Augustin Zonjić, Ivona Šetka-Čilić *The causes of Brexit and its consequences*
on the English language in the EU
DHS 2 (5) (2018), 171-190

Augustin Zonjić, Ivona Šetka-Čilić

THE CAUSES OF BREXIT AND ITS CONSEQUENCES ON THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE IN THE EU

The paper discusses the causes and consequences of exit of the UK from the European Union, popularly called "Brexit" and whether that would change the position of English as the dominant language of the EU. Authors are also discussing whether the beginning of Brexit can be traced back further in the past, with a possible reality after 2016, when David Cameron, the Prime Minister of that time, being certain that it would not happen, agreed to hold a referendum on that question. However, the Prime Minister, the European Union and the entire world were taken by surprise when the majority of voting citizens opted for exit from the EU. The reasons for that are discussed in the paper. It is especially interesting whether, if it actually happens, the position of English will change, since it has been the "strongest" official language of the EU.

Key words: Brexit, English language, European Union, official language, future of the EU

INTRODUCTION

The UK exit from the EU, popularly known as Brexit has long been the main intriguing and discussing point since at the long-expected referendum (in 2016) 52% of the UK citizens declared that they wanted to live the EU after 43 years (Withnall and Payton, 2016). The expected results of the referendum were impossible to predict due to difference in polling results from different sources, but the only obvious thing was that it had been extremely dubious till the very end, which was, however,

confirmed by the results. There were different factors influencing the result of the referendum - public support for this side, or that side, from the Queen to David Beckham. They all influenced the British public which, at that point, had a chance not only to decide to make an important step for Britain, but also for Europe and the entire world.

The founders of the EU have been thinking of languages since 1958, when one of the first regulations of common institutions was made, and which stated that: "The official languages and the working languages of the institutions of the Community shall be Dutch, French, German and Italian" (EEC Council, 1958). The development of the Union influenced the need for extending the legislation and citizens' rights on communication with the EU in language they understand. Therefore, the article 21 of the Treaty establishing the European Community says: "Every citizen of the Union may write to any of the institutions or bodies (…) in one of the languages (…) and have an answer in the same language" (Official Journal, C 325). Hence, citizens have the right to address the official EU bodies in any of the EU's official languages and to receive a reply in that language. Nevertheless, all documentation or communication with citizens as a right, day-to-day work of the European Commission, for example, is based on approximately three commonly used working languages: English, French, and German, out of which English is the most widespread (Europa.eu, 2016).

The domination of English vs. French depends a lot on the unit or directorate within the EU institutions. Only few of the Commissioners use a non-English language as their working language. German is rarely used as a true working language in the Commission, and German media have called this as the dominance of English and French and a discrimination against German, as well as a violation of the regulations pertaining to the EU's working languages (Ammon, 2010). The language situation also disappoints many in France. European Commissioner for the Budget and Human Resources, Kristalina Georgieva, who is from Bulgaria, gained a round of applause when she told in the Parliament that she would learn French while being in the Commission (Morris, 2010). Parliament translates its proceedings into all official languages although the actual spoken language of members of the parliament (MPs) is English, so fellow MPs can understand each other better than if they had the delayed translation. Committee meetings are also mostly done in the language understood by the attenders.

The EU ability for legislative acts and other initiatives on language policy is legally based on provisions in the Treaties of the European Union. Based on the principle of "subsidiarity," the EU institutions play a supporting role in promoting

Augustin Zonjić, Ivona Šetka-Čilić *The causes of Brexit and its consequences*
on the English language in the EU
DHS 2 (5) (2018), 171-190

cooperation between the member states, as well as in promoting of the European dimension in the language policies of the member states, especially through teaching and dissemination of the languages of the member states (Journal C 321E).

ENGLISH AS A *LINGUA FRANCA*

The special status that can be recognized worldwide is what makes a global language global, which means that countries whose official language is not global have to choose such language as a means of communication. This can be done in two ways. First, by giving that language an official status in the country, which means that it is used as a means of communication in domains such as government, law, education and media; second, by giving that language a predominant status in the process of foreign-language teaching. Therefore, it becomes the language that children will most likely learn when they enter the educational system or it becoms the most available language for the adults in their process of foreign language teaching (Crystal, 2003). The term English as Lingua Franca has emerged as a way of denoting communication among speakers of English with different first languages. English has become a contact language of the people who share neither a common native language nor culture, and for whom English is a chosen language of communication (Seidlhofer, 2005). The process of globalization enabled English language to become what Latin was during the Middle Ages. However, that is not connected with the number of English language speakers. There is a strong connection between language dominance and economic, technological and cultural power of its speakers (Crystal, 2003). Considering the fact that language only exists in people's minds, the success of the nation reflects on its language. Therefore, when the language speakers succeed, their language becomes more prominent and successful. It was believed that simplicity of English grammar (lack of gender markers, lexical productivity, etc.) made it so appealing to the speakers, which resulted that English has become so popular on a global scale. Nevertheless, Latin as complex as it is, was once an international language, which brings us to conclusion that neither intrinsic properties nor ease of learning promote a language into global-like status. As Crystal (2003, p.9) states, "A language traditionally becomes an international language for one chief reason: the power of its people - especially their political and military power." The military power itself is not sufficient. The military power only enables establishing of a language, but it is economic power that maintains and expands it. This has become particularly

Augustin Zonjić, Ivona Šetka-Čilić *The causes of Brexit and its consequences*
on the English language in the EU
DHS 2 (5) (2018), 171-190

prominent since the nineteenth century, when economy became the major driving force supported by the development of the new communication techno-logies: radio, telephone, and television. Mass media crossed international boundaries and made information available to everyone. Accordingly, any language that could have found itself in the center of such an explosion of international activity, would have gained a global status. English seems to have been at the right place in the right time. Britain had become the world's leading industrial and trading force by the beginning of the nineteenth century. At the beginning of the twentieth century the population of the USA was larger than that of any other country in Western Europe (counting 100 million) and its economy was the most productive and the fastest growing in the world. British imperialism launched English around the world. This worldwide supremacy continued throughout the twentieth century with the continual rise of the new American superpower. Politics was replaced by economy as the main driving force (Crystal, 2003).

THE NEED FOR A GLOBAL LANGUAGE AND THE DANGERS THAT IT CAUSES

The idea that a *Lingua Franca* might be needed by the whole world emerged during the 1950s. It was the time when many international organizations, such as United Nations (UN), World Health Organization (WHO), World Bank, (…), were established. As regards to the fact that many nations and countries are part of these organizations, there is a growing tendency to reduce the number of languages used in it. This is motivated by practical considerations – the need to avoid too much bureaucracy in the process of translation and interpreting. Nowadays, the majority of English users are non-native speakers, and the number of people speaking English as a foreign or second language has surpassed the number of native speakers. As Seidlhofer (2005) claims, it cannot be denied that English functions as *global Lingua Franca*. As a consequence of its international use, English has been shaped by the non-native speakers as much as by the native speakers. This has led to a somewhat paradoxical situation where for the majority of its users, English is a foreign language and a great amount of verbal exchanges do not involve any native speakers at all. The need for a global language is particularly appreciated by the international academic and business communities. The availability of technology and transportation enabled people to have been mobile, both physically and electronically

Augustin Zonjić, Ivona Šetka-Čilić *The causes of Brexit and its consequences*
on the English language in the EU
DHS 2 (5) (2018), 171-190

with a result that they have become the inhabitants of the so-called "*global village*" (Crystal, 2003).

There are several arguments which can be pointed out as relevant in the race for the global status and applied to any language besides English. The first argument is a linguistic power. Those people who speak a global language as a mother tongue are in a superior position in comparison to those people who have to learn it as an official or foreign language. This is of course a possible outcome, but if we consider the fact that children are apt for bilingualism or even multilingualism, then this statement does not have to be true. Significant efforts have to be made in children's education, especially in foreign language teaching. As regards to this process, we have to be led by the key principle - the sooner, the better, exposing children to comprehensible input that can lead to their native-like language competence (Crystal, 2003). The second argument, as Crystal (2003) suggests, is a linguistic complacency, which means that a global language will eliminate adults' motivation for learning other languages. Unwillingness to learn other languages can be triggered by poor test results or negative experiences during a language learning situation. A considerable effort has been made during recent years to stop the trend of monolingualism. Many countries and governments pay a lot of attention to this, especially those which use English as a mother tongue. Australia has made Japanese the first foreign language, and the USA and the UK are devoting time and attention to Spanish, whose number of native speakers is growing more rapidly than the English ones. The third argument that Crystal (2003) points out is a linguistic death, which means that the rise of global language will accelerate extinction of minority languages. By establishing a general perspective on this issue, it is visible that throughout the history many languages died out mostly because of the fact that some ethnic group assimilated to more dominant society and accepted its language. This process continues nowadays, especially in North America, Brazil, and Australia and in parts of Asia and Africa. Nevertheless, it is evident that global language has a little impact on local communities and their languages. For example, the status of Galician in Spain simply depends on political and economic history of that country.

The status of language is often somewhere between mutual intelligibility and identity. The former has a prevalent role. All in all, not only has the process of globalization had disastrous effects on English language, but on global diversity as well. Luckily, there are many organizations which deal with the issue of language extinction. However, a concrete solution has to come from the domains of economy and politics; the branches that have eventually caused this issue. The world's

Augustin Zonjić, Ivona Šetka-Čilić *The causes of Brexit and its consequences*
on the English language in the EU
DHS 2 (5) (2018), 171-190

governments have to make a step in creation of linguistic future whether in promoting English or developing the use of other languages in their communities (Crystal, 2003).

BREXIT IS NOT YESTERDAY'S NEWS – IT HAS
BEEN LASTING FOR MORE THAN 40 YEARS

The first thing to be mentioned is that Brexit did not become the main topic in the last few months; some people consider it has been the most important topic since 1973. Nevertheless, since then, some people, groups and political trends in the UK have been trying to make Britain exit from the Union, which was then called the European Economic Community (EEC), not European Union. EEC was founded on 25 March 1957 in Rome by six states, members of the European Coal and Steel Community. It had been previously considered as the forerunner of the European integration. The goal of such a community was to enlarge trade, the flow of goods and profit, as well as to enlarge and unite the power. When talking about EEC, the vital thing to be mentioned is which states formed that block considering the fact that the founder would always have the "preference treatment," as it is the case with every club, no matter what it is like and with which capacities it participated later. Therefore, these would be the first arguments for Brexit since Britain is not one of the original founders of the EEC, but the following states are: Belgium, France, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and former West Germany (these six states are sometimes called "
"). The UK submitted the claim for membership in 1961. However, Charles de Gaulle, the French president at that time, was strongly against it arguing that Britain was the American "Troyan horse" and that the British entering the EEC would mean enlarging of the American influence on Europe. After de Gaulle had left, the UK became the member of the EEC in 1967 (Hoskyns and Newman 2000).

Hence, there are several reasons for British Euroscepticism, some of which are general, while some are very "British". With the implementation of the Maastricht Treaty, the EEC changed its name into the European Community, which together with the European Coal and Steel Community and the European Atomic Energy Community became one of "three keystones" on which the EU is based. Nevertheless, in the EU there is a group of states often called "The Big Four" or EU4, which are the four most powerful EU states: France, Germany, Italy and the UK. Does it mean that Britain has finally achieved its goals? Does it mean that it has eventually become

Augustin Zonjić, Ivona Šetka-Čilić *The causes of Brexit and its consequences*
on the English language in the EU
DHS 2 (5) (2018), 171-190

a power state next to other European power states despite the fact that it was not among the founding member states of the block?

The first British "Brexit" referendum took place in 1975, only two years after joining the EU. All big political parties wanted Britain to stay in the EEC, as well as all leading media, but there was the split as regards to the dilemma whether to stay or not inside the governing Laburist party, whose members on party conference voted 2 vs 1 for British exit from the block.

However, due to extremely anti–European ministers in the government in that period, the referendum was organized on 5 June 1975 and it ended with the result that 67.2% of citizens voted that Britain should stay in the EEC, whereas 32.8% voted that Britain should exit the EEC, and the total number of citizens who voted was 64.5% (BBC, 1975).

Eight years after that, the Laburists tried to (re)initiate the topic of British exit from the EEC, which was the main political message during the elections for the British parliament. The elections took place in 1983, when the Conservative candidate Margaret Thatcher became the British Prime Minister. Of course, Thatcher, who at that time had a very close connection with the USA, did not even think of taking Britain out of the EEC, and her victory was so strong that even the Laburists mostly quit the idea of "Brexit".

For those who favored European integration, the logical, reasonable and natural step took place in 1993, when the EEC became the political union as well. However, for those who were against the integration, it was the nightmare and the beginning of the end of European national states. Therefore, it is not surprising that in the same year, 1993, the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP) was founded, which is currently led by Nigel Farage, who is known by his speeches which vary from intuitive, humorous to insulting. Nevertheless, he remained determined in his goal as one of the founders of the UKIP (UKIP, 2016). However, the UKIP has been improving its results, especially after the European crisis. In the year 2014 it won the largest number of votes, 27.5% at the EU elections, which was the first time since 1910 that one political party, with the exception of Laburist and Conservative parties, won the majority in some national elections in Britain (Wintour and Watt, 2014). It is also important to mention that since the day it was founded, the UKIP has been fighting for British exit from the EU, and in recent years it has turned to extreme nationalism, as well as neoliberalism. Its messages have already been known and there is no need to look for too many reasons why some right-oriented party would support the exit of its state from the EU.

The hypothesis that is likely to occur or prove the truth is that most of "right-oriented" European parties, with some exceptions, want their state to exit from the EU. The reason which would justify that decision is very simple. "*Self-determination of the people, together with national sovereignty, is the starting lever for creation of national states;*" however, in the modern world, as well as in the EU, "*One-Nation states are mostly disappearing as a combination of unifying the identities, (…) now, an ethnically homogeneous states are almost non-existent*" (Iličić, 2015). Namely, by being members of the political union, national states are becoming less important and their world turns to internationalization, globalization and total freedom of movement, labour, goods, capital and services. Such development of events would not be so bad if decisions made in Bruxelles were actually good for all citizens of Europe and elsewhere. However, it does not mean that all decisions made in Bruxelles are *a priori* bad, it is actually completely opposite - the EU as an integrate union brings many advantages and sets bases for potentionly high life standards of its citizens. One of the "troubles" with Europe is in fact the invasion of neoliberalism, primarily from the USA, mostly via Britain in the 1980s, as well as the breaking of the European "social state." Accordingly, it is important to mention that inside the EU, the controversy over whether to stay or leave is not the only issue. There are also proponents for a total reform of the EU (Lasić, 2016). Why could it not be possible to reform the EU as an organization in a way that it keeps everything that is good, and fix everything that is bad? However, there will be a problem with nationalism and all stronger right-oriented parties because they neither want to make pressure on Bruxelles nor carry out internal reforms. Such parties want to return their national borders and authorities at any cost while speaking in public about anything that is good, patriotic, etc. However, in reality, it is all about the conflict inside the capitalist class, actually, it is all about conflicts between minor national, regional capitalists and major supranational capitalists.

There are important differences in profiles among the proponents of remaining in the EU, especially regarding age groups, education or geographic position. According to the results of the referendum by regions, Scotland, Northern Ireland and the capital city London were the strongest supporters of staying in the EU. Is this surprising? Not at all since these regions realize that they would have less influence if they exit from the EU. According to the research conducted before the beginning of the referendum, the younger generations mostly wanted to stay in the EU. As regards to older generations, the older they are, the more they want to exit the EU. The British exit from the EU was mostly supported by the labor class and lower classes, whereas

Augustin Zonjić, Ivona Šetka-Čilić *The causes of Brexit and its consequences*
on the English language in the EU
DHS 2 (5) (2018), 171-190

upper classes and managers prefered to stay in the EU (Kirk, 2016). These data are not connected to politics since it is all about classical sociology – the poor want to change their life status and therefore they vote for changes, whereas the rich are satisfied with their status and they are resisting to changes, which Myers (2013) confirms saying: "*Those who attribute poverty and unemployment as a personal dispositions tend to adopt political positions unsympathetic to other people. (…) Tell me your attributions for poverty and I will guess your politics.*"

The question which cannot be answered with a single answer is why did David Cameron actually accept to make a referendum if he personally supports staying in the EU? One of the possible answers is that he wanted to silence those who were increasingly louder in their demands for the referendum - the UKIP, as well as half of representatives from his Conservative Party. He did it in a way that he made a promise in 2012 that if he won, as he did, he would allow the referendum. Nevertheless, in order to become stronger in favour of remaining in the EU, he demanded that the EU should make many concessions for Britain, to which the EU agreed since it did not want to lose Britain as its member state. Those concessions included the fact that Britain could regulate many issues, such as social funds for migrant workers and keeping the pound (Erlanger and Castle, 2016). Accordingly, why do the UKIP and Eurosceptics want Britain to exit from the EU? It is obvious that there is no threat of losing national identity in Britain. On the contrary, they think that EU forces too many rules on British business, and Britain hates paying annual membership which costs billions of pounds. Nevertheless, at this point it is important to note that the UK is the only EU state that has a "discount" on the contribution to the EU budget. The UK rebate is a financial mechanism that reduces the UK's contribution to the EU budget which has been in effect since 1985. It is a complex calculation which equates to approximately 66% of the UK's net contribution – the amount paid by the UK into the EU budget reduces the EU expenditure in the UK (EEC Euratom, 1985). Based on a net contribution of €12.1 billion (£9.8 billion) in 2014, the UK Treasury estimated the 2015 rebate had amounted to €6.2 billion (£4.9 billion), which reduced the ultimate UK contribution for the 2015 budget to €16.6 billion (£12.9 billion) (HM Treasury, 2015). Although the rebate is not set in the EU treaties, it is negotiated as part of the Multiannual Financial Framework every seven years and must be unanimously agreed (Kovacevic, 2016). However, everything is about money and conditions for business with which they finally showed that the voters had been cheated on in the pre-referendum campaign, and the masses were engaged with nationalism and promises about better social welfare (Piccaver, 2016).

Supporters of the British exit from the EU have never cared about the policy of free movement inside the EU, and therefore they wanted to return the control over their borders. Furthermore, they dislike the process of increased integration of the EU, i.e. the process which leads steadily and certainly toward the increased transfer of parts of sovereignty to common institutions and policies. Only now is the British panic regarding the EU integration understood since they are afraid that eventually Bruxelles or Berlin would become "the capital of Britain". Those who voted for the stay in the EU are actually those who belong to the other side of the same medal. They argued that Britain had profited from the membership in the EU, which means that it is much easier to sale goods to other EU members; and as regards to migrants, they are mostly thought to be the young people who are willing to work, which is more important for the business–oriented way of thinking than the issue of the ethnic structure of future Britain.

However, some think that the British status in the world would be degraded with its exit from the EU and that it is safer if Britan stays in the EU. Not only is there a point in it, but this was also confirmed by dramatic change on the stock markets and the fall of the value of the pound in the morning after the referendum. The British economist Andrew Lilico thinks that it would be better for both Britain and the EU if Britain gets out from the EU. He believes that the British exit became inevitable at the moment when Britain decided not to introduce the EU currency, the Euro. Lilico claims that the Euro can function only if Europe becomes united, integrated "superstate". Therefore, by rejecting the common currency, Britain has become the biggest obstacle to European integration (Lilico, 2016). Almost all member states have introduced, or are introducing the Euro. There are seven states which are supposed to introduce the Euro after a period of coordination, and they are: Croatia, Bulgaria, the Check Republic, Romania, Poland, Hungary and Sweden. Furthermore, there is also Denmark, whose citizens rejected the Euro at the 2000 referendum, which presents a minor problem for Europe since the exchange rate of Danish national currency is connected to the one of the Euro. Evidently, Britain is the only "renegade" in this club. Ten years ago, Britain did the so-called "five economic tests", which the Euro should satisfy in order to be accepted by Britain. From the very beginning "the tests" were not set as the British wanted in order to accept the Euro, but they were set as conditions which could not be satisfied by any other currency in the world.

The liberal democracy triumphed inside the EU. So far it has succeeded in absorbing even the post-fascist Spain, Portugal, and Greece, as well as the post-socialistic states of the eastern block and part of the broken Yugoslavia. However,

Augustin Zonjić, Ivona Šetka-Čilić *The causes of Brexit and its consequences*
on the English language in the EU
DHS 2 (5) (2018), 171-190

liberal democracy is not an ideal system. It is actually "incomplete democracy" in which people are only rarely asked for opinion, but corporations and the capitalist class are taking more and more power. Nevertheless, it is easier to turn incomplete democracy to democracy than to do the same with totalitarism. There are no wars in the EU, which is also an important fact, but some claim that there is a confrontation between the EU and Russia. Is that true? It is clear to everybody who followed the international economic forum in Sankt Peterburg in 2016 that Russia would make a big economic integration with the EU if it could. Conflicts, such as the one in the Ukraine, would not have happened if the entire situation had been decided only by Russia and the EU. The USA is the one which causes problems here, as it has not yet overcome its cold war legacy. As a matter of fact, the explanation of geopolitical games in "Heartland" is not the goal of this paper, but the short review was needed for a better understanding of Brexit.

LANGUAGES IN THE EU

There are many languages spoken in the EU. There are 23 officially recognized languages, more than 60 indigenous regional and minority languages, and many non-indigenous lan-guages spoken by migrant communities. The EU, although having limited influence because educational and language policies are the responsibility of individual member states, is committed to safeguarding this linguistic diversity and promoting knowledge of languages. This is motivated by reasons of cultural identity and social integration and cohesion and because multilingual citizens are in a better position to take advantage of the economic, educational and professional opportunities created by integrated Europe (EACEA, 2012). A mobile workforce is a solution for the competitiveness of the EU economy. The Commission's very first Communication on Multilingualism (2005) "*A New Framework Strategy for Multilingualism*", adopted in November 2005 and now superseded by the 2008 Strategy, set out three basic strands to the EU's policy in this area: "*1) underlining the major role that languages and multilingualism play in the European economy and finding ways to develop this further; 2) encouraging all citizens to learn and speak more languages in order to improve mutual understanding and communication; 3) ensuring that citizens have access to the EU legislation, procedures and information in their own language.*" This Strategy complements the Commission's Action Plan "*Promoting Language Learning and Linguistic Diversity*", adopted in

Augustin Zonjić, Ivona Šetka-Čilić *The causes of Brexit and its consequences*
on the English language in the EU
DHS 2 (5) (2018), 171-190

2003, which set out measures aimed at supporting initiatives carried out at local, regional and national levels, designed to extend the benefits of language learning to all citizens as a lifelong activity; improving the quality of language teaching at all levels; and building an environment in Europe favorable to languages by embracing linguistic diversity, building language-friendly communities, and making language learning easier. The EU encourages all citizens to be multilingual, with the long-term objective that every citizen should have practical skills in at least two languages in addition to his or her mother tongue.

German is the most widespread mother tongue in the EU and it is spoken by approximately 18 % of the EU population. English, Italian and French are each mother tongues for approximately 60 to 65 million people (each accounts for 12 – 13% of the total number). However, there are 38 % of people who beside their mother tongue speak English as the first foreign language, which puts English in front of German and other languages which are mostly used in the EU. Only 14% of the EU population use French or German as the first foreign language. The joining of additional 12 states to the EU only confirmed the supremacy of English as the language whose use largely goes beyond the boundaries of the state in which it is spoken, i.e. English is the EU Lingua Franca (CEPEI, 2016). In 15 states or regions of the states it is regulated by the law which languages are obligatory for the students, i.e. which languages must be learned by all students. In Belgium (German and Flemish community), Cyprus, Island and Lichtenstein there are two obligatory languages. In Luxembourg there are even three obligatory languages. All students must learn German, French and English during the obligatory education. In 14 states or regions of the states all students must learn English and in most cases it is the first language to be learned. French is more often the second official language. In 3 out of 5 states or regions of the states in which French is the obligatory language, the same thing happens with one of the national languages. In several states, foreign-language learning is obligatory due to historical or political reasons, for example in Belgium, Luxembourg, Finland and Island (except for Italy and Lichtenstein), in which learning of a certain language was obligatory at some stage of education in 2010 ⁄ 2011. Such policy was applied even in 1992 ⁄ 1993. According to the reform which was conducted in Slovakia in 2011 ⁄ 2012, English became obligatory (EACEA 2012). The Croats learn foreign languages more than ever before. It is interesting that even 97.1 % of children in Croatia learn English, 42.3% learn German and only 1.5 % learn French. More than 97 % of children in elementary school in Croatia learn English as a foreign language, which is an increase of 12 % in comparison to 7 years before. This was

Augustin Zonjić, Ivona Šetka-Čilić *The causes of Brexit and its consequences*
on the English language in the EU
DHS 2 (5) (2018), 171-190

shown by the latest data of Eurostat published in Bruxelles on the occasion of the European Day of the Language (Palokaj, 2014).

WHAT WILL HAPPEN WITH ENGLISH LANGUAGE IN THE EU?

Danuta Hübner, the head of the European Parliament's Constitutional Affairs Committee, warned that English would not be one of the European Union's official languages after Britain's leaving of the EU. English is one of the EU's 24 official languages because the UK identified it as its own official language, Hübner said: "*We have a regulation (…) where every EU country has the right to notify one official language. The Irish have notified Gaelic, and the Maltese have notified Maltese, so you have only the UK notifying English. If we don't have the UK, we don't have English. English is one of the working languages in the European institutions, it's the dominating language. (…) When Ireland and Malta joined the EU, English was already an official language, which is why the two countries asked for Irish and Maltese to be added to the list. If a member state has more than one official language, the language to be used shall, at the request of such state, be governed by the general rules of its law,*" (Politico.eu)

As argued above, Britain's relationship with the European Union has been a rather turbulent one from the very beginning, and the final "Brexit" referendum results raise the question of the future of English, the language which currently seems to dominate the institutions of the European Union. Despite the fact that all the 24 official languages of the 28 member states of the EU have equal legal status, English has become the most used language, gradually displacing French as the European Lingua Franca. If Britain leaves the EU, this will create a very odd linguistic phenomenon – the result will be a language which is only co-official for some 5 million people (Ireland with a population of 4.6 million and Malta with a population of 450,000) and which is used to discuss and further the interests of 450 million European citizens. Therefore, following the results of the Brexit referendum, many European politicians and MPs have questioned the status of English in the European institutions. Furthermore, the European Commission has released a statement to counter these claims: "*The Council of Ministers, acting unanimously, decides on the rules governing the use of languages by the European institutions. In other words, any change to the EU Institutions' language regime is subject to a unanimous vote of the Council, including Ireland*" (EC, 2016).

Will Brexit pave the way for a greater linguistic variety and increased multilingualism in Europe? Language groups across Ireland, Wales, and the rest of the UK have warned of the damaging consequences of Brexit on lesser-spoken languages, such as Welsh, Cornish or Gaelic. UKIP's MP Nathan Gill has countered these claims pointing out that Welsh did not have a full official status in the European Union, and claiming that "*the Welsh language is safer…by us having the freedom to legislate ourselves in the Senat or in Westminster*" (Williamson, 2016). However, the groups argue that the EU plays an important role in the promotion of lesser-used languages, and "cultural wealth", as opposed to the British governments which "*throughout much of our shared history conducted aggressive language policies designed to eradicate our languages*". They go on to say that „*being a part of a heterogeneous European Union with its robust congregation of minority and majority cultures allows for a better understanding and protection of our own languages*"(Williamson, 2016). What can be said about the European future of English language without England? The language seems less dependent on Britain's membership in the EU than legislation seems to suggest. In fact, a sort of Euro-English, influenced by foreign languages has already been in use, particularly among members whose native language is not English. An EU report from 2013, by Jeremy Gardner, an official at the European Court of Auditors, entitled "*Misused English Words and Expressions in EU Publications,*" addresses dozens of incorrectly used terms, e.g. "actor," "valorize," or "delay": „*Delay' is often used in the EU to mean 'deadline' or 'time limit'. In English 'delay' always refers to something being late or taking longer than is necessary. You cannot, therefore comply with (or 'respect') a delay*" (Curia Rationum, 2016). Namely, the language is capable of surviving outside the zone of British influence, yet such an existence will have unparallel consequences on the type of English spoken in the European institutions. Euro-English has already been rife with various quirks which seem to resemble the type of English spoken in India or South Africa, where a small group of native speakers is dwarfed by a far larger number of second-language speakers. Despite the fact that such languages successfully exist in many parts of the world, they are not usually used as the main legislative and communication tool for a Union of such unprecedented geographical scope and influence. They cannot be an accurate tool for political negotiations and subsequent rendition of the European law. Nevertheless, rather than enriching the original language, putting it in the hands of non-native speakers risks the simplification of more complex linguistic features. Brexit would not be the end of English, but as Dr Ingrid Piller, professor of Applied Linguistics at Macquarie

Augustin Zonjić, Ivona Šetka-Čilić *The causes of Brexit and its consequences*
on the English language in the EU
DHS 2 (5) (2018), 171-190

University, suggests, it would represent "*another nail in the coffin of native speaker supremacy,*" with native speakers choosing to give up their prime role in the story of English (Piller, 2016). The preponderance of English has nothing to do with the influence of Britain or even Britain's membership of the EU. Historically, the expansion of the British empire, the impact of the industrial revolution and the emergence of the US as a world power have embedded English in the language repertoire of speakers across the globe. Unlike Latin, which outlived the Roman empire as the Lingua Franca of medieval and renaissance Europe, there are native speakers of English (who may be unfairly advantaged), but it is those who have learned English as a foreign language and who now constitute the majority of users (Jenkins, Modiano, and Seidlhofer, 2001). The report of the 2012 Special Eurobarometer on Europeans and their Languages, it was stated that English was the most widely spoken foreign language in 19 member states in which it was not the official language. It was also stated that across Europe, 38% of people spoke English as a foreign language well enough to have a conversation, compared to 12% of people speaking French and 11% of people speaking German. The report also found that 67% of Europeans considered English the most useful foreign language, and that the number of people favoring German (17%) or French (16%) had declined. As a result, 79% of Europeans wanted their children to learn English, compared to 20% of people who preferred their childer to learn French or German (DG COMM, 2012). Huge sums of money have been invested in English teaching by both national governments and private enterprise. Not only has the demand for learning English increased, but the supply has increased as well. English language learning worldwide was estimated to have been worth US$63.3 billion in 2012, and it is expected that this market will have risen to US$193.2 billion by 2018 (Ragan and Jones, 2013). As regards to the speakers of other languages, the importance and value of English language are not going to diminish any time soon. Namely, too much has been invested in it. Speakers of English as a second language outnumber speakers of English as a first language by 2:1 not only in Europe but all over the world. For many Europeans, and especially for those employed in the EU, English is a useful ''tool'' which is used when necessary – a point which has become evident in a recent project on whether the use of English in Europe was an opportunity or a threat (Linn, 2016). Therefore, in the majority of cases, using English has precisely nothing to do with the UK or Britishness. The EU needs practical solutions and English provides one. We can assume that English will not maintain its privileged position forever. However, it is not the predominantly monolingual British that benefit now, but European anglocrats

Augustin Zonjić, Ivona Šetka-Čilić *The causes of Brexit and its consequences
on the English language in the EU*
DHS 2 (5) (2018), 171-190

whose multilingualism provides them with a key to international education and employment.

CONCLUSION

Which language will become the new *lingua Franca* if English loses that position? Since Britain was not one of the founding members of the European Community, French was initially used as the official language. In fact, certain institutions, such as the European Court of Justice, have maintained the use of French as their working language for both historical and economic reasons. However, it is unlikely that it can be restored to its former primacy. Despite the economic and political strength of Germany, it is unlikely that German will become the obvious replacement either. To forcefully eject English would be to plunge the Union into a period of costly and complicated structural revisions in every unit and at all levels. For many years now, English has not been the prerogative of the British. In time, it has become almost neutral, a tool for communication with friends and colleagues. In an ideal world, the Union would have a language of no state which belongs to no one and everyone all at once. Yet, would that really celebrate the European motto of being "*united in diversity*"? To move away from English would be to go against both heart and mind. Although the UK may not be linked with the EU in legislation, it remains the part of the same continent united by the same values and in solidarity with all those who want to partake in them, regardless of the language they speak.

The idea of integration is and will always be especially attractive. Nevertheless, what will happen if the ideals of integration become false; if integration becomes only the goal of the ruling class profiting? How can we support and look forward to integration if it, at this very moment, threats us with cruelty of neoliberalism? Such integration can not be a good result even though it presents itself as such. However, those who want to take chances with neonationalism, may do it, but all who support such a scenario have to keep in mind the proverb "*Historia est magistra vitae*" before they take it as their final answer. The answer and the key could be found in a positive reform of the EU, but in order to make it happen, those *pressures to which such reform is unimaginable should be bowed*. Maybe, from such point of view, the victory of economic nationalism in the USA would be good because in that case, Europe would have a space for "breathing", i.e. those forces willing and ready to make such reforms could take over. Nevertheless, if the British government listens to the voice of its

people at the unobligatory Brexit referendum and starts the procedure of exiting from the EU, they will both instantly encounter instability. The EU will then have to either quickly become consolidated through even larger integration, or it will inevitably break by the domino theory. Both could be bad. Unfortunately, there are no ideal scenarios here; however one thing is certain: Europe will not be the same, but we are only to find out how much it will change. Nevertheless, the world changes, and if Liberal democracy, as was predicted by Francis Fukuyama, stays the only dominant global ideology, that is definitely not "the end of history" because as it can be seen now, crucial changes could happen inside the EU which would change everything, including history.

LITERATURE

1. Ammon, U. (2010), *Warum Deutsch in der EU diskriminiert wird.* Die Welt, 25 Feb. 2010, available at: https://goo.gl/k6X8gg, retrieved 2 Dec. 2016
2. BBC (Jun. 6, 1975) *UK embraces Europe in referendum.* Available at: https://goo.gl/HeGWMm, retrieved 15 Nov 2016
3. CEPEI (2016), *Stanovništvo EU i strani jezici,* available at: https://goo.gl/mPLZ yc, retrieved 19 Nov 2016
4. Comition of the European Communities (2005), A *New Framework Strategy for Multilingualism,* Brussels, 22.11.2005 COM(2005) 596 final, available on https://goo.gl/Wird71, retrieved 19 Nov 2016
5. Crystal, D. (2003), *English as a Global Language.* 2nd. Cambridge University Press, New York
6. Curia Rationum (2016), *Misused English words and expressions in EU publications,* available at: https://goo.gl/HSTwSg, retrieved 18 Nov 2016
7. DG COMM (2012), *Europeans and their Languages,* available at: https://goo.gl/ZjaiB3, retrieved 19 Nov 2016
8. EACEA (2012), *Ključni podaci o poučavanju jezika u školama u Europi,* Eurydice, available at: https://goo.gl/NWu1lj, retrieved 14 Nov 2016
9. EC (2016), EU *languages: Statement on behalf of the European Commission Representation in Ireland,* available at: https://goo.gl/z6tvQW, retrieved 30 Nov 2016
10. EEC Council (1958), *Regulation No 1 determining the languages to be used by the European Economic Community,* EUR-Lex - 31958R0001

Augustin Zonjić, Ivona Šetka-Čilić *The causes of Brexit and its consequences*
on the English language in the EU
DHS 2 (5) (2018), 171-190

11. EEC Euratom. (1985), *Council Decision 85/257/ of 7 May 1985 on the Communities' system of own resources.* EUR-Lex.

12. Erlanger S., Castle, S (June 21, 2016) *In 'Brexit' Vote, David Cameron Faces Problem of His Own Making.* The New York Times. https://goo.gl/iJqXFO retrieved 19 Nov 2016.

13. Europa.eu (2016), FAQ - *What are the working languages of the European Commission?* Available at: https://goo.gl/EDCXff, retrieved 2 Dec. 2016.

14. Gourland, H. (Jun. 27, 2016), *English will not be an official EU language after Brexit, says senior MEP* Politico.eu: https://goo.gl/pYayrD, retrieved 29 Nov 2016

15. HM Treasury (2015), *European Union Finances 2015: statement on the 2015 EU Budget and measures to counter fraud and financial mismanagement.* Available at: https://goo.gl/SrVJYm, retrieved 14 Nov 2016

16. Hoskyns, C. and Newman, M. (2000), *Democratizing the European Union: Issues for the twenty-first Century (Perspectives on Democratization).* Manchester University Press.

17. Iličić, G. (2015), *Različit pristup nacionalnom fenomenu i problem ravnopravnosti. u Identitetska i kulturna raznolikost BiH i europske perspektive jednoga podijeljenog društva,* Zbornik radova, Sv 1, Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Mostaru, Mostar, str. 215

18. Jenkins, J., Modiano, M. and Seidlhofer, B. (2001), '*Euro-English*', English Today, 17(4), p. 13-19

19. Journal C 321E (2006), *Consolidated version of the Treaty establishing the European Community*, EUR-Lex - C:2006:321E:TOC.

20. Kirk, A. (June 22, 2016), *EU referendum: Which type of person wants to leave, and who will be voting to remain*? The Telegraph: https://goo.gl/8doK3T, retrieved 18 Nov 2016

21. Kovacevic, T. (2016), *Reality Check: How vulnerable is the UK's rebate?* BBC News. Available at: https://goo.gl/U0cUwf, retrieved 14 Nov 2016.

22. Lasić, M. (2016), *Transnacionalne socijalizacije – politike i institucije Europske Unije.* Paneuropska unija BiH i HKD Napredak, Mostar i Sarajevo

23. Lilico, A. (2016), *We have won the Brexit war. Now it's time to win the Brexit peace,* available at: https://capx.co/54KqJ, retrieved 18 Nov 2016

24. Linn, A. (2016), *Investigating English in Europe - Contexts and Agendas,* Vol. 6. Gruyter Mouton, London

Augustin Zonjić, Ivona Šetka-Čilić *The causes of Brexit and its consequences*
on the English language in the EU
DHS 2 (5) (2018), 171-190

25. Morris, H. (2010), *French language losing its cachet? Au contraire!* Financial Times, available at: https://goo.gl/vS93lK, retrieved 21 Nov 2016

26. Myers, D. (2013), *Social Psychology, Eleventh Edition.* New York: The McGraw-Hill Co. p. 108

27. Official Journal, C 325 (1957), *Treaty establishing the European Community.* EUR-Lex - 12002E/TXT

28. Palokaj, A. (2014), *Čak 97 posto djece uči engleski jezik, Jutarnji list,* 25.09.2014,

29. Piccaver, M. (Jun. 24, 2016), *The biggest political decision for a generation was based on a lie about £350m – the NHS will never see that.* The Independent: https://goo.gl/E0JmSF, retrieved 30 Nov 2016

30. Piller, I. (2016), *Have we just seen the beginning of the end of English?* Available at: https://goo.gl/19SuOb, retrieved 29 Nov 2016

31. Ragan, L. and Jones, S. (2013), *The Global English Language Learning (ELL) Market,* available at: https://goo.gl/cXKfMf, retrieved 30 Nov 2016

32. Seidlhofer, B. (2005), *English as lingua franca.* Oxford Journals: 339-341.

33. Steinhauser, G (2016), *English Loses Currency as Europe's Lingua Franca After Brexit Vote,* The Wall Street Journal, available at https://goo.gl/hf1ewW, retrieved 29 Nov 2016

34. UKIP (2016), *Statement from UKIP Leader Nigel Farage on EU Referendum Designation.* Available at: https://goo.gl/qJoctH, retrieved 18 Nov 2016

35. Williamson, D. (2016), *Language groups join forces to warn of 'disastrous' consequences of Brexit,* Wales Online, available at: https://goo.gl/k1MCHN, retrieved 30 Nov 2016

36. Wintour, P. and Watt, N. (2014), *Ukip wins European elections with ease to set off political earthquake.* The Guardian, available at: https://goo.gl/znwC3S, retrieved 18 Nov 2016

37. Withnall, A. and Payton, M. (2016), *EU referendum results tracker: Follow the results live as Brexit is confirmed.* Independent, 22 June 2016, available at: https://goo.gl/UdAEXQ, retrieved 2 Dec. 2016.

UZROCI BREXITA I NJEGOVE POSLJEDICE NA POLOŽAJ ENGLESKOG JEZIKA U EUROPSKOJ UNIJI

Sažetak

U ovom se radu raspravlja o uzrocima i posljedicama izlaska Ujedinjenog Kraljevstva iz Europske Unije, što je poznato pod nazivom ''Brexit'' i hoće li to napuštanje utjecati na promjenu položaja engleskog jezika kao dominantnog jezika u Europskoj Uniji. Autori ovoga rada također razmatraju može li se početak Brexita nazrijeti u prošlosti, a što je postalo stvarnost nakon 2016., kada je tadašnji premijer David Cameron, siguran da do navedenog neće doći, pristao na održavanje referenduma o tom pitanju. Međutim, tadašnji Premijer, Europska Unija, kao i cijeli svijet su bili iznenađeni kada se većina građana koja je glasala odlučila za izlazak iz Europske Unije. U ovom se radu raspravljaju razlozi navedenog. Posebice je zanimljivo pitanje hoće li se položaj engleskog jezika promijeniti budući da je engleski jezik ''najjači'' službeni jezik u Europskoj Uniji.

Ključne riječi: Brexit, engleski jezik, Europska Unija, službeni jezik, budućnost Europske Unije

Adresa autora
Authors' address
Augustin Zonjić
Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Mostaru
zonjic.augustin@gmail.com
Ivona Šetka-Čilić
Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Mostaru
ivonasetka7@gmail.com