Language planning on the eve of the 21st century

Björn H. Jernudd
Baptist University, Hong Kong

Introduction: purposes of my talk

My first purpose in this talk is to raise questions about the organization of our work as students and practitioners of language planning. In a contribution to our conference organizers' e-journal *NOVES SL* (2001), I ask if our work constitutes a discipline and if so which one. I will speak to that question here. I do it from the point of view that language is in the center of all our work. Whatever work we do must be related to language. We must keep our eyes on the ball; dribbling it means to manage spoken and signed utterances and displayed sentences, on the playing field of communication. If we relate our work merely to "language" as an abstraction or as a symbol and not to language as a communicative system in active use, then we are playing a different ball game.

But do we recognize and share one discipline, several disciplines? There is study through the disciplines of political science, sociology, law, and economics and geography and linguistics and more. We must recognize differences and clarify relationships. I feel there is good potential for accomplishing that.

My other purpose is to encourage networking, between students of language planning, of language policy, and of language management; incorporating into our college as visibly as we can experts in language cultivation, terminology management, translation, the language industry, and any and all others who share an interest in managing language.

Some decades ago there was a network that I used to refer to as the *iglp*, its members *iglp-ers*. This was a college in the true sense of an **i**nternationally dispersed **g**roup of scholars creating new knowledge on **l**anguage **p**lanning through exchange of information and direct cooperation. I feel very strongly about putting a network of information sharing and discussion in place. It is therefore especially meaningful that this is the 2nd conference in a series.

Taking the pulse of language planning study today

A haphazard survey

What are the major interests that are represented in our networks of language planning study today? To find out, I circulated a question by e-mail among a haphazard selection of leading scholars of language planning. Rather precisely a year ago, I asked:

"would you help me by letting me know which three publications that have appeared in the last 5 years or so that you regard as the most innovative ('important') by virtue of their contribution to language planning theory"

It was a very small and very informal exchange of letters and I make no claims of fair representation; therefore I will not venture a fair accounting of replies. However, the answers I got helped me to understand a little better what major and different interests that are represented in our networks of language planning study today. I thank those who participated[i]. I reproduce in an appendix the list of publications that respondents nominated.

Keywords reveal trends

Playing around a little bit with the titles of nominated publications and eliminating 'language' and 'linguistic', 'planning' and 'policy' in general, and particular attributes of place and so on, the following keywords emerge, alphabetically sorted:

culture and policy	multilingualism for all
diversity	motivation
economics of policy	political sociology of the world system
ethnic identity	(re)production of minority groups
ethnicity and the state	reversing shift
foreign-language policy	right and a resource
future of English	rights, minorities (and hegemonism)
genocide	sociopolitical perspectives
identity, insecurity and image	status change
ideology, politics and policies	

The list is suggestive. I have built my talk to reflect on these themes, taking into account also other readings.

The rise of 'policy' -- unease with planning

Spolsky and Shohamy write how "in the last decade a parallel interest [to language planning] has developed in what is now more generally labeled "language policy"" (1997:99). The discussion forum that was opened in preparation for our conference posted the question "Can the concept "language planning" be used nowadays? Or would it be better to use "language policy", "aménagement linguistique", "gestió lingüística" (language management), or any other?"

Spolsky and Shohamy suggest that there is an element of faddism in "this change" towards an idiom (in Neustupný's meaning, 1978:253) indexed by 'policy'. If that is so, I would seek a force behind the faddism and that could simply be that some writers seek demarcation of their own work. But there must be more serious reasons, given the pervasiveness of this idiom.

Spolsky and Shohamy suggest that the planning concept is less "related to politics and government" (ib.) than is "policy", and that it lacks or disallows "understanding of bureaucracies". Perhaps it is a matter of degrees. However, I would have thought that study of government organizational processes and therefore of bureaucracies is very much within the purview of language planning.

Spolsky and Shohamy suggest a "disenchantment with central planning by government" and I very much agree. This sentiment has led some scholars to avoid study of planning processes and even to reject the very notion. This is unfortunate. Governments will not go away, planning is a very necessary process in democratic polities, and language planning is one arena of planning. Nevertheless, the disenchantment is there.

The concepts of development and government are closely associated with language planning. A perception of failure of development contributed to discrediting such language planning thought and idiom that was seen as directed at development. This is unfortunate because of the lack of logic of the association. It is counterproductive because good development is desirable. This is unfortunate also because language planning was itself developing to embrace far more than development problems from very early on. I will return to this expansion of scope.

There is unease with language planning in our literature because of disenchantment with governments' inability to attend to grassroots initiatives. There has been a groundswell of concern with dysfunctional governance because of a perception of discontinuity between the local interests and what interests the national (state) level of institutionalized politics can cope with: "language planning studies have tended to primarily focus on national level policies and goals" (Davis 1994:xiii). Davis calls for "in-depth localized studies of language goals, language use and language change", an ambition very much shared by sociolinguists anywhere. Davis continues (91): "individual involvement in community efforts ensures commitment to and, thus, most likely leads to realization of community economic, educational, and language goals". She extends this call for individual involvement in the pursuit of goals that are pursued by higher levels of governance, too,

which implies that she wants to bridge discontinuities that arise when higher levels of governance address local issues. She does not reject language planning and extends her call for involvement to the very sensible suggestion that "Language planners then have the responsibility to provide political and professional support needed to realize the potential of indigenous community decisions" *(ib.)* as inclusively as can. She has in mind involving "indigenous interested individuals" to "receive the theoretical knowledge and research training needed to investigate, implement, and/ or document their own language policies and plans". Such involvement would guide the process in the direction of success.

Davis quotes (1999:89-90) an example of unsuccessful planning in Papua New Guinea. Success with the "grassroots, community initiative" Tok Ples Pri Skul that used "hundreds of different vernaculars" was systematically undermined by a centrally developed national community school system that ignored the vernaculars. The reasons for this conflict are not made explicit. I infer that lack of community representation in the national level educational planning process prevented exchange of information and therefore led to failure among significant others to understand that using vernaculars achieved education goals and more. This gap prevented setting in motion a process of planning that could perhaps have reconciled possibly competing goals, or otherwise would have built on the Tok Ples schools' success.

Also a sign of present times is that Davis further wishes to see "local control of research, planning, and implementation of programs" (89), which she refers to as "indigenous language planning".

De Varennes concludes his major study on language rights with the matter of fact observation that the *increased importance of the state* over the last century leads to increased concern with state-language relationships and a broadening of investigation into that relationship, for individuals as for groups of various kinds (1996:277).

These sentiments in the college of language planners are shared by scholars in other disciplines. Low, a theorist of space and social organization, problematizes democracy: "contemporary issues of immigration, migrant labor, steeply increasing refugee populations, and social marginalization within national communities surely make it crucial to reconsider in what ways democracy can be redefined and reorganized around less problematic notions of political community" (Low 258). He comments on difficulties with the territoriality concept in view of in-migrated dispersed ethnic populations. He especially comments on the fact that "the national state is in decline" because of the emergence of consolidated interstate systems. He feels that autonomous national democracy looks more and more like "a vanishing point".

Lo Bianco comments that "participatory democratic processes" interface with the "'technical' function of language planning and the 'political' imperative and right of those affected" so that what is done is "negotiated with and influenced by those most likely to be affected by the ultimate policy decisions" (45). His unease shows when he recommends that "Language planning theory must increasingly address itself to how language problems are constructed, what motivations are revealed and what selections are advocated." (45)

The volume edited by Nancy Hornberger (1997) carries its similar message in the title: *Indigenous literacies in the Americas. Language planning from the bottom up.* The message, well illustrated in its papers, a higher priority should be attached to the "massive implementation of reading and writing at every level and in all aspects of social life" in the indigenous languages and to the priority of developing a large literary corpus, over finding the perfect orthography or building a dictionary (358-359). The power to produce indigenous writing lies primarily in the hands of the indigenous population itself.

I go a step further with Khubchandani: " everyday speech in human interaction […] never loses immediate connection with reality, whereas the idealized language with precisely defined concepts is confined to a construct, a sort of 'formalized' reality" (1997:198)[ii]

Several decades ago, Krishnamurti expressed the same view when he commented on development of Telugu in Andhra Pradesh state in India : "The process of language development seems to have

been slowed down by the avid normative policies of governments, academies, and textbook bodies. There is nothing wrong in established agencies coining technical terms as long as it is understood that their use is not obligatory, particularly, if in actual use speakers come up with better alternatives" (1998:186). He favors "a linguistic 'laissez faire' approach […] even with uninhibited code-mixing […] to precede any normative work"[iii].

A theoretician of space, Low (261) discusses moral sentiment and claims that "the development of cosmopolitan moral codes and impulses, where relationships with distant and unknown others are felt to be equivalent to those close to home or to the body, is a dim prospect." He quotes Ginsburg (1994) to enquire skeptically into the possibililty of moral sentiment in relation to those distant in space, time, and social context from the self (*cf.* Bauman 1989, 1993).

Our present Zeitgeist (durée) demands that language planning discourse pays attention to individual and local language use and sentiment. It must keep up with postmodern society's search for the comforts of closeness and home.

Policy or planning: how to decide?

Dennis Ager opens his book on French language policy (1999:1) by referring both language policy and language planning to "governments who have the capacity to propose legislation or ensure administrative action" while at the same time recognizing that there are other agents who exercise "deliberate efforts to influence the behaviour of others" with regard to language, such as "individuals or interested groups, like dictionary makers or campaigners". His opening raises both the issue of relationship between the terms planning and policy, and between management of language by governments and by others.

Schiffman studied France, India and the USA (1996). Ager interprets Schiffman's use of the word policy as the entire speech community's (socio-)linguistic *ethos*. Ager rejects Schiffman's concept of "policy" as too broad. It does not explain the particulars of the political community's deliberate actions to divert such language change that is motivated by social change. Ager writes that in his view there is not "much difference between policy about language and policy about social welfare or taxation: any policy will work if the community accepts it. […] policy, is the result of a political assessment of the realities of the day and an estimation of what can be done about them. Language policy […] is not the same as […] long-term beliefs of the speech community, although it derives from them." I agree with the need to reserve "policy" in a narrower meaning than comprising the entire (socio-)linguistic *ethos* of communities.

Incidentally, Ager concludes that "language policy can work; that it works because it is in essence political; and that the political community has every right to work on the basis of the importance of language to society […] the political community is aware of what it is doing and why." (214)

Das Gupta suggests to view *planning* "as a *series of policy episodes* rather than as a single episode of expert treatment of one set of problems in intellectual and administrative terms". The wider view subsumes "the rational elements involved in composing plans as well as designing appropriate modes of intervention in society […] the public processes involved in defining the content of problems, the order of priority of treatment involved in the political process, and a recognition of beneficiaries of the outcome of planning." It considers "how demands for changing the language situation emerge and how the policy system in a country is prepared to respond to them in an ordered sequence of coordinated action". Das Gupta presents planning as a political scientist[iv], but linguists can equally share his model.[v]

I continue to quote extensively from Das Gupta: "When planning is viewed in this wider perspective, it will be easier to notice the role of civil society in inducing the state to act in certain directions and the relative autonomy of the state to act effectively. In other words, the focus will not be limited to bureaucratic processing of problems. Planning will be viewed as a complex process of bargained activities at various stages including the stages of policy intimation, plan making, and plan pursuit. The pursuit of plan, again, raises a wider question than what is normally implied in implementation. Politically, the idea of plan pursuing implies a continuous attention to possibilities of learning, adaptation, and modification of policy. Thus planning becomes a long-term system of policy

responses in a larger context of political resolution of conflicting claims rather than a single-step matter of administrative expertise performed in an insulated boardroom." (222-223). In the same spirit, and referring to his study of Irish language planning, O'Riagain refers to planning as an evolutionary process of social learning (283, quoting Alonso).

Not all decision-making is planning. Planning is anticipatory; it is complex system of decisions. Many interrelated decisions have to be taken to achieve the desired future state which, it is believed, would not occur otherwise. Planning applies when sets of interdependent decisions are too large to handle all at once (Ackoff 1969:2-3). This means that planning has to be an on-going process. Ackoff explains why planning "never gets there": continuous reviews (of the plan) are possible, and, the world around us changes as do we and the planners. So the planning process continuously updates itself – until, for other reasons, a non-planned decision is taken to "settle for what one has".

I feel that the contributions that sociologists and political scientists and geographers have made to the study of language planning, in the interests of their own disciplines, have to some extent prevented linguists from developing their disciplinary agenda. For linguists, interest or identity politics, political institutions, policy intimation, plan making, and plan pursuit, or the evolution of bureaucratic processes, are not primary concepts, language use and speaking are. However, students of language planning have an obligation to at least glean benefits from decision-making and planning theory and to harmonize their analytical frameworks with those of other disciplines.

I wish to mention especially the benefit in paying attention to the contribution from colleagues in the economics discipline, among whom are Grin, Vaillancourt and de Swaan. There have been previous attempts (see these authors' references for some) but I am hoping their work forebodes a flood. They apply fundamental economic reasoning on the basis of which minority language use (*e.g.,* Grin 1996, Grin and Vaillancourt 1999), and the evolving world language system (de Swaan, 1998) can be modeled, respectively. Their modelling work prepares the way for empirical work to test models and to assess interventions. In one of his papers, Grin explores conditions on immigration (1991), a topic that I think will intensify because of events that are now playing out following the 9 11 event.

And there is the other side of economics, the use of estimation of costs and benefits as a tool for choosing between alternative future paths of action Language use is such a peculiar economic good that almost any work here is pioneering work

Can language (still) be planned?

Richard Lambert strongly endorses "centralized, national-level planning" of foreign language instruction and suggests that "language planners in the United States would be well advised to examine the Dutch example closely" (1997:81-82). He points to the "new Dutch plan [which] not only assumes a dominant role for centralized planning, but also tried to fit almost all of the segments of foreign-language instruction into a common framework". He notes how the planning system allows (I would say requires) a "balance between fiat and persuasion, between central and local decision-making" and how this balance is "open to continual negotiation". Lambert's interest is obvious: he directed the National Foreign Language Center in the US. This is NFLC's mission statement (http://www.nflc.org/): "The mission of the NFLC is to improve the capacity of the US to communicate in languages other than English. We implement that mission through intensive and innovative strategic planning and development with globalized institutions, organizations and enterprises throughout the US."

Yet there is a profound difference between European and US practices. People orient positively to governance in Europe, not so in the US. Kari Sajavaara's presentation of foreign language policy in Finland (1997:117) brings home this message: "The foreign (non-native) language policy adopted by the Finnish Government is the result of a number of recommendations by a series of committees from 1964 to 1992." Such planning is expected and accepted in Finland, and if it is conducted in the same manner as in Sweden, with broad public consultation[vi].

Richard Tucker expresses a sentiment in favor of planning in the same volume: "I see a pressing need for bold and decisive national leadership – leadership of the type displayed by Theo van Els in leading the investigations, the deliberations, and the drafting of the Dutch Working Party that resulted in the Dutch National Action Programme." (1997:96-97) Note that Tucker discusses not foreign languages but the implications of the English-Only movement, therefore, endorses a planning approach to issues of US domestic ethnic and linguistic tension.

(Planning for nation-building)

One feature of the association of language planning with development was the belief that the model somehow was limited to, and by, attention to nation-building goals through selection and promotion of one language only at the exclusion of attention to other language varieties. If language planning practice in some polities was so focused, this was however not a limitation of language planning thought. If cases of language planning study primarily dealt with status issues before, it is however a fact that scholarly work continued under the policy label to attend almost exclusively to adjustment of the status of the one language or the other.

In any case, nation-building continues and is recognized as a motivating force behind language planning. Mart Rannut concludes his paper on "The Common Language Problem" with a normative call for "a multiple language planning model that may cover language spread, nation building and minority protection within the same framework, with explicit links and constraints, based on linguistic human rights" (1999:112).

(Slovenia and Croatia)

A nation-building language planning is live and well also in Robert de Beaugrande's focus on today's Slovenia and Croatia: "**Language planning** is urgently demanded to consolidate a language as a primary symbol of national identity and cultural sensitivity, and to prepare it for new uses in such important domains as politics, commerce, science, and mass media." (1998:275)

(Iran)

At the recently held conference on Language for Special Purposes in Vaasa (August, 2001, www.uwasa.fi/lsp2001), a group of speakers from the Academy of the Persian Language and Literature's terminology section point-by-point contrasted the difference between their national agenda of coining and selecting Persian equivalents to be substituted for foreign vocabulary (and terms) with their understanding of the common European standardizing and harmonizing terminological project. Theirs is a typical project of developing a language in a modernizing nation.

The European project was amply represented by other speakers at the conference and is very much a modern project (Neustupný 1978:chapter XIII) to standardize and harmonize terms within and across speech communities within which the vocabulary resources and use have stabilized. Thus, I had the pleasure of witnessing the simultaneous appearance at this conference of two planning behaviors, the one preceding the other in developmental time (Jernudd 1986, 1996; Neustupný 1978:255).

(The Baltic states)

The nation-building enterprise is very much alive in Europe, and defending its legitimacy in an intellectual environment that no longer supports its hegemonic goals. A case in point is how Ozolins counters claims that the Baltic states violate rights on grounds that these states are recapturing and consolidating sovereignty, motivated by another right to primordial ethno-linguistic continuity (1999:258-259). "Moreover, Estonia and Latvia see it as ironic that they are willing to give citizenship to those who are able to speak and understand the national language, while some *Western* European countries will not grant citizenship to certain minorities no matter how well they speak the national language, reserving citizenship on a *jus sanguinis* basis." (258)

(A different angle of approach altogether)

Out of an orientation to the grassroots, the local, and speaking, and in order to "successfully implement developmental programmes such as family planning", there should also come a renewed concern with "the persuasive powers of language for different kinds of media in the milieu of interpreting and sharing common experience thorough diverse languages" (Khubchandani 199-200). This orientation would supplement or even replace the "nation-building" and "statist" orientation that language planning was associated with in its beginnings. One exponent of such a new orientation is Antia who reports on the instrumentalities of term planning and generally LSP management to lower morbidity and mortality rates in a Nigerian locality (1999).

(Planning to accommodate ethnic diversity)

Ricento in his historical and theoretical review of language planning (2000) uses "'language policy' as a *superordinate* term which subsumes 'language planning'." Why does he do that? "Language policy research is concerned not only with official and unofficial acts of governmental and other institutional entities" he writes, "but also with the historical and cultural events and processes that have influenced, and continue to influence, societal attitudes and practices with regard to language use, acquisition and status" (note 2, page 209). Language planning is variously motivated at different historical periods – it is a necessarily a prisoner of the durée, of the Zeitgeist[vii].

Fishman takes Zeitgeist into account in his deeply engaging and richly textured advocacy for the undisrupted inter-generationally continued practice of X-ish (in relation to Y-ish) by members of ethnic groups to whom primordialism appeals (1991:338-339). R[eversing]L[anguage]S[hift]-ers should be ready to act "when *Zeitgeist* and material opportunities for renewed RLS present themselves". (396)

Fishman (1991:65) is in tune with the Zeitgeist when he argues for "recognizing cultural democracy as a component and as a responsibility of the general democratic promise", and how "cultural rights must focus on ethnocultural groups (70).

Perhaps because Fishman deals in fundamentals of identity and its social embedding, he also diagnoses what I think will now accelerate as a shared concern in at least American and European societies. I quote: "The real question is […] how one (not just minority ethnics but any social movement) can build a home that one can still call one's own and, by cultivating it, find community, comfort, companionship and meaning in a world whose mainstreams are increasingly unable to provide these basic ingredients for their members"(393)

Fishman is clear about the important role planning plays in shaping the social environment: "there is no alternative route to social problem solving than the route via planning […] If there is a dilemma it

deals with the *how* [...] with a systematic overall approach that can guide the efforts that must be undertaken."

(The special case of new immigrants, displaced people and refugees)

Ricento (2000) identifies "massive population migrations, the re-emergence of national ethnic identities (and languages) […] and new regional coalitions" (203) as themes in language policy research from the mid-1980s, and still forming. He adds language loss and linguistic human rights as emerging themes.

Recent tragic events will intensify discussion of rights of immigrant and refugee groups partly in the face of heightened security measures to protect home territories from intruders; protective measures are already impacting on immigration policies and are likely to intensify recognition of differences between hosts and guests, therefore also between autochtonous constituent group's rights and those of immigrants and refugees. We need continued normative discussion of language rights and of ethno-linguistic representation. We need intensive empirical study of the processes that generate problems related to the local uses and acquisition of languages by groups of speakers who are excluded, claim, or on whose behalf claims are made of exclusion, from democratic representation and kinds of social and economic participation. (Cox 1997:14) (Low 1997:272).

Tove Skutnabb-Kangas' heart is always in the right place. One of her many sensible suggestions is that people "have to come together and compare" (1995:9). One goes someplace else and discovers things about oneself! I feel very strongly about the need to explore rights reciprocally to understand what *my situation* would be in the home and state of the individual who is now *my guest* or who represents that state. I feel that reciprocal knowledge and understanding is missing in normative debate. Once I know the situation of the other, the actions of the other at his/her home, I also know better how I can represent myself in relation to that other. Mutual knowledge of this kind prepares the way for negotiating a better world – and will be a necessary component of planning for the linguistic accommodation by hosts of others.

Planning and relationships of local to global

The tension between 'local' and 'global' is discussed in many disciplines, and the graph below illustrates discussion by economic (-political) geographers: ""society" (the national state) is fading out as a shared focus of concern, the "global" and the "local" (or "place"), the latter a constituent of both the national and the global which permits their articulation, area becoming constituted as objects of study across a broad set of disciplines" (Low 1997:256-257)

	Declining or Decaying object	Emerging object, or agent of decay	Linking or articulatory element
Early 20th century	"Community"	"Society"	"The individual"
Late 20th century	"The national"	"The global"	"The local"

We have a lot to learn about processes that make us speak of globalisation. Do we know what actually happens in industrial relocation, say? Plants do not have to move to and across third world locations to maximize profits (Cox 1997:132). And if they do, the majority of participants, the labor force of management as of workers, will be local. There are expatriates everywhere in professional services, but do they dominate localities? Interfacing with foreigners may be dominated by English as the contact language, but certainly not at the exclusion of other language practices. And, is it not reasonable to think that it would be most peculiar indeed if a firm did not use – did not take advantage of -- the local language system? Why should a production plant or a service company attempt to alter the language factor of production to make it discontinuous with the surrounding community's language system? The proposition is strengthened by the simple fact that much production is destined for local and regional markets. In China, it is the domestic market that lures.

If financial markets can be understood as dependent on a geography of information that includes the "locally specific information networks of produces and their locally specific monitoring of the financial and investment performance of firms" (Cox 1997:8), how much more so must we not understand acts of language use as exponents of exchange of cognitive, affective and appeal information, exposing a vastly more complex phenomenon than pointing to that piece of financial information that was included in the act. We badly need descriptive and explanatory study of actual discourse, in contexts claimed to be in danger of leveling by forces of globalisation.

I came across a study of the Honda corporation. Honda's localization did not follow the path of the traditional model of multinational enterprise. I regret that I do not know of studies of the impact on language practices of such localization. Corporations establish operationally independent subsidiaries which suggests adaptation to local communication practices. Honda is apparently a special case. It is a *global local corporation* which "is extraordinarily sensitive to local variations in markets and production conditions and yet is also able to function as an integrated unit at the global scale." The author categorically rejects "the thesis of the postnational, stateless, or global enterprise operation in a borderless world" as "hopelessly simplistic" (Mair 86). I want to learn much, much more about the complexities of production and management that are global and local at the same time and what the impact is on language systems and on speaking.

One aspect of *glocalization* (Swyngedouw 1997:137ff) means increased organised interaction across communities and the emergence of supra-national (supra-state) regional and international organizations, including political unions, businesses, labor unions (Cox 1997:10,12) professional organizations, charities and aid organisations, sports and media enterprises, and so on. What do we know of continuity or discontinuity of language practices of the people in these organizations with the practices of any particular one of its locations?

At the supra-state level, the UN and the EU are prime examples of the complexity that such organizations face in organizing their communications internally as well as in their external communicative relationships. Internal communication practices have to be sorted out and communicative solutions have to be found that allow democratic participation by citizens in member states. A good thing is that the operational complexities of language use within supra-statal organizations, and in particular EU, seems to support local management of language resources. The relative internationalization of political exchange and competition has "rescaled" opportunities for regulatory practices, which I interpret as an opportunity for language planning through a different institutional framework. The language problems that already now are given attention reflect the tension between local and global that is emerging in the late 20th century replacing the earlier tension between individual and society.

"Glocalization" seems to have invigorated opportunities for ethno-linguistic groups below the level of the state to make their cases at a supra-state level, not as before limited to a hearing at the level of the state policy. I think we see this happen in Europe. Studies of ethno-linguistic politics and planning may reveal parallel experiences in federated states such as the US, Canada[viii], Australia and India, if not in their past so in their futures. Global interest-groups are relentlessly pressing local ethnic interests into the media. The global trend is towards regional coalitions and new forms of governance and an interesting effect of this trend is to stimulate new political opportunities of support for ethno-linguistic interests.

The localization industry offers another window into the discourse realities of globalization. LISA is "the premier organization providing the mechanisms, services and network for professionals interested in sharing information on the development of globalization and localization processes, tools, web-technologies and business models – so that they can become more effective in their own business." Members localize because they work globally or offer organizations localization services. They localize because they exist in a multilingual and otherwise diverse environment. A LISA forum took place a few days ago in Vienna (www.lisa.org/events/2001/vienna/). Here is a selection of what speakers discussed at this forum:

How businesses create value by "understanding the user-landscape" and adjust to geographic-cultural differences (by localizing activities),

Managing language resources in global content management processes, explicated in one abstract as "gaining control of the creation and change of content across languages and then delivering that content into the multiple output types"; and in another how "in close cooperation with key industry partners, the SALT consortium has developed a range of tools and work flows that allow flexible designs. Modeling, building and exchange of multilingual lexical and terminological resources for all applications in global content management, localization and internationalization, translation management."

The general title: Translation and terminology management for the localization industry; and the specific title: Managing multilingual content for clinical trials, product information, and product packaging has unique characteristics within a highly regulated industry such as healthcare. Behind these titles can be glimpsed the reality of a whole industry out there adjusting messages of whatever origin into diverse languages.

Integrating translation tools and terminology databases

And why not end this short sample with:

Multilingual success

Not only does the LISA agenda challenge uninformed guesswork about processes of internationalization and globalization, it also places before us colleagues who are deliberately managing languages at local levels, who are actively managing language contact, and who are producing much of the commercial texts that surround us in daily life. (*See* also http://www.hltcentral.org/, *LeJournal*).

English and language planning

I find it difficult to think of language planning situations that would not one way or other be concerned with the relationship between English and glocalization processes. Reactions to contact with English are legion throughout the world. Language planners and students of language planning anywhere share an interest in understanding the relationship of English to their discourse realities. Among the celebrated contributions are the "critical" appraisals of pro-English interests by Philipson (1992) and Pennycook (1994), the empirically oriented collection by Fishman *et al*. (1995) and the Open University text edited by Graddol (1997), and may I also draw your attention to Ammon (2001). Although there is a huge literature on English besides these books, where are the in-depth, inclusive, comparative surveys and analyses of problems and reactions, from a language planning and management perspective?

Sweden is an example of state reaction to English. Swedes feel their language is threatened, and English has of course already been declared guilty. A parliamentary enquiry is underway and will deliver its report in April 2002. The enquiry is not limited to effects of English contact. Perhaps it was high time for the country to take stock of its language management assets and set in motion a planning process towards a more desirable future state of language management in any case?

There are two directions of work that I feel are neglected in international language planning discussion:

language problems that arise as a result of contact with English, and
a future language order

The first direction asks for cooperation in massive surveying of effects of English contact with other languages[ix]. The scientific value is obvious and the value to language management would be beyond doubt.

Concerning the second direction, Europe already has one model in the European schools' language program (Baetens-Beardsmore 1995). I feel that educationalists from all regions of the world should be party to this debate so that (once more?) the "Western" world is not accused of hegemonic exclusion. It would certainly be in Europe's interest to engage with Asian countries about second and foreign language futures. I am reminded of initiatives in the past, among them Ali Mazrui's (1976). He argues in favor of a sub-federation of Anglophone cultures, each sector of the English-speaking world maintaining its own distinctiveness; issues involved are decolonizing, de-Anglicizing, de-racializing and Africanizing (regionalizing) English. He proposes a 'Model for language in a World Federation of Cultures'. He suggests English, French, Russian, Arabic, and Chinese as world languages; and proposes that in a new world, every child be required to learn three languages – a world language, a regional language, and either a national language or a communal language. The world has changed since he wrote this. But not the value of preparing for a future of use of shared languages that at the same time safeguards language diversity.

What else motivates planning?

Clyne (1997:483) concluded from studies on undoing and redoing corpus planning that "the significance of models" has been underestimated in the study of corpus planning. In fact, "often the codex is based on the models"" (483). By models he means, *inter alia*, "media texts, official publications, and the speeches of political leaders" and creative, educational and scholarly writing. This is nothing but the realization of the primacy of discourse, of actual speech and writing. Clyne also draws our attention to "patterned discourse", or "the level of discursive pragmatics", comprising rules for address, norms for […] "writing job applications to renting a flat" (484) and to broadcasting in more "rustic" popular forms of speech or generalizing an informal pronoun of address to support a "democratization" agenda (489). Clyne's presentation of norm change as corpus planning acts sidesteps status planning (other than in what I refer to as the trivial insight that individuals speak and when they do they speak in some language or other (*cf.* Fishman 2000)).

A massive amount of language management within speech communities on terms, dictionaries, grammars, style manuals, names of persons and places and products, is not motivated by ethnic-symbolic or ethnic-maintenance or status problems. The entire translation enterprise, and the entire terminological enterprise from the local branch of industry to international harmonization or professional standardisation, technical writing for manuals and for other texts to support use of products, advertising, product description and labeling, all need to be recognized as planned and as language management activities that interface with language planning, as the case may be.

A unified approach: language management

In his study of Irish language planning, Ó Riagáin postulates that "any consideration of the role of the state requires attention to the *'implicit' language consequences* of all policy interventions" (29 et passim; my italics) He establishes a relationship between *state* (of course, in all its complexity of action) and language use, *discourse*; at least in Ireland, a valid measure of outcome of state action to implement goals is whether the Irish language is acquired and used.

Ó Riagáin shows how the best intentioned planning does not work if the parties to the process do not have knowledge of what language is used for, what it is in peoples' lives that sustains the continued unremarkable use of their language. For example, if people disperse from a village in search of jobs, the speech community with all its raison d'êtres for continued use of the village language (especially page 276) breaks up. It is not reasonable to place the symbolic burden of maintaining Irish on the dispersed individuals when Irish discourse lacks motivation in their new living spaces[x].

Ó Riagáin remarks that the "stability of current Irish usage is dependent on the stability of the social networks of users, that is, on a series of interlinked social relationships that may grow out of contacts in an institutional setting, but whose survival depends on the achievement of some degree of friendship, intimacy, and interpersonal knowledge among participants" (282)

Ricento (2000) concludes his survey of the historical and theoretical development of language policy and planning with a claim[xi] that a key variable which separates the "older, positivistic/ technicist approaches from the newer critical/postmodern ones" (208) is "agency". By that he means the "role(s) of individuals and collectivities in the processes of language use, attitudes and ultimately policies." *The agency is individual*. Ricento formulates some research questions (my rearrangement and my italics):

- Why do *individuals* adopt to use (or cease to use) particular languages and varieties for specified functions in different domains, and
- how do *those [individual] choices* influence – and how are they influenced by – institutional language policy decision-making (local to national and supranational)?

I heartily agree and I hope Ricento is right if this is a prediction of what will come next, not just what should. I would hope that language planning study will go beyond the issue of use of "particular languages and varieties", beyond an apparent preference to deal with status issues, to include investigation of language problems in actual discourse. It is a fact that difficulties arise in the process of communication. It is equally a fact that when people talk, they manage these difficulties in subsequent turns. This fact is incorporated in several theories of discourse, e.g., in conversational analysis and ethno-methodology, in theories of speaking and in the theory of language correction (Neustupný 1974). A limiting case is that people do not share "a language", yet, the idea that this extreme contact situation can be successfully resolved in discourse is inherent in studies of language contact, and in the theory of discourse management (Neustupný 1994:55).

A discipline that builds on language for communication takes as its fundamental premise that communication is a discourse process between people who communicate. Thus, it can identify but is not equipped to deal with exclusionary practices; political science takes up what language management cannot. Finding a shared language is a language problem, how to learn a language, any language, is a language problem; but requirements that one particular language and not another must be known or used or displayed (for commerce, for access) may reflect some other kind of problem. These latter problems motivate different disciplinary approaches and multidisciplinary cooperation.

The late Muhammad Hassan Ibrahim said to use the language, not to plan it! Well, unless there is language use, unless there is discourse, there is little point to the whole exercise! Discourse is fundamental to language management theory. Discourse implies participation – because people communicate. The trick is to avoid constructing linguistic chimeras. Our theoretical axiom must be that language planning as all other kinds of language management focus on people who relate to people in discourse. Language exists in discourse and therefore problems of language exist in discourse.

The ultimate criterion for success is self-sustaining use of language in discourse.

Nominated

Ager, Dennis (1999) *Identity, insecurity and image: France and language.* Clevedon, Philadelphia, Toronto, Sydney: Multilingual Matters

Ager, Dennis (2001) *Motivation in language planning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Baldauf, R. B. and Kaplan Robert B. (1997*) Language planning*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

Baldauf, R. B. and Kaplan, Robert B. (1999) (Eds.) Language planning in Nepal, Taiwan and Sweden. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 20:4&5

Baldauf, R. B. and Kaplan, Robert B. (199?) (Eds.) Language planning in Malawi, Mozambique and the Philippines. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*

Bongaerts, Theo and de Bot, Kees (1997) (Eds.) *Perspectives on foreign-language policy. Studies in honour of Theo van Els*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins

Calvet, L.-J. (1996) Les politiques linguistiques. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France

De Varennes, Fernand (1996) *Language, Minorities and Human Rights.* The Hague, Boston, London: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers

De Swaan, Abram (1998) A political sociology of the world language system: the dynamics of language spread (parts 1 and 2) *Language Problems and Language Planning* 22:1:63-75 & 2:109-128

European Commission, *Euromosaic -- The Production and Reproduction of the Minority Language Groups of the European Union*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

Fettes, Mark and Bolduc, Suzanne (1998) (Eds.) Al lingva demokratio/Towards Linguistic Democracy/Vers la démocratie linguistique. Rotterdam: Universala Esperanto-Asocio

Fettes, Mark (2000) *The Linguistic Ecology of Education*. PhD dissertation, University of Toronto

Fishman, Joshua , Conrad, A. W. and Rubal-Lopez, A. (1995) (Eds.) *Post-Imperial English: Status Change in Former British and American Colonies, 1940-1990.* (Contributions to the Sociology of Language, 72) Mouton de Gruyter

Fishman, Joshua (1991) *Reversing language shift.* Clevedon, Philadelphia, Adelaide: Multilingual Matters

Fishman, Joshua (1999) (Ed.) *Handbook of language and ethnic identity*. Oxford UP

Fishman, Joshua (200?) *Can Threatened Languages be Saved?* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters

Graddol, David (1997) *The future of English*. London: British Council

Grin, François (report for the NZ Treasury; an application of the economics of language policy)

Huebner, Thom, and Davis, Kathryn A.; with assistance from Joseph Lo Bianco (1999) (Eds.) *Sociopolitical perspectives on language policy and planning in the USA* (Studies in Bilingualism v. 16) Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins

Kontra, Miklós., Phillipson, Robert., Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove and Várady, Tibor (Eds.) *Language: a right and a resource*. Budapest: Central European University Press

Nettle, Daniel (1999) *Linguistic diversity*. Oxford UP

Piron, Claude (1994) *Le défi des langues: du gâchis au bon sens.* Paris: L'Harmattan.

Ricento, Thomas (2000) (Ed.) *Ideology, Politics and Language Policies*. (Impact: Studies in language and society 6.) Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins

Ricento, Thomas (2000) Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policy and planning. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4/2:196-213.

Schiffman, Harold (1996) *Linguistic Culture and Language Policy.* London and New York: Routledge

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove and Phillipson, R. (2000) *Linguistic genocide.*

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (1995) (Ed.) *Multilingualism for all*. Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger:

References

Ackoff, Russell L. (1969) *A Concept of Corporate Planning*. Wiley-Interscience.

Ammon, Ulrich (2001) (Ed) *The Dominance of English as a Language of Science. Effects on Other Languages and Language Communities*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter

Annamalai, E., Jernudd, B. and Rubin, Joan (1986) (Eds.) *Language Planning: Proceedings of an Institute*. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages and Honolulu: Institute of Culture and Communication 1986.

Antia, Bassey E. (2000) *Terminology and language planning: an alternative framework of practice and discourse*. University of Maiduguri.

Baetens Beardsmore, Hugo (1995) The European School Experience in multilingual education. In Skutnabb-Kangas, pages 21-68.

Bauman, Z. (1989) *Modernity and the Holocaust*. Cambridge: Polity Press

Bauman, Z. (1993) *Postmodern ethics*. Oxford: Blackwell

Blommaert, Jan (1996) (Ed) *The politics of multilingualism and language planning*. Antwerp: University of Antwerp (UIAGER) (Antwerp papers in Linguistics)

Blommaert, Jan (1996) Language Planning as a Discourse on Language and Society: The Lingustic Ideology of a Scholarly Tradition. In *Language Problems and Language Planning* 20:3:199-222

Clyne, Michael (1997) (Ed) *Undoing and redoing corpus planning*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter

Coulmas, Florian (1997) (Ed) *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers

Cox, Kevin R. (1997) (Ed) *Spaces of globalization: reasserting the power of the local.* New York and London: The Guildford Press

Das Gupta, Jyotirindra (1990) Language Planning and Democratic Becoming. In Weinstein, pages 222-240

Davis, Kathryn A. (1999) Dynamics of indigenous language maintenance. In Huebner and Davis, pages 67-97

De Beaugrande, Robert, Grosman, Meta and Seidlhofer, Barbara (1998) (Eds.) *Language Policy and Language Education in Emerging Nations*. Stamford and London: Ablex

De Beaugrande, Robert (1998) Designing language programs in post-colonial contexts: the outlook in Slovenia. In de Beaugrande *et al*., pages 275-288

Fishman, Joshua A. (2000) The Status Agenda in Corpus Planning. In Lambert and Shohamy, pages 43-51

Ginsburg, C. (1994) Killing a Chinese mandarin: The moral implications of distance. *Critical Inquiry* 21:46-60

Grin, François (1991) *Territorial Multilingualism*. Language and Society Papers. Series: Linguistic Decisions. Number: LD15. University of Washington Interdisciplinary Research Committee on Language and Society.

Grin, François (1996) (Ed) Economic approaches to language and language planning. Theme issue #121, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*

Grin, François and Vaillancourt, François (1999) *The cost-effectiveness evaluation of minority language policies. Case studies on Wales, Ireland and the Basque Country*. Flensburg: European Centre for Minority Issues monograph no. 2 ISBN 3-932635-12-4

Hornberger, Nancy (1997) (Ed.) *Indigenous literacies in the Americas. Language planning from the bottom up.* Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter

Jernudd, Björn, Singh, R. A. *et al.* (1986) Criteria for success in term planning and vocabulary planning. In Annamalai et al., pages 418425.

Jernudd, Björn (1996) Coexisting realities in language planning. In Blommaert, pages 184195

Jernudd, Björn (2001) What happened to language planning? *Noves SL,* Winter/Spring (http://cultura.gencat.es/llengcat/noves/hemeroteca/internacional00t.htm)

Kandiah, Thiru and Kwan-Terry, John (1994) (Eds) *English and Language Planning: A Southeast Asian Contribution.* Singapore: Times Academic Press

Khubchandani, Lachman M. (1997) *Revisualizing boundaries: a plurilingual ethos*. New Delhi/Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications

Krishnamurti, Bh. (1998) *Language, Education and Society.* (Language and Development, v. 7.) New Delhi, Thousand Oaks, London: Sage Publications

Lambert, Richard D. and Elana Shohamy (2000) (Eds.) *Language Policy and Pedagogy. Essays in honor of A. Ronald Walton*. Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Lambert, Richard (1997) *Horizon Taal* and Language Planning in the United States. In Bongaerts and de Bot, pages 79-88.

Lo Bianco, Joseph The Language of Policy: What Sort of Policy Making is the Officialization of English in the United States? In   , pages 39-65

Low, Murray (1997) Representation unbound: Globalization and Democracy. In Cox, pages 240-280

Mahnoush, Tehrani (2001) The Academy of the Persian language and literature: Terminology projects, successes and failures. Paper presented at LSP 2001, "Porta Scientiae", University of Vaasa, August

Mair, Andrew (1997) Strategic Localization: The Myth of the Postnational Enterprise. In Cox, pages 64-88

Mazrui, Ali A. (1976) *A World Federation of Cultures: An African Perspective*. New York: Free Press

McConnell, Grant D. (1997) Global Scale Sociolinguistics. In Coulmas, 344-357

Neustupný, Jirí (1978) Post-structural approaches to language. Language theory in a Japanese context. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press

Neustupný, Jirí (1994) Problems of English Contact Discourse and Language Planning. In Kandiah and Kwan-Terry, pages 50-69

Ozolins, Uldis (1999) Separating Language from Ethnicity: The Paradoxes of Strict Language Policies and Increasing Social Harmony in the Baltic States. In Kontra *et al.,* pages 245-262

Pennycook, Alastair (1994) *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language.* London: Longman

Phillipson, Robert (1992) *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford UP

Rannut, Mart (1999) The Common Language Problem. In Kontra *et al*., pages 99-114

Ó Riagáin, Pádraig (1997) Language policy and social reproduction: Ireland, 1893-1993. Oxford UP

Ricento, Thomas (1998) National Language Policy in the United States. In Ricento and Burnaby, pages 85-112

Ricento, Thomas and Burnaby, Barbara (1998) (Eds.) *Language and Politics in the United States and Canada. Myths and Realities.* Mahwah, New Jersey and London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Sajavaara, Kari (1997) Implementation of Foreign-Language Policy in Finland. In Bongaerts and de Bot, pages 113-128

Spolsky, Bernard and Elana Shohamy (1997) Planning Foreign-Language Education: An Israeli Perspective. In Bongaerts and de Bot, pages 99-111.

Spolsky, Bernard and Elana Shohamy (2000) Language Practice, Language Ideology, and Language Policy. In Lambert and Shohamy, pages 1-41.

Swyngedouw, Erik (1997) Neither Global nor Local: "Glocalization" and the Politics of Scale. In Cox, pages 137-166

Tucker, G. Richard (1997) Developing a Language-Competent American Society: Implications of the English-Only Movement. In Bongaerts and de Bot, pages 89-98

Weinstein, Brian (1990) (Ed.) *Language policy and political development*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex

Williams, Colin H. (1998) Introduction: Respecting the Citizens—Reflections on Language Policy in Canada and the United States. In Ricento and Burnaby, pages 1-32

II Congrés Europeu sobre Planificació Lingüística
Andorra la Vella, 14, 15 i 16 de novembre de 2001

[i] Hugo Baetens Beardsmore, Louis-Jean Calvet, Probal Dasgupta, Mark Fettes, Joshua Fishman, François Grin, Mohd Gary Jones, Jirí Nekvapil, Dónall Ó Riagáin, Bernard Spolsky, Miquel Strubell i Trueta, Humphrey Tonkin, Kees Vaes, Jehannes Ytsma

[ii] Khubchandani goes further in placing speech activity before language norm: "The values of language modernization place great emphasis on a clear-cut categorization and ad hoc solutions concerning languages and scripts (by selecting a single writing system, a 'uniform' standard grammar, a single style for everyday domain of use). These concerns seem to be largely responsible for promoting the mobilization of different language pressure groups in the Indo-Pakistani subcontinent. This pluralism, which could aid in accelerating social change, has led developing nations into serious difficulties in social planning." (1997:199)

[iii] This happens to be the principle on which the Swedish term agency operates: to wait until a language problem arises out of usage, and then to invite speakers to participate in a problem-solving process. TNC represents a society with very stable use of a long-established national norm for Swedish, Krishnamurti a modernizing society.

[iv] Brian Weinstein is also a political scientist who studies language planning. This is his agenda: "If it is true that institutional language choices can influence identity and participation, which are basic political concepts, then the study of the choices should help us understand more about states and public policies; what values underlie the policies; how a state is being maintained or reformed; how the state is trying to transform the society living within its boundaries; who will benefit, and who will lose; what groups, individuals, and elites have the most influence over public policy." Weinstein's disciplinary problem is to defend a political science agenda on language planning: "a study of language choice or policy and its implementation or planning can shed light on important political processes and political change. It is by no means peripheral to politics or to general public policy making." (1990:1)

[v] However, Das Gupta's own research interest takes him beyond linguistics to enquiry into questions of social transformation and democratic development, in particular the "changing division of social advantage and political power" (223)

[vi] Through the "remiss" system.

[vii] "the 'situatedness (Giddens 1984) of the networks themselves in time and space tends not to be examined" (O'Riagáin 1997:37); also Neustupný 1978:255).

[viii] "The American system" is founded on constitutional protection of individual rights and "bilingualism and bilingual services are a *means* by which fundamental rights are protected and enforced" (Williams 1998:27). Canada is different. The Canadian approach "has been directed toward group rights rather than individual rights". This points directly to the determinants of political power, responsibility, and citizenship rights in Canada, and tension between federal multiculturalism (read: multilingualism) and governance distributed according to ethnically distinct territories. "As Canada approaches the next century it faces the specter of fragmentation, which is the enemy of mutual trust in any democracy" (*ib*.:1998:30) In Canada, language planning is intertwined with the continuation of the system of governance, of the federal and constituent states.

[ix] McConnell laments the "general paucity of national and international functional language data (other than in the school domain)" in the macro domain of studies. He is very pessimistic as to funding (1997:353). And I have added to the quest for macro-level data, also the importance of micro-level data. Even in the school domain, there is hardly any micro data – in our field of interest. For example, educational language policy in Hong Kong (where I work) is seriously undermined by the lack of discourse data on speaking behaviors in classrooms in schools and universities. Meanwhile, the policy process rolls on referring to a classification of educational institutions into "English-medium" and "Chinese-medium" which from a sociolinguist's and language planner's point of view is fictitious. The actual discourse situation is much more complex. But where are the studies of discourse?

x And the converse: language examinations for university and career access may inculcate a degree of proficiency but then, once the civil servant passed the exam and is in the career, it also is not reasonable to place the burden on the individual to propagate Irish further in discourse – although (quite logically) he discerned a small effect from urban "social concentration of high ability Irish speakers within the middle classes" centered on schools in "integrating 'novice' or 'reluctant' bilinguals with longer established and, perhaps, more committed groups. This is a crucial element in the whole process of generating and sustaining minority language networks." (Ó Riagáin 1997:277)

xi Similarly, Jan Blommaert, in his survey of the field (1996:216) foregrounds "a particular language planning history […]: the political significance of talk [which] is an index of larger political arrangements of the speech repertoire in a particular society".

II Congrés Europeu sobre Planificació Lingüística
Andorra la Vella, 14, 15 i 16 de novembre de 2001