languages in the UN already represents around a fifth of the budget of this international organization (IRENA, 2013). Also it can be imagined how the costs for the UN would further increase if other languages were adopted. The obvious

impossibility of employing all the languages of the world imposes a question of equity and democracy. Apparently, many of the "other than the six official languages" is at disadvantage.

In fact, in world linguistic competitions, it was felt that the adoption of an auxiliary neutral language, a language belonging to nobody in particular, allowing everyone to express him/herself on a democratic basis of equal linguistic opportunities, would overcome the previous shortcomings of dominant English. It indeed would favor the conservation of the cultural and linguistic ecosystem of the world and especially its neutrality helps minority languages not to give way to strong dominant ones. In addition, strengthening cooperation and peace by overcoming the problem of communication were all among the first wishes of neutral-language supporters.

The idea of a constructed language is not at all new. Going back no further than the seventeenth century Comenius (1592-1670), Descartes (1596-1650) and Leibniz (1646-1716) were all interested in a universal auxiliary language that could cross boundaries. Since that time there have been hundreds of constructed languages. None of them proved, however, as successful as Esperanto, published by Ludwig Zamenhof in 1887.He, like most other makers and supporters of constructed languages, hoped that Esperanto would provide more than a universal language to supplement, but not supplant mother tongue. It is very difficult to gauge accurately the current status and scope of Esperanto or the degree of its achievement to pre-announced goals, but there are obstacles in front of it that has made this notion of world neutral language less powerful. Different factors contributed to its present unfortunate place.

First, the movement has been mainly European, from non-English-speaking countries and it almost found a nationalistic or regional taste. This again became a kind of problem that most of its original proponents wanted to remove. Also, there has always been a quasi-religious element to Esperanto movement. Zamenhof himself moved markedly in this direction in his later years. Close links between Socialism and Esperanto ideals have been another weak point which caused this originally linguistic movement include other peripheral issues .Another very important criticism related to Esperanto has been that to construct adequate motivation for people to begin is not that much easy and has always been a central difficulty facing the proponents of constructed languages like the Esperanto. Of course initial successes of Esperanto should not be ignored. As an example, in 1979 the Universal Association of Esperanto (UAE) based in Rotterdam had 30,000 members. Politically, Esperanto almost could obtain official recognition from the League of Nations in the 1920, and has had some success with UNESCO.

The rise and fall of Esperanto as a linguistic innovation simultaneously illustrated both the resistance against the hegemony of dominant languages and facing the problem of the past linguistic choices. In fact, Esperanto fails to transmit the unique voice of each language; it cannot represent their cultural and social backing. Esperanto continues to exist, but now without its previous strong claims.

MULTILINGUALISM

As mentioned multilingualism is as old as human life, although some historical or religious myths want to undermine this fact, but this is apparent that multilingualism or the diversity of world languages has been a widespread global phenomenon. As the socio-historical and biological evidence states that languages evolve in a multitude of cultures to respond to a variety of interactional needs. As mentioned before, the very existence of multilingualism necessitates the appearance of important lingua francas to communicate across speech communities. Mostly these languages have been the language of a potent and prestigious society like Greek, Latin, French, Arabic and currently English.

Multilingualism in contrast to the monolingualism rejects the dominance and language-killing potential of the so-called superior world language. Monolingualism as a result of the necessity for wider communication accompanied by a narrow cultural awareness and suprastatal policies is strongly against letting other languages and as a result other civilizations to flourish. Following Bakhtin (1981) language is not merely a neutral system of abstract grammatical categories but rather it is an ideological and value-based system; therefore, in any language-related planning deeper ideological issues are involved. As an advocate of multilingualism, Crystal (1997) believes that multilingualism presents us with different perspectives and insights, and thus enables us to reach more profound understanding of the nature of the human mind. Indeed the argument in favor of multilingualism is that with it comes diversity and depth of understanding. A multilingual experiencing of the world is thus a thorough access to metaphorical understanding with all the freshness and differences that this implies.

Multilingualism or what Tsuda (1994) calls "the ecology-of-language" paradigm carries a bundle of features and tendencies that manifest in the structures and processes that support it. A human rights perspective, equality in communication, maintenance of languages and cultures, protection of national sovereignties and promotion of foreign language education are important implications of a multilingual–oriented world. A multilingual principle insists that participants in communication should be in a position of equality, irrespective of mother tongue, gender, or other distinctions. There are different international organizations that following the principle of fundamental human rights and maintenance of languages and cultures, have chosen multilingualism as their selected language policy. Needless to say, there are manifest difficulties in administering the multilingual principle in such world-wide foundations when running a vast, complex, bureaucratic and political enterprise. Heavy cost for translation is an example in this regard.

EU and UN language polices, trends of multilingualism on the net and globalization which move from imposed Englishization to multilingualism are among the main evidences that show the acknowledged significance of responding and taking-in-to-account of all cultures and nationalities.

Multilingualism in cyberspace is a clear example .Here two main directions are involved. First is the hegemony of English-based, United States-centered single culture spreading all over the world. The second direction is where various cultures in different countries thrive and interchange with each other, resulting in a fruitful, "plural" global culture. The present day trend among world nations supports a prosperous and hopeful future for the second trend. As an instance of this global tendency was the third UNESCO congress on Informatics and Education held in Moscow, July 1996 that more than 40 countries representative confirmed their willingness to participate in the establishing multilingual telematics support for educational needs. All these trends, considering especially the powerful hindrances, prove that the time of such notions like "superior nation or language" has come over. Multilingualism invites all nations to express themselves. It considers all identities and cultures regardless of old classifications of dominant and dominated, strong and weak to contribute to the global dialogue.

CONCLUSION

From its very announcement DaC has been an attempt to prove the power of language in bringing together all seemingly different and sometimes historically hostile civilizations. In this paper the notion of linguistic challenges in front of DaC was investigated. Monopolist configuration of the world linguistic context though is armed economically and politically is not representative of the realities of a multilingual world. Neutral, constructed languages with the claim of giving linguistic equality to all speakers and providing a prejudice-free tool of communication, failed to achieve their goals because they had ignored the very first meaning of languages as the mirrors of unique experiences of each nation and their spiritless option could not find a place among different language speakers of the world.

Finally, the old familiar phenomenon of multilingualism despite all its present obstacles proves itself to be the best possible linguistic choice for the multi-ethnic and multi-cultural table of DAC. It can suffice well the need of different nations to be accepted as they are and with what they have. Translation as the inseparable companion of multilingualism, has been always criticized for the huge amount of money spent on in different organizations. However, by expanding a cheap and widespread technology to facilitate translation and interpretation, this weakness of multilingualism will be removed.

REFRENCES

Auerbach, E. R. & Burgess, D. (1985). The hidden curriculum of survival ESL. *TESOL Quarterly*, *19* (3), 475-495.

Bakhtin, M.M. (1981). *The Dialogic imagination: Four essays.* (Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson & Michael Holquist). Austin and London: University of Texas Press.

Baugh, A. C. & Cable. T. (1978). *A history of English language* (Third edition). Prentice-Hall.

Bolinger, D, (1980). *Language: The loaded weapon.* New York: Longman

Bolton, K., & Kachru, B. B. (Eds.). (2006). *World Englishes: Critical concepts in linguistics* (Vol. 2). Taylor & Francis.

Brown, R. & Gilman, A. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In T.A. Sebeok (ed.). *Style in language.* (pp. 253-76). MIT Press.

Chaika, E. (1994). *Language, the social mirror*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a global language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carson, J. G. (1998). Cultural backgrounds: What should we know about multilingual students?. *Tesol Quarterly*, *32*(4), 735-740.

Edwards, J. (1994). *Multilingualism*. London: Routledge

Ferguson, A.C. & Heath, S. B. (1982). *Language in the USA.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dryden, J. (1693). *A history of English language* (Third edition). Prentice-Hall.

Gaskel, R. (1997). *A possible second language for the world*. Retrieved from http://www.kafejo.com/rgaskell/index.htm

Gritsenko, V. I & Anisimov, A.V. (2017). Multilingual Environment in the Cyberspace, Kiev. *International scientific and training center of information technologies and systems.* Retrived from http://www.unesco.org/webworld/infoethics _2/eng/papers/paper_9.htm, 4 October.

International Renewable Energy Agency (2013). Report of the director general on multilingualism. *Third session of the assembly.* Retrieved from https://www.irena.org/DocumentDownloads/2013/Assembly/A_3_7_Multilingua lism.pdf.

Kaplan, R. B. (1983). Contrastive rhetoric: Some implications for the writing process. In A. Freedman, I. Pringle, & J. Yalden (Eds.), *Learning to write: First language/second language* (pp. 139-161). London: Longman.

Mauranen, A. (1993). Cultural differences in academic discourse: Problems of a linguistic and cultural minority. *The competent intercultural communicator*, 157-174.

Master, P. (1998). Positive and negative aspects of the dominance of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, *32*(4), 716-727.

Nishigaki, T. (1998). Multilingualism on the net. *Retrieved March*, *2*, 2005.

Phillipson, R. (2002). *International languages and international human rights.* Retrieved from http://www.uea.org/info/angle/ed37-angla.html.

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

Phillipson, R. & Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1999). Englishisation: one dimension of globalisation. In Graddol, D. & Meinhof, U. H. (eds). *English in a changing world* (pp. 19-36). AILA Review 13 Oxford: The English Book Centre.

Phillipson, R., & Skutnabb-Kangas, T. O. V. E. (1996). English only worldwide or language ecology?. *TESOL quarterly*, *30*(3), 429-452.

Popham, P. (1996). The day a language died. *Independent*, 39, 43.

Schumann, J. H. (1978). *The pidginization process: A model for second language acquisition*. Rowley: Newbury House Publishers.

Toolan, M. (2017). *Nation languages, local literatures, and international readers: a new indigenization in native English writers*. Retrived from http://artsweb.bham.ac.uk /MToolan/nationlanguage.html.

Tsuda, Y. (2001). Globalization and the hegemony of English. *Forum of International Development Studies*, *18,* 125-137.

Tsuda, Y. (1994). The diffusion of English: Its impact on culture and communication. *Keio Communication Review*, *16*, 49-61.

Wooding, M. (2002). The notion of an international language and the case of English. Retrieved online from www.aiic.net/view page. fm/article 519.htm.