

Le présent ouvrage constitue les Actes du colloque international sur l'aménagement linguistique qui a réuni à Ottawa, du 25 au 29 mai 1986, des participants et observateurs d'une vingtaine de pays.

On s'est alors particulièrement soucié de favoriser de fructueux échanges entre les interprètes des aspects théorique et pratique de l'aménagement linguistique, question dont l'importance et l'actualité sont grandissantes. Grâce à la dualité linguistique du Canada, le colloque a réuni, comme cela ne s'était jamais vu auparavant, ce que l'on pourrait appeler les traditions « anglophone » et « francophone » de l'aménagement linguistique.

This book contains the Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Language Planning that was held in Ottawa, May 25-29, 1986, with the contributions of participants and observers from some twenty countries.

This International Colloquium focused on promoting a fruitful encounter between theoretical and practical aspects of language planning, an issue of increasing importance. Considering Canada's linguistic duality, the colloquium brought together for the first time what one could call the « English-speaking » and the « French-speaking » traditions in language planning.

Actes du COLLOQUE INTERNATIONAL
SUR L'AMÉNAGEMENT LINGUISTIQUE
*Proceedings of the INTERNATIONAL COLLOQUIUM
ON LANGUAGE PLANNING*



Actes du COLLOQUE INTERNATIONAL SUR L'AMÉNAGEMENT LINGUISTIQUE

Proceedings of the INTERNATIONAL COLLOQUIUM ON LANGUAGE PLANNING

Ottawa

25-29 mai 1986 / May 25-29, 1986

présentation/presentation

Lorne LAFORGE



CENTRE INTERNATIONAL DE RECHERCHE SUR LE BILINGUISME
INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON BILINGUALISM



LES PRESSES DE L'UNIVERSITÉ LAVAL

**Actes du
COLLOQUE INTERNATIONAL
SUR L'AMÉNAGEMENT LINGUISTIQUE**

***Proceedings of the
INTERNATIONAL COLLOQUIUM
ON LANGUAGE PLANNING***

Travaux du Centre international de recherche sur le bilinguisme
Publications of the International Center for Research on Bilingualism

A. — ÉTUDES/STUDIES

1. *Les Indices d'utilité du vocabulaire fondamental français*, Jean-Guy SAVARD et Jack RICHARDS (1969).
2. *Les Droits linguistiques des Franco-Américains aux États-Unis*, Heinz KLOSS (1971).
3. *Contribution à l'étude du statut des langues en Europe*, Jean FALCH (1972).
4. *Les Noms de lieux et le Contact des langues/Place Names and Language Contact*, Henri DORION, édit. (1972).
5. *La Sélection en didactique analytique*, Lorne LAFORGE (1972).
6. *L'Aménagement constitutionnel des États de peuplement composite*, Bernard TOURET (1973).
7. *Computation in Language Text Analysis*, Michael S. MEPHAM (1974).
8. *Conflit entre les Néo-Canadiens et les francophones de Montréal*, Paul CAPPON (1974).
9. *Les États multilingues : problèmes et solutions/Multilingual Political Systems: Problems and Solutions*, textes présentés par Jean-Guy SAVARD et Richard VIGNEAULT (1975).
10. *Atlas géographique des langues et des ethnies de l'Inde et du subcontinent : Bangladesh, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Népal, Bhoutan, Sikkim*, Roland J.-L. BRETON (1976).
11. *Identité culturelle et Francophonie dans les Amériques (I)*, Colloque tenu à l'Université d'Indiana, Bloomington, du 28 au 30 mars 1974, publié par Émile SNYDER et Albert VALDMAN (1976).
12. *Le français en contact avec l'anglais en Amérique du Nord*, Jean DARBELNET (1976).
13. *Quebec's Language Policies: Background and Response*, compiled and edited by John R. MALLEA (1977).
14. *Lexique analytique du vocabulaire inuit moderne au Québec-Labrador*, Louis-Jacques DORAIS (1978).
15. *Minorités linguistiques et Interventions, essai de typologie/Linguistic Minorities and Interventions, Towards a Typology*, Colloque sur les minorités linguistiques tenu à l'Université Laval du 15 au 17 avril 1977 (1978).
16. *Actes du 5^e congrès de l'Association internationale de linguistique appliquée/Proceedings of the 5th Congress of the Association internationale de linguistique appliquée*, textes présentés par Jean-Guy SAVARD et Lorne LAFORGE (1981).
17. *La Politique linguistique en Afrique francophone — une étude comparative de la Côte d'Ivoire et de Madagascar*, Denis TURCOTTE (1981).
18. *Lois, Règlements et Textes administratifs sur l'usage des langues en Afrique occidentale française (1826-1959)*, Denis TURCOTTE avec la collaboration de Hélène AUBÉ (1983).
19. *Langue et Territoire*, Jean A. LAPONCE (1984).
20. *Changing the Language of the Law. The Sri Lanka Experience*, L. J. Mark COORAY (1985).

E. — INVENTAIRES/INVENTORIES

1. *Composition linguistique des nations du monde/Linguistic Composition of the Nations of the World*, Heinz KLOSS et Grant D. McCONNELL, édit.
 Vol. 1 : *L'Asie du Sud, secteurs central et occidental/Central and Western South Asia* (1974).
 Vol. 2 : *L'Amérique du Nord/North America* (1978).
 Vol. 3 : *L'Amérique centrale et l'Amérique du Sud/Central and South America* (1979).
 Vol. 4 : *L'Océanie/Oceania* (1981).
 Vol. 5 : *L'Europe et l'URSS/Europe and the USSR* (1984).
2. *Les Langues écrites du monde : relevé du degré et des modes d'utilisation/The Written Languages of the World: A Survey of the Degree and Modes of Use*, Heinz KLOSS et Grant D. McCONNELL, édit.
 Vol. 1 : *Les Amériques/The Americas* (1978).

F. — BIBLIOGRAPHIES

1. *Bibliographie analytique des tests de langues/Analytical Bibliography of Language Tests*, Jean-Guy SAVARD (1977, 2^e édition revue et augmentée).
2. *Language Contact and Language Planning in China (1900-1967). A Selected Bibliography*, Rosaline Kwan-wai CHIU (1970).
3. *Bibliographie internationale sur le bilinguisme/International Bibliography on bilingualism*, William MACKEY, dir. (1982, 2^e édition revue et mise à jour).
4. *Le Bilinguisme chez l'enfant et l'Apprentissage d'une langue seconde : bibliographie analytique/Child Bilingualism and Second Language Learning: A Descriptive Bibliography*, Evangelos AFENDRAS et Albertina PIANAROSA (1975).
5. *Contact des langues et Bilinguisme en Europe orientale : bibliographie analytique/Language Contact and Bilingualism in Eastern Europe: Analytical Bibliography*, Daniel GUNAR (1979).

Actes du
COLLOQUE INTERNATIONAL
SUR L'AMÉNAGEMENT LINGUISTIQUE

25-29 mai 1986 / Ottawa

Proceedings of the
INTERNATIONAL COLLOQUIUM
ON LANGUAGE PLANNING

May 25-29, 1986 / Ottawa

présentation/presentation
 Lorne LAFORGE

Travaux du Centre international
 de recherche sur le bilinguisme

*Publications of the International
 Center for Research on Bilingualism*

A-21

LES PRESSES DE L'UNIVERSITÉ LAVAL
 Québec, 1987

Travaux du Centre international de recherche sur le bilinguisme
Publications of the International Center for Research on Bilingualism

A. — ÉTUDES/STUDIES

1. *Les Indices d'utilité du vocabulaire fondamental français*, Jean-Guy SAVARD et Jack RICHARDS (1969).
2. *Les Droits linguistiques des Franco-Américains aux États-Unis*, Heinz KLOSS (1971).
3. *Contribution à l'étude du statut des langues en Europe*, Jean FALCH (1972).
4. *Les Noms de lieux et le Contact des langues/Place Names and Language Contact*, Henri DORION, édit. (1972).
5. *La Sélection en didactique analytique*, Lorne LAFORGE (1972).
6. *L'Aménagement constitutionnel des États de peuplement composite*, Bernard TOURET (1973).
7. *Computation in Language Text Analysis*, Michael S. MEPHAM (1974).
8. *Conflit entre les Néo-Canadiens et les francophones de Montréal*, Paul CAPPON (1974).
9. *Les États multilingues : problèmes et solutions/Multilingual Political Systems: Problems and Solutions*, textes présentés par Jean-Guy SAVARD et Richard VIGNEAULT (1975).
10. *Atlas géographique des langues et des ethnies de l'Inde et du subcontinent : Bangladesh, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Népal, Bhoutan, Sikkim*, Roland J.-L. BRETON (1976).
11. *Identité culturelle et Francophonie dans les Amériques (I)*, Colloque tenu à l'Université d'Indiana, Bloomington, du 28 au 30 mars 1974, publié par Émile SNYDER et Albert VALDMAN (1976).
12. *Le français en contact avec l'anglais en Amérique du Nord*, Jean DARBELNET (1976).
13. *Quebec's Language Policies: Background and Response*, compiled and edited by John R. MALLEA (1977).
14. *Lexique analytique du vocabulaire inuit moderne au Québec-Labrador*, Louis-Jacques DORAIS (1978).
15. *Minorités linguistiques et Interventions, essai de typologie/Linguistic Minorities and Interventions, Towards a Typology*, Colloque sur les minorités linguistiques tenu à l'Université Laval du 15 au 17 avril 1977 (1978).
16. *Actes du 5^e congrès de l'Association internationale de linguistique appliquée/Proceedings of the 5th Congress of the Association internationale de linguistique appliquée*, textes présentés par Jean-Guy SAVARD et Lorne LAFORGE (1981).
17. *La Politique linguistique en Afrique francophone — une étude comparative de la Côte d'Ivoire et de Madagascar*, Denis TURCOTTE (1981).
18. *Lois, Règlements et Textes administratifs sur l'usage des langues en Afrique occidentale française (1826-1959)*, Denis TURCOTTE avec la collaboration de Hélène AUBÉ (1983).
19. *Langue et Territoire*, Jean A. LAPONCE (1984).
20. *Changing the Language of the Law. The Sri Lanka Experience*, L. J. Mark COORAY (1985).

E. — INVENTAIRES/INVENTORIES

1. *Composition linguistique des nations du monde/Linguistic Composition of the Nations of the World*, Heinz KLOSS et Grant D. McCONNELL, édit.
Vol. 1 : *L'Asie du Sud, secteurs central et occidental/Central and Western South Asia* (1974).
Vol. 2 : *L'Amérique du Nord/North America* (1978).
Vol. 3 : *L'Amérique centrale et l'Amérique du Sud/Central and South America* (1979).
Vol. 4 : *L'Océanie/Oceania* (1981).
Vol. 5 : *L'Europe et l'URSS/Europe and the USSR* (1984).
2. *Les Langues écrites du monde : relevé du degré et des modes d'utilisation/The Written Languages of the World: A Survey of the Degree and Modes of Use*, Heinz KLOSS et Grant D. McCONNELL, édit.
Vol. 1 : *Les Amériques/The Americas* (1978).

F. — BIBLIOGRAPHIES

1. *Bibliographie analytique des tests de langues/Analytical Bibliography of Language Tests*, Jean-Guy SAVARD (1977, 2^e édition revue et augmentée).
2. *Language Contact and Language Planning in China (1900-1967). A Selected Bibliography*, Rosaline Kwan-wai CHIU (1970).
3. *Bibliographie internationale sur le bilinguisme/International Bibliography on bilingualism*, William MACKAY, dir. (1982, 2^e édition revue et mise à jour).
4. *Le Bilinguisme chez l'enfant et l'Apprentissage d'une langue seconde : bibliographie analytique/Child Bilingualism and Second Language Learning: A Descriptive Bibliography*, Evangelos AFENDRAS et Albertina PIANAROSA (1975).
5. *Contact des langues et Bilinguisme en Europe orientale : bibliographie analytique/Language Contact and Bilingualism in Eastern Europe: Analytical Bibliography*, Daniel GUNAR (1979).

Actes du
COLLOQUE INTERNATIONAL
SUR L'AMÉNAGEMENT LINGUISTIQUE

25-29 mai 1986 / Ottawa

Proceedings of the
INTERNATIONAL COLLOQUIUM
ON LANGUAGE PLANNING

May 25-29, 1986 / Ottawa

présentation/presentation
Lorne LAFORGE

Travaux du Centre international
de recherche sur le bilinguisme

Publications of the International
Center for Research on Bilingualism

A-21

LES PRESSES DE L'UNIVERSITÉ LAVAL
Québec, 1987

The International Colloquium on Language Planning and the publication of this report by the International Center for Research on Bilingualism were made possible by grants from the following organizations:

UNESCO

*The Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages (Canada)
The Department of the Secretary of State (Canada)
The Department of External Affairs (Canada)
The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada*

Le Colloque international sur l'aménagement linguistique ainsi que la publication de cet ouvrage par le Centre international de recherche sur le bilinguisme ont été rendus possibles grâce aux subventions des organisations suivantes :

UNESCO

*Le Commissariat aux langues officielles (Canada)
Le Secrétariat d'État (Canada)
Le Ministère des Affaires extérieures (Canada)
Le Conseil de recherches en Sciences humaines du Canada*

ORGANIZING COMMITTEE / COMITÉ D'ORGANISATION

**COMMISSIONER OF OFFICIAL LANGUAGES /
COMMISSARIAT AUX LANGUES OFFICIELLES**

CHAIRMAN / PRÉSIDENT

Stuart Beaty

Stella Ohan

**DEPARTMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE /
SECRÉTARIAT D'ÉTAT**

Alain Landry

Guy Côté

**CANADIAN COMMISSION FOR UNESCO /
COMMISSION CANADIENNE POUR L'UNESCO**

Dawn Conway

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS / AFFAIRES EXTÉRIEURES

Guy Paquet

**CONSEIL INTERNATIONAL DE RECHERCHE ET D'ÉTUDE EN
LINGUISTIQUE FONDAMENTALE ET APPLIQUÉE**

Jean-Claude Corbeil

STAFF / PERSONNEL

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF OFFICIAL LANGUAGES / COMMISSARIAT AUX LANGUES OFFICIELLES

Stephen Acker

Maryse Bradbury

Emmanuelle Gattuso

Charles Hollands

Sarah Hood

Jocelyne Potvin

SECRETARY OF STATE / SECRÉTARIAT D'ÉTAT

Adèle Lacroix

CANADIAN COMMISSION FOR UNESCO / COMMISSION CANADIENNE POUR L'UNESCO

Madeleine Parisien

CONFÉRENCIER(E)S

Sélim Abou
Doyen
Faculté des lettres et des
sciences humaines
Université St-Joseph
Beyrouth (LIBAN)

Renée Balibar
Ancien professeur de littérature
française
Université de Tours
Tréguier (FRANCE)

Hugo Baetens Beardsmore
Professeur
Faculté des lettres et de philosophie
Vrije Universiteit Brussel
Bruxelles (BELGIQUE)

Zefaniasy Bemananjara
Professeur adjoint
Université de Madagascar
Directeur
Institut de linguistique appliquée
Antananarivo (MADAGASCAR)

Henri Marcel Bot Ba Njock
Directeur de recherche
Centre de recherches et d'études
anthropologiques
Yaoundé (CAMEROUN)

Ranko Bugarski
Faculté de Philologie
Université de Belgrade
Belgrade (YUGOSLAVIE)

SPEAKERS

Sélim Abou
Dean
Faculty of Letters and Humanities
Université St-Joseph
Beirut, LEBANON

Renée Balibar
Past Professor of French Literature
Université de Tours
Tréguier, FRANCE

Hugo Baetens Beardsmore
Professor
Faculty of Letters and Philosophy
Vrije Universiteit Brussel
Brussels, BELGIUM

Zefaniasy Bemananjara
Assistant Professor
University of Madagascar
Director
Institute of Applied Linguistics
Antananarivo, MADAGASCAR

Henri Marcel Bot Ba Njock
Research Director
Centre de recherches et d'études
anthropologiques
Yaoundé, CAMEROON

Ranko Bugarski
Department of Philology
University of Belgrade
Belgrade, YUGOSLAVIA

Françoise Cestac
Directrice
Division de la traduction
Secrétariat des Nations-Unies
New York (ÉTATS-UNIS)

Juan Cobarrubias
Professeur
Université Seton Hall
South Orange, New Jersey
(ÉTATS-UNIS)

Jean-Claude Corbeil
Secrétaire général
Conseil international de recherche
et d'étude en linguistique
fondamentale et appliquée
Montréal, Québec (CANADA)

T.N. Dhar
Co-conseiller en éducation (Langues)
Ministère de l'éducation et
de la culture
Nouvelle-Delhi (INDE)

Hans Raj Dua
Documentaliste et chargé de
recherches
Institut central des langues
indiennes
Mysore (INDE)

Joshua Fishman
Professeur chargé de recherches
en sciences sociales
Ferkau Graduate School of
Professional Psychology
Yeshiva University
New York (ÉTATS-UNIS)

D'Iberville Fortier
Commissaire aux langues officielles
Ottawa, Ontario (CANADA)

Carmen Garmendia Lasa
Secrétariat de la politique
linguistique
Gouvernement Basque
Vitoria (ESPAGNE)

Françoise Cestac
Director
Translation Division
United Nations Secretariat
New York, UNITED STATES

Juan Cobarrubias
Professor
Seton Hall University
South Orange, New Jersey
UNITED STATES

Jean-Claude Corbeil
Secretary General
Conseil international de recherche
et d'étude en linguistique
fondamentale et appliquée
Montreal, Quebec, CANADA

T.N. Dhar
Joint Education Advisor (Languages)
Ministry of Education and Culture
New Delhi, INDIA

Hans Raj Dua
Reader cum Research Officer
Central Institute of Indian Languages
Mysore, INDIA

Joshua Fishman
Research Professor of Social Sciences
Ferkau Graduate School of
Professional Psychology
Yeshiva University
New York, UNITED STATES

D'Iberville Fortier
Commissioner of Official Languages
Ottawa, Ontario, CANADA

Carmen Garmendia Lasa
Secretariat for Language Policy
Basque Government
Vitoria, SPAIN

Roger Goffin
Bureau de terminologie
Commission des communautés
européennes
Bruxelles (BELGIQUE)

Tracy Gray
Croix-Rouge américaine
Washington (ÉTATS-UNIS)

Michel Guillotte
Directeur général
Centre de linguistique de l'entreprise
Montréal, Québec (CANADA)

Amran Halim
Ancien Directeur
Centre national de développement
linguistique
Djakarta (INDONÉSIE)

Einar Haugen
Professeur honoraire
Université Harvard
Cambridge, Massachusetts
(ÉTATS-UNIS)

Björn Jernudd
Agrége de recherche
Institut de la culture et
de la communication
Centre est/ouest
Honolulu (ÉTATS-UNIS)

Abduh Khamisi
Directeur
Institut de recherches Kiswahili
Dar-es-Salaam (TANZANIE)

Victor A. Kravchenko
Président
Conseil de philologie anglaise
Institut pédagogique
Ivano-Frankovsk
Ivano-Frankovsk (URSS)

Roger Goffin
Terminology Department
Commission of the European
Communities
Brussels, BELGIUM

Tracy Gray
American Red Cross
Washington, UNITED STATES

Michel Guillotte
Executive Director
Business Linguistic Centre
Montreal, Quebec, CANADA

Amran Halim
Former Director
National Centre for Language
Development
Jakarta, INDONESIA

Einar Haugen
Professor Emeritus
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts
UNITED STATES

Björn Jernudd
Research Associate
Institute of Culture and
Communication
East-West Centre
Honolulu, UNITED STATES

Abduh Khamisi
Director
Institute of Kiswahili Research
Dar-es-Salaam, TANZANIA

Victor A. Kravchenko
Chairman
English Philology Board
Ivano-Frankovsk
Pedagogical Institute
Ivano-Frankovsk, USSR

J.-Bernard Lang
Institut Romand de recherches
et de documentation pédagogiques
Neuchâtel (SUISSE)

H.H. (David) Stern
Professeur honoraire
Institut d'études pédagogiques
de l'Ontario
Toronto, Ontario, (CANADA)

Peter Strevens
Directeur général
Bell Educational Trust
Cambridge (ANGLETERRE)

Hong-kai Sun
Professeur agrégé
Vice-directeur
Département de linguistique
Institut d'études sur la nationalité
Académie chinoise des
sciences sociales
Beijing (CHINE)

Brian Weinstein
Professeur
Département de sciences politiques
Université Howard
Washington (ÉTATS-UNIS)

Winston Wells
Directeur général
Direction générale de la
terminologie et de la documentation
Secrétariat d'État
Ottawa, Ontario (CANADA)

PRÉSIDENTS DE SÉANCE

Edmund Aunger
Faculté St-Jean
Université de l'Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta (CANADA)

J.-Bernard Lang
Institut Romand de recherches
et de documentation pédagogiques
Neuchâtel, SUISSE

H.H. (David) Stern
Professor Emeritus
Ontario Institute for
Studies in Education
Toronto, Ontario, CANADA

Peter Strevens
Director General
Bell Educational Trust
Cambridge, ENGLAND

Hong-kai Sun
Associate Professor
Vice Director
Department of Linguistics
Institute of Nationality Studies
Chinese Academy of Social Sciences
Beijing, CHINA

Brian Weinstein
Professor
Department of Political Science
Howard University
Washington, UNITED STATES

Winston Wells
Director General
Terminology and Documentation
Branch
Department of the Secretary of State
Ottawa, Ontario, CANADA

CHAIRMEN OF SESSIONS

Edmund Aunger
Faculté St-Jean
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta, CANADA

Paul Lamy
Département de sociologie
et d'anthropologie
Université d'Ottawa
Ottawa, Ontario (CANADA)

Jean Laponce
Département de sciences politiques
Université de la Colombie-Britannique
Vancouver, Colombie-Britannique
(CANADA)

William F. Mackey
Centre international de recherches
sur le bilinguisme
Université Laval
Québec, Québec (CANADA)

Grant McConnell
Centre international de recherches
sur le bilinguisme
Université Laval
Québec, Québec (CANADA)

Kenneth McRae
Département de sciences politiques
Université Carleton
Ottawa, Ontario (CANADA)

Jean Martucci
Président
Conseil de la langue française
Montréal, Québec (CANADA)

Joseph G. Turi
Secrétaire général
Institut international de droit
linguistique comparé
Montréal, Québec (CANADA)

John de Vries
Département de sociologie
et d'anthropologie
Université Carleton
Ottawa, Ontario (CANADA)

Paul Lamy
Department of Sociology and
Anthropology
University of Ottawa
Ottawa, Ontario, CANADA

Jean Laponce
Department of Political Science
University of British Columbia
Vancouver, British Columbia
CANADA

William F. Mackey
International Centre for Research
on Bilingualism
Laval University
Quebec, Quebec, CANADA

Grant McConnell
International Centre for Research
on Bilingualism
Laval University
Quebec, Quebec, CANADA

Kenneth McRae
Department of Political Science
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario, CANADA

Jean Martucci
President
Conseil de la langue française
Montreal, Quebec, CANADA

Joseph G. Turi
Secretary General
International Institute of
Comparative Linguistic Law
Montreal, Quebec, CANADA

John de Vries
Department of Sociology and
Anthropology
Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario, CANADA

TABLE DES MATIÈRES / TABLE OF CONTENTS

Préface / Preface

Lorne Laforge	xix
---------------------	-----

Introduction aux délibérations du colloque international sur l'aménagement linguistique (Ottawa)

Stuart Beaty	1
--------------------	---

Introduction to the Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Language Planning (Ottawa)

Stuart Beaty	3
--------------------	---

1. Considérations théoriques / Theoretical Considerations

Éléments pour une théorie générale de l'aménagement linguistique

Selim Abou	5
------------------	---

Commentaires / Comments

Commentaire de la communication de Sélim Abou

Jean-Claude Corbeil	17
---------------------------	----

Comments on Selim Abou's Paper

Einar Haugen	25
--------------------	----

2. Typologie des stratégies d'aménagement / Typology of Language Planning Strategies

Language Planning and Interests

Brian Weinstein	33
-----------------------	----

Commentaires / Comments

Comments on Brian Weinstein's Paper	
Hans R. Dua	59

Language Planning: For Whom?	
Björn H. Jernudd and Jíří V. Neustupný	69

3. Quelques études de cas d'aménagement linguistique / Case Studies in Language Planning

L'aménagement linguistique en France	
Renée Balibar	85

Language Planning in Indonesia	
Amran Halim	95

Language Planning in Belgium	
Hugo Baetens Beardsmore	103

An Outline of Language Planning in China	
Hong-kai Sun	115

Language Planning in Yugoslavia	
Ranko Bugarski	133

Language Policy and Language Planning Efforts in Spain	
Juan Cobarrubias and Carmen Garmendia Lasa	143

Language Planning Strategies in Tanzania	
Abduh Khamisi	193

Planification linguistique au Cameroun	
Henri Marcel Bot Ba Njock	203

4. Secteurs d'intervention / Areas of Intervention

A - La législation et les services gouvernementaux / Legislation and Governmental Services

La loi et les services gouvernementaux: le cadre et le portrait / Legislation and Government Services: Matching the Frame to the Artwork	
D'Iberville Fortier	223

Language Planning and Development: Problems of Legislation Amidst Diversity

T.N. Dhar	237
-----------------	-----

B - Education I / Education I

Language Policy and Educational Strategies for Language Minor- ity and Majority Students in the United States	
--	--

Tracy Gray	255
------------------	-----

L'instruction dans la langue de la minorité de langue officielle au Canada	
---	--

Stuart Beaty	279
--------------------	-----

Official Language Minority Education in Canada	
--	--

Stuart Beaty	289
--------------------	-----

French as a Second Language in Canada: A Case Study of « Emergent » Second Language Planning	
---	--

H.H. (David) Stern	295
--------------------------	-----

C - Education II / Education II

Les langues et l'enseignement à Madagascar	
--	--

Zefaniasy Bemananjara	307
-----------------------------	-----

La situation linguistique de la Suisse	
--	--

Jean-Bernard Lang	315
-------------------------	-----

Experience of Teaching Russian and Native Languages in the Soviet National School	
--	--

Victor A. Kravchenko	329
----------------------------	-----

D - Le secteur privé / The Private Sector

L'aménagement linguistique dans l'entreprise privée au Québec	
---	--

Michel Guillotte	339
------------------------	-----

5. La place de l'anglais dans la communauté linguistique / The Place of English in the Community of Languages

The Spread of English and the Decline of French: A Paradox for Canada	
--	--

Peter Strevens	349
----------------------	-----

6. Services de soutien linguistique / Language Support Services

Les services de soutien linguistique	
Winston Wells	357
Le statut des langues et les stratégies linguistiques dans les services de traduction des communautés européennes	
Roger Goffin	365
La traduction et les services de conférence à l'Organisation des Nations-Unies	
Françoise Cestac	377

7. Discussion sur le suivi du colloque / Discussion on the Follow-up to the Colloquium

La séance du suivi	
Stuart Beaty	395
Follow-up Session	
Stuart Beaty	401

8. Synthèse / Synthesis

Conference Comments: Reflections on the Current State of Language Planning	
Joshua A. Fishman	405

PRÉFACE

Ce volume contient le texte des communications présentées lors d'un colloque international sur l'*Aménagement linguistique*, tenu à Ottawa du 25 au 29 mai 1986. À cette occasion, les quelques organismes canadiens mentionnés ci-contre, ont réussi le coup de maître de réunir un certain nombre de spécialistes les plus réputés au monde dans ce champ d'étude, dont l'importance et l'actualité se situent de nos jours à un très haut niveau.

En effet, de tout temps, l'homme en société a eu à résoudre des problèmes posés par la situation linguistique ambiante. Certains en font remonter l'origine au mythe de Babel où les hommes, selon la Bible, apprirent les conséquences de vouloir s'élever au niveau de Dieu en vivant pour la première fois « la confusion des langues ». Intervention divine sur la situation linguistique, apologie de l'unilinguisme, fléau du multilinguisme, toutes ces formes d'interprétations peuvent être invoquées. Il n'en demeure pas moins qu'avec l'évolution de l'histoire des événements, les savants du monde entier ont construit un domaine pluridisciplinaire dont l'objectif principal est, d'analyser dans un premier temps, les particularités inhérentes aux situations linguistiques pour un territoire donné, de proposer, dans un second temps, une position politique en matière linguistique enchassée dans un cadre juridique et de déterminer enfin, toutes les applications pratiques dans la vie quotidienne des citoyens, que ce soit pour les fonctions de la langue, de l'éducation, dans le monde du travail, de l'administration publique, du commerce, des communications.

Le Centre international de recherche sur le bilinguisme est particulièrement fier de s'associer à cet événement unique que constitue la publication des Actes de ce colloque. En acceptant d'éditer le texte des communications et d'inclure cet ouvrage dans sa Collection A, le CIRB voit un prolongement de ses objectifs fondamentaux, soit l'étude du contact des langues et des cultures dans une perspective d'aménagement linguistique. Le CIRB se

CONFERENCE COMMENTS :

Reflections on the Current State of Language Planning

Joshua A. Fishman

Résumé

Rapport synthèse du colloque dont l'auteur fait connaître les points saillants et les place dans la perspective des colloques précédents. Commentaires personnels sur l'aménagement du statut et du corpus de la langue. Identification d'un certain nombre de thèmes oubliés ou négligés, qui justifieraient amplement la tenue d'un autre colloque, que l'auteur souhaite d'ailleurs de ses vœux.

Abstract

Conference synthesis; the author presents the outstanding issues and places them in relation to past symposiums. Offers personal comments on the status and corpus of language planning. Identifies a certain number of forgotten or neglected themes which would easily justify another much welcomed symposium.

CONFERENCE COMMENTS :

Reflections on the Current State of Language Planning

The commentator-summarizer-synthesizer's task is not an enviable one, neither during the conference nor thereafter. The constant alertness and note-taking during the conference are difficult enough, but that difficulty is compounded by the unlikelihood that the product of all this travail will be regarded with much favor, either by the authors of the papers being reviewed or by the readers of those papers once the proceedings are published. Both authors and readers are likely to be disappointed by restatements of what has only just been written or read and, therefore, needs no jog to be retrieved from memory. In addition, authors also tend to be disappointed if they are insufficiently quoted and readers tend to be displeased if their own reactions and evaluations are not seconded. The best that the conference commentator can hope for, therefore, is that his efforts will be regarded much as we all regard reviews of books or plays that we have read or seen; i.e., as an opportunity to see what someone else recognized or missed in a product that we are quite convinced we have thoroughly understood and correctly appreciated ourselves.

Locating the Conference Within an Intellectual Tradition

In her recent biography of her mother, Margaret Meade, Kathy Bateson tells us that as a child she was taken along to so many conferences that she became convinced that conferences were the adult mode of problem solving. Certainly, we as academics and practitioners concerned with the problems of language planning must view this conference in the light of others, on the same or closely related topics, that preceded it. Perhaps there are several more such than I will mention here, but it seems to me that there are at least the following three predecessor conferences that should be mentioned, both for their own importance and because several of those present at this conference were also present then.

A « grand-daddy » of the present Conference was doubtlessly the 1966 Airlie House Conference (sponsored by the [American] Social Science Research Council's « Committee on Sociolinguistics »). That Conference discussed a large number of countries, primarily (but not exclusively) in conjunction with status planning issues. Its proceedings, *Language Problems of Developing Nations* (Fishman, Ferguson and Das Gupta 1968) are not infrequently cited to this very day and could, conceivably, have been required reading for all those attending the present Conference.

The Airlie House Conference was one of the few, in my nearly 30 years of conference going, to have a more focused follow-up. Since the Airlie House Conference had primarily attended to status planning, a follow-up conference was convened in 1969 at the East-West Center, Honolulu, sponsored by the International Division of the Ford Foundation. This conference concentrated rather more on corpus planning. This was a truly unusual conference in many ways. Participation was restricted to less than two dozen individuals, several of whom (the organizers and conveners of the conference) had attended the Airlie House Conference and most of the other of whom were central figures in local corpus planning efforts in one Asian country or another. In addition to spending the better part of a week to carefully discuss each others papers, the participants also helped plan the International Research Project on Language Planning Processes (IRPLPP). The conference proceedings appeared as the book *Can Language be Planned?* (Rubin and Jernudd 1971). The IRPLPP research project findings appeared under the title *Language Planning Processes* (Rubin, Jernudd, Das Gupta, Fishman and Ferguson 1977). Both of these volumes continue to be important sources of theory and of data for the language planning field.

The third conference that I would like to call to mind took place in Paterson, N.J., in 1979, under the aegis of Paterson State College. It too was substantially continuous with the two conferences that had preceded it, both in terms of its organizers as well as in terms of several of its participants. The title of its proceedings, *Progress in Language Planning* (Cobarubias and Fishman 1983), correctly implies its focus: to summarize the previous decade's efforts in the language planning field, both with respect to status planning as well as with respect to corpus planning. This is the major immediate predecessor to the current volume of papers on the 1986 Ottawa meeting and, as such, it could well have served as a point of departure for our presentations and deliberations, in addition to whatever merits it may have in its own right.

Of course, conferences and their proceedings do not tell the whole story vis a vis an intellectual tradition. Language planning now has a periodic newsletter of its own (*Language Planning Newsletter*). It is a recognized topic of publication in a variety of sociolinguistic journals. Courses are often offered in connection with it at various universities and at the Summer Linguistic Institutes of the Linguistic Society of America. (Note, e.g., the 1977 SLI at the University of Hawaii, Honolulu, that was largely

devoted to language planning and was, in many ways, continuous with the two conferences that had preceded it). Collective volumes have been published in connection with it (e.g., Fishman 1973), as have introductory texts (e.g., Eastman 1983). All in all, the Ottawa conference came at a time when the field of language planning was reasonably well established (which does not mean, of course, that it was, necessarily, reasonably well conceptually integrated) and that those in attendance in Ottawa could, if they were so disposed and sufficiently oriented to do so, draw upon an appreciable common intellectual heritage in order to contribute to it all the more. This was probably done to some extent, but, it seems to me, that it was not done to the degree that one could have hoped for given the amount of relevant work on language planning that had gone on during the intervening twenty years, since the Airlie House Conference of 1966.

What is Language Planning ?

On the assumption that we were dealing with a previously well defined process we generally proceeded to regard language planning as if it were an intuitively graspable primitive that could productively remain such without impeding our deliberations. Accordingly, we spent little time defining language planning, although a few participants did try out their own favorite definitions in the course of their own presentations. It should be recognized, however, that there are by now a number of different definitions of language planning and its various foci and stages. It would be instructive if someone brought all of them together, confronted them with each other, and explored their overlapping as well as their unique emphases and implications. As it is, it was not always clear whether we were always calling a spade, a spade or a rose, a rose.

For me, language planning remains the authoritative allocation of resources to the attainment of language status and language corpus goals, whether in connection with new functions that are aspired to, or in connection with old functions that need to be discharged more adequately. This definition, admittedly, leads in societal directions more than it does in linguistic ones, although it is fully compatible (as I have demonstrated elsewhere: Fishman 1980) with the definition long espoused by Haugen and reiterated by him in this volume. At a surface level, this definition seems to depart most obviously from the « correction » model and the management-planning distinction previously espoused by Neustupny and Jernudd and reiterated by them in this volume. The substantive and theoretical differences between these two definitions deserve to be fully explored. Is the latter more linguistically oriented? Does it materially broaden the field of investigation? Does it relevantly broaden the field of investigation? Does it more successfully relate the language planning efforts in *developed* countries to those planned, ongoing and completed in *third world countries*, focused upon in this volume and in most of the volumes mentioned above? We devoted relatively little attention to the Neustupny-Jernudd model,

primarily because we devoted little attention to *any* model but, perhaps also, because it is still somewhat offbeat. At some future time and place it would be instructive to determine whether the distinctions between the two models are really etic or emic, i.e., whether they are just distinctions or whether they really make a difference; whether they really require different types of data or whether they lead to different conclusions based on the same data. I think we would all gain from a serious exercise along these lines.

Focus on Status Planning

The hallmark of this Conference is its focus on status planning. Accordingly, the appropriate comparison work is that which was produced by the 1966 Airlie House Conference, which also was primarily focused on status planning. The ultimate question is whether we are any more sophisticated and theoretically integrative or parsimonious in our discussions of status planning today than we were in 1966. On the basis of our papers in this volume I am not convinced that we are. On the other hand, I am also not convinced that even the optimal collection of papers in this area, whatever that collection might be, would indicate much progress during the past score of years. Sociological theory in general and social change theory in particular are simply too diffuse and unsystematized, and most sociolinguists engaged in language planning are simply too uninformed with respect to formal sociology anyway, for the situation to be otherwise. Given that state of affairs at a purely conceptual-theoretical level, is it any wonder, then, that we are even further away from closure in the status planning area insofar as applied sophistication is concerned?

None of the foregoing limitations led us to narrow our scope, however. We embraced, or wandered at will across, all levels of status planning: international, national, regional/provincial, city-wide and neighborhood. Each of these territorial levels poses challenging issues for any theory of status planning, particularly for any theory that tries to embrace them all. Try we did, but perhaps a more focused follow up, one restricted to one level or another, would enable us to develop conceptually more integrative, more powerful, more explanatory and more predictive theory than the omnibus (or is it blunderbuss) approach we have just taken. Of course, even that type of self-restriction will be fruitful only if we either agree to devote more time to the study of sociology/political science before we undertake our explorations, or, alternatively, if we discuss our work in the presence of a larger and more varied social science contingent than we normally invite to our conferences. We (i.e., most of those interested in language planning) have been making up social science theory far too long and, as a result, have benefited far too little from the theory that has been elaborated by specialists working in other areas of social change and social planning.

Philosophical Underpinnings

One thing that can be said in our favor, however, is that we immediately recognized that many of the basic issues impinging upon language planning not only go beyond language planning (substantially involving, as they do, culture planning and identity planning, i.e., some of the most sensitive and value-encumbered aspects of human society), but go beyond the social sciences themselves. Questions such as « should language planning be undertaken? », « dare we [language planners] question/attempt to influence the rights of human aggregates to pursue/develop their cultures as they desire? », « may we question/attempt to influence the rights of individuals to join or leave groups as they wish? », such questions cannot really be answered by recourse to social science alone. Language planning efforts, in particular, and social science efforts more generally, can haltingly attempt to implement answers to such questions, or, more confidently, to provide factual evidence on the basis of which answers to such questions can be formulated, but the answers themselves must come from philosophical/ideological sources that are « over and above » language planning or social science per se. Language planners, therefore, must take care that they, as responsible individuals, agree with the purposes and values of those whom they serve. Any pretense to be merely neutral technicians or impartial theoreticians does not relieve them of moral responsibility for the purposes (the policies) to which their work is directly put.

Faced by the immensity of the moral and ethical problems that surround language status planning we intoned, not once but often, that « all languages are equal », even though most of us must have realized well enough that this could be true only in the mind of God or in the best of all possible « in principle » worlds. Languages are, obviously, *not* equal in number of speakers, in the functions for which they are currently typically used or in their past functional histories, in their prestige in the eyes of their users as well as in the eyes of outside beholders. In sum: languages are manifestly *unequal* in social utility and, therefore, in social power, and this inequality is palpable both at the intra-ethnonational as well as at the inter-ethnonational levels. Indeed, it is this inequality of languages that guarantees (a) an infinite future for language planning, since the less prestigious and functionally less modernized languages of the world will always seek to become functionally intertranslatable with the more prestigious and functionally modernized ones, as well as guarantee (b) an infinite future for multilingualism as a worldwide phenomenon, since only the speakers of a very few languages at the very top of the heap can pretend that they can afford to be monolingual. Language planning is engaged in by the mighty and by the intermediate and by the lowly, but it is primarily the means whereby less fortunate language communities (i.e., those less powerful in their particular confrontation with another ethnolinguistic aggregate) organize their self-defense, as well as their inter-translatability-at-least-to-some-extent-and-in-some-functions vis-a-vis one or another « international language ». Were all languages really equal then all speech-and-writing communities would need only

one language for intra-group purposes and could insist on the right of simultaneous translation for inter-group purposes. The latter is exactly the stance that politics and autonomous regions take toward one another, particularly if their relationship is strained, precisely because they are « making a point »: they are equal and will not bow to the other(s), at least not for state-symbolic functions.

Given the functional inequality that exists between languages at any particular time, we, the community of language planners, tend to be defenders of « pluribus » first, and of « unum » only to the degree essential for econotechnical functioning. We tend to oppose imposed and unrestrained unification and uniformation. We tend to want a world that is characterized by one or two international languages for the most urgent, « higher » functions, well over a hundred national languages, an even larger number of regional and local languages, and a fairly endless array of community languages, all in peaceful co-existence or, at least, in creative tension with the other languages that impinge upon them. This is admittedly a tall order (and we have not even opened the Pandora's box of « dialects » considered to be languages by some but not by others), one that cannot possibly be achieved without language planning. Perhaps the tallness of the order is one reason that why we are convinced that we, language planners, represent necessary, rather than merely esoteric or expendable, expertise. It is the very nature of our work, and of the ethical, ideological and personality variables that have brought us to language planning, to reject the notion that the « free marketplace » could possibly either solve the problems that arise between languages, cultures and politics or bring about that « peaceful co-existence of all languages » to which we are so committed. On the one hand, the « free marketplace » is the very antithesis of planning, and, on the other hand, there is no « free marketplace » anyway, but rather a variety of contending and unequal forces. The « free market place » is a locally acceptable myth if the forces in operation lead to one's own victory; otherwise, it is merely a variety of « survival of the fittest » (« fittest » only in the sense of physically fit, i.e., strongest), the law of the jungle rather than the rule of human decency, mutual acceptance and cultural democracy. The self-interest of the dominant is always dressed up as an untrammelled, universal, unifying, inevitable, free-flowing principle. It is only the weaker who are accused of interfering with the laws of nature, of being manipulative, of acting out of self-interest, of manifesting the incivility of resisting the inevitable, of organizing to stay alive (Fishman 1985a).

Perhaps our rediscovery of the (not exactly hidden) principle of avowed or unavowed (self-) interest in the work of language planners and their supporters has at least one valuable lesson to teach us: on as interest-laden a topic as language and culture (language and the state, language and economic power, etc.) there is not only no interest-free language planning but, also, no interest-free research on language planning. Even research of the « I am a camera » variety (« I am only here to get the facts, m'am »), to the extent that this posture still persists, must still decide *what* to describe and *what* to leave out and, in so doing, someone's interests are likely

to be fostered and someone else's are likely to be slighted. Furthermore, there are no generally acceptable criteria of desirable goals, moral objectives, universally right values. The Language planner is, therefore, forced to choose whose side he wants to be on. It is precisely because all languages/varieties in any particular setting are *not* equal that language planners and language planning must, inevitably, either oppose or foster that inequality (or a particular compromise between the contestants). There is seldom a solution that will make everyone happy. We must take a stand and live with it and with ourselves for doing so. The locals usually know or sense that state of affairs and if we insist in masquerading under pious « universal » slogans we are fooling no one but ourselves.

To sharpen this issue even further, it probably bears pointing out that political democracies are not necessarily guarantors of ethnolinguistic pluralism. They may be permissive of such pluralism, provided it already exists or when it arises due to acceptable immigration, but « permissiveness » is a passive blessing and is not at all the same as « planning » or fostering pluralism. On the other hand, totalitarian regimes do not necessarily combat ethnolinguistic pluralism; indeed, they often find it tactically useful in mobilizing support for political, econotechnical and other immediate goals. There is a certain anomaly here. Political democracies, by adopting a hands-off approach to the protection of pluribus (or to governmentally conducted culture planning more generally), are often, directly or indirectly, fostering or acquiescing to the re-ethnification and re-linguification of minorities into the mainstream. Modern totalitarian regimes predictably wind-up pursuing that very same goal, regardless of their initially pluralistic postures, as soon as they consider themselves sufficiently consolidated, via stressing their own integrative languages (« first among equals ») in the many subtle and not so subtle ways that are particularly available to totalitarian regimes. If language planners really seeks a permanently pluralistic world, not only between but also within self-governing polities, then they must oppose uniformizing tendencies that arise under any and all auspices, rather than doing so only when they arise in « the other camp ». We must not adopt the uninformed band-wagon view that sees voluntary re-ethnification/re-linguification in one's own econopolitical system and compulsion only in the other. There are many paths that undercut pluralism and we must remain alert to them all, even to those adopted by newly dominant establishments that can become vindictive and oppressive of the minorities in their midst very soon after their own servitude has ended.

The result of the foregoing is that language planners (including the cultural/political elites that sponsor or call for language planning) may not be very popular with all circles in the very establishments whom they serve or with all circles within the populations upon whom their efforts have the most direct impact. This is not because language planners are more self-seeking than others, by any means, but because they are (or should be) issue definers and consciousness raisers vis-a-vis the goal of ethnocultural pluralism and ethnocultural democracy. Indeed, language planners are part

of the ethnocultural elite without whom there would be no language status planning (or replanning). And without the careful study of this entire elite there can be no sociology of language planning, that is: no sociology of knowledge about language planning.

Case Studies as Research Tools

From philosophy we preceded to something not at all methodologically easier, namely, case studies. A major question that plagues case studies is the question of how the cases are selected, i.e., along what dimensions. There are some 160-170 polities in the world today, more, in fact, than ever before. They cannot all be studied at any language planning conference (although there are a few studies in the sociolinguistic literature that do try to encompass the entire world, e.g., Fishman 1966, Pool 1969, Fishman and Solano [in press]), and, as a result, just a few cases must be selected out of a much larger universe. Any intellectually productive selection procedure must have certain dimensions in mind, so that cases can be selected in order to gauge or reflect these dimensions and, thereby, provide a more definitive idea as to how these dimensions are related to each other, on the one hand, and their relative importance vis-à-vis some criterion of « language planning success » on the other hand. If we are to learn anything worthwhile, i.e. anything generalizable, from cases we must know what they are cases of, i.e., what dimensions they have been chosen to illuminate in conjunction with what criterion or criteria of language planning effectiveness.

The organizers of every conference that makes use of the case study method are well aware of the above considerations, and of others as well, that complicate case study research, but, inevitably, problems crop up that make it necessary for them to tamper with, or even to abandon, whatever dimensional typology they might initially have had in mind. The exigencies of conferences are particularly likely to result in (a) some cases that are greatly sought after, nevertheless and unfortunately, *not* materializing, (b) some cases that are not particularly sought after, nevertheless and unfortunately, insisting on being accommodated at the conference (even though there may also be other cases of « the very same type » or « the very same dimensional characterization ») already well represented at the conference, (c) all cases selected being examples not only of the dimensions that led to their selection but, also, of other dimensions that contaminate, counteract or, somehow, influence the particular dimensions of initial primary interest, and (d) ambiguity as to the « rating » of cases on the dimensions of interest, that is, disagreement between the « experts » as to whether case x is high, low or intermediate on dimension y. We may assume that our Conference was as plagued by these problems (the first two pertaining to « conferencitis » and the last two pertaining to « typologitis ») as any other. The result is that we are left with a collection of cases that are both non-representative, on the one hand, and too few in number, on the other hand, to support any conclusions with respect to any dimensions

of interest. When faced by this particular constellation of contra-indicated methodological characteristics my initial approach is to utilize the data primarily for speculative (hypothesis formulation) and debunking purposes. Our proceedings can' certainly be fruitfully examined in these two ways.

The Javanese case *may* be an example of ethnolinguistic self-denial (i.e., of a demographically major, highly regarded, well standardized and amply elaborated language voluntarily « bowing out » of national language functions in favor of a demographically weaker, less statusful, as yet unstandardized and unelaborated language) when self-interest is raised as the major and necessary motivation in connection with language status planning. I would feel more certain of the Javanese case, in this particular connection, if it were presented as such by a Javanese who was not dependent on Indonesian governmental support for his livelihood and position. I am still looking for a study that details the self-denying decision within the usual decision making framework. Who was for it? Who was against it? Was a compromise or trade-off reached or was the latter faction unceremoniously vanquished? Reports of democratic unanimity among large groups of leaders or among huge populations of inhabitants always makes me suspicious, particularly when ascribed to elites that are known not to have been overly democratic in connection with most other matters. If there is anyone now alive who remembers elitist and non-elitist discussions of this issue in the early days of modern Indonesian nationalism, and who can retrospectively give a detailed account of this entire decision-context, he/she should be encouraged to write about the matter, particularly if the individual is currently independent of governmental reward or punishment. It would also be most welcome to read a detailed account of policy with respect to the regional/local languages of Indonesia since independence and to this very day. Are any of these languages fostered (i.e., not just permitted) and, if so, in what ways and with what results? The most recent published *in-passing* references to this matter (can a policy of planned- or hoped-for- attribution be responsible for the fact that in forty years of independence there have been no full fledged discussions of so palpable a degree of linguistic heterogeneity as that which exists/existed in Indonesia?) are far from reassuring in connection with foreseeing modern or substantial functions for the regional languages, many of which still have millions of speakers (e.g., Alisjahbana 1986).

The Belgian and Cameroon cases imply that two fully developed and relatively secure languages (French and Dutch, in the first instance, and French and English, in the second) *can* come to a modus vivendi based upon the territorial principle, rather than seek a full triumph for the generally stronger one or a separatist solution for the locally weaker one. The Canadian case may become another example of this type, if it continues and stabilizes along its present path. There are other examples, to be sure (Switzerland, Finland). A better understanding of what brings such solutions into being and of what stabilizes them would constitute a major contribution of status planning to intra-polity and inter-polity peace. McRae's efforts along these lines (1983, 1986) deserve to be encouraged and ex-

panded. They represent a welcome combination of social science and language planning expertise.

There are several examples of international cooperation on behalf of particular languages. Such cooperation obtains not only in connection with languages of clear worldwide significance, i.e. languages whose functions extend far beyond their mother tongue orbits (as, e.g., in connection with English or French), but also in connection with languages of more limited international functionality. The inter-polity arrangements on behalf of corpus planning for Malay/Indonesian, Dutch, Spanish, Portuguese, etc., deserve particular attention because they are examples of the pursuit of corpus planning unity in the midst of status differences between their respective political components. The decision making and implementing processes, under such circumstances, deserve to be better understood.

On the other hand, the most typical characteristic of the international arena is not, by any means, the above mentioned ability of some of its member to co-adopt and to co-plan inter-polity languages, but, rather, the tendency of these polities to function on a « one polity — one language » basis vis-a-vis one another. As a result, the international arena is now « blessed » with well over 100 standardized « national » languages, each of which tends to have top billing (which, of course, is not necessarily the same as exclusive billing) within its own territorial frontiers and to seek parity with other national languages for the purposes of inter-polity communications. If we now consider « inter-polity » as another way of saying « intra-one world », then we may realize that the goal of one inter-polity language for the world merely raises to the next higher level the problem of highly multilingual polities in which several languages are recognized for the purposes of governmental operations. In both instances there may be one or two languages that may have exceptional, higher level integrative functions, but, on the whole, a large number of languages are rather permanently established and any change in their number is more likely to be upward than downward. Those intellectuals who react negatively to the prolonged « tolerance of costly multilingualism » in certain developing countries might better come to realize the difficulty and the sensitivity of any efforts to reduce this number if they transferred their parsimony aspirations to the international arena.

The language-and-ethnicity linkage is interestingly illuminated by the re-ethnification tendencies that accompany the spread of unifying inter-ethnic languages. The cases of Yugoslavia, Indonesia, China and Tanzania all reveal a slow but growing tendency of this kind. « Indonesians », « Yugoslavians », « Tanzanians » are identities claimed by increasing numbers, identities that hardly existed a few generations ago and identities that definitely have their linguistic counterparts. Of course, this is exactly why some support and why some oppose language status planning for unification.

Several observations are in order, however, in connection with the formation of newer, supra-local ethnic identities. The growth of such overarching identities should be slower in Yugoslavia, where several of the local ethnicities have long-standing traditions of ethnic consciousness and standard language symbolism (particularly for Croatian, Serbian, Slovenian), than for Tanzania, China or Indonesia, where such prior, consciously formulated and symbolically elaborated local ethnonational identities are more uncommon. Furthermore, the new, overarching ethnonational identities, even where and when attained, may only be part-identities for a rather indefinite period of time. This is particularly obvious in Yugoslavia and in Spain, and to a smaller degree in China, where both local and unifying languages receive conscious attention (the balance between the two efforts not yet having been spelled out in any definitive way, either in the Yugoslav, Spanish or Chinese language planning literatures), but it should be very much the case as well in the other instances, due to the substantial continuation of rural, pre-modern econotechnical life in large parts of many countries. Finally, the probability of periodization in identity formation/prioritization, and in unification vs regionalization language policies, should not be overlooked. Ethnonational identities are not straight line phenomena, developing only in monotonic directions. The « center » holds out a certain promise that makes relinguification and re-ethnification not merely an ideological but also a material consideration. That promise always competes with other simultaneous reward-systems and, accordingly, it goes through periods of greater or lesser actualization. The central reward system may falter and the regional ones may attain renewed vitality due to unforeseeable econotechnical and ethnocultural developments, either at the intrapolity or the interpolity levels (or both). Thus, while it is hard to predict whether Indonesia or Malaysia will ever officially adopt Yugoslavia's, Spain's or China's somewhat more even-handed solutions to the unification vs regionalization alternatives to the language-and-ethnicity issue, it is relatively easy to predict that the unification curve will not always rise, that the regionalization curves will not always fall, and that the long-term co-existence of part-identities within the total ethnic make-up of most social networks is a forgone conclusion (Fishman 1985b, 1985c).

I am struck by the large number of success-stories reported at our Conference. Dutch has succeeded in obtaining equal status in Belgium (and may yet succeed in Brussels as well). Catalan has strongly re-established itself in Spain (and the Basques, though still far behind, may succeed to an increasing degree during the coming generation) as has French, not only in Quebec but in Canada more generally. Yugoslavia continues to provide impetus to « Serbo-Croatian » while those who favor reasonably separate Serbian and Croatian varieties are also permitted some degree of accommodation. China pushes ahead with unificational Putonghua while assisting language minorities to attain literacy in their local languages. The Soviet Union does likewise, even more so and better. Tanzania and India may not be as successful as they would like to be with Swahili and Hindi, but they too have made great strides. Only participants from the Cameroons and Malagasy admitted to less than fully satisfactory results,

as did, more indirectly, the speaker who addressed herself to the bilingual education policies of the USA. These two or three cases were the only exceptions to the generally upbeat tenor of presentations at our Conference. Our proceedings may be of particular interest to readers who are interested in learning more about successful cases of language status planning. However, a word of caution is in order. Many of the presentations were made by official spokesmen for totalitarian regimes and, as such, their comments cannot be taken as being anything other than a restatement of official views. This constitutes a serious problem for Conferences sponsored by institutions/agencies in the Western democracies. The Conference sponsors are often eager to obtain participation by scholars from within totalitarian countries and, quite often, they must accept whatever participant such countries delegate for that purpose. While it is quite obvious to all that the « party line » is being presented, rather than an independently arrived at empirical or theoretical formulation, Western conference « manners » prohibit any overt confrontation on this basis. While it is true that off the record interactions with the delegates from totalitarian regimes are sometimes more fruitfully frank, these interactions never get into the proceedings. The result is that our literature is burdened with propaganda statements and, more significantly, the voices of protest from within the very same totalitarian societies are not only not heard but are ignored. No one, not even an outsider, has prepared to speak up for them. The only planned exception to this generalization that I can remember took place at the 1974 World Congress of Sociology. At that Congress an entire session was set aside for Catalan sociolinguistics and it was truly unforgettable. There was a hush and a level of attention at that session, as if visitors from the moon had suddenly appeared to tell of life in that unknown region. It seems to me that we must find some way out of the quandary with which we are currently faced and that presenters not dependent upon totalitarian regimes must be included in the program/proceedings on the same topics as are addressed by representatives of such regimes so that an « other point of view » can at least be on record. I think we have both a moral and a scientific responsibility here that is being neglected.

The « mother tongue principle » has certainly not run out of steam in those settings in which language-and-ethnicity consciousness have been historically deep. On the other hand, that « principle » (conviction, value) does not (yet) seem to have attained mass appeal in various other settings, represented at our Conference by Indonesia, Tanzania and the Cameroons, where the combination of a unifying indigenous and/or international language, on the one hand, and severe ethnocultural diversity coupled with deficiencies in econotechnical development, on the other hand, have thus far diverted attention from the « mother tongue principle ». The stress on nationalism, rather than nationalism, in the latter contexts, generates its own language status planning thrust. This thrust, in the absence of any notable counter-thrust from local languages, may, if continued in sufficiently long and in sufficiently stable fashion, ultimately result in integrative nationalism in which the unification languages initially adopted

for econotechnical functional purposes are also accorded full ethnonational symbolic value. Then, these integrative languages may come to be reacted to in terms of the « mother tongue principle » and nationalism rather than nationalism may be part and parcel of the national ethos (Fishman 1972). The above sketch is still very far from being a fully adequate status planning theory. In fact, the elaboration of any such theory may still be very far off, given the number of variables involved, the paucity of hard data with respect to most of them and the primitiveness of social change theory more generally. Thus, while we cannot be pleased with the level of social theory represented at our Conference, the lion's share of the problem lies outside of our Conference proper, i.e., with the relative immaturity of the social sciences themselves in connection with involved issues of the type that language status planning must cope with. While this immaturity cannot excuse us from knowing the social theory that does exist, knowing that theory will, in this day and age, still not take us very far.

The spread of English is a good case in point. The dynamics of language spread in general (and of English language spread more specifically) have been given considerable attention by Cooper (1983) and by Fishman and Cooper (1977). Nevertheless, when this spread was discussed at our Conference it was considered not in terms of any theory whatsoever but, rather, in terms of questionable census estimates, on the one hand, and equally questionable social dynamics, on the other. I tend to be both a believer in and a user of language census data (see, e.g., Fishman 1985d) but language census data is at its worst when neither the units of enumeration (individuals, countries) nor the criterion of enumeration (understanding, speaking, reading) are precisely established and retrievable. To make matters worse, the positing of such societally weak factors as improved English teaching methodology and language learning materials as the causal factors in the purportedly accelerated spread and increased growth of English « speakers » (?) is certainly to overlook the mountains for mere molehills.

English today, more than any other language of international proportions, represents the attainment, and even more, the vision of modernity (technology [both popular technology and « high » technology, including a massive, worldwide predominance in computerized systems and data banks], popular mass media and the culture of consumerism), a vision whose lowest common denominator appeal has reached into the four corners of the world. With the decline of traditional values (by the way, probably Arabic and Spanish related), on the one hand, and of humanistic values (by the way, probably French related) or ideological values (by the way, probably Russian and Chinese related), on the other hand, the social dynamics of the spread of English have not only substantially spread beyond the networks related to interaction with the English mother-tongue « inner circle » (Kachru 1986) but have even gone beyond the scope of American aid and Anglo-American trade. French-Canada's terrified reaction to the spread of English (and I myself am quite convinced that English is still spreading in Canada, and elsewhere in the world, in many functions, and often at the expense of French [see, e.g., Maher 1986], even though the

original presenter of that view at our Conference was persuaded to withdraw it) is totally unrelated to superior teaching methodologies and improved learning materials. Indeed, if the co-founding language of Canada, and the dominant language in all provinces outside of Quebec, were Dutch rather than English (and if the relative international positions of Dutch and English otherwise remained unchanged), then Francophone Canada would have less cause for alarm, but ample cause non-the-less. It is the need to attain intertranslatability with English and to manage purification from excessive intrusions of English that drives corpus planning throughout francophonie and much of the rest of the world today. Teachers of English to speakers of other languages can take credit for none of these powerful forces, which, although they remain essentially undocumented, are theoretically much more promising than any of those advanced by our Conference deliberations. A theory of language status planning must search for such variables, on the basis of an informed reading of the social change literature.

All in all, our discussion of status planning was a stimulating one, even though it was, unfortunately, far from being a conclusive one. One of the eye-openers that it contained was the admission that status planning often proceeds by studiously *not* gathering certain types of data (e.g., language census data in Belgium) and *not* doing certain types of research (language attitude research in Yugoslavia). Just as status planning problems can be researched to death (whenever the « need for more research » becomes an excuse for not adopting or implementing desired language policy changes, thereby reinforcing the status quo), so the studied absence or hard data can also be a tool of language policy (and of maintaining the status quo against change).

Types of Interventions

Since so much of language status planning is conducted under governmental auspice we attended, quite naturally, primarily to governmental interventions in that connection, except, interestingly enough, in conjunction with the spread of English (where the spirit of Adam Smith led us to assume culturally appropriate private enterprise dynamics). We hardly paused to note that in many quarters there is a palpable fear of governmental « meddling » in connection with language issues, as if the mix of language and government were particularly likely to lead to brain-washing and to thought-control. Perhaps, therefore, it would be best to state at the very outset that governmental intervention in the language area is not only not particularly cruel, vindictive or punitive, but that it is regularly and predictably conducted in accord with the norms and mores of the local « culture of planning » more generally. Where the latter is punitive, so is the former, and to a similar degree. Nevertheless, punitive or not, all regimes have some need for the support of public opinion (« constituency support ») in connection with language planning, just as they do in connection with industrial, agricultural, family and other types of planning. Some consultation with the public is usually involved, directly or indirectly, although

exactly what « consultation » means is a cultural variable and is likely to be much different from one political/ideological climate to another. One of our participants claimed that *exactly the same curriculum* had been established for all local nationality schools throughout the country, involving dozens of nationalities and thousands of schools, on the basis of « consultation with the parents » involved. This, indeed, would be a feat bordering on the legendary (if not the mythical) in most parts of the world characterized by far greater cultural homogeneity.

Furthermore, governmental intervention in the language status area (and in the language corpus area too, for that matter) seems to be far from a universal cure-all, even though governments are everywhere among the major conduits of social power. At our Conference the lack of governmental success was evident in the reports from Tanzania, Malagasy and the Cameroons, prompting the realization that governments differ in the priorities that they assign to language planning and in the sanctions that they can exercise in that area even were they to assign high priority to it. Accordingly, it should come as no surprise that bilingual governments are not necessarily fully bilingual, not even in conjunction with their own civil service personnel. Since governments are usually the highest expression of local power, they are also usually self-monitoring [particularly in the culture planning area] and, therefore, also more difficult to redirect, reform, keep honest or render more effective in connection with their language planning efforts than are most other promoters of language planning.

The governmental efforts that we addressed most often were (again, understandably enough) those in the field of education, although I am not sure that we did so on necessarily cogent grounds. Most of us are teachers. Education is not only *our* major source of livelihood, and that of our students (and of all proto-elites throughout modern history), but it is obviously a highly structured, language encumbered means of influencing the young on language status and language corpus matters. What needs to be faced more squarely, however, is that we are the only ones who remain in educational settings all our lives. All others graduate (or otherwise pass through and escape) from these institutions, leave them and enter the other institutional contexts of « normal life ». The effectiveness of education as an orienting, motivating, and teaching force (in the implementation of language planning goals) needs to be evaluated relative to the effectiveness of these other institutions. This has never really been done and given the theoretical potency of some of these other institutions (e.g., the church, the armed forces, the work sphere, the mass media), not to mention other governmental activity such as population resettlement in conjunction with agricultural, industrial or security planning, the efficacy of education as an independent predictor of any criterion of language planning success remains moot. Schools may well be no more than initial shapers of pivotal/transitional generations, massively teaching the language to the young at those historical junctures in which other institutions are not yet able to contribute to that function. Subsequently, however, the role of formal schooling may well be a far more modest one. Schools may well become secondary factors,

serving, reflecting and reinforcing other influential institutions in society. Ultimately, schools prepare for after-school life and, therefore, it is so crucial (particularly, but by no means exclusively, for minority languages whose out of school status is rather weak) that out of school reward-systems be available to reinforce and further develop (to a more advanced adult level) that which the school has begun in connection with status and corpus implementation. All in all, therefore, I think it best not to uncritically assume that schools provide maximum intervention beyond early stages of status planning and, on the contrary, to assume that, unless other reward systems are massively available, status planning based upon in-school rewards alone is more likely to fail than to succeed. This is the case with most of the history, math and science that schools teach and, without special post-school reinforcement, it is likely to be the case for language attitudes, lexicon, grammar and spelling as well.

If I tend to be a « doubting Thomas » (or perhaps I should say « from Missouri », since all I am asking for is an empirical test), insofar as the status and corpus planning yield of formal schooling during childhood and adolescence are concerned, relative to other sociocultural reward systems, then it may be expected that I would be doubly dubious in conjunction with instructional strategies and learning materials as significant or independent causal variables. In comparison with opportunity factors, ideological factors, reinforcement from family and friends, structural factors such as age and ethnicity, etc., etc., differing pedagogic methodologies and learning materials may represent etic distinctions rather than emic differences. Since education is a process that does not control itself to the extent that other professions do (politicians, school-boards, administrators, parents and even pupils all chipping away at the individual teacher's control of what goes on in the classroom), methodologies and materials tend to replace each other without full evaluation and on other than empirical grounds. When evaluations of educational methodologies and materials are finally undertaken, these evaluations are, more often than not, under political control insofar as their formulation, initiation, conduct, interpretation, release and implementation are concerned. This is all quite understandable, in view of our earlier discussion of the subsidiary role of education in most stabilized modern cultures, and makes me all the more dubious as to whether pedagogic methodologies could really be serious causal factors in status or corpus planning success. At the very least, any claim to the contrary requires empirical confirmation via an appropriately contrastive research design.

Language Corpus Planning

Our relatively late and more meager attention to corpus planning nevertheless reinforced my general conviction that corpus planning and status planning must be in reasonable tandem or they are not really serious enterprises. Status upgrading without corpus modification, to permit new functions to be adequately spoken about or written about, is as much an example

of « cooling the mark » as employing hundreds of linguists to prepare exquisite terminologies for everything from anthropology to zoology, without any social rewards or sanctions in order to influence networks of speakers/writers that these matters be communicated about in language X among Xmen. On the other hand, as a result of our deliberations I became even more convinced than heretofore that status planning is the real engine of the language planning train. Only when status planning is seriously enforced does corpus planning really take root. It is the legal requirements pertaining to French as the language of the school (including higher education) and the workplace that have made the substantial linguistic work of the Office de la langue française and of the Régie de la langue française into the effective examples of corpus planning that they are. It is status planning, with all of its difficulties and indeterminacies, that grapples with the behavioral and motivational breakthroughs that must come (must be stimulated or must be compelled) if new terms and standard varieties are to be employed (at least in print and at least by government employees or in government sponsored contexts). The latter (the products of corpus planning) have no dynamic of their own. Many languages will never get much corpus planning codification or elaboration, and even less implementation, precisely because their status planning remains unresolved or indifferent.

Topics Overlooked or Neglected

No conference can cover everything and our Conference was no exception to this generalization. What we left uncovered would more than fill the agenda for another conference, e.g., status planning that is not governmentally fostered. In many settings, voluntary societies conduct their own status and corpus planning efforts, ranging in scope from those of the « English Language Amendment » lobby in the USA (with its glossy newsletter and frequent nationwide and focused mailings soliciting funds and membership affiliation), on the one hand, to the minuscule efforts on behalf of Sardinian or Frisian in the USA, on the other hand, with the efforts of a huge number of industrial and scientific bodies in between. Underground movements also need to be mentioned in any discussion of totalitarian regimes. There may be no public efforts on behalf of an unhyphenated Croatian in Yugoslavia, but there are certainly underground efforts along those lines, judging by the number of protests that I get in the USA every time I use the designation « Serbocroatian » in my publications. The transition from underground to governmental sponsorship, as has occurred relatively recently for Basque, but is part of the history of many other language planning efforts, needs to be studied both as a process as well as a product variable.

The role of individual language planners has also been slighted in our deliberations. Many languages have benefited from the contributions of particularly charismatic and authoritative advocates, innovators and normifiers. We really know all too little about more than a mere handful of them

and, as a result, we really lack any theoretical approach to their successes and failures. We even lack any precise manner of discussing how central the issue of language per se was/is in the total agenda of such individuals (Fishman, in press). This is definitely an area for fruitful exploration and one in which we would be eagerly joined by psycho-historians, from whom we would have a great deal to learn.

Within the governmental arena we did not sufficiently touch upon the role of the courts as an agency of elaboration, implementation, evaluation and iteration of language status planning. This arena may be more or less important, given different political, legal and cultural frameworks (« *leges sine moribus vanae* », the ancients opined), so that interpolity as well as intrapolity consideration is called for in this connection. Also unmentioned (or nearly so) were such governmentally encumbered areas public as signs, mass media of communication and the wide array of different governmental agencies and services (health, welfare, civil service jobs and civil service contacts with the public, etc.).

Of the various stages in the language planning flow chart we tended to give least attention to iteration, i.e., to how the results of prior language planning are evaluated and « next steps » decided upon. Neither the evaluation nor the decision may be formalized but, formalized or not, new efforts are repeatedly undertaken and these are inevitably informed by past efforts. What is done « next » and why that rather than something else is a fascinating step in the entire flow of events and one that often seems to be slighted in the total language planning picture.

Realistic factors such as costs and economies of scale have never received much attention in our professional literature. The early beginnings of cost-benefit analysis (Jernudd 1971, Thorburn 1971) were possibly too theoretical to be useful, but that is no excuse for the paucity of data, to date, on how much various types of programs cost, both absolutely as well as in terms of incremental costs. It is even more distressing that there seems to be no central address to which one could turn for information of this kind. A central clearing-house, perhaps a UNESCO-supported, affiliated or sponsored central clearing house (why not the Centre international de recherche sur le bilinguisme at Université Laval?), for hard data of all kinds is long overdue in connection with language planning. Language planning is too serious a matter to leave to conferences every now and then.

Translation below the level of between-state or between-region communication was also not squarely scrutinized. In both of the above contexts equality of interlocutors (state A and state B) is symbolically stressed, often by assuming a monolingual stance for each party and, therefore, requiring translation « for the record » even where that may not really be necessary due to joint proficiency in a mutually shared language. However, at the intra-polity level, where individuals require « recognition », the above scenario does not apply. Either the individual is expected to accommodate to the state, when seeking police, hospital, legal or other public services, by requesting these in the national, regional or official language(s), or the

state is expected to accommodate to its citizens/inhabitants, by offering its services to them in their preferred language(s), even when these are neither national nor official. In the latter instances we encounter multilingual services whereby courts, schools, hospitals, post-offices, etc., etc., operate in any one of several different languages that may be preferred by a particular « client ». There are, of course, limits of scale which may be applicable under such « personality principle » arrangements, so that the number of languages that these institutions are expected to cope with will vary in different parts of the state and at different points in history, depending on the amount of « traffic » that each language generates. Such arrangements, and the « personality principle » in general, as contrasted with the « territoriality principle », were generally neglected by our Conference. Nevertheless, the « personality principle » involves status planning (and, at times, also corpus planing) and should by no means be ignored in any consideration of the total language planning enterprise.

Our lack of attention to the « personality principle » is also directly responsible for our neglect of immigrant groups, as well as smaller and/or weaker indigenous groups, who not only usually *do not* benefit from the « territoriality principle » but who also usually *must not* do so (from the point of view of the established authorities). These groups are commonly « low man on the totem pole », entirely dependent on zeitgeist and ortgeist for any linguistic crumbs that may be thrown their way. Particularly the poor, the most recently arrived and the racially (in addition to ethnically) different among them are often considered to be expendable when language planning is engaged in. « Why should we pay for (linguistic accommodation to) them ? » is the usual (overt or covert) rationale for overlooking them, a negative view that cannot so easily be extended to larger indigenous minorities. Because the former populations are so commonly overlooked, it is high time they were focused upon by students of language planning. The modicum of positive experience that has accumulated in connection with them (e.g., in Australia, Canada and India) deserves to be presented, both so that others can learn from the pathbreakers in this type of endeavor and as a means of stimulating additional attempts to introduce enlightened policies in this area.

Lack of attention to smaller and weaker languages led to an almost complete lack of attention to the inevitable interaction between language planning and language maintenance. For numerically and functionally weaker languages this interaction may be not only substantial but crucial, indeed, and raises the issue of limits, i.e., whether even concerted governmental intervention on behalf of favorable status planning may not, nevertheless, come too late to accomplish anything noteworthy in so far as the overt language usage repertoire is concerned. The Irish, the Romanch, the Frisian and the Basque cases are all relevant in this connection, as are many others. At a theoretical level, the entire distinction between primary and secondary institutions of language maintenance (e.g., family, neighborhood, religion and worksphere, on the one hand, and schooling, sports and entertainment, military service and high culture, on the other hand) must be

examined, in terms of *where* language status planning should best be focused in order to have the greatest payoff for shoring up and strengthening the meager internal vitality of weak speech communities (Fishman 1985c). When we are dealing with severely wounded and weakened speech communities *the functional goals of status planning* (e.g., widespread attitudinal positiveness vs intergenerational continuity as a mother tongue vs optimal use as a second language in a large variety of functions) and *the specific means (programs, projects) of status planning* must be selected with much more care than is the case in connection with the establishment languages that we focused upon at our seminar. The former cannot afford the margin of error (and of useless effort) that the latter can take in their strides. Where the goal is intergenerational continuity as a mother tongue it is obviously more crucial to focus on the primary societal institutions than on the secondary ones, flashier though the latter may be for aspiring protoelites. This is certainly a topic worth returning to in detail.

Given the locale of our Conference, it is particularly hard to understand why we did not focus more on the French-Canadian language planning experience. It is, after all, one of the most startling successes (and reversals) in recent history and its story (examined precisely in the theoretical terms of one language planning model or another) is still very far from having been either fully told or fully evaluated.

Finally, it must be stressed that too few empirical studies were presented at our Conference in any but a historical vein. The study of history is, of course, empirical in terms of documentation of the past record. But sociolinguistics is also concerned with the exhaustive, multidimensional depiction of the present, with attitude studies, with usage studies, with criterion evaluation studies, in short, with quantitative studies of various kinds. We ultimately want to know more about what kinds of populations are more likely, and what kinds are less likely, to adopt the status planning and corpus planning products of language planning authorities and why these differentials exist. There have been serious beginnings of such work (Rubin, Jernudd, Das Gupta, Fishman and Ferguson 1977, in general, and Fishman 1977, in particular). Our Conference did not contribute to studies of this kind and they are sorely needed.

Concluding Sentiments

The wise men of Chelm (a legendary Eastern European Jewish city of self-infatuated fools) always began every conference with a unanimous resolution to convene another conference. In that way they were always assured of having accomplished something. As for us, we have more than enough genuine agenda left over for another conference (for a topically focused one, I would hope), for another attempt to foster a truly cumulative dialogue between generations of scholars who have attended to language planning. Fortunately, we also decided on a series of practical steps that may also bear good fruit by the time we meet again, namely, to establish

a clearing-house for language planning bibliography, information and networking. If this recommendation is seriously implemented (perhaps by providing UNESCO support to the above mentioned [Canadian] International Research Center on Bilingualism), then this may yet be remembered as having been more than « just another conference ».

References

- COBARRUBIAS, Juan and Joshua A. Fishman (eds)
1983 *Progress in Language Planning : International Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton.
- COOPER, Robert L.
1982 « A framework for the study of language spread », in his (ed.), *Language Spread; Studies in Diffusion and Social Change*. Bloomington and Washington, D.C., Indiana University Press and Center for Applied Linguistics, 5-36.
- EASTMAN, Carol M.
1983 *Language Planning : An Introduction*. San Francisco: Chandler and Sharp.
- FISHMAN, Joshua A.
1966 « Some contrasts between linguistically homogeneous and linguistically heterogeneous polities », *Sociological Inquiry*, 86, 146-158.
1968 « Nationality-nationalism and nation-nationism », in J.A. Fishman, C.A. Ferguson and J. Das Gupta (eds), *Language Problems of Developing Nations*. New York: Wiley, 39-52.
1974 *Advances in Language Planning*. The Hague: Mouton.
1977 « Selected dimensions of language planning : a comparative analysis », in J. Rubin, B.H. Jernudd, J. Das Gupta, J.A. Fishman and C.A. Ferguson (eds), *Language Planning Processes*. The Hague: Mouton, 195-214.
1980 « Bilingual education, language planning and English », *English World-Wide*, 1, 11-24.
1985a « Positive pluralism : some overlooked rationales and forefathers », in his (et al.), *The Rise and Fall of the Ethnic Revival: Perspectives on Language and Ethnicity*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 445-456.
1985b « Language maintenance and ethnicity », in his (et al.), *The Rise and Fall of the Ethnic Revival: Perspectives on Language and Ethnicity*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 57-76.
1985c « Epilogue : The rise and fall of the « ethnic revival », in the USA », in his (et al.), *The Rise and Fall of the Ethnic Revival: Perspectives on Language and Ethnicity*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 489-526.
1985d « Mother-tongue claiming in the United States since 1960 : trends and correlates, in his (et al.) », *The Rise and Fall of the Ethnic Revival: Perspectives on Language and Ethnicity*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 107-194.
In press *The centrality of language in the thinking of language ideologists*.
- FISHMAN, Joshua A., Charles A. Ferguson and Jyotirindra Das Gupta (eds).
1968 *Language Problems of Developing Nations*. New York: Wiley.
- FISHMAN, Joshua A., Robert L. Cooper and A.W. Conrad
1977 *The Spread of English : The Sociology of English as an Additional Language*. Rowley: Newbury.
- FISHMAN, Joshua A. and Frank Solano
In press *Explaining linguistic heterogeneity at the polity level: New data and methods for an old problem*.

JERNUDD, Bjorn H.

- 1971 « Notes on Economic analysis for solving language problems », in J. Rubin and B.H. Jernudd (eds), *Can Language be Planned ? Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice for Developing Nations*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 263-276.

KACHRU, Braj B.

- 1986 *The Alchemy of English : The Spread, Functions and Models of Non-Native Englishes*. Oxford: Pergamon.

MAHER, John

- 1986 « The development of English as an international language of medicine », *Applied Linguistics*, 7, 206-219.

McRAE, Kenneth D.

- 1983 *Conflict and Compromise in Multilingual Societies : Switzerland*. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press.
1986 *Conflict and Compromise in Multilingual Societies : Belgium*. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press.

POOL, Jonathan

- 1969 « National development and linguistic diversity », *La Monda Lingvo-Problemo*, 1, 140-156.

RUBIN, Joan and Bjorn Jernudd (eds)

- 1971 *Can Language be Planned ? Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice for Developing Nations*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

RUBIN, Joan, Bjorn H. Jernudd, Jyotirindra Das Gupta, Joshua A. Fishman and Charles A. Ferguson

- 1977 *Language Planning Processes*. The Hague: Mouton.

THORBURN, Thomas

- 1971 « Cost-benefit analysis in language planning », in J. Rubin and B.J. Jernudd (eds), *Can Language be Planned ? Sociolinguistic Theory and Practice for Developing Nations*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 253-262.