

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



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



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.

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.

**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 Etats-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 Etats de peuplement composite*, Bernard TOURET (1973).
7. *Computing in Language Text Analysis*, Michael S. MEFHAM (1974).
8. *Confliit entre les Néo-Canadiens et les francophones de Montréal*, Paul CAPON (1974).
9. *Les Etats 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 DARBLINET (1976).
13. *Quebec's Language Policies: Background and Response*, compiled and edited by John R. MALLEA (1977).
14. *Lexique analytique du vocabulaire indien moderne au Québec-Labrador*, Louis-Jacques DORAIL (1978).
15. *Minorities' linguistic and 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<sup>e</sup> congrès de l'Association internationale de linguistique appliquée/Proceedings of the 5<sup>th</sup> 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. LAFONCE (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*, secrète 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).
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 textes de langues/Analytical Bibliography of Language Texts*, Jean-Guy SAVARD (1977, 2<sup>e</sup> édition revue et augmentée).
2. *Language Contact and Language Planning in China (1960-1967). A Selected Bibliography*, Rosaline KWAN-WAI CHIU (1970).
3. *Bibliographie internationale sur le bilinguisme/International Bibliography on bilingualism*, William MACKY, dir. (1982, 2<sup>e</sup> 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 Alberthina 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

Lorne LAFORGE

A-21

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

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 Etats-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 Etats de peuplement composite*, Bernard TOURET (1973).
7. *Computational in Language Text Analysis*, Michael S. MEFHAM (1974).
8. *Conflict entre les Néo-Canadiens et les francophones de Montréal*, Paul CAPON (1974).
9. *Les Etats 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.
12. *Le français en contact avec l'anglais en Amérique du Nord*, Jean DARBLÉ (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 DORAI (1978).
15. *Minorities linguistiques et Interventions*, *Linguistic Minorities and Intervention*, textes présentés par l'Université Laval du 15 au 17 avril 1977 (1978).
16. *Actes du 5<sup>e</sup> congrès de l'Association internationale de linguistique appliquée/Proceedings of the 5<sup>th</sup> Congress of the International Association of Applied Linguistics*, 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. LAFONCE (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, secteur 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'Amérique/Oréania* (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 textes de langues/Analytical Bibliography of Language Texts*, Jean-Guy SAVARD (1977, 2<sup>e</sup> édition revue et augmentée).
2. *Language Contact and Language Planning in China (1960-1967)*. A Selected Bibliography, Rosaline Kwan-wai CHIU (1970).
3. *Bibliographie internationale sur le bilinguisme/International Bibliography on bilingualism*, William MACKEY, dir. (1982, 2<sup>e</sup> 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).

A-21

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

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

Lorne LAFORGE  
présentation/presentation

LES PRESSES DE L'UNIVERSITÉ LAVAL  
Québec, 1987

A-21

*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 /  
COMMISSARIOAT AUX LANGUES OFFICIELLES**

### **CHAIRMAN / PRÉSIDENT**

Stuart Beatty

Stella Ohan

**DEPARTMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE /  
SÉCRÉTARIAT 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

© Les Presses de l'Université Laval 1987  
*Tous droits réservés. Imprimé au Canada*  
Dépot légal (Québec et Ottawa), 2<sup>e</sup> trimestre 1987  
ISBN 2-7637-7129-7

## STAFF / PERSONNEL

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

Stephen Acker

Maryse Bradbury

Jocelyne Potvin

Charles Hollands

Sarah Hood

Adèle Lacroix

### SECRETARY OF STATE / SECRÉTARIAT D'ÉTAT

Madeleine Parisien

## CONFÉRENCIER(E)S

### SPEAKERS

SÉJOUR	NOM	PRÉNOM	INSTITUTION	ADRESSE	CITÉ	PAYS
CONFÉRENCE	Abou	Sélim	Balibar	Renée	Balibar	FRANCE
CONFÉRENCE	Doyen					
CONFÉRENCE	Faculté des lettres et des sciences humaines					
CONFÉRENCE	Université St-Joseph Beyrouth	(LIBAN)				
CONFÉRENCE	Acker	Stephen				
CONFÉRENCE	Bradbury	Maryse				
CONFÉRENCE	Gattuso	Emmanuelle				
CONFÉRENCE	Hollands	Charles				
CONFÉRENCE	Hood	Sarah				
CONFÉRENCE	Potvin	Jocelyne				
CONFÉRENCE	Lacroix	Adèle				
CONFÉRENCE	Parisien	Madeleine				
CONFÉRENCE	Bot Ba Njock	Henri Marcel				
CONFÉRENCE	Bugarski	Ranko				
CONFÉRENCE	Bugarski	Ranko				
CONFÉRENCE	Department of Philology					
CONFÉRENCE	University of Belgrade					
CONFÉRENCE	Belgrade (YUGOSLAVIE)					
CONFÉRENCE	Beardsmore	Hugo Baetens				
CONFÉRENCE	Professor					
CONFÉRENCE	Faculty of Letters and Philosophy					
CONFÉRENCE	Vrije Universiteit Brussel					
CONFÉRENCE	Bruxelles (BELGIQUE)					
CONFÉRENCE	Bermananjara	Zefaniasy				
CONFÉRENCE	Professor adjoint					
CONFÉRENCE	Université de Madagascar					
CONFÉRENCE	Directeur					
CONFÉRENCE	Institut de linguistique appliquée					
CONFÉRENCE	Antananarivo (MADAGASCAR)					
CONFÉRENCE	Bermananjara	Zefaniasy				
CONFÉRENCE	Assistant Professor					
CONFÉRENCE	University of Madagascar					
CONFÉRENCE	Director					
CONFÉRENCE	Institute of Applied Linguistics					
CONFÉRENCE	Antananarivo, MADAGASCAR					
CONFÉRENCE	Bot Ba Njock	Henri Marcel				
CONFÉRENCE	Directeur de recherche					
CONFÉRENCE	Centre de recherches et d'études anthropologiques					
CONFÉRENCE	Yaoundé (CAMEROUN)					
CONFÉRENCE	Bugarski	Ranko				
CONFÉRENCE	Faculté de Philologie					
CONFÉRENCE	Université de Belgrade					
CONFÉRENCE	Belgrade (YUGOSLAVIE)					
CONFÉRENCE	Bugarski	Ranko				
CONFÉRENCE	Department of Philology					
CONFÉRENCE	University of Belgrade					
CONFÉRENCE	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 Ferkauf 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)
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 Agrégé 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, TANZANIA	Victor A. Kravchenko Président Conseil de philologie anglaise Institut pédagogique Ivano-Frankovsk Pedagogical Institute 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 (URSS)
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, Québec, 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 Ferkauf 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

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

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

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

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

Peter Strevens  
Directeur général  
Bell Educational Trust  
Cambridge (ANGLETERRE)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### PRÉSIDENTS DE SÉANCE

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

#### CHAIRMEN OF SESSIONS

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

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

Jean Laponce  
Département de Political Science  
University of British Columbia  
Vancouver, British Columbia  
CANADA

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

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

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

Jean Martucci  
President  
Conseil de la langue française  
Montréal, Québec, 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**

<b>Préface / Preface</b>	xix
Lorne Laforge .....	xix
<b>Introduction aux délibérations du colloque international sur l'aménagement linguistique (Ottawa)</b>	
Stuart Beatty .....	1
<b>Introduction to the Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Language Planning (Ottawa)</b>	
Stuart Beatty .....	3
<b>1. Considérations théoriques / Theoretical Considerations</b>	
Éléments pour une théorie générale de l'aménagement linguistique	
Selim Abou .....	5
<b>Commentaires / Comments</b>	
Commentaire de la communication de Sélim Abou	
Jean-Claude Corbeil .....	17
Comments on Selim Abou's Paper	
Einar Haugen .....	25
<b>2. Typologie des stratégies d'aménagement /</b>	
<b>Typology of Language Planning Strategies</b>	
Language Planning and Interests	
Brian Weinstein .....	33

<b>Commentaires / Comments</b>		
Comments on Brian Weinstein's Paper	59	
Hans R. Dua	.....	237
<b>Language Planning: For Whom?</b>	69	
Björn H. Jernudd and Jíří V. Neustupný	.....	
<b>3. Quelques études de cas d'aménagement linguistique / Case Studies in Language Planning</b>		
L'aménagement linguistique en France	85	
Renée Balibar	.....	
Language Planning in Indonesia	95	
Amran Halim	.....	
Language Planning in Belgium	103	
Hugo Baetens Beardsmore	.....	
An Outline of Language Planning in China	115	
Hong-kai Sun	.....	
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	
<b>4. Secteurs d'intervention / Areas of Intervention</b>		
<b>A - La législation et les services gouvernementaux / Legislation and Governmental Services</b>		
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
<b>5. La place de l'anglais dans la communauté linguistique / The Place of English in the Community of Languages</b>		
'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	357
Winston Wells . . . . .	
Le statut des langues et les stratégies linguistiques dans les services de traduction des communautés européennes	365
Roger Goffin . . . . .	
La traduction et les services de conférence à l'Organisation des Nations-Unies	377
Françoise Cestac . . . . .	

## PRÉFACE

La séance du suivie	395
Stuart Beatty . . . . .	
Follow-up Session	401
Stuart Beatty . . . . .	

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

La séance du suivie	395
Stuart Beatty . . . . .	
Follow-up Session	401
Stuart Beatty . . . . .	
8. Synthèse / Synthesis	
Conference Comments: Reflections on the Current State of Language Planning	
Joshua A. Fishman . . . . .	405

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-dessus, ont réussi le coup 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 enchaînée 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 qui constitue la publication des Actes de ce colloque. En acceptant d'édition 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

## LANGUAGE PLANNING AND INTERESTS

Brian Weinstein

### Résumé

En recourant à de nombreux exemples, l'auteur tente de démontrer la place prépondérante qu'occupent souvent les intérêts idéologiques, politiques, sociaux ou économiques lors de la formulation et de l'implantation de l'aménagement linguistique. Un clan, une élite, un groupe ethnique, peut se servir de cet aménagement pour atteindre ou conserver le pouvoir, la richesse ou le prestige. C'est pourquoi on devrait toujours se préoccuper d'identifier les véritables intentions qui président à l'aménagement linguistique, et prêter une oreille attentive aux échos qui parviennent de la population que l'on entend servir par cet aménagement.

### Abstract

The author shows the major role played by ideological, political, social, and economic interests in the elaboration and implementation of language planning. Feels that any group (clan, elite, ethnic group) could use language planning as a means to retain or gain power; illustrates with examples. Sees the need to identify the real intentions motivating language planning and to pay attention to feedback from the target population.

## LANGUAGE PLANNING AND INTERESTS

The purpose of much of what we now call language planning is not the resolution of communication problems in a linguistic sense; it is, rather, a means to pursue an ideological, political, social or economic interest. Resolution of well defined non-political communication problems through discreet linguistic choices, called « cultivation » by J.V. Neustupny or « elaboration » by E. Haugen, is certainly an important aspect of language planning, and it always will be. But, it is often overwhelmed by conscious efforts to change or to protect the identity of a society or a culture and to alter or to defend patterns of access to power, wealth and prestige by means of grand linguistic choices made by important institutions capable of implementation over a significant area or among a significant population. Most of these institutions enjoy the implicit or explicit sanction of the state. A paradigm or a typology of language planning seen exclusively in terms of linguistic means and linguistic goals to solve communication problems is valid intellectually and useful practically, but it should not ignore the non-linguistic ideological, political, social or economic finality of language choices and patterns of implementation, particularly when that finality is the true intention of the planners.

Eminent scholars have already presented the strictly linguistic typologies to the world of intellectuals and practitioners. Einar Haugen and Heinz Kloss have taught us all; Joshua A. Fishman has articulated a field of study, the sociology of language, of which language planning is an important part. J.A. Fishman, Joan Rubin, Bjorn H. Jermudd and J.V. Neustupny have also been my own teachers in a literal sense since the Linguistic Institute of 1977. J. Das Gupta, Y.U. Desheriev, Pierre E. Laporte, Richard Bourhis, Robert Cooper, L. Khubchandani, D.P. Pattanayak, E. Annamali, Amran Halim, H.R. Dua, H. Baetens-Beardsmore and many others have published their analyses of important cases and their theories which have enriched the field.

None of these scholars needs a lesson from me about the non-linguistic purposes of language planning. In his magisterial book, *Language Conflict and Language Planning: The Case of Modern Norwegian*, Einar Haugen

concluded that national and class identity motivated the Norwegian language movement which culminated in language planning. Joshua Fishman in his « Language Modernization and Planning in Comparison with other Types of National Modernization and Planning » wrote that

all planning is value-encumbered, not only insofar as the reactions of target populations are concerned, but, equally so at much earlier stages in the total planning process (in the decision as to what should be planned, what priority it should receive...).<sup>1</sup>.

My purpose is, therefore, not to claim a discovery unknown or ignored by my elders and teachers; it is, rather, to underscore, emphasize and insist that the pursuit of an idea for its own sake, the quest for power, wealth and prestige or respect are the main purposes of almost all of what H. Kloss called status planning or what E. Haugen and J.V. Neustupny call norm selection as well as much of what Kloss called corpus planning, not an incidental cause or result. In this sense, the choice of language status and form, implementation and evaluation are instruments or what one might call intervening variables in the process of reaching a non-linguistic end which is the satisfaction of the non-linguistic interest of a class, an elite, a region, and ethnic or racial community, or a gender.

The organized pursuit of what we value, what we believe would be good for us as individuals and as members of communities is rational, human behavior most of the time. We refuse to leave our destiny to fate, the forces of nature or to the ebb and flow of the market place. We insist that the government and bureaucracy help us by initiating a program, or we support policies they have already begun. Pressure to change and support are « inputs » in political science jargon; they are fed or pushed into the system in hopes of changing or strengthening a policy, an « output ». Planning as one means to satisfy interest is a very conscious intervention into the communication market place in order to speed up, slow down or change patterns of language use and form, particularly in public domains. Language planning may contribute in its own way to the solution of the seemingly most intractable social and political problems in the world today even when there is no obvious communication issue. K.P. Prinsloo recently suggested that the officialization and modernization of African languages might contribute in a small but significant way to peaceful change in the Republic of South Africa, for example<sup>2</sup>.

What is « organized pursuit of interest? » Idiosyncratic interest rarely influences policy except when the individual concerned has a very important position. Interest must be shared by significant groups of people who have combined their efforts in a sustained and structured way to make their

views known to policy makers. There is no limit to the characteristics of the group or to the focus or concern. Language may serve as symbol, and language decisions may be the instrument they use to bring about changes. The interests of groups fall into at least four general categories, to wit, ideological, political, economic and social. An ideological interest, less obvious than the other forms, is an absolute principle the pursuit of which gives a group the satisfaction they are pursuing the truth for its own sake or for some other metaphysical purpose which does not bring an immediate material benefit. Religious intolerance as well as religious freedom are examples. Ideology may also be a justification or an explanation for tangible political, economic or social interest, and some colleagues might insist that ideology can never be separated from tangible interest. I believe the distinction is useful in understanding the role of a planner who proposes and implements a plan for a group to which he or she does not belong. Such a person has nothing to gain except a sense of personal fulfillment and possibly the conviction that he or she is doing God's work. The same person probably has nothing to lose if the ideology is responsible for harmful results.

By political interest I mean access to power in terms of the ability to exercise power over others or to help determine how others exercise power in matters of concerns to the groups to which people perceive they belong. Economic interest is access to wealth in terms of the ability to share in the goods and services of the society through individual effort, investment, and inheritance. By social interest I mean access to prestige and respect in terms of the possibility of sharing in the valued symbols of the society. What are the highly regarded identities in the society, and how close are the individual's characteristics and his or her group's characteristics to those highly regarded identities. Can the individual acquire those characteristics by making a reasonable effort?

Are any decisions made by political authorities which do not satisfy one of these interests? Is there any objective which is not the response to interest? Most decisions and objectives are the result of expression of interest. Even mass literacy programs can be seen as a policy designed to satisfy a democratic ideology, to promote political cohesion and increase economic productivity. V.I. Lenin saw literacy as a way to achieve mass political consciousness and as a way to increase productivity in a new post-revolutionary Soviet society. According to Glyn Lewis

For the Soviet regime... language planning is important « because it is part and parcel of the work of the Communist Party » (*Oktiabr Gazzeta*, 1968). Language planning leads to literacy and so opens the way to an understanding of Marxism. Lenin maintained « an illiterate person is outside politics and he has to be taught his ABC. Without this there can be no politics » (Lenin 1918).<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Joshua A. Fishman, « Language Modernization and Planning in Comparison with other Types of National Modernization and Planning », in Joshua A. Fishman (ed.), *Advances in Language Planning*, (The Hague: Mouton, 1974), p. 95.

<sup>2</sup> K.P. Prinsloo, « A Proposed Agenda for Language Planning in South Africa », in SA Journal of Linguistics : *Language Planning in South Africa*, Occasional Papers, No 2, July 1985, pp. 24-31.

<sup>3</sup> Glyn Lewis, « Implementation of Language Planning in the Soviet Union », in Juan Cobarrubias and Joshua A. Fishman (eds.), *Progress in Language Planning : International Perspectives*, (The Hague: Mouton, 1983), pp. 312-313.

It is the elites who articulate these interests in terms understandable to the masses in order to win mass support for policies. Since the masses do not dumbly accept everything elites claim, the interest must be felt by them, and the explanation must be credible. One of the tasks of articulation is to find symbols and to choose programs which will make abstract the tangible interest, provide an agenda for action, and define a successful tangible outcome. These elites may be independent individuals or they may work in government or non-governmental institutions. I have called the creative writer and linguist who innovates in language form in order to further a political cause a «language strategist»<sup>4</sup>. By themselves individuals can accomplish little. J. Das Gupta has shown that language associations in India

were active in the controversies pertaining to the formulation of federal and state language policies. Their more recent participation in the language scene has been focused primarily on implementing language policies although they have continued to play a broader political role as well.<sup>5</sup>

Individuals and these groups wish to win government approval and action (output) in order to be successful, but often they can use the mass media and popular writers and singers to introduce their innovations into discourse without explicit government action.

Some groups or non-governmental institutions may be so important that they do not need government action. Their own membership is so large and their tasks so specific that they can consider incoming messages, decide to make a language choice and implement their decisions in the domains under their control. This is true of religious institutions such as the Roman Catholic church whose hierarchy in the United States of America has decided to provide a large place for Spanish in the mass and in schools. In 1983 the National Conference of Catholic Bishops recognized the need to promote Spanish within their church :

Respect for culture is rooted in the dignity of people made in God's image. The Church shows its esteem for this dignity by working to ensure that pluralism, not assimilation and uniformity, is the guiding principle in the life of communities in both the ecclesiastical and secular societies.

They announced that Spanish would be used in the mass and recommended that parish priests working with Spanish speaking parishioners learn Spanish. Catholic schools must include bilingual «opportunities» although children must be trained to enter the English-speaking mainstream, the bishops said.<sup>6</sup>

Perhaps this is an example of what J.A. Fishman calls micro language planning affecting behavior in a single institution, as compared with macro language planning conducted for the whole state.<sup>7</sup> Like macro planning, the micro form is a response to interest.

#### Interest and Language Planning : The Language of Education

The pursuit of ideology for its own sake seems to be one important motivation of language planning with respect to the issue of medium of education, mother tongue, national tongue, or language of wider communication. It is not difficult, however, to see how some other interests are served. For example, the assertion that education through the medium of the mother tongue is absolutely superior to education through any other language in the name of authenticity is one basis for the demands for bilingual education which has then been used to demand the teaching of different cultures in the schools as a way to cultural pluralism for the whole society. A final goal of cultural pluralism can be to serve the political goals of local elites through institutional change such as federalism, confederalism, alteration of administrative frontiers such as states reorganization in India or, in a few cases, even secession. The assertion that education through the medium of a widely used language such as English or French is absolutely superior in the name of scientific progress is one basis for demands that an educational system follow an external model which ignores local needs and differences. This policy may favor certain classes with easy access to the language. A final goal can be suppression of local differences and external alliances which limit a country's freedom. The assertion that education through the medium of one national language such as Spanish in the name of unity is one basis for demands that localized differences be suppressed as disloyal or abnormal. This policy may also favor certain ethnic and regional groups who will enjoy easier access to power, wealth and prestige than others.

The never-ending debate about the alleged advantages or alleged disadvantages of mother tongue education is both a reflection of a clash of interests and inconclusive test results. Perhaps one problem is the definition of mother tongue which D.P. Pattanayak has discussed. He concludes, however, that education through the mother tongue «brings the child into a harmonious relationship with his environment and maximizes the opportunities offered by the early learning experience». It also, he says, «establishes group identity... and avoids fanaticism».<sup>8</sup> In his writings J.A. Fishman consistently associates the maintenance of mother tongues in the United States of America with a healthy pluralism. Frank S. Anshen

<sup>4</sup> Brian Weinstein, *The Civic Tongue : Political Consequences of Language Choices*, (New York: Longman, 1983), pp. 62-78.

<sup>5</sup> Jyotirindra Das Gupta, «Language Associations in India», in Joan Rubin, Björn H. Jernudd et al (eds.), *Language Planning Processes*, (The Hague: Mouton, 1977), pp. 181-182.

<sup>6</sup> National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *The Hispanic Presence : Challenge and Commitment*, (A Pastoral Letter on Hispanic Ministry, 12 December 1983), (Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1984), pp. 5, 14, 15, 18.

<sup>7</sup> Joshua A. Fishman, «Language Modernization and Planning in Comparison with Other Types of National Modernization and Planning», in Chris Kennedy (ed.), *Language Planning and Language Education*, (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1984), p. 41.

<sup>8</sup> D.P. Pattanayak, *Multilingualism and Mother-Tongue Education*, (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1981), p. 65.

assumes that children know their mother tongue better than any other language and that, therefore, they « will learn better » in it<sup>9</sup>.

On the other side the Indian scholar H.R. Dua, has written that no definite conclusion can be drawn in favour of vernaculars, national languages or world languages as media of instruction. The conflicting evidence of experimental studies for comparing the effectiveness of mother tongue or world languages emphasizes the fact that the choice of any alternative in language education policy may not be simply decided on the basis of research findings<sup>10</sup>.

Ralph Fasold adds that despite « numerous studies », the consensus is « that nobody knows whether using the mother tongue as the medium of instruction is better than using a second language or not »<sup>11</sup>. C.B. Paulston asserts there is no evidence a child will be a better student in a second language if he or she has first become literate in the mother tongue thus contradicting a number of educators who have proposed mother tongue education for small language communities as a type of bridge to other more widely used languages<sup>12</sup>.

Thirty years ago the authors of a famous Unesco publication had no doubts about the superiority of mother tongue education. *The Use of Vernacular Language in Education*, published in 1953, is an excellent example of language ideology. The report itself and its introduction have become a deus ex machina, quoted without question by many educators as Holy Writ in the debate over media of instruction. At the core of the book is the 31-page report, the result of a meeting of language specialists at Unesco headquarters in Paris in 1951. To that document were added an introduction, a survey of « vernacular languages », some case studies done by members of the group of specialists and a classification of the world's languages<sup>13</sup>.

The authors who claimed they discovered certain absolute truths promoted an ideology for its own sake as well as important political interests. One of their most famous statements was the following :

It is axiomatic that the best medium for teaching a child is his mother tongue. Psychologically, it is the system of meaningful signs that in his mind works automatically for expression and understanding. Sociologically, it is a means of identification among the members of the world's languages<sup>14</sup>.

<sup>9</sup> Frank S. Anshen, review of Ralph Fasold, *The Sociolinguistics of Society*, in *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 57, 1986, p. 111.  
<sup>10</sup> Hans R. Dua, *Language Planning in India*, (New Delhi: Hamam, 1985), p. 187.  
<sup>11</sup> Ralph Fasold, *The Sociolinguistics of Society*, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1984), pp. 298-299.

<sup>12</sup> Christina Bratt Paulston, « Linguistic Consequences of Ethnicity and Nationalism in Multilingual Settings », Unpublished paper prepared for the Conference on the Educational Policies and the Minority Social Groups Experts' Meeting organized by CERI/OECD at OECD Headquarters, Paris, 16-18 January 1985, pp. 6-7.  
<sup>13</sup> For an important review see William E. Bull, « The Use of Vernacular Languages in Education », in *International Journal of American Linguistics*, 1955, 21, pp. 228-294.  
<sup>14</sup> *The Use of Vernacular Language in Education*, (Paris: Unesco, 1953), p. 11.

community to which he belongs. Educationally, he learns more quickly through it than through an unfamiliar linguistic medium<sup>14</sup>.

The particular mother tongues the authors wished to promote were what they called « vernaculars », a term which they politicized immediately : « A language which is the mother tongue of a group which is socially or politically dominated by another group speaking a different language »<sup>15</sup>. By identifying vernacular mother tongues with the principle or concept of « domination » they provided a link between language policy and political struggle. The absolute good is freedom which would be promoted, it is implied, by study through the mother tongue. The authors made other appeals to universal principles with respect to child development. Who could not oppose policies which make children suffer ?

Ideas which have been formulated in one language are so difficult to express through the modes of another, that a person habitually faced with this task can readily lose his facility to express himself. A child, faced with this task at an age when his powers of self-expression even in his mother tongue are but incompletely developed, may possibly never achieve self-expression<sup>16</sup>.

Another set of assertions was introduced to appeal to the sense of justice of the reader :

the shock which the young child undergoes in passing from his home to his school life is so great that everything possible should be done to soften it<sup>17</sup>.  
 the use of the mother tongue will promote better understanding between the home and the school when the child is taught in the language of the home<sup>18</sup>.  
 if they try to begin to learn in a foreign language most of them will never become truly literate<sup>19</sup>.

The reader should think of the child faced with the shock of school, the problem of self-expression and the dangers of alienation from the family. No more proof is offered for these statements than for the definition of vernacular as « dominated ». These were all essentially ideological positions designed to quell discussion in the name of universal truth, freedom and justice. In the context of the early 1950s intellectuals were naturally and correctly sensitive to the freedom movements of Asia and Africa, and it seems this concern was reflected in the Unesco study.

In other parts of the book the authors showed an implied bias against European languages. In the « Survey of Vernacular Languages » the authors imply that American Indian languages (which by definition are domi-

nated) should be made official : « None of the native languages has yet attained the status of an official language »<sup>20</sup>. Apparently, they did not consider English, Spanish or Portuguese native to the Americas. In Appendix I, « Tentative Classification of the Language Spoken in the World Today », only the Indian languages are listed for the Americas. English, Spanish, Portuguese did not appear despite the fact they are spoken by the vast majority of people. In Europe the « real vernaculars » are Breton in France and Basque in Spain and France<sup>21</sup>. Although the authors recognized that there would be political limitations on the use of the mother tongue, necessitating the use of other languages in education, the tone of the document and assertions were enough to turn the discussion into an ideology used later by others.

Some contradictions in the book emerged in the case studies. Sutan Takdir Alisjahbana, a distinguished Indonesian scholar, prepared a case study on his country. After a passing reference to the mother tongues of his country he described the development of the national language and Lingua franca, Bahasa Indonesia, a cornerstone of the nationalist movement there : « the Indonesian people must learn as quickly as possible to think and to express themselves fluently in their national tongue... »<sup>22</sup>. In other words, all vernaculars are equal, but some are more equal than others. Sutan Takdir Alisjahbana in the years following publication of the Unesco report wrote extensively about Bahasa Indonesia, reflecting his own interests, which is quite natural.

The authors of the Unesco report had and have interests just as do those who have disagreed with them. These interests are not communication or linguistic; they are ideological and political. Most of the 13 members of the specialist group were already involved in the study of non-European languages or were in administrative positions which involved supervising the schools using mother tongues other than European languages. Chairman Berg was Professor of Austronesian Languages at Leyden; Dr. P.A.W. Cook worked in the Department of Education of the then Union of South Africa which had introduced African languages into primary schools as media of instruction. Morris Swadesh was interested in Indian languages of the Americas. A.E. Meeuissen served in the Belgian Ministry of Colonies which introduced African languages into Zaire's schools; he also was a student of Zaire's languages. The most influential member of the board, all of whom were and are extremely talented scholars and administrators, was Dr. Kenneth Pike.

There has never been any doubt about the position of Dr. Pike on the issue of mother tongue education because he has honestly and clearly stated his thoughts in hundreds of important publications. His own life

experiences are a matter of public record, and they show an unwavering support for mother tongue use. Born into a Protestant missionary family he wished to spread the message of Christianity, but thwarted in his plan to serve Protestant mission overseas he joined Bible translating projects designed to help missionary work. He began what became a distinguished university and scholarly career also serving as a director of Summer Institute of Linguistics courses and later as president of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, one of whose purposes is translation of the Bible into all languages<sup>23</sup>. In his own words, « The Word of God needs to be translated for the little tribes all around the world. I believe it is especially appropriate that scholars be involved in Bible translation »<sup>24</sup>. « Christ prayed to the Father, 'I have given them Thy Word... So send I them — to give the Word, ... so I am a Bible Translator »<sup>25</sup>. And, « These words of Christian witness need to be in the Vernacular »<sup>26</sup>. Dr. Pike has held such ideas honestly, sincerely and consistently, and they are certainly important to his belief in mother tongue education. Thus, it is not surprising that he should have been a forceful voice for mother tongue education in the 1953 Unesco report the result of which might be called a secular version of the Protestant missionary language ideology. Unesco has continued to promote mother tongue usage, particularly in Africa, through conferences, projects and publications.

Contemporary manifestations of this ideology are increasingly important in Africa most of whose countries have passively followed colonial inspired ideologies since independence. The Organization for African Unity created a Bureau of Languages for the promotion of African tongues. The African linguists associated with the Bureau recently published a book called the *Linguistic Liberation of Africa* in which they claim that the generalized use of African mother tongues will contribute to freedom and unity in Africa. Thus, the African linguist must be committed to the struggle for the « defence and development of their own language and culture »<sup>27</sup>. They say that Africa must be liberated from these sequels of colonialism, and liberation means officialization of African languages and their use in education. Individual African countries must also be united within their present frontiers, and then the continent must be united. Both goals are within reach, and the use of African languages will help to reach them. The choice of Ewe as the official language of Togo will help unite that country, they believe, and the use of Hausa should help unite all of West Africa. General economic and social development will be promoted by the use of mother tongues as well :

<sup>23</sup> Eunice V. Pike, « Pike — A Biographical Sketch », in Ruth M. Brend (ed.), *Kenneth Pike : Selected Writings*, (The Hague, Mouton, 1972), pp. 321-325.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 307.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 309.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 311.

<sup>27</sup> *Linguistic Liberation and Unity of Africa*, Kampala, Uganda: OAU Inter-African Bureau of Languages, Publication 6, 1985, p. iii.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 23, my emphasis.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 42.

<sup>22</sup> Sutan Takdir Alisjahbana, « Developing a National Language in Indonesia », in *ibid.*, pp. 94-103.

By becoming official our languages will be the language of the countryside and of towns, which will reduce the desire of the youth to move to towns the only place where a knowledge of foreign languages is very profitable to the small minority who cannot all find the coveted work there.<sup>28</sup>

In Great Britain the National Council for Mother Tongue Teaching, whose purposes are also very honestly stated, recently criticized the Swann Report, the result of an official Committee in Inquiry set up in 1979 to study minority group educational needs. The Council was displeased with the findings of Swann which insisted that all students should study mainly through the English language which, in the Swann view, will contribute to unity. The Council criticized Swann for insisting that « linguistic needs meant needs in English ». Aside from Welsh, Swann was opposed to using non-English mother tongues in education.

One of the purposes of the National Council is to promote what they call a pluralistic Great Britain, and they believe that the state itself must help minorities maintain and develop their distinctive cultures. In their view, pluralism is not possible without the official promotion of mother tongue education by the state : « Only those securely equipped with their own language and culture can embark on the educational journey towards 'democratic pluralism'. »<sup>29</sup> Why should the state promote pluralism ? Swann said that rooms in schools could be available after school hours to groups teaching various languages with their own resources; Swann agreed that all students should learn to appreciate all non-Anglo Saxon cultures, but it does not wish to make any basic changes in British society or institutions. The Council believes in basic change, and public institutions must support it. Like many other promoters of mother tongue ideologies, they are statist who believe the central government must take responsibility for promoting diversity even when market forces seem to promote conformity and assimilation.

Supporters of national unity also articulate ideologies to support their promotion of only one national and official language. Their interest is primarily political. For example, Marx and Lenin believed « that assimilation is both progressive and ultimately inevitable ». In the Soviet Union Lenin believed that use of Russian « as the common medium of communication would have 'progressive significance', particularly 'if there were no compulsion to use it' ». For Stalin the victory of socialism would lead in its first stage to the use of national languages or mother tongues, then zonal languages and eventually « one common international language »

(Russian probably) for the whole Soviet Union.<sup>30</sup> It is not unfair to say that the ultimate goal of planners in the Soviet Union is universal Russian literacy as a way to keep the country united and fully conscious of Marxist-Leninist goals, but in the short run they also promote non-Russian languages in education because of a strong desire on the part of the affected populations to keep the languages<sup>31</sup>. Despite a vigorous effort to help non-Hindi languages in India, it is clear that planners in the central government wish for one official language for the whole country.

In the United States of America English has also been promoted in the name of political unity. Behind the ideology of unity are important political, economic and social interests. The United States opened its doors to tens of millions of immigrants from the 1880s to the 1920s, and the latter arrived with a variety of languages and political ideas considered by some to be a threat to the unity and power of the United States. The radicalism, of some immigrants speaking German, Italian, Russian or Yiddish was opposed as were the languages used to express it. Pressures to conform culturally strengthened pressures to conform to the political norms of the times. In 1986 fears about new waves of immigrants, particularly from Spanish speaking countries along side claims of bilingual education advocates that the USA must become a vaguely defined pluralistic society have led to the creation of a new organization which proposes making English the sole official language by an amendment to the constitution.

In the view of one journalist who approves the actions of this organization called « U.S. English » :  
the United States is receiving the largest wave of immigration in its history. This influx strains our facilities for assimilation and provides fertile ground for those who would like to turn language minorities into permanent power blocs.<sup>32</sup>

« U.S. English » asserts that America is « heading toward a crisis » because of bilingualism which puts « foreign languages in competition with our own ». The unifying force of English is threatened, in this view, and former Senator S.I. Hayakawa says he has « launched a national public interest organization to establish English as our official language ». If successful, efforts to promote other languages would be easily labelled unpatriotic and even illegal. English speaking people living among large groups of Spanish speakers in Florida, Texas and the Southwest would once again claim they carry the banner of identity.

<sup>28</sup> Kahombo Mateene, « Reconsideration of the Official Status of Colonial Languages in Africa », in *Linguistic Liberation...*, p. 26.

<sup>29</sup> National Council for Mother Tongue Teaching, « The Swann Report: Education for All ? », in *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, Vol. 6, No 6, 1985, pp. 497-508.

<sup>30</sup> Walker Connor, *The National Question in Marxist-Leninist Theory and Strategy*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), pp. 255-256, 259.

<sup>31</sup> Jonathan Pool, « Soviet Language Planning : Goals, Results, Options », in Jeremy R. Azrael (ed.), *Soviet Nationality Policies and Practices*, (New York: Praeger, 1978), pp. 223-249.

<sup>32</sup> Guy Wright, « U.S. English », in the *S.F. Sunday Examiner and Chronicle*, undated, distributed by U.S. English.

<sup>33</sup> Form letter from S.I. Hayakawa, Ph.D., Honorary Chairman of U.S. English, 1985 ?

Interests are pursued at the international level in over 30 countries where French is either official or an important language. Teachers, linguists, politicians, writers and others have begun and sustained the francophone movement. The supporters work on the corpus of French to maintain a standard purified of English words and words and syntax from local mother tongues in places like Africa, for example. They work to maintain French as an official language and language of education in their respective countries. In short, they engage in both corpus and status planning to reach a non-linguistic goal of political interdependence, economic cooperation and renewed pride in French.

The political, economic and social interests of the francophones vary with the country concerned. For France, maintenance of French adds to French power in the world arena because it can claim to speak for the world's French-speakers; it facilitates trade; and it contributes to French sense of self worth, identity and grandeur. The minorities who speak French in Africa, Haiti, Belgium, Canada and Louisiana fear isolation and assimilation into other language groups. The emergence of divergent varieties of French could create that isolation as could de-officialization of French. It is in the interest of these groups to support policies which maintain the status of French as the official language and which maintain standard international French.<sup>34</sup>

To justify efforts to maintain French as official and to purify it leaders have articulated a francophone ideology with the same appeal to universalistic principles as the mother tongue ideology: French belongs to all who use it; they are all equal, and they must protect it. French has special qualities that other languages do not have such as clarity, logic, precision, harmony and humanism. French is the language of a large worldwide communication in 35 countries with 200 or even 300 million souls. French is homogeneous; a standard has thus far been maintained so that it is an effective instrument of international communication, and this standard must be maintained. French is the ideal instrument of scientific progress, particularly in Africa where admittedly mother tongues may be used for initial literacy but they are and will be inadequate for higher education. French is also a means to unify multilingual states of Africa because it belongs to now particular ethnic group. It promotes a healthy multilateralism, mutual help across national frontiers.<sup>35</sup> A February 1986 summit of 42 delegations from 38 countries where French is used strengthened determination to maintain the goals of francophonie.

<sup>34</sup> France's efforts to remove English words are familiar. See Loïc Depêcker and Alain Pagès (eds.), *Guides des mots nouveaux*, (Paris: Nathan for the Commissariat Général de la Langue Française), 1985.

<sup>35</sup> See Brian Weinstein, *The Civic Tongue*, p. 171. And, Brian Weinstein, « Francophonie : Language Planning and National Interests », in Cheri Kramarae, Muriel Schulz and William M. O'Barr (eds), *Language and Power*, (Beverly Hills and London: Sage, 1984), pp. 227-242.

Minorities may refuse the global appeals or calls for national unity. They may even reject the mother tongue argument as they promote a particular change in language but behind the most surprising input is a vision of the future. Even in the absence of official sanction they can still succeed if they have the support of some educational institutions, literary reviews, newspapers and cultural organizations. A recent example is the Albanian minority in Yugoslavia which believes it is being discriminated against. In response to this perception of discrimination and what is called a Serbian effort « to destroy among Albanians in Yugoslavia the sense of common national identity with their compatriots across the border »<sup>36</sup>, Albanians are consciously changing the standard literary language.

Yugoslavian Albanians speak what is called the « Geg » variety of language as do their closest neighbors in northern Albania, but the official and standard language in Albania is a southern variety called « Tosc ». From 1945 to 1968 Yugoslavia intellectuals used the local « Geg » variety as a literary standard, but from the late 1960s to the present they have been making an effort within the university, in book publishing, product labeling, subtitling of foreign films and in newspapers to promote the Albanian « Tosc » standard in order to draw the people closer to Albania and away from Yugoslavia. In 1981 riots against Yugoslavian policies sharpened the differences and opened a gulf between Serbians-speakers and Albanian speakers living in the same area. Serbs now claim they are being harassed. The latest development is a purist movement among Albanians to remove all traces of Serbo-Croatian from their own language.<sup>37</sup>.

#### Interest and Language Planning : Officialization

Another minority in Yugoslavia was able to win official recognition for their language and a separate republic to protect the language and the separate identity of the people, which the Albanians have been unable to accomplish. This group is the Macedonians. The original interest was partly ideological and partly social, a desire to be respected. During the 1930s and 1940s Macedonian students began to differentiate themselves from the more numerous Serbs, who dominated the country, and the neighboring Bulgarians and Greeks all of whom claimed that Macedonian was a dialect of their language, and an inferior one at that.<sup>38</sup> In order to create a literary standard which could serve as an official language, intellectuals and students sought out varieties of language in relatively isolated areas where there was minimal Serbian influence. During World War II Macedonians rallied to Tito's movement partly because he promised them a form of autonomy

<sup>36</sup> Janet Byron, « An overview of language planning achievements among the Albanians of Yugoslavia », in *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 52, 1985, p. 67.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, passim and p. 83.

<sup>38</sup> See Horace G. Lunt, « The Creation of Standard Macedonian : Some Facts and Attitudes », in *Anthropological Linguistics*, Vol. I, No 5, pp. 19-26.

after the war<sup>39</sup>. True to his word, he created the Macedonian Republic within an independent Yugoslavia, and the Macedonian language based on relatively pure varieties was made official. Intellectuals then worked to ensure acceptance of one literary standard by publishing a widely heralded dictionary. In the words of one person who worked on projects to make Macedonian official and to diffuse a standard form, the literary language « offers a constant challenge to those who would like to ignore the fact of the political and cultural emancipation of a small nation ». In other words, a distinctive variety of language, officially recognized, guarantees the existence of a people<sup>40</sup>.

Officialization raises the status of a language and its speakers, giving them a new dignity. It also ensures jobs in the state apparatus and perhaps in private enterprise if the state takes action to insist that the official language be used in that sector; and it ensures speakers they will have easier access to the wielders of power.

Efforts to make Hindi the sole official language of the central government of India and the sole link language between the center and the states, a status planning matter, and the parallel efforts to draw the Hindi language closer in lexicon to its Sanskrit origins, a corpus planning matter are linguistic means to satisfy interests. Language planning in India serves a purely ideological interest insofar as it draws India back to its Hindu traditions. In more tangible fashion it serves to define non-Hindi speakers and non-Hindus as non-Indian. It serves to limit access to jobs in the civil service to northern Hindus and Hindi speakers. Similarly, the choice of Urdu as the official language of Pakistan served the interests of the elite immigrants from Northern India who spoke and wrote Urdu. Because of its writing system and Arabized lexicon, choice of Urdu strengthened the Islamic identity of Pakistan excluding Hindus. The choice offended Muslim Bengali speakers who were justifiably proud of their literary traditions and who saw the choice of Urdu as a way to keep them subordinate, particularly when they realized that the army, the civil service and the economy were already dominated by non-Bengalis. Urdu language planning contributed to the independence of Bangladesh.

In all these cases census data are a favorite instrument of those who call on government to begin or to change language planning. It seems that census questions and the results about language can be used in whatever way is wished. Census data in North Africa either underestimate or ignore the numerous Berber speakers because official policy is that Arabic is the language of the Moroccan and Algerian peoples. Arabic will keep them united, and it is their link with the past, the world of Islam and Arab peoples

everywhere. Countries deny the existence of a Kurdish minority; Greeks count Macedonians as Greek; and under the Czars the Ukrainians were « Russians » — all in the name of some principle but in fact serving some real interest. Thanks to census data, supporters of assimilation in the United States of America found a decline in the use of languages other than English, or they ignored such languages altogether. Thanks to census data generated by a different set of questions in 1970 and 1980 supporters of bilingual education discovered an increase in speakers of languages other than English, even among native born Americans.<sup>41</sup>

In an effort to promote Hindi as the sole official language K.L. Gandhi has calculated census data to show that up to 42% of the population already know this language. Unity is good; Hindi will contribute to unity; therefore, Hindi is good<sup>42</sup>. Gandhi claims there were 208.51 million speakers of Hindi in 1971<sup>43</sup>, but the Central Institute of Indian Languages, using the same census data, claims 162,577,000 Indians spoke Hindi in 1971, a decline of 0.70% from 1961<sup>44</sup>.

A similar process of census manipulation has been at work in Senegal where Wolof speakers claim their language is rapidly spreading throughout the country and that it is already spoken by a majority of the population as a second language, if not as a mother tongue :

Although the Wolof account for only 35 % of the population, their language is spoken and understood by more than 80 % of the population. In Senegal there is a dynamic expansion of Wolof, even to the far south in Casamance. This important linguistic process should facilitate the development of bilingualism<sup>45</sup>.

As far as I can determine, the source of the 80% figure, which is often cited, is a survey whose results were published in 1967 as « L'expansion du wolof au Sénégal », by François Wioland and Maurice Calvet<sup>46</sup>. In 1964 Wioland sent a questionnaire to the government primary schools of Senegal. Teachers filled in the questionnaire for their students, and the responses covered 35,434 youngsters. The authors recognized the possibility of error but not because of the teachers' own identity or because of the desire of students to conform :

To respond to the questionnaire the teacher depended on what the students told him. Like any other language survey, our results include a certain amount of approximation but altogether they correspond to what we have a right to expect given the ethnic map of Senegal<sup>47</sup>.

<sup>41</sup> K.L. Gandhi, *The Problem of Official Language in India*, (New Delhi: Arya, 1984), p. 116.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 148.

<sup>43</sup> CIL, *Distribution of Languages in India, in States and Union Territories*, (Mysore: CIL, 1973), p. 77.

<sup>44</sup> Pierre Dumont, *Le français et les langues africaines au Sénégal*, (Paris: Éditions Karthala, 1983), pp. 25-26.

<sup>45</sup> In *Bulletin de l'I.F.A.N.*, Vol. XXX, Series B, Nos 3-4, pp. 604-618.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 605.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 24.

<sup>48</sup> Blaze Konéki, « The Macedonian Dictionary », in *Review of National Literatures*, Vol. V, No 1, Spring 1974, p. 34. Also, see Victor A. Friedman, « The Sociolinguistics of Literary Macedonian », in *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 52, 1985, pp. 31-57.

What struck the researchers as most significant was the finding that « Among the students claiming that they speak Wolof at home, 68.92% have a Wolof father and mother; 15.76% have one Wolof parent; and 15.32% have no Wolof parent »<sup>47</sup>. This proved to the satisfaction of the researchers that Wolof had become a lingua franca. They even ventured to say that the process was irreversible : Wolof is spreading and is the « only language in Senegal » which children of other ethnic groups will speak. The magic 80% came from data that showed 80% of the non-Wolof families were composed of Paul, Serer and Bambara<sup>48</sup>, which is very different from claiming 80% of the people already know Wolof.

Even if one could accept the validity of the data reported by the teachers about their students, one cannot accept the conclusions. The study was synchronic without reference to any study in the past; nor were students broken down into age or grade which might show a progression of some kind. There is no indication what percentage of all the students in the country the 35,434 represent. Yet, these data have been used for the last twenty years to support Wolof as the predominant national language of Senegal and as the eventual official language, too. During a visit to the Center for Applied Linguistics of Dakar (CLAD) in December 1984 I asked researchers about these data. The Wolof linguists claimed the 80% figure was accurate today; the non-Wolof denied it; and a non-Senegalese linguist said there was no way to know since no survey had been made in the last twenty years.

The interest behind these assertions seems related to the fact the Wolof people, who live exclusively in Senegal and neighboring Gambia, are a very small group compared with the other Senegalese ethnic groups within the large context of West Africa. The Peul, another Senegalese group, number in the tens of millions in all of West Africa. The linguistic assertion serves social interests for it is a way to assert an identity within West Africa, to wit, that Senegal means Wolof. The assertion gives Wolof speakers a long term chance to see their language made official alongside French opening or preserving economic advantage. An unexpected consequence, however, is that the Peul have reacted to these claims by setting up their own privately funded literacy program to promote their language and identity. Perhaps a survey in 1986 would now show an increase in claims of non-Wolof language skills and a denial that the Peul use Wolof.

John de Vries has pointed out the endless manipulation of such data, particularly with respect to language in North America. The reason is partly because there are usually not enough census questions about language to obtain a clear response. Questions about ethnicity are also unclear : the distinction between descent and self-identification is not made, and, as a result, « the German ethnic category [in Canada] appears to follow the

course of international politics rather closely... »<sup>49</sup>. If the question about mother tongue is phrased in such a way that it is determined by what was spoken in the childhood home, which was the case during the 1980 USA census, « respondents are more likely to choose the socially more acceptable alternative », because it is likely that more than one language was spoken<sup>50</sup>. Questions about the « ability to speak designated languages... will overestimate the size of declining language communities... »<sup>51</sup> if there is an effort to preserve identities.

### Elite Behavior

Cultural elites sound the alarm, define the interest or the danger and they propose a program of language planning. Within this group it is usually the communication experts who are most articulate and who have the most to gain or to lose. They are teachers, linguists, journalists, writers, translators, poets, singers and other artisans of language. Individuals need networks and institutional support from the media or a church before government decides to act, but it is surprising in human history how often individual initiative has made the difference. E. Haugen has written :

While official government agencies are often involved, we should not limit the term « planning » to such action... Individuals make their selections, and they may be followed by voluntary groups, whose practice may become normative for a church, a political party, a province, or even a whole country<sup>52</sup>.

Because individuals or small groups of cultural elites have no means to enforce their choices of language, they must work for state action. They become part of the « input » process organizing their supporters allying themselves with other elites and requesting or demanding a policy.

The history of Quebec nationalism is the history of the development of an elite consciousness, elite unification and an effort to build mass support for actions in the cultural, economic and political sectors. The history has been well documented, and there is no need to repeat it except to note that in the early part of this century meetings of intellectuals issued complaints about the quality of French used, particularly the tendency to absorb English words into discourse. In 1960 the book *Les insolences du Frère Untel* electrified a larger population with its lament about the decline of French and Quebec. Five years later the Office de la Langue Française was created in response to a growing demand by some élites to maintain Quebec French close to the international standard. In 1970 the Association

<sup>47</sup> John de Vries, « Some Methodological Aspects of Self-Report Questions on Language and Ethnicity », in *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, Vol. 6, No 5, 1985, p. 352.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., p. 356.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., p. 359.

<sup>50</sup> Einar Haugen, « The Implementation of Corpus Planning : Theory and Practice », in Juan Cobarrubias and J.A. Fishman, p. 271.

québécoise des professeurs de français published *Le livre noir* in which they claimed that the poor quality of French was due to the fact that French was « dominated », and they demanded a « political solution »<sup>53</sup>. In each of the above cases a single individual or a relatively small group articulated a complaint or a demand. Simultaneously social change increased the urban labor force while francophone birthrates declined and immigrants began to swell the anglophone population with the result that political elites and labor leaders saw the advantage of state initiatives some of which would favor the French-speaking population. These, too, were individuals or small groups of individuals who were eventually allied with cultural elites.

The individuals who are most active in either promoting language choices or in implementing language choices often have a very personal reason for being so involved, as the example of Dr. Kenneth Pike shows. Interviews reveal some very human and moving experiences. African linguists tell about a shock they felt when they realized they did not know their mother tongue well enough to communicate with family members, particularly a mother or a grandmother. A Québécois translator was converted to the cause of language planning when he saw a woman cheated by an insurance company because of a faulty translation from English into French. Many of the leaders of francophonie have lived in more than one French-speaking country and sense a need to keep the bonds; many are linguists or French teachers with a professional-job interest in the language; and some were colonial administrators keen to maintain the influence of France overseas. Some intellectual leaders have shared their experiences. Susan M. Ervin-Tripp has written : « As a social psychologist, I was first drawn to work on bilingualism by the dramatic personal experiences of bilingual friends who said they were troubled by a sense of multiple identity, of multiple personality »<sup>54</sup>. Einar Haugen, who lived in both North America and Norway and was bilingual from an early age, wrote that « much of my writing is simply an attempt to clarify and explicate the existential problems I have faced »<sup>55</sup>. Joshua A. Fishman shared his early life experiences with readers : As a child he sensed that he belonged to a minority language group struggling to keep « the Yiddish language alive ». His family also believed in the importance of knowing English in America. Out of this concern to be competent in two languages for both instrumental and symbolic purposes he began to intellectualize what this meant : « Starting from such origins, it is no longer any wonder that 'small languages' everywhere are my particular passion... »<sup>56</sup>. Professor Fishman is justifiably proud that « my *Language Loyalty in the United States* helped bring about the Bilingual Education Act... »<sup>57</sup>.

<sup>53</sup> Jacques Maurais, « La crise du français au Québec », in Jacques Maurais (éd.), *La crise des langues*, (Québec: Conseil de la Langue française, 1985), p. 51.

<sup>54</sup> « Author's Postscript », in Anwar S. Dill (ed.), *Language Acquisition and Communication Choice: Essays by Susan M. Ervin-Tripp* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1973), p. 374.

<sup>55</sup> « Author's Postscript », in Anwar S. Dill (ed.), *The Ecology of Language: Essays by Einar Haugen*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1972), p. 340.

<sup>56</sup> « Author's Postscript », in Anwar S. Dill (ed.), *Language in Sociocultural Change: Essays by Joshua A. Fishman*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1972), p. 357.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 362.  
Referring to the bilingual education goals of elites in the United States of America, Glendon F. Drake has asserted that :

<sup>58</sup> J.V. Neustupny, « Towards a Paradigm for Language Planning », in *Language Planning Newsletter*, Vol. 9, No 4, p. 2.

<sup>59</sup> Carol Myers Scotton, « Language in East Africa : Linguistic Patterns and Political Ideologies », in Joshua A. Fishman (ed.), *Advances in the Study of Societal Multilingualism*, (The Hague: Mouton, 1978), p. 719.

the desire for cultural pluralism is in many cases an ideal of the elite, and not in accord with the desires and ideology of the masses of « ethnics », who have demonstrated over our history a desire for mobility and integration<sup>60</sup>.

John Edwards concurs. He has written with respect to the 1968 act introducing government supported bilingual education programs that « There are grounds for thinking that the legislation was a response to 'spokesmen' and not to a widespread movement »<sup>61</sup>. Such statements are likely to be vigorously contested by proponents of bilingual education. Proponents of language planning elsewhere imply quite clearly that they believe they know what is best for the masses. Israel's planners, who have enjoyed a spectacular success in the revival and modernization of Hebrew, nonetheless complain about how the masses use the language today. Rivka Herzlich and Ora (Rodriguez) Schwarzwald complain about « present-day permissiveness » in language use :

western laxity influences language discipline. The freedom from norms of behavior in personal dress, sexuality and in human relations is reflected in changes in language behavior. Formerly one « dressed » to go to the opera; no more today. It is the same thing for language : from being cultivated, cared for it has become familiar and popular<sup>62</sup>.

French linguists who have embarked on a huge corpus planning project to purify their language of English words and expressions admit that the average person is not so worried as they. They write that they must draw the public's attention to the need for correction and « to awaken thus a dynamic linguistic consciousness »<sup>63</sup>.

The recent debate in Quebec about the success or not of language planning seems to be another example of elite mistrust of the masses in whose name the planning has been launched. In an interesting paper presented at the 7th World Congress of Applied Linguistics in 1984 Michel Amyot explained that despite some successes he is still worried about the future of French in Quebec. One reason is that French speakers do not demand « their rights and insist on French ». When they are spoken to in English in business or in shops, they tend to respond in English rather than to demand that others use French : « il suffirait d'un relâchement chez les principaux agents de la francisation pour remettre immédiatement en cause les acquis de la francisation »<sup>64</sup>. In other words, without the constant direction from the elites the masses will fall back into their bad ways, their

bad choices of language. Amyot calls on the Quebecois to realize their responsibilities to the national language and to act accordingly<sup>65</sup>. What the outside observer finds perplexing is that other scholars in Quebec conclude that French is secure and that the principal goals of language planning have been met. Michel Plourde, President of the Conseil de la langue française, wrote that « a good number of the desired results » have been reached : francization programs have been approved, large businesses accept planning goals, immigrant enrollment in French schools have climbed significantly, and in « downtown Montreal, only 5% of outdoor commercial advertising is still in English only, while approximately 70% of establishments conform to the law by using French only ». A vast majority of English speakers now say that they « believe it is indispensable for an anglophone to know French... »<sup>66</sup>.

The disagreement may have little to do with language planning as such; it may be the result of different individual perceptions of reality or the result of differences in elites' interests. Another sign of differences among elites and between elites and masses is that the achievement of particular interests encourages some leaders of language movements to abandon them. Once the non-Brahmans won power in Tamil Nadu and excluded the Brahmins, their ardour for social change and language planning diminished. One might similarly ask if the enthusiasm of language planning and the promotion of French has declined — as Amyot claims — because middle class French-speaking urban professionals have entered into good positions in a newly Frenchified middle ranks of private industry. « As the socio-economic status of francophones improved in the business world, francophones may have become even more aware of the importance of English in the international business community »<sup>67</sup>. And, as a result, they may not oppose an English education for their children or even speaking English with more frequency to make sure it is acceptable to Anglo-Saxon and other business interlocutors.

Elites play the key role in policy choices and in planning or implementation. Their effectiveness depends in partly on an agreement among the various elites — cultural and political — as well as on an agreement with the attitudes and values of the masses. The absence of a general agreement is probably one reason one finds examples of planning without a prior policy choice and examples of a policy choice which is not implemented. For example, most African states have maintained the colonial language as official although they have chosen African languages as « national », a purely symbolic gesture. African intellectuals, who are often in disagreement

<sup>60</sup> Glendon F. Drake, « Problems of Language Planning in the United States », in John Edwards (ed.), *Linguistic Minorities, Policies and Pluralism*, (London: Academic Press, 1984), p. 146.

<sup>61</sup> John Edwards, « Language, diversity and identity », in John Edwards (ed.), pp. 298-299.

<sup>62</sup> « La crise de la langue en Israël », in Jacques Mauraïs (éd.), pp. 399, 398.

<sup>63</sup> Loïc Depêcker and Alain Pages (eds), p. 10.

<sup>64</sup> Michel Amyot, « La planification linguistique québécoise — Bilan et orientations », Unpublished version of paper given at 7th World Congress of Applied Linguistics, Bruxelles, 7 August 1984, p. 10.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 25.

<sup>66</sup> Michel Plourde, « Language Policy in Quebec : Why and How ? » Unpublished version of a paper given at a conference, « Encounter with America », at CUNY City University of New York, 20 April 1984, pp. 10-11.

<sup>67</sup> Pierre E. Laporte, « Status Language Planning in Quebec : An Evaluation », in Richard Y. Bourhis (éd.), *Conflict and Language Planning in Quebec*, (Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters, 1984), p. 76.

with the government on a wide range of issues, are introducing African languages into school programs, cultural events, and literature. In this regard, Unesco has played a key role of encouragement through conferences to standardize African languages, promote the African lingua franca, and to suggest areas where African languages can be introduced into official domains. This effort, like the 1951 conference, is led by flesh and blood human beings — not a disembodied institution — who have interests<sup>68</sup>.

Shirley Brice Heath has pointed to the fact that English was never officially chosen as the language of public life in the United States of America but that « where there has been no policy, society has created an unwritten ‘policy’ which is the legacy of English history »<sup>69</sup>. This is a sign that some elites did not agree with political elites and promoted it in spite of the resistance to making it official. It has also been true that the masses of Americans saw their interests served by the use of English, and most believe that it is the official language. Another example from the USA is Joan Rubin’s observation that the introduction of foreign languages into American universities’ curricula was policy without a plan : « The language requirement was established without specifying what the skills to be attained were, without considering the student’s need for this skill, and without considering social opportunities to use this skill »<sup>70</sup>. The disagreement here was probably between masses and decision-makers. In Haiti, Creole is being introduced in schools while the policy change is not clear. In Kenya, at least ten institutions plan the expansion of Swahili even though no choice of Swahili has been made by the government<sup>71</sup>.

If elites are promoting language choice and language planning for pure self-benefit, they must be mistrusted. On the other hand, someone must lead; someone must sound the call for action when they perceive that over the long run a society will suffer because of problems which the masses do not yet perceive. Elites’ motives must be examined in light of a sensitivity to the issue of interest. In other words, their interest may not be the interests of the whole community. In that case, their call for language planning should be rejected.

#### Implications

Taking into account « interest » means adding socio-political « input » to a language planning paradigm. Input is pressure on decision makers or

support given to decision makers from groups organized on the basis of perceived class, ethnic, racial, linguistic, gender, regional, or professional interest with the purpose of encouraging a certain action by decision makers to satisfy that interest. The output or choice and implementation of that choice affects the legitimacy of rulers and institutions, the symbols which distinguish and identify the political system, patterns of participation or access to power, patterns of distribution of goods and services or access to wealth, and the ability of the state to penetrate its society for purposes of control, extraction of resources, and problem solving.

Taking into account these goals means adding « input » to the typologies of language planning. Einar Haugen’s typology has four parts : planners select a code; they standardize the corpus of that code; they and others implement the choices by adopting and diffusing it in the public domain, and a process of elaboration continues so that the new norm meets « the functions of a modern world » in all domains of the society<sup>72</sup>. Moshe Nahir writes that Haugen has focused on the process of language planning as has Neustupny ; he, therefore, offers language planning goals to complete the typology. His goals are language purification, language revival, language reform, language standardization, language spread, lexical modernization, terminology unification, stylistic simplification, interlingual communication, language maintenance, and auxiliary code standardization<sup>73</sup>. Nahir says that his « classification deals with what language planners attempt to achieve », while Haugen’s model deals with the question of how they go about achieving it<sup>74</sup>.

Is purification a goal in any final sense ? It is not. Certainly there are linguistic reasons for purification efforts, and they are one element in francophonie, but the non-linguistic goals are so overwhelming that they cannot be ignored. Maintaining political and economic unity among users of French is one of the ultimate goals of francophonie because it increases their power and prestige. Redefining Tamil society to exclude Sanskrit-using Brahmins, who dominated other castes socially and began to monopolize positions in the civil service and politics, was the main goal or purism in South India. The Pure Tamil Movement was an instrument to reach social, political and economic goals. If the Brahmins could have been made to disappear through prayer, their opponents would have flocked to the temples instead of demanding language change<sup>75</sup>. Reacting against strong assimilationist pressures from Russian culture, Ukrainian and Belarusian intellectuals attempted to purify their languages of non-native elements to

<sup>68</sup> For Unesco action see Alfa Ibrahim Sow (ed.), *Langues et politiques de langues en Afrique noire : L’expérience de l’Unesco*, Paris: Nubia, 1977.

<sup>69</sup> Shirley Brice Heath and Frederick Mandabach, « Language Status Decisions and the Law in the United States », in Juan Cobarrubias and Joshua A. Fishman (eds), p. 101.

<sup>70</sup> J. Rubin, « Bilingual Education and Language Planning », in Chris Kennedy (ed.), p. 8.

<sup>71</sup> Carol M. Eastman, *Language Planning : An Introduction*, (San Francisco : Chandler and Sharp, 1983), p. 231.

<sup>72</sup> Einar Haugen, « The Implementation of Corpus Planning : Theory and Practice », in Juan Cobarrubias and Joshua A. Fishman (eds), pp. 269-289.

<sup>73</sup> Moshe Nahir, « Language Planning Goals : A Classification », in *Language Problems and Language Planning*, Vol. 8, No 3, Fall 1984, pp. 294-327.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 320.

<sup>75</sup> Brian Weinstein, « India : Planners and Poets », in *Praci-Bhasa-Vijnan : Indian Journal of Linguistics*, Vol. 10, 1983, pp. 47-76.

preserve their identities as peoples. Purists helped prevent the disappearance of the Ukrainian and Belarusian peoples<sup>76</sup>.

The process and linguistic goals of language planning are most often instruments or intervening variables in the pursuit of interest. As such, it would be useful for scholars to make more than a passing reference to the original motivation for language planning and the ultimate purpose of language planning. Examination — or discovery — of the interests behind planning should reveal who receives the most benefits from it. These benefits may be different from the benefits alleged in an ideology. If a class or a narrow elite will benefit while other lose, the scholar must explain what is at stake.

The promoters and practitioners of language planning cannot be expected to analyze and to proclaim their motivations and interests in the same way, but they should be candid with themselves and the groups whose interests they are promoting. They should spend a great deal of effort in evaluation of messages « feedback » from the population they claim they are serving, and they should ask themselves if they are serving the cause of justice. If planning does not serve this final goal, change is better left to the forces of the communication market place.

#### Résumé

Après avoir formulé quelques commentaires sur l'enseignement en langue maternelle, l'auteur s'attache à démontrer les lacunes et les faiblesses de certains énoncés de Brian Weinstein, notamment en ce qui concerne le rôle des élites sur l'aménagement linguistique, leurs rapports avec les masses et la place de l'idéologie dans l'aménagement linguistique. Il fait finalement la critique de la typologie des intérêts proposée par Weinstein.

#### Abstract

After commenting briefly on native language teaching, the author demonstrates the deficiencies and meeknesses of some of Brian Weinstein's premises, notably: the role of elites in language planning, their connections with the masses, and the place of ideology in planning. Criticizes the typology of interests proposed by Weinstein.

### COMMENTS ON BRIAN WEINSTEIN'S PAPER : LANGUAGE PLANNING AND INTERESTS

Hans R. Dua

<sup>76</sup> Paul N. Werker, *Purism and Language : A Study in Modern Ukrainian and Belarusian Nationalism (1840-1967)*, (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1974).

## COMMENTS ON BRIAN WEINSTEIN'S PAPER LANGUAGE PLANNING AND INTERESTS

### Introduction

In my comments on Brian Weinstein's paper I propose to consider first three sections of his paper separately as they raise certain significant issues. I shall then take up the introductory remarks and the concluding implications as discussed by him to highlight certain issues of theoretical nature for the development of language planning paradigm.

### Interest and Language Planning : The Language of Education

The question of language use in education is most complex and controversial in language planning. It raises both the theoretical and practical issues for which no universally acceptable solution has been found so far. In considering this question the main thrust of Weinstein's argument is that « The pursuit of ideology for its own sake seems to be one important motivation of language planning with respect to the issue of medium of education, mother tongue, national tongue, or language of wider communication » (8). To prove his point he has provided a detailed account of the historical background of the UNESCO report on *The Use of Vernacular Language in Education* (1953), the personal ideological and political motivations of the authors involved in it, and its contemporary manifestations in Africa, Great Britain, U.S.S.R., U.S.A. and in Francophone movement. The emphasis on ideology for explaining the question of language use in education seems to avoid some serious issues. I will discuss here only three issues very briefly (see Dua 1985 for a detailed discussion).

The first issue concerns what may be referred to as a binary approach. Considering the benefits of mother tongue education Weinstein emphasizes goals of authenticity and cultural pluralism which are seen to be in conflict with the goals of scientific progress and unity considered to be attainable through the medium of a widely used language. While there may be conflict

in the underlying ideological interests in the use of various languages, it would be absurd to assume that scientific progress can be achieved by one language and not by another. The association of ideologies with language in a binary opposition also ignores the reality in multilingual countries like India where several languages perform complementary functions. Srivastava (1984) examines the early socialization function, the identity function and psychic function of the mother tongue and comes to the conclusion that often these functions are shared by two or three languages in a multilingual situation. Pattanayak (1985) points out that « the only alternative acceptable in a multilingual setting is structural incorporation of groups leading to a cultural mosaic. This is based on compromise and accommodation and aims at building a common society, economically, culturally, socially and politically where needs and interests of all segments forming the population should be equitably met ». Assuming that the use of mother tongue and other tongue media in education are motivated by different ideological considerations which conflict with one another, the basic question, then, is how the use of different languages in education can be made compatible and non-conflicting and how language planning can help in this process.

The second issue raises a more fundamental question which pertains to language rights. Pattanayak (1981; 1986) has argued that mother tongue education is a matter of right as well as need for every child and its denial to the minority is discrimination against the minority and is a violation of fundamental human right. Cobarrubias (1983) points out that the nature of language rights is in serious need of clarification. He distinguishes between the natural and legal or conventional language rights and discusses them in relation to linguistic pluralism and linguistic inequalities. He points out that even if we assume that « language status decisions are made with the best of intention, are rational and moral, still ethical criteria depend upon the ideologies of the dominant group ». In other words it is not enough to say that the question of language medium in education is motivated by ideologies. We must also see how these ideologies distort our perceptions of reality, how contradictory elements may persist in any ideology we may justify for one reason or another and how by following a certain ideology we may ignore the basic issue of language rights.

Finally, let us consider the issues involved in the never ending debate about alleged advantages or alleged disadvantages of mother tongue education which, according to Weinstein, is both a reflection of a clash of interests and inconclusive first results. In fact if we follow his thesis, one of the reasons for the inconclusive test results could be conflict in ideologies or their distorting effect. If this is so, then language planning and researchers on language use in education must resolve one fundamental problem. It must be answered whether experimental studies can be conducted and their results can be interpreted without any ideological biases or distortion. If the answer to this question is in the negative, then the issue of medium has to be fought on the ideological ground, and the mother tongue will be more likely to lose in the battle in facing the dominant ideology of national

tongue, or language of wider communication. In other words if mother tongue is not accepted as a matter of right, there are very little chances of accepting the possibility, feasibility and effectiveness of mother tongue education even with experimental research supporting it. If the answer to the above question is in the affirmative, the onus lies on the researchers to consider and control all the relevant variables for an objective, value-neutral comparison between mother tongue and other tongue medium education. This task is almost impossible (see Pattanayak 1986, Dua 1985; Fasold 1984 for discussion in detail) and requires a great deal of insight, patience and concerted efforts in educational planning.

### Interest and Language Planning : Officialization

There can be no disagreement with the statements made by Weinstein that the official recognition of a language raises its status and gives its speakers a new dignity and a sense of identity and that the census data are a favourite instrument of those who call on government to begin or to change language planning. But I find this section of his paper weak for two main reasons. The first concerns the official status of Hindi. As in his book, Weinstein seems to fail in perceiving the Indian situation in the right perspective (see Dua's forthcoming review of Weinstein 1983). In the present context the following statement would be least expected from a knowledgeable person like him. To quote : « Language planning in India serves a purely ideological interest in so far as it draws India back to its Hindu traditions. In more tangible fashion it serves to define non-Hindi speakers and non-Hindi as non-Indian. It serves to limit access to jobs in the civil service to northern Hindus and Hindi speakers ».

The other reason for the weakness of the second section lies in the fact that more attention has been paid to the manipulation of data than to the characterization of issues involved in officialization. Cobarrubias (1983) points out that the concept of official status has not been made entirely clear in the literature on language planning, that there may be different levels of officialization, and that the language regarded as official may be used for various purposes of government, including use in governmental documents, publication of laws, government assemblies, record keeping and the like. Dua (1983) in his forthcoming volume on the use of minority languages deals at length with the issues involved in officialization including the gap between the ideal and the reality, use in governmental documents and the implementation of decisions about official status. It would have been extremely useful if Weinstein had brought out the implications of ideological, political, economic and social considerations involved in the question of officialization.

### Elite Behaviour

Elite behaviour is extremely complex and significant in the context of language planning. It has been very well documented in the case of language movements and language policy issues in India (Brass 1975), and in Francophone movement (Weinstein 1983, 1986). In the paper under consideration Weinstein has mainly discussed the attitudes and motives of elites vis-à-vis masses and touched upon certain issues which need more attention in view of the scope of his paper. He rightly points out that elites may show a wide range of attitudes, ranging from general disdain and mistrust of masses to respect for the values and interests of the masses. In fact, the success of elites depends partly upon, as pointed out by him, how they can create a feeling of « agreement with the attitudes and values of the masses ». Similarly he has rightly warned that « elites' motives must be examined in light of a sensitivity to the issue of interest », and if they are « promoting language choice and language planning for pure self-interest, they must be mistrusted » and « their call for language planning should be rejected » (37). In any case masses do not merely follow the elites as he points out elsewhere, « They can also shift allegiance to the challengers within the community and can carry demands and conflict beyond the limits and goals set by the elites » (1983: 121). Thus, attitudes, interests and motives of elites vis-à-vis masses indicate a dynamic and dialectic relationship between them and needs to be studied for understanding the success or failure of language planning issues that form the basis for such a relationship.

The question of relationship between the elites and masses touches upon several other related questions which have not been adequately treated in the present paper. For instance, Weinstein has mentioned two types of elites, cultural and political in his paper, but five types of elites in the context of the Francophone movement in his book. The question of number of types of elites is not so important as the « agreement among the various elites » which he rightly points out is another important factor for their effectiveness in policy choices and in planning or implementation. However, he has not discussed how elite formation, development of an elite consciousness and elite unification is a continuous process involving growth of counter-elites and inter-elite competition, willingness on the part of competing elites to share power, and their capacity to establish channels of communication and commonality of interests among them.

Weinstein mentions the importance of agreement of elites with the attitudes and values of the masses as discussed above. However he does not discuss how this agreement can be reached. This is a significant question for two reasons. First, it involves different types of interests which the elites may exploit to select and focus on identity symbols, to define group boundaries and to create myths of group history and destiny. Secondly, it also concerns the strategies which they may adopt to communicate their message and mobilize the masses in order to increase the number of their potential followers and to prevent the growth of counter-elites. This also depends partly on their power and influence which they initially hold and which

they can muster in the process of manipulation of symbols and interests and values associated with them. It is in terms of these two issues that we can characterize how elites relate to social order, social change and social mobilization affecting the group they wish to lead and assess their potential strength and weakness.

### Interests and Language Planning Paradigm

In the introductory remarks Weinstein points out that the purpose of much of what we now call language planning is to pursue an ideological, political, social or economic interest and that his objective in this paper is to underscore and emphasize the finality of non-linguistic choices. Again, in considering the implications of his thesis he points out that taking into account « interest » means adding socio-political « input » to a language planning paradigm. One might ask here whether « interest » is the only factor relevant as « input » to a language planning paradigm. If it is not, then what are the other elements of « input ». In my analysis of language planning paradigm I consider social system characterized in terms of societal goals, cybernetic capacities, interdependence between societal and language planning, and public participation as comprising one system, the other two being the language system and the planning system. I discuss how these systems interact with each other, how constraints arise from the components of the systems and how they influence the course of language planning.

Even if we do not bother for the other factors, the issue of interest has not been fully characterized. It is quite clear that Weinstein is using the term « interest » in the sense of ultimate goals. He remarks that « most decisions and objectives are the result of expression of interest » (p. 5). He does not consider purification or such language goals as ultimate goals as considered by Nahir. He also points out that interest must be shared by significant groups of people, that the groups may be « organized on the basis of perceived class, ethnic, racial, linguistic gender, regional or professional interest » and that there is no limit to the characteristics of the group or to the focus or concern » (4). One might ask here whether all the interests which the groups might pursue can be reduced to the four general categories established by Weinstein. If it is so, then what criteria would be used in the process of classification of interests. One could also ask whether groups might pursue some interests which are not ultimate and if that is so how they would be distinguished from others. The answers to these questions is necessary for understanding the nature of interests and their implications for language planning.

In defining the four categories of interests Weinstein remarks that the ideological interest is less obvious than the other forms. It is also clear that his usage of ideology is at time so broad that it subsumes political, economic and social interests. For instance, he mentions these interests underlying the ideology of unity (18), and also the Francophone ideology.

If all the interests are subsumed under ideological interest, the very basis of four categories of interest breaks down.

Even the notion of ideology has not been properly characterized. There does not seem to be any limit to the number of ideologies. Besides the ideology of unity Weinstein has referred to language ideology, ideologies of authenticity and cultural pluralism and so on. One could also have social, political or economic ideologies. Even the notion of language ideology is not a simple matter. Cobarrubias (1983) has distinguished between four types of language ideologies, linguistic assimilation, linguistic pluralism, vernacularization and internationalism. An ideology may be differently perceived and interpreted to serve different interests at different periods of time or it can be seen in the history of pluralism in the United States (Gleason 1984). Thus the issue of ideology needs a more comprehensive treatment than what Weinstein has offered. We need not only to distinguish between different kinds of ideologies but also to characterize how they interact with one another. Furthermore, we must study how ideologies arise and are interpreted and transmitted by the elites for gaining mass support. They also need to be distinguished from such other related concepts as outlooks, creeds, systems and movements of thoughts and programmes. Only by clarifying all the related issues can ideology or ideological interest become a useful construct in the language planning paradigm. Cobarrubias (1983) points out the problem involved in using ideology as a construct : « But, although the relation of status policy decisions to ideological matters is so pervasive, it seems difficult to offer a satisfactory model or taxonomy of language policy ideologies that will explain and/or predict how a particular type of ideology affects language change » .

Finally, a word about the typologies of language planning. Weinstein refers to Einar Haugen's typology which has four parts and to Moshe Nahir who offers language planning goals to complete the typology. On the first page of his paper he points out that a paradigm or a typology of language planning should not be seen exclusively in terms of linguistic means and linguistic goals though it is « valid intellectually and useful practically ». It should rather focus on non-linguistic ideological, political, social or economic finality of language choices and patterns of implementation, particularly when that finality is the true intention of the planners. However, no typology has been offered by him. Dua (1985) presents a typology of language planning in terms of five dimensions related to language as a symbol, language structure, language use, language user and language material. It not only takes care of both the linguistic and non-linguistic factors fully bringing out the implications of the latter for the former, but also focuses on the issues of language material language use and language user which have emerged as significant topics in the context of language spread and language allocation. Rubin's suggestion (1983) that we might use « the dichotomy 'allocation of use' and corpus planning as more representative of two kinds of planning foci which are on the same level of abstraction » and Dua's analysis of the issues involved in language allocation (forthcoming) support the five-fold typology mentioned above.

To sum up, an understanding of non-linguistic factors in both status language planning and corpus planning is essential for the development of language planning theory and language planning paradigm. Weinstein's discussion of ideological, political, social or economic interests is timely and useful, though it needs further clarification and elaboration. It is hoped that my comments on his paper would stimulate discussion of the issues raised here and lead to an adequate understanding of non-linguistic factors in language planning. However, I may add a word of caution here. It must be understood how the debate about the non-linguistic factors in language planning tends to undermine the role of language in the human mind and development.

#### References

- BRASS P. 1975 *Language, Religion and Politics in North India*. Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.
- COBARRUBIAS J. 1983 « Ethical Issues in Status Planning », in Juan Cobarrubias and Joshua A. Fishman (eds), *Progress in Language Planning*. Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton Publishers.
- DUA H.R. 1985 *Language Planning in India*. Delhi: Harman Publications. Forthcoming a) *Language Problems of Linguistic Minorities in India*. Forthcoming b) *Issues in Language Allocation: Patterns of Language Use and Change*. Forthcoming c) *Review of Brian Weinstein: The Civic Tongue*.
- FASOLD R. 1984 *The Sociolinguistics of Society*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- GLEASON P. 1984 « Pluralism and Assimilation : A Conceptual History », in John Edwards (ed.), *Linguistic Minorities, Policies and Pluralism*. London: Academic Press.
- PATTANAYAK D.P. 1981 *Language and Social Issues*. Mysore: Prasaranga, University of Mysore.
- 1985 *Mother tongue : An Indian Context*. Mimeo.
- 1986 « Educational Use of the Mother Tongue ». To appear in Bernard Spolsky (ed.), *Mother Tongue Education*.
- RUBIN J. 1983 « Evaluating Status Planning : What Has the Past Decade Accomplished ? », in Juan Cobarrubias and Joshua A. Fishman (eds), *Progress in Language Planning*.
- SRIVASTAVA R.N. 1984 *Mother Tongue and Bilingual Education*. Mimeo.
- WEINSTEIN B. 1983 *The Civic Tongue: Political Consequences of Language choices*. New York & London: Longman.
- 1986 *Language Planning and Interests*. Mimeo.