

Swedish Language Politics in Finland: Paradigm Changes of Social-Communicative Practices and Discourses From the 12th Century to the Present

Annikki Koskensalo

University of Turku, Turku, Finland

The purpose of this paper is, in spite of lots of desiderata, to find a scientific way concerning the possibilities of a monitoring and alarm function in the field of language politics and practices in Finnish democracy. The topic deals with the specific constellation of languages in Finland, especially the politics and situation between the minority of Swedish-Finns, the majority of Finns and other minority groups (Saami, Russians, Somalis, Estonians, Arabics, and the work and welcome migrants). With the help of CDA (Critical Discourse Analysis) on theoretical basis of comparative language culture research, combined with the historical context (history of Swedish language politics in Finland and included paradoxes), it is methodologically possible to find out scientific results about opportunities for comparison in the case of interlingual language culture research. The scientific achievement of this case-study consists in using CDA for the first time in this given topic. Furthermore, it is possible to get better results concerning the causalities between Swedish language minority, Finnish language majority, special discourses of law, inter-discourses, and the history of Finland, not only at the macro-level, but also at the micro-level.

Keywords: (Swedish) minority language politics, Swedish-Finns, CDA (Critical Discourse Analysis), transdisciplinarity, monitoring and alarm function, language-ombudsman

Introduction

In this paper there are some preparations and pre-considerations made concerning the casestudy of the Swedish-Finns. There are numerous desiderata due to a relative scale of research published internationally on the Swedish-speaking Finns or Swedish language in Finland (Liebkind, Tandefelt, & Moring, 2007, p. 2). The concept “finlandssvenskar” (Swedish-speaking Finns) and the term “Svenskfinland” (Swedish-Finland or Swedish-speaking Finnland) referring to communities where Swedish was the dominant language, was established in the 1910s (Östman, 2008, p. 170). Therefore, firstly, in the case of comparative language culture research, a theoretical framework on the basis of language culture theory will be developed. Secondly, describing the history of Swedish Language Politics in Finland will highlight critically some paradoxes which have become

evident. Thirdly, this case study will try to apply for the first time the empirical method of CDA (Critical Discourse Analysis).

Theoretical and Methodological Framework

Theoretical Aspects of Comparative Language Culture Research

The concept of language culture has come into existence in the year 1925 and in 1929 was the scientific foundation of the Cercle Linguistique de Prague. The further theoretical development of this concept took place after WW II (the Second World War)—especially in Eastern Germany (Schnerrer, 1994, p. 12). This concept was taken over by linguistic science in 1984 in Western Germany, which produced some misunderstanding because of no distinct general concept of culture. Language culture is by definition a positively judged level not only of language use but also of language system. Language cultivation means all measures and activities which are promoting and constituting language culture (Greule, 2002, p. 8). The theory of language culture seems principally suitable as an interphilological basis of understanding but assumes a wide and open definition of the concept of language culture. In order to describe language culture and language cultivation, there is not only a requirement to find out the state of language and the number of language speakers but also the description of the state of codification of language necessitation. In order to be able to understand actual language culture, there is a requirement to have a knowledge of the history of these languages and of the genesis of language culture and language cultivation throughout the course of the required language's history. The description of language cultivation is asking for judging stages of language cultivation, governmental relations to language cultivation, existence of language laws, relations of mass media to language cultivation, existence of language politics, language criticizing, etc. (Greule, 2002, p. 8).

Opportunities for Comparison in the Case of Interlingual Language Culture Research

With no claim of absolute completeness there are eight categories of research:

- (1) The connection between language situation and language culture as the determinants of language situation. For example, the number of language speakers, dialectal diversification, socio-linguistic state (standard language, official and national language or bilingual situation);
- (2) Grade of state of development in terms of plurality and diversity of language culture;
- (3) In case of pluricentric or plurinational language, there is the question of whether language cultivation is also pluricentric or plurinational?;
- (4) The governmental participation concerning language cultivation, for example ways and extent. Are there language laws and sanctions, what if these laws are violated?;
- (5) Is language cultivation prominent in an academy?;
- (6) How strong is the influence of language purism to language culture?;
- (7) How does political history determine the identity of language?;
- (8) What are the resulting effects when comparing language histories and language cultures? (Greule, 2002, pp. 10-11).

Paradoxes of Swedish Language Politics-History in Finland

When discussing special aspects, peculiarities, and paradoxes, there is no doubt that this has attributed the

Swedish-speaking Finns with the reputation of being the most privileged linguistic minority in the world (Liebkind, Tandefelt, & Moring, 2007, p. 2; Andersson & Herberts, 1996, p. 387). Gorter (2009, p. 7) stated that the Swedish-speaking minority in Finland is probably the best protected minority in Europe. Liebkind, Tandefelt, and Moring (2007, p. 4) mentioned critically the false image of the Swedish-speaking Finns as an overprivileged group. During the time of the Swedish Kingdom, after 1809 and also being a part of Czaristic Russia, Swedish was the language of aristocracy, administrative officials, middle classes, and educated elites. The majority (90%!!!) has always been paradoxically Finnish-speaking (McRae, 1997, pp. 16, 89). The Swedish General Governor Brahe demanded that Swedish elites learn Finnish. An official just could simply be people who were born in Finland and spoke Finnish (Militz, 2002, p. 14). The Finnish national movement was again paradoxically inspired by Swedish folklore collections of the 1820s and 1830s. So a Finnish cultural consciousness did not start from zero but rather underwent a language change (Schot-Saikku, 1998, p. 29). During the 100-year language struggle between Svekoman (Swedish-speaking Finns) and Fennomans, the Finns have always been against Swedish-speaking Finns holding prominent positions (Militz, 2002, p. 21). For example, Johan Vilhelm Snellman was and continues to be a very prominent figure due to his idea, one nation—one language (Schot-Saikku, 1998, p. 35; Broermann, 2008), p. 110). There have also been efforts by prominent Finnish figures to try and improve the situation of the Finnish language, e.g., the compiler of the national epic *Kalevala* (1835) by Elias Lönnrot and the famous poet Runeberg (ibid). They were all Swedish speaking persons. The Fennomaniac movement was created in the 19th century and initially led by members of the Swedish-speaking elite, which Liebkind, Tandefelt, and Moring (2007, p. 4) considered as an historical anomaly. Finnish received in 1863 an official status. Before this Swedish was the only official language of the country (Saari, 2000, p. 3; Andersson & Herberts, 1996, p. 284). McRae (1997, p. 373) noted critically that legislation guarantees the linguistic rights of this linguistic minority but on the other hand does not protect it as an minority from being assimilated by the majority. According to “the connection between language situation and language culture as the determinants of language situation”, there is something worth noting in regards to language culture and language situation especially in the number of language speakers when comparing minority and majority. In the year 1610, there were 70,000 Swedish-speaking people in Finland (17.5% of total population); in 1815, 160,000 (14.6%); in 1880, 294,900 (14.3%); and in 1930, 342,900 (10.1%). From this time the percentage of Swedish-speaking Finns has gone down from 5.6% for the year 2004 to 289,751 Swedish-Finns (Tandefelt & Finnäs, 2007, p. 44). From 2008 to 2011, the percentage of Swedish-speaking Finns stayed at the same level of 5.4% with 291,219 Swedish-Finns (2011) (Statistics Finland, 2012). In summary, the number of Swedish-Finns is nearly the same as it was 100 years ago (Hedberg, 2004, p. 20). The number of Swedish-speaking Finns has not changed dramatically throughout the last century (Liebkind, Tandefelt, & Moring, 2007, p. 3). The number of native Swedish speakers (314,000) stayed roughly unchanged from 1920 to 2000 (293,000). But in relative terms the number of Swedish speakers has declined from 11% to 5.9% of the total Finnish population (Ortega & Tangeras, 2007, p. 2). In summary, the proportion of the Swedish-speaking group has steadily decreased in relation to the total population (Hedberg 2004, p. 20), mainly due to demographic reasons: (1) the growing number of Finnish-speaking persons (3 million in 1912 to 5.4 million in 2012) (Saarikivi & Marten, 2012, p. 8); (2) lower Swedish-Finn birth rate, Swedish-Finns marriages across the language border to the Finnish side; (3) an increasing number of bilinguals and emigration of the labor force by a relatively large number of

Swedish-speaking Finns to the USA and Australia; and (4) particularly in the later 1960s and 1970s from Finland to Sweden and perhaps more importantly, the migration within Finland (Hedberg, 2004, p. 21; Reitz & Zeller, 2010, p. 15; Allard & Starck 1981; Klövekorn, 1958, p. 171), industrialisation and urbanisation since the end of the last century (Klövekorn, 1958, p. 161). The direction of migration from monolingual Finnish in Finland to the country's bilingual and monolingual Swedish areas has undoubtedly had consequences for the balance between the linguistic groups, and thus contributing to a process of language shift and a Fennicization of the Swedish-speaking minority (Tandefelt, 1994, p. 246; Hedberg, 2004, p. 23). The minority-majority ratio at the turn of the century was approximately 1:16 (Teleman, 2005, p. 1845). In conclusion, the level of language conflict is low in Finland as a result of the formal linguistic equality between Finnish and Swedish speakers (Hedberg, 2004, p. 23).

In reference to "the connection between language situation and language culture as the determinants of language situation" concerning the socio-linguistic state in Finland, which has its own features regarding ethnicity and migration. Finland has, like Norway and Sweden, the only European indigenous population, the Sami. There are also the Swedish-speaking Finns and native Swedish speakers living on the autonomous Åland-Islands. In all of these three cases, different solutions regarding linguistic and other rights have had to be developed, which is relevant in terms of socio-linguistic state. There are also other historic groups: the Romany, Jews, Tatars, and "Old Russians" (Kauranen & Tuori, 2000, p. 1). Finland has been for a long time in a country of emigration, therefore Finland has had for a long time no real distinct history of labor immigration. But with the breakdown of the Soviet Union, the first asylum seekers began to arrive in Finland: Russians, Estonians, Somalis, Arabs, Kurds, Poles, the Boat people of Vietnam, Turks, Moroccans, and Black Africans (Similä, 2006, p. 2; Horsti, 2002, p. 352). This phenomenon has dominated since the discourses of ethnic relations in Finland, where multiculturalism is considered as an entirely new phenomenon, only related to immigration, especially to asylum seekers (Similä, 2006, p. 2). Finland has since the mid-1980s become increasingly culturally diverse. The number of foreign nationals was 1.7% of total population, but has quadrupled during the 1990s (Horsti, 2002, p. 351). Finland today is regarded as being a linguistically and culturally homogeneous country—also on communal level—even though it has become ever more international and multilingual due to immigrants (Kivelä, 2010, p. 29). The linguistic status of the municipalities is verified every decade (Janson, 1995, pp. 77-89). In order to understand more clearly the existing landscape of ethnic and language-groups, one has to delve into Swedish and Finnish history (Reitz & Zeller, 2010, pp. 1-16). The history of Swedish Language Politics in Finland is quite well described (Reuter, 2005; pp. 1647-1656; Saari, 2000; McRae, 1997; Tandefelt, 1997, pp. 1007-1014; Andersson & Herberts, 1996, pp. 384-388; Klövekorn, 1958, pp. 161-182). Therefore, this will be just a very short retelling of the story with special concentration on some special aspects, peculiarities, and paradoxes.

There are a number of problems in relation to Swedish Language Politics in Finland, namely Swedish being used as the administrative language from the 12th century until 1809 whilst Finland was part of the Swedish Kingdom and also Czarist Russia until December 6, 1917, gaining independence in 1917 and Finnish becoming the new administrative language in 1902, these effects contributed to Swedish becoming in the long run a less elitist language and also losing its function in Finland. The balance of power and language politics changed due to the Finnish Constitution of 1922 (Schellbach-Kopra, 2002, p. 661). The basis of language politics in Finland is a combination of the individual (personal choice of mother tongue (Ministry of Justice, 1999, Chapter 2, Section

17)) and territorial (communal level) principle (Broermann, 2008, p. 116; Schellbach-Kopra, 2002, p. 661). Concerning territorial principle, a community has officially two languages, if the language minority has 3,000 inhabitants or consists of an 8% minimum (Broermann, 2008, p. 118; Schellbach-Kopra, 2002, p. 661). The Åland-Islands-Question (Modeen, 1977b, pp. 605-618; Mäkinen, 2005; Elsner, 2000) which has been solved October 20, 1921 by the League of Nations at Geneva, which brought about autonomy status and exclusively the Swedish language (only territorial principle (Broermann, 2008, p. 116); flexible, static territorial principle (Haarmann, 2010, p. 357)) for Åland-Islands despite becoming part of Finland, which played a crucial role in the language struggles of the intervening years up to 1937. Since the 1930s, there have been no more severe language struggles (Kivelä, 2010, p. 38). Nowadays, the 6% Swedish minority in Finland (Reitz & Zeller, 2009, pp. 24-80) has been virtually unproblematic, well accepted and practiced political and language—e.g., no change of language duty in the Languages Law of 2003 (valid January 1, 2004) (Broermann, 2008, p. 117), which could potentially be viewed as a model in language politics by other countries. For example, there is a requirement for teachers at Finnish universities to take a Swedish language ability test in order to communicate with Swedish-Finnish students and to be able to examine them in their mother tongue concerning the danger of Fennicization (Modeen, 1977a, p. 71; Broermann, 2008, p. 114; Kivelä, 2010, pp. 30, 34). Since the 1930s, there have been no major language debates. Research about language struggles in Finnish newspapers during the 1980s and 1990s always shows the return of certain arguments: The main arguments against Swedish in Finland are: (1) Swedish-speaking Finns are a privileged minority; (2) Swedish language enjoys high image in Finland; and (3) Finland should only have the Finnish language, because Swedish, is a forced language since 1990s (Saari, 2000, p. 5) and like English a compulsory foreign language in all Finnish schools (Andersson & Herberts, 1996, p. 386) which is regarded as strange element in Finland. The main arguments for Swedish in Finland are: (1) Finland has always been by historical, cultural, and traditional reasons a bilingual country; and (2) Swedish connects Finland with the other northern countries (Kivelä, 2010, p. 38; Saari, 2000, p. 5). There have always been some discussions and discourses—mainly in the media (reader-letters in newspapers) about obligatory language education—especially later than 2004, considering that the Finnish Parliament has since decided that the country's second language should not be an obligatory part of the A-level examinations (Broermann, 2008, p. 113). Swedish actually seems to be becoming a language of a decreasing minority. Swedish-speaking Finns are increasingly more bilingual (Allardt & Starck, 1981, p. 96). Telemann (2005, p. 1845) guessed that Swedish will continue to recede, however, the speed of this process is difficult to predict. In his opinion and also in Allard's (2000, p. 14), it is very probable that Swedish will exist in Finland as a private home language. There seems to be in this process of language history a loss of domain (Saari, 2000, p. 9).

Concerning “grade of state of development in terms of plurality and diversity of language culture” and “In case of pluricentric or plurinational language, there is the question of whether language cultivation is also pluricentric or plurinational”, there exists in Finland an institutionalised multilinguality (Mehlich, 2003, p. 10). Finland represents a higher linguistic instability, more flexible adjustment of language boundaries, a unitary (non-federal) form of government and some recent indications towards a more pluralistic linguistic model (McRae, 2007, p. 13). Swedish is a pluricentric language, where the language used in Sweden represents the core region. The variety used in Finland represents the periphery (Liebkind, Tandefelt, & Moring, 2007, p. 6). Liebkind, Tandefelt, and Moring (2007, p. 5) were noticing that Swedish in Finland is a complete language, serving the

society and uniting the minority, but doubts are raised over the future of the language. Answering “Governmental participation concerning language cultivation, for example ways and extent. Are there language laws and sanctions, what if these laws are violated?” and “Is language cultivation prominent in an academy?” in connection to “In case of pluricentric or plurinational language, there is the question of whether language cultivation is also pluricentric or plurinational?”, there exists since 1976 an Institute for the Languages in Finland under the auspices of the Ministry of Education and Culture, which its key aim is the planning and cultivation of the Swedish language in order to prevent Finnish-Swedish from growing too distant from the standard variant spoken in Sweden (Kotus, 2012; Tandefelt, 1997, p. 1014). To answer point and “How strong is the influence of language purism to language culture?”, language planning activities were carried out by Hugo Bergroth, who fought against Finlandisms (Reuter, 2005, p. 1654). The fact that his book *Antibarbarus* (Bergroth, 1917) has been used for more than 50 years in Swedish schools in Finland is testament to the strength of his activities in regards to language culture (Saari, 2000, p. 8). Surely there is the strong rival Finnish language with a marked language culture (Greule, 2002, p. 12). However, the answers of the remaining questions can only be found after additional empirical research, and also a more indepth analysis can only be achieved with more time and a larger word count.

This complete change is giving a basis for an interesting casestudy, which contents a lot of different aspects, discourses, special discourses, and the inter-discourse. There are closely touched upon issues of power and politics in language and law.

The central research question of this research plan and sketch will be therefore: What is the contribution (role and function) of inter-discourse with special focus to arbitration and litigation (Bhatia, Candlin, & Gotti, 2012) in the arena of special and public discourses concerning Swedish Language Politics in Finland?

This case study will mainly discuss paradigm changes of social-communicative practices and discourses of Swedish Language Politics in Finland concerning also socio-economic implications and influences by law like *Ius Naturae* (Engle, 2010), sociological positivism of law (Hart, 1973), pragmatism (Peirce, 1991), international law (UN-Charta of Human Rights), and law of the EU (European Union) (e.g., Charta of Regional and Minority Languages, ratification: March 1, 1998 (Broermann, 2008, p. 93); Frame Consensual Document of European Counsel for Protection of National Minorities, ratification: February 1, 1998 (Broermann, 2008, p. 120)).

Methodological Aspects

This casestudy will be a good example researching the causalities between Swedish language, public discourse, special discourses of law, inter-discourse, and the history of Finland. There is a long tradition of discourse-research in Finland. The concept of discourse and analytical discourse perspective has been central in Finnish academic discussion on media and ethnicity. The majority of the scientific community has approached these issues using discourse analysis, which allows researchers to find more subtle forms of discrimination hidden in media texts (Horsti, 2002, p. 360). A triangulation of CDA, contents analysis and expert interviews will bring better results.

CDA will serve theoretically and methodologically concerning this research object which deals with a special range of social problems connected with Swedish Language Politics in Finland. The special focus is the relationship between language and power or rule. Characteristics of CDA like transdisciplinarity (Fairclough, 2005, p. 76; Defila, Di Giulio, & Scheuermann, 2008; Hirsch Hadorn, & Pohl, 2006; Hirsch Hadorn et al., 2008)

and integration of inter-text and inter-discourse relations and historical context are helpfully solving this special research problem. A combination that fits with Bhatia's (2008, pp. 165, 171) model of interdiscursivity must be developed, however, more in the direction of specialized discourses instead of professional discourses.

The Viennese approach to CDA in "In case of pluricentric or plurinational language, there is the question of whether language cultivation is also pluricentric or plurinational?" (1997-2003) with the main research field "Discourse, Politics, and Identity" tries to answer the central research question concerning the connection between discourse, politics, and identity in a national framework, which is influenced by international, European and global levels. One EU—research project by Prof. Wodak (2002) about DYLAN (Language Dynamics and the Management of Diversity) tries to learn more about language(s) politics of EU and its implementation on national, regional, and local level. The Viennese approach of CDA is very helpful due to a number of reasons. Research in the case of Swedish Language Politics in Finland: Wodak (2002) stressed that discourse is "socially constitutive as well as socially conditioned" (p. 8). The discourse about the rise and decline of the practical use of Swedish in Finland is also socially constitutive as well as socially conditioned. If some native-speaking Finns are nowadays meeting Swedish-speaking Finns in a shop in Helsinki, they will normally speak in Finnish and not in Swedish (Laakso, 2007, p. 1). Certainly, there are broader issues of communicative practices touched on rather than just discourse as a social practice. However, a more general view of law and language is addressed.

Language politics discourses are also ideologically determined. CDA considers ideology as an instrument of construction and transmission of sense. Language and ideologies play a crucial role in the creation and stabilisation of unequal power relations. Discourses and ideologies cannot be viewed as a super-construction ("Überbau") and divided of social conditions, but as only abstracted, objective social forms. Symbolic forms have to be researched, if they are creating and supporting power. Their genealogy of concrete social conditions helps to rediscover ideology criticism and discourse analysis as society analysis. Especially the breakings should be marked where the ideological character becomes evident (Institut für Staatspolitik, 2004, p. 17).

The concept of power describes the relation between inequalities in social structures. Language is not the cause of power but is used as a medium of power allowing the articulation and subversion of rule. The research object of CDA is focused on linguistic forms, which are used by power in a practical manner.

The concept of critic includes some aspects: On one hand, empirical data should be viewed in relation to their social context in order to make clear some essential characteristics like the interconnectivity of social and political engagements and sociologically based construction of society (Fairclough, 1995, p. 747); and on the other hand to create an awareness of social agents concerning their own interests. Therefore, this second aspect of critique should serve as a monitoring function in order to correct some potentially wrong developments of Swedish Language Politics in Finland.

The broad concept of context guarantees that historical developments of discursive praxis, intertextuality, and interdiscursivity (Bhatia, 2008, 2004) have to be taken into account during the research of texts. The de-construction of socio-political and historical contexts, in which discourse events are embedded, are essential (see above). Transdisciplinary approaches are necessary to give context a theoretical basis.

A feasible way to analyse rhetoric of language politics is described by Reisigl (2007, pp. 5-6; 2008, pp. 96-120). He outlined an eight-step method to the analysis of political rhetoric in an attempt to move toward a transdisciplinary politic-linguistic approach. His approach tries to counteract previous amateur approaches to the

development in theory and methodology in this area (Boz, 2010, p. 135).

His key concepts and terms through the rhetorical analysis are focused on nomination (naming of actors), predication (attribution of features), argumentation (justification/de-legitimation of nomination and predication), perspectivation (point of view of expression), and intensification and/or mitigation as analytic categories (Reisigl, 2008, p. 99) and heuristic devices (Nymalm, 2011, p. 9).

Step 1 of Reisigl (2007, p. 5) (activation of theoretical pre-understanding to this special research-problem, search for literature, formulation of the central research question) has now nearly been done. Step 2 (triangulation of data and the collection of context-information) (ibid) has to be made next in the future. As a result of step 2, the collected material has to be precisely prepared and transcribed with focus to the central research question (ibid). Step 4 includes the narrowing of the topic and formulation of hypotheses on the basis of step 3. Step 5 deals with qualitative pilot-analysis in order to develop a more precise operationalization of concepts and the working out of specific categories of analysis (see step 6). Step 6 contains detailed qualitative and partly quantitative analyses including the interpretation of results in relation to the social, political, and historical context. Here the macro-analysis touches upon the context-analysis several times.

The macro-analysis deals with the definition of structure of discourses and segmentation of discourses in phases. The relation of discourse to social areas of action in which it is situated and the used semiotic types (super- and specialized- and sub-genres) has to be clarified (see above). There is the global, European, Nordic, national, regional, communal, institutional (e.g., media), and individual level of discourses of Swedish Language Politics. The segmentation of discourses in phases is determined by the history of Finland being part of the Swedish Kingdom, Czaristic Empire and independent republic to the present. The social areas of these discourses in action are in the home, at school, in the army, in the courts, elitist culture, popular culture, in the church, and contact with the state's power (administration), etc.. The used genres in these discourses are articles in newspapers, reader-letters, legal and official documents, etc.. The relationship between the discourses has to be clarified. Patterns of language actions and functional text segments have to be defined. Analyses of rhetorical patterns, words frequencies and semantic isotopies have to be made.

The micro-analysis deals with the key concepts and terms used by Reisigl (2007, p. 6) (see also above): (1) How are social actors (individuals, groups like Finland-Swedes) called and constructed by language (nomination)?; (2) Which (positive or negative) characteristics are used for social actors positioned in discourse (e.g., stereotype, Finland-Swedes as rich, better people in the 19th century (Broermann, 2008, p. 115) (predication))?; (3) Which actions are connected in language and semiotics with social actors?; (4) Which processes are presented by language and semantics (orientation of action and process)?; (5) Which arguments justify or make relative theses (including predications) in discourse (argumentation)?; (6) Which point of view concerns an actor in spoken or written rhetorics in regards to Swedish Language Politics in Finland (argumentation)?; and (7) Are presentations in language (nominations, predications, argumentations) more mitigated or intensified (mitigation vs. intensification)?.

The next task is that of connecting detailed results with the social, political, and historical context of language. This context-analysis contains the analysis of direct "co-text" and "co-discourse" (pre- and post-discourse) of language, inter-textual and inter-discursive connection, sociological factors, and institutional conditions of remarks, and sociopolitical and historical contexts.

Step 7 deals with the careful formulation of critique (CDA! Monitoring- and alarm-function for Finland-Swedish minority): working out of suggestions and proposals for improvements (Reisigl, 2007, p. 6).

Step 8 includes the implementation of the research-results in society (publication of recommendations, trainings (seminars, courses), exhibitions, etc. (ibid).

Conclusions

This paper has shown that the topic of Swedish Language Politics can be researched on the basis of theory and methodology. There are certainly lots of desiderata. Therefore, lots of research has to be conducted in order to stabilize the relationship between the Finnish language majority and the Swedish language minority not only politically and formally but also in social-communicative practices. The Fennomans had the motto “one nation, one language”, the Svekomans the motto “one nation, two languages” (Broermann, 2008, p. 110), but nowadays, under European and multicultural conditions, Finland must have the motto “one nation, many languages”, because there are also minorities speaking Saami, Russian, Somali, Estonian, English, and Arabic (Broermann, 2008, p. 94). There are also other languages of work and welcome immigrants. The worth of democracy can be determined by how a majority treats minorities as equal partners. This casestudy should show in spite of formal legal equality of Finnish and Swedish—offer the possibility of a monitoring and alarm function for the Finland-Swedish minority (CDA!), emphasized by the fact that in the Language Law of 2003 (Ministry of Justice, 2003) valid January 1, 2004), there is no paragraph about installing a special mechanism for control, for example, a language-ombudsman in order to keep the implementation of the Language Law under surveillance (Broermann, 2008, p. 118).

References

- Allard, E. (2000). Swedish in town: An attitude's questionnaire (Stadin ruotsi: Asennetutkimus). *Finlandssvensk rapport*, 39. Helsinki: Svenska Finlands folkting.
- Allard, E., & Starck, Ch. (1981). *Language borders and societal structure: The Finland Swedes in a contemporary perspective (Språkgränser och samhällsstruktur: Finlandssvenskarna i ett jämförande perspektiv)*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Andersson, H., & Herberts, K. (1996). The case of Swedish-speaking Finns. *International Review of Education*, 42(4), 384-388.
- Bergroth, H. (1917). *Finlandswedish: Handbook to avoid provincialisms in spoken and written language (Finlandssvenska:Handledning till undvikande av provinsialismer i tal och skrift)*. Helsinki: Holger Schildts förlag.
- Bhatia, V. K. (2004). *Worlds of written discourse: A genre-based view*. London: Continuum International.
- Bhatia, V. K. (2008). Genre analysis, ESP and professional practice. *English for Specific Purposes*, 27, 161-174.
- Bhatia, V. K., Candlin, Ch. N., & Gotti, M. (Eds.). (2012). *Discourse and practice in international commercial arbitration: Issues, challenges and prospects*. Farnham/Burlington: Ashgate.
- Boz, C. (2010). Review. In R. Wodak & M. Krzyzanowski (Eds.), *Qualitative discourse analysis in the social sciences. Language in Society*, 39(1), 134-135.
- Broermann, M. (2008). Language attitudes of language-minority youth literature in case of Sorbs and Finland-Swedes (Spracheinstellungen minderheitssprachiger Jugendliteratur am Beispiel von Sorben und Finnlandschweden) (Dissertation, Philologische Fak., Universität Leipzig, Zugl.).
- Defila, R., Di Giulio, A., & Scheuermann, M. (2008). *Management of interdisciplinary research teams: Possibilities of professionalization and support (Management von forschungsverbünden: Möglichkeiten der professionalisierung und unterstützung)*. Weinheim: Wiley.
- Elsner, B. R. (2000). The importance of people in international law: With special focus to the historical development and practice of the law of self-determination of peoples (Die bedeutung des volkes im völkerrecht: Unter besonderer berücksichtigung der historischen entwicklung und der praxis des selbstbestimmungsrechtes der völker) (Dissertation, Universität Gießen, Zugl.). Berlin: Dunker & Humblot.

- Engle, E. A. (2010). *Lex naturalis, jus naturalis: Law as positive reasoning and natural rationality*. Melbourne: Elias Clark.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2005). Critical discourse analysis. *Marges Linguistiques*, 9, 76-94.
- Gorter, D. (2009). Minority languages today: A short history of the international conference on minority languages (1980-2009). University of Tartu, Bookmill. Retrieved from <http://www.icml13.org/fileadmin/icmlxiii/pdf/>
- Greule, A. (2002). European language cultures: Aspects of comparative language culture research (Europäische sprachkulturen: Aspekte einer vergleichenden sprachkultur-forschung). In A. Greule & N. Janich (Eds.), *Language cultures in comparison: Consequences of language politics and international communication of economics (Sprachkulturen im vergleich: Konsequenzen für sprachpolitik und internationale wirtschaftskommunikation)* (pp. 7-14). München: Forost.
- Haarmann, H. (2010). External linguistics (sociolinguistics) of European languages (Externe linguistik (soziolinguistik) der sprachen Europas). In U. Hinrichs (Ed.), *Handbook of Eurolinguistics (Handbuch der Eurolinguistik)* (pp. 357-370). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Hart, H. L. A. (1973). *On the concept of law (Der begriff des rechts)*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.
- Hedberg, C. (2004). The Finland-Swedish wheel of migration: Identity, networks and integration 1976-2000 (Dissertation, Uppsala universitet, Zugl.). Retrieved from uu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/.../FULLTEXT01
- Hirsch Hadorn, G., & Pohl, Ch. (2006). *Principles for designing transdisciplinary research*. München: Oekom.
- Hirsch Hadorn, G., Hoffmann-Riem, H., Bieber-Klemm, S., Grossenbacher-Mansuy, W., Joye, D., Pohl, C., & Zemp, E. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of transdisciplinary research*. Berlin: Springer.
- Horsti, K. (2002). Finnland. In J. ter Wal (Ed.), *Racism and cultural diversity in the mass media: An overview of research and examples of good practice in the EU member states, 1995-2000* (pp. 351-371). Vienna: European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia (EUMC).
- Institut für Staatspolitik. (2004). Critics as ideology: Critical discourse analysis of the institute of language and social research in Duisburg (*Kritik als ideologie: Die "kritische diskursanalyse" des Duisburger instituts für sprach- und sozialforschung (DISS)*). Albersroda.
- Janson, J.-M. (1995). Language legislation. In J. Uotila (Ed.), *The Finnish legal system* (pp. 77-89). Helsinki: Finnish Lawyers Publishing Company.
- Kauranen, R., & Tuori, S. (2000). Mapping minorities and their media: The national context. Finland. Retrieved from <http://www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/Media/EMTEL/Minorities/reports.html>
- Kivelä, M. (2010). *The role of languages at Finnish universities: An questionnaire under university staff members (Zur rolle von sprachen an Finnischen hochschulen: Eine umfrage unter dem hochschulpersonal)*. Zugl.: Universität Jyväskylä, Institut für moderne u. klassische Sprachen.
- Klöveborn, M. (1958). The Finnish-Swedish population and conditions of languages in Finland (Die Finnlandschwedische bevölkerung und die sprachverhältnisse in Finnland). *Erdkunde*, 3, 161-182.
- Kotus (Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus). (2012). Swedish. Helsinki: Institute of the Languages in Finland. Retrieved from <http://www.kotus.fi/index.phtml?l=en&s=205>
- Laakso, J. (2007). Immersion of language in a minority-language: Experiences from Finland (Sprachimmersion in einer minderheitssprache: Erfahrungen aus Finnland). *WEBFU (Wiener elektronische Beiträge des Instituts für Finno-Ugristik. Sondernummer*, 2, 1-5.
- Liebkind, K., Tandefelt, M., & Moring, T. (2007). Introduction: Why a special issue on the Swedish-speaking Finns?. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 187/188, 1-11.
- Lönnrot, E. (1835). *Kalewala or the old Karelian poems about the ancient times of the Finnish people* (1st ed., Vol. 1). Helsinki: JC Frenckelin Son's company.
- Mäkinen, E. (2005). Åland and its special status (Åland und sein Sonderstatus). *Jahrbuch des Förderalismus* (pp. 350-362). Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- McRae, K. D. (1997). *Conflict and compromise in multilingual societies: Finland*. Waterloo, Canada: Wilfried Laurier University Press.
- McRae, K. D. (2007). Toward language equality: Four democracies compared. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 187/188, 13-34.

- Mehlich, D. (2003). What means language politics? Theoretical aspects (Was ist sprachpolitik? Theoretische aspekte). In D. Mehlich, R. Arnold, N. Grau, J. Dolnik, M. Arens, & V. Dumbrava (Eds.), *National language politics and European integration (Nationale sprachpolitik und Europäische integration)* (pp. 7-16). (Tagungsbericht der forost-Projektgruppe III). München: Forost.
- Militz, E. (2002). *Finland: A country between European powers at European periphery (Finnland: Schnittstelle zwischen den mächten am rande Europas)*. Gotha: Klett-Perthes.
- Ministry of Justice. (1999). The Constitution of Finland (731/1999, amendments up to 1112/2011 included). Helsinki, Finland. Retrieved from <http://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/kaannokset/1999/en19990731.pdf>
- Ministry of Justice. (2003). Language Act No. 423/2003. Helsinki. Retrieved from http://www.slmc.uottawa.ca/?q=bi_finland_act#
- Modeen, T. (1977a). Problems of The International Law of Åland-Islands (Völkerrechtliche Probleme der Åland-Inseln). Retrieved from www.zaoerv.de/37_1977/37_1977_3_4_a_604_619.pdf
- Modeen, T. (1977b). The situation of Swedish-Finns in Finland between the era of First and Second World War (Die Lage der schwedischen Volksgruppe in Finnland in der Zwischenkriegszeit). In U. Corsini & D. Zoffi (Eds.), *Minorities between the time of the two World Wars (Die Minderheiten zwischen den beiden Weltkriegen)* (pp. 67-75). Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.
- Nymalm, N. (2011). The end of the "Liberal Theory of History"? Dissecting the U.S. congress' discourse on China's currency policy. *GIGA WP 170 (German Institute of Global and Area Studies & Leibniz-Institut für Globale und Regionale Studien (Ed.), Working Papers No. 170)*. Giga Research Unit, Institute of Asia Studies. Hamburg. Retrieved from http://www.giga-hamburg.de/dl/download.php?d=/content/publikationen/pdf/wp170_nymalm.pdf
- Ortega, J., & Tangeras, T. P. (2007). Unilingual versus bilingual education: A political economy analysis. *IZA Discussion Papers*. Retrieved from <http://www.ifn.se/BinaryLoader.axd?OwnerID=2ca32515-0e9a-4667-b8a2-18b1a62978de&OwnerType=0&PropertyName=File1&FileName=ortega-tangeras.pdf>
- Östman, A.-C. (2008). Traditions of gender, class, and language: Cooperative organizing in a Finland-Swedish community. In P. Wawrzyniuk (Ed.), *Societal change and ideological formation among the rural population of the Baltic area 1880-1939* (pp. 169-185). Huddinge: Södertörns högskola.
- Peirce, Ch. S. (1991). Papers on pragmatism and pragmatizism (*Schriften zum pragmatismus und pragmatizismus*). Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.
- Reisigl, M. (2007). Research project report: The Viennese approach of critical discourse analysis (Projektbericht: Der Wiener ansatz der kritischen diskursanalyse). *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 8(2). Retrieved from <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0702P75>
- Reisigl, M. (2008). Analyzing political rhetoric. In R. Wodak & M. Krzyzanowski (Eds.), *Qualitative discourse analysis in the social sciences* (pp. 96-120). Basingstake: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Reitz, C., & Zeller, K. (2010). Finland and Sweden in a new Europe: Linguistic processes in politics and construction of identity (*Finnland und Schweden im neuen Europa: Linguistische prozesse in politik und identitätskonstruktion*) (pp. 1-16). Frankfurt a. M.: Lang.
- Reuter, M. (2005). Swedish in Finland in the 20th century. In O. Bandle, L. Elmevik, & G. Widmark (Eds.), *The Nordic languages: An international handbook of the history of the North Germanic languages* (pp. 1647-1656). Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Saari, M. (2000). Swedish as second national language of Finland: Sociolinguistic aspects (Schwedisch als die zweite nationalsprache Finnlands: Soziolinguistische aspekte). *Linguistik online*, 7(3). Retrieved from http://www.linguistik-online.de/3_00/saari.html
- Saarikivi, J., & Marten, H. F. (2012). Introduction to the special issue: Political and economic obstacles of minority language maintenance. *Journal of Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe*, 11(1), 1-16.
- Schellbach-Kopra, I. (2002). Finnish (Finnisch). In M. Okuka (Ed.), *Viennese encyclopedia of European East: 10th lexicon of languages of European East (Wiener Enzyklopädie des Europäischen Ostens 10: Lexikon der Sprachen des europäischen Ostens)* (pp. 647-664). Klagenfurt: Wieser.
- Schnerrer, R. (1994). History of language culture in ancient Eastern Germany (Zur geschichte der Sprachkultur in der ehemaligen DDR). In H. Bickes & A. Trabold (Eds.), *Improvement of language culture in German Republic (Förderung der sprachlichen Kultur in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland)* (pp. 12-62). Stuttgart: Bleicher.

- Schot-Saikku, P. (1998). East is East and West is West: On the cultural identity of the Finns. In A. Swanson & E. Törnqvist (Eds.), *Yearbook of European studies 10* (pp. 27-46). Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Similä, M. (2006). Editorial. *Finnish Journal of Ethnicity and Migration*, 1(1), 2.
- Statistics Finland. (2012). Appendix Table 1. Population according to language 1980-2011. Helsinki. Retrieved from http://www.stat.fi/til/vaerak/2011/vaerak_2011_2012-03-16_tau_001_en.html
- Tandefelt, M. (1994). Urbanization and language shift. In B. Nordberg (Ed.), *The sociolinguistics of urbanization: The case of Nordic countries* (pp. 246-273). Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Tandefelt, M. (1997). Finnish-Swedish. In H. Goebel, P. H. Nelde, Z. Sary, & W. Wölck (Eds.), *Contact linguistics: An international handbook of contemporary research* (pp. 1007-1014). Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Tandefelt, M., & Finnäs, F. (2007). Language and demography: Historical development. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 187/188, 35-54.
- Teleman, U. (2005). Future perspectives for the history of the Nordic languages. In O. Bandle, L. Elmevik, & G. Widmark (Eds.), *The Nordic languages: An international handbook of the history of the North Germanic languages* (pp. 1843-1851). Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Wodak, R. (2002). Aspects of critical discourse analysis. *Zeitschrift für Angewandte Linguistik (ZfAL)*, 36, 5-31.