ANTWERP PAPERS IN LINGUISTICS
87

THE POLITICS OF MULTILINGUALISM AND LANGUAGE PLANNING

PROCEEDINGS OF THE LANGUAGE PLANNING WORKSHOP HELD AT THE POLITICAL LINGUISTICS CONFERENCE, ANTWERP, DECEMBER 1995

Edited by
Jan Blommaert

ANTWERP PAPERS IN LINGUISTICS

87

THE POLITICS OF MULTILINGUALISM AND LANGUAGE PLANNING

**Proceedings of the language planning workshop held at the
Political Linguistics Conference, Antwerp, December 1995**

Edited by

JAN BLOMMAERT

1996

Discussant's comments:

COEXISTING REALITIES IN LANGUAGE PLANNING

Björn H. Jernudd

1. Introduction

Realities of language use in the European Union have created an interest in language planning. The responsible scholar who shares this interest rounds up the usual suspects for the literature review. What s/he reads is not (yet) likely to refer directly to language problems in the European Union but to other realities. Fortunately, European scholarly behavior also responsibly requires an interpretation of literature that takes into account its time and place of formulation. For example, in his introductory remarks for this conference, Jan Blommaert (this volume) advocates adding a critical historical perspective to language planning theory and practice: "an awareness that every theory of the past, especially in disciplines that strongly rely on contingent historical and sociopolitical realities (language planning is a case in point), should be reassessed in the light of the present [in such a way as to be] oriented at the optimalization of existing theoretical models".

Realities motivate scholarship, thus, later evaluation of thought will enrich knowledge when evaluation aims at explaining this relationship and at the same time capture universal generalizations as well as particular historical truths.

For example, although the project that Joshua Fishman led at the East-West Center in 1968-69 clearly aimed at developing a language planning theory and practice for the (then) developing nations (Rubin & Jernudd 1971), the team had hardly sat down to work before it agreed that language planning theory has to explain all decision-making on language and that language planning theory has to connect with linguistic theory. The team recognized that language planning theory must go in directions of political theory, economic theory, sociological theory (and so on) as well. It is hardly surprising, however, that first things came first during that year and in the international research project on language planning processes that followed. In both activities the team kept in focus the developing nations' problems. The project thus delivered on the promise of the deliberations of the Airlie House conference of 1966 (Fishman et al. 1968). But the focus did not exclude attention to language cultivation in Sweden (as reflected in the account for the Project in Rubin et al. 1977).

Differences have always been there but nowadays people interact much more which will inevitably lead to degrees of convergence of behaviors, increased awareness of differences, and much else. One effect that I experience routinely is a source of misunderstandings in scholarly discourses in international meetings, in particular discourses of knowledge which aim at universality. Scholars use the same terms and may even sincerely address the same theoretical framework but with different empirical, practical, and ideological underpinnings of everyday importance and saliency. It is apparently a behavioral fact that these underpinnings cannot easily be introduced into the discourses as assumptions or variables. Why that is so I cannot say. I can say that development of good theories requires that these underpinnings be made explicit (cf. Jernudd & Neustupny 1987: 82)

For example, European as South-East or East Asian colleagues have their very different needs, therefore different concerns, i.e., they live in typologically different periods from each other and from people elsewhere, say, in North America. How can one conceptualize this challenge and its motivating differentials? This is very difficult as each one of us normally lives in each our concrete but different period, with only brief (and by brief I mean up to some several years) excursions into other peoples' realities.

2. Beeby's theory of developmental stages in primary education

Although not in the sphere of language, there is a study that presents an interesting example of a historical and typological manner of thinking, also perhaps because it does not deal with economics. In the realm of education, Beeby (1966) came up against the developmental side of differentials in a very direct way when from 1945 to 1959 he was responsible for the educational policies in both New Zealand and Western Samoa. He characterizes the two as "2000 miles apart in space, and, at the beginning of this period, more than half a century apart in time" (pages 50-51). He found himself advocating educational practices in Western Samoa which he had "spent half a working lifetime trying

to discourage in New Zealand". His attempt at justification, as a matter of fact his very penetrating analysis of the reasons for having had to adopt such differential practices, led him to a "conception of stages of development in the life-history of a primary educational system, stages through which all systems, at least of a certain type, must pass, and which, though they may be shortened, cannot be skipped". Beeby summarizes his theory in a graph of four stages from Dame School, through Formalism, Transition, to Meaning (page 72).

Beeby is most unassuming about his theory. I think it is important to recognize that his claim is confined to a chronological interval in contemporary global history. This particular interval may allow a theory of stages when other intervals do not. It is also a very concrete theory in that it does not hold that individuals cannot function individually in different places (in different stages) but merely that when individuals interact purposefully in a particular community they do so in context of many, many co-determining factors. It is the totality of the system that got to move ahead to allow a 'next stage' to come about. This assumes of course that individuals agree to want this next stage to happen.

3. Coexisting realities in language planning

Industrialization foregrounded liberalism but it also spurred Marx' thought with its necessary developmental stages. Post-war reconstruction and decolonization inspired Rostow's theory of economic stages which are just as inevitable as Marx'. Equivalently, scholars can interpret language management and planning in terms of necessary before-after relationships and in terms of historical stage, while they are inevitably so situated and partly at least themselves so determined.

Two aspects of the chronology of motivation of language planning can fruitfully be distinguished, though manifest in simultaneous reality. One aspect is *phases of change* in a given society as language management evolves with that society; another is the *Zeitgeist*, also changing and variably consummated across communities and networks. Interpretable by both aspects, language problems and interests, therefore responses in management and planning, will vary with historical period and developmental stage. In this paper, I shall not attempt to discuss phenomena of *the Zeitgeist, the durée*, but I shall discuss phasing, as types and as developmental stages.

4. Neustupny's typology as developmental theory

At the recent European Conference on Language Planning in Barcelona, in November 1995, Jiri Neustupny presented a reformulation of his framework for a typology of language management in a paper titled 'Types of language management - Reformulation of a framework'. His interest in grand typological-historical theory has matured into a multilevelled hierarchical model of interdependent bundles of features that relate societal events to language change and to language management behaviors. Following on his earlier work, Jiri Neustupny distinguishes the Premodern, Early Modern, Modern, and Postmodern types of language management. He now elaborates the types in detail from a descending and interdependent hierarchy of (1) General premises, (2) Maxims, (3) Strategies, (4) Ordinary rules, and (5) Listing rules. Each type is characterized by related principles (the general premises, maxims, *etc.*). At each level these principles can be classified into and interrelated through five categories. One of these categories is 'alliance'. For example, the postmodern type is characterized in the category of alliance by internationalization of markets. Its consequence at the level of maxim is that English is favored, of strategy in consequences on language teaching and English pressure on other languages, and so on. His paper represents an attempt at grand, wholistic theory and offers a rich set of claims of interrelationships between society and language, and chains of phased change.

At the Barcelona conference, Jiri Neustupny also pointed out how my paper which took the tension between the global and the local as its theme provided an example of his Modern type of language management. I discussed the language and language management situation in Hong Kong where people couldn't care less about variation; and where social and economic mobilization leave elite interests intact and even endorsed. The Hong Kong situation contrasts sharply with European realities in its absence of concern with rights and ethnicities and variabilities. Not that uniqueness isn't noted! For example, my Swedish doctoral hat causes good-humoured comment (each time) and mirth, in good cheer I take it, when I wear it for ceremonial academic occasions. But it does not mean a thing beyond the individually odd.

5. Term planning and vocabulary planning as co-existing realities

In regard to planning for the lexicon, I recognize a concrete example of co-existing realities

in language planning. I suggested once to distinguish between term planning and vocabulary planning. The distinction could be useful to understand phasing.

There is one behavioral bundle of features that I label term planning, which is a corrective response to requests from specialists in a domain of usage, e.g., hydrology or paints, for help with solving their systematic language problems; or at least the systematic solving of language problems in a specialized domain in collaboration with specialists from that domain. Its main purpose is agreement on stabilization of usage, often with normed content by way of explicit definitions.

Another bundle is vocabulary planning, which is rather a component of language replacement or language expansion, a most typical component of language development in newly independent nations. Even the implementation of vocabulary planning is marked by its 'political' motivation, namely, it is typically informed by principles such as principles of nativization, internationalization, 'x-ization' (e.g., Sanskritization), and these principles may be elaborated in rules and procedures of considerable detail. Its main purpose is demonstration that one's own language *has* these lexical items and thus is worthy of adoption in usage, in stead of, e.g., the formerly imposed language. However, the implementation process is conducted with an expectation of ultimate use by the public of the proposed words. In vocaulary planning, it is problematical whether the public will actually use more than a lesser proportion of suggested vocabulary items, in particular of neologisms. In term planning, the projected users are domain specialists who *are* quite likely to adopt the terms in the manner suggested, and adjustments do not typically produce neologisms but rather work towards agreement among users of vocabulary already in use (thus creating *terms* out of *vocabulary*).

Term planning is likely to occur in stable speech communities and for established domains of usage. Vocabulary planning typically accompanies domain expansion and is likely to occur in communities where languages are being promoted. Such communities have in recent history been the post-colonial newly independent nations; but such communities may also be those of ethnic self-assertion including indigenous peoples who are developing and asserting use of their languages. Interestingly, practitioners in both lexical planning types of societies may refer to their activities as terminological. Perhaps they are, each in its context, but the differences are so significant that in language planning theory they have to be distinguished in order for theory to have any bearing on practice. Term planning is likely to succeed vocbulary planning, but not vice versa.

6. Agencies and language planning differentials

I suggest that the developmental conspiracy that determines vocabulary and term planning can be studied empirically. There is theory to be recovered from the historical record. The record to be read in order to create data for theory to be tested could begin with the chronological record of language planning agency work.

6.1. Turkish language planning

A recent article on Turkish language planning agency history (Dogançay-Aktuna 1995) allows correlation of agency agenda, indeed, the fates of the successive agencies themselves, with the succession of socio-politically pervasive ideologies from the 1920's into the present. An early Westernizing, modernizing ideological phase asserted what was seen as indigenous to Turkish (against Arabic) and matured into very assertive purism. This phase also allied Turkish with European languages by script reform, and had strong agencies. It was succeeded by a phase characterized by simplification of the language towards its consolidation in a climate of contentment (on the political right) or even detachment (on he political left) following the second world war. In this phase, the former agencies lost their importance, to reappear in the next phase in which a research orientation dominates. The article seems to reveal a contemporary interest in management of variation, governed by a consultative ideology, and calling for an Academy.

The simple juxtaposition of a vocabulary and term planning type may seem naive in the density of historical realities but, notwithstanding, the vocabulary planning type would be compatible with the events in the 1930's in Turkey, the term planning one should emerge later. This begs the question: what terminological work is now going on in Turkey?

6.2. South African language planning of Afrikaans

The several volumes edited by István Fodor and Claude Hagège on *Language Reform* (1983, and later) are a veritable gold mine of information to help plan typological and historical resarch on language planning. For example, in the rich data in the article by T. J.R. Botha on language planning for Afrikaans in South Africa can be seen also the historical trajectory of terminological work. The South African Academy was founded in

1909 to expand domains of usage of "'Hollands', i.e. Afrikaans and Dutch, in a broad sense". Botha chose to discuss the three areas of work of standardisation of spelling, the expurgation of anglicisms in Afrikaans and the development of terminology. As for the latter, I wish to quote Botha extensively (page 228):

> In this demanding era, Afrikaans was proclaimed an official language, in 1925 - a challenge indeed. On the one hand, Afrikaans had to make up its leeway to English in the minimum time possible: in a bilingual country, all official documents, at least, must appear in both languages. The result was that translators, especially in government departments, were initially forced to create hundreds of terms, many of which were unsuitable. If that generation of translators had been experts, and had had the knowledge and staff to trace the terms which did, in fact, already exist (inter alia, in literature and ordinary dictionaries) and to document and standardise them properly, it would not have been necessary to create so many superfluous terms.

What Botha describes is not anomalous or unexpected, but entirely typical. He continues on the same page:

> The only solution was conscious, planned formation of terminology. In 1930 the State Translation Bureau was established, followed by the establishment of terminology bodies in various government departments. All these institutes were inadequate: there was a lack of sufficient specialisation, too little opportunity for research, and a lack of educated linguists. Too much decentralisation and a lack of co-ordination led to overlapping and duplication, which thwarted the progress of standardisation of terminology.

We note that Botha recognizes 'standardisation' as the concomitant of assertion of Afrikaans in government domains.

The problem of disorganisation was solved, claims Botha (page 229) "by the establishment of a central specialist body, the 'Vaktaalburo' ('Technical Language Bureau')", while not eliminating the Translation Bureau or the other bodies. Authoritative, scientifically based, specialist coordination led to phenomenal success, writes Botha and cites how lists and dictionaries, e.g., a "Medical Dictionary", were completed.

The successful production was the culmination of the vocabulary planning type in the management of Afrikaans. Later developments that Botha describes moved management of Afrikaans lexicon into the term planning type. Not only is the Bureau itself "now more market oriented" (page 229) but in "the future, it will be necessary to proceed to the compilation of more explanatory terminological dictionaries which will state the semantic field of a term, because [...] It is not sufficient to start from English terminological dictionaries and to assume that the semantic field is familiar". And significantly, "Nowadays, terminologists are not inclined to create Afrikaans synonyms alongside international terms."

Symptomatic of the fact that Afrikaans management has moved from vocabulary to term planning is the entry in a new directory of *Sociolinguistic and Language Planning Organizations* (compiled by Francesc Domínguez & Núria López, 1995) for the National Terminology Services (NTS)/Nasionale Vakterminologiediens (NVD) (#462, pages 248-250). The agency's objectives are reproduced as: "to provide a national terminology service through: - the collection, systematization and documentation of technical terminologies; - the provision of systems for processing and distributing terminological information; - operation of the National Termbank for users of technical and scientific languages." Although, for example, The Jordan Academy of Arabic (#366, pages 204-5) also operates a terminological data bank, its entry states as objectives the equivalent of what was once also those for Afrikaans, namely, " - to preserve the purity of Arabic and to develop it to keep up with the requirements of modern works in literature, the sciences and arts; - to unify the terminology of the sciences, literary works, and arts, compile lexicons; - to revive the Arab-Islamic cultural heritage." The Jordan Academy's mode of work includes, predictably, translation.

That South Africa now operates in a variational paradigm of language ideology is clear from another entry in the (#460, pages 247-8) on the Language Planning Division of State Language Services in Pretoria, whose objectives are " - to develop a strategy for ensuring language equality in South Africa; - to promote multilingualism in South Africa." For clarity's sake, a contrast is found in Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka in Malaysia (#376, pages 209-10) with the objectives " - to develop and enrich the national language, Malay;

- to develop and enrich literature through Malay; - to standardize the spelling and pronunication and coin appropriate technical terms in Malay; - to publish or promote publications in Malay." Both are contemporary types of language planning, but in radically different social, political and economic contexts and relative period (type) placement.

6.3. *Beyond the lexicon*

It is obvious from the above brief quotations of objectives that languge planning typology would have to cope with features far beyond those which characterize the vocabulary *vs* term planning types. While the Pusat Bahasa in Indonesia (#312, pages 179-80) includes among its objectives "to improve Indonesian as the first and main language in Indonesia" and "to encourage people to use the standard language on any appropriate occasions" the Dansk Sprognaevn in Denmark (#194, pages 129-31) includes "to answer questions about Danish usage" and "to chart the development of Danish". Very different situations are reflected in this contrast and the differentials deserve particular historical explication and also theoretical typological prediction.

6.4. *George Thomas'* Linguistic Purism

There is a parallel to my interest in the rich work by George Thomas on *Linguistic Purism* (1991) in which he develops classifications of the intensity of patterns of purism across communities and of levels of intensity at phases of standardisation, and on the basis of cross-classification of the two, suggest some very specific hypotheses towards a comparative history of purism. For example, he claims (page 195) as his first hypothesis that "Purism - at least as defined here - is a universal characteristic of standardised languages", and as his fifth hypothesis (page 201) that "The most widespread form of purism is concerned with elements of the lexico-semantic system". It is not an accident then that my interest was drawn to vocbulary and terminology in my attempt at understanding periodization; and neither is the apparent coincidence of the shift from vocabulary to term planning types with phase shifts in the cooccurrence of standardisation with purism an accident.

7. The particular *vs* the universal

Periodization begs the question: is there a language universal core of language planning behavior? If so, where is it? What unites human beings in language management and planning? In the institutional specifics, I do not think there is a universal core other than typologically of relative period (called a phase by George Thomas) or in the sense of Neustupny's grand historical typology. A typological theory predicts societally specific expression of interest which necessarily is ideologically informed (embedded), materially constrained in its particulars, and temporary. I do, however, think that there is a communicative universal core. Humans communicate and will look after their languages by managing them and the processes of discourse management are as universal as humans' capacity for language acquisition and language production. For example, rules developed by the ethnomethodologists, and I refer in particular to Schegloff, Jefferson & Sacks' important paper 'The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation' (1977), are quite precise and universally apply to any discourse. Another, compatible, approach is language management which incorporates a fundamental component of discourse management and which relates linguistic and non-linguistic interests to discourse management (cf. Jernudd & Neustupny 1987).

Further, logic demands that one explains the link between institutions, language planning agencies, and discourse management. One of these links is created when participants in discourse problematize an inadequacy that has been noted in the flow of discourse and subject it to deliberate problem-solving. Another of these links is created when language planners project ideologies onto the language system (or a part) and demand compliance in discourse with their evaluation of it (e.g., to not use any 'English' words in French).

8. A closing remark

A typology of language planning behavior must thus be valid in its particular historical claims as well as grounded in an understanding of actual discourse behavior and in the theoretical universals of speaking. This paper makes a distinction between vocabulary and term planning types of behavior and claims that the former precedes the latter. The one type does not exclude the other but if both are present in a language community, the former

dominates and the latter is situated within specialized organizations only. Their importance later reverses. There is a much stronger relationship between vocabulary planning and purism for the same reasons as motivate standardisation than between term planning and purism although the two are not exclusive. Vocabulary planning cooccurs with language development and promotion, while term planning requires a stable speech community. The former environment for lexical planning precedes the latter, therefore, vocabulary planning precedes term planning.

References

Beeby, C.E.

1966   *The quality of education in developing countries*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Botha, T.J.R.

1983   Afrikaans: origin and lexical evolution. In Fodor & Hagège (eds.): 213-237.

Dogançay-Aktuna, Seran

1995   An evaluation of the turkish language reform after 60 years. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 19/3: 221-249.

Domínguez, Francesc & Núria López (eds.)

1995   *Sociolinguistic and language planning organizations*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Fishman, Joshua A., Charles A. Ferguson & Jyotirindra Das Gupta (eds.)

1968   *Language problems of developing nations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Fodor, István & Claude Hagège (eds.)

1983   *Language reform*. Hamburg: Buske Verlag

Jernudd, Björn H. & Jiri V. Neustupny

1987   Language planning: for whom? *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Language Planning May 25-29, 1986/Ottawa*: 69-84. Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.

Neustupny, Jiri V.

1995   Types of language management - reformulation of a framework. Paper, European Conference on Language Planning, Barcelona, November 1995.

Rostow, W. W.

1960   *The stages of economic growth*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Rubin, Joan & Björn Jernudd (eds.)

1971   *Can language be planned? Sociolinguistic theory and practice for developing nations*. Honolulu: The University of Hawaii (An East-West Center book.)

Rubin, Joan, Björn H. Jernudd, Jyotirindra Das Gupta, Joshua A. Fishman and Charles A. Ferguson

1977   *Language planning processes*. The Hague: Mouton.

Schegloff, E., G. Jefferson & H. Sacks

1977   The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53: 361-382.

Thomas, George

1991   *Linguistic purism*. London: Longman.