

NEWSLETTER NEW NEWSLETTE ER LANGUAGE PLANNING NE ER NEWSLETTER NEWSLI NEWSLETTER NEWSLETTER NE

Volume 7

JUNE 1993

Number 4

LANGUAGE MANAGEMENT FOR ROMANI IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE

1. THE ROMANI LANGUAGE AND THE ROMS

The term Romani refers to the dialects of the Gypsy language, spoken by a considerable number of people over many parts of Europe and the world¹. Romani is quite clearly a language of Indian origin and is divided into a number of dialects (Hancock 1975). The name Rom, which will be used in this paper, has been adopted as a general denomination for members of all Gypsy groups (Rom, Sinti, Kalé, etc.) since the 3rd Congress of the Romani Union in 1981. Originally it referred to only one part of the whole population.

While most Roms of Western Europe are nomadic and speak a language characterised by an admixture of vocabulary and structures of the respective matrix languages (Kenrick 1979, Liégeois 1987), Roms of Central and Eastern Europe have been sedentary, often for centuries, and their language maintenance is much superior.

Exact numbers of the Rom population are not easy to obtain from official censuses. For instance, in Czechoslovakia the 1991 census revealed 114 000 people who claimed Rom origin (Mann 1992a) but we know from semi-official records, kept by local authorities until 1989, that the more likely figure would be in the vicinity of 400 000 to 500 000. Rom sources claim 800 000 people (Hübschmannová, forthcoming). These different estimates are due to the fact that in official censuses many Roms opt for other ethnicities. Representatives of the Romani Union, a private international association of various Rom organisations, quote the total number of Roms in the world as 10 to 15 million. Countries of Europe which have particularly high absolute numbers of the Roms are Romania, former Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Hungary, former Czechoslovakia and the former Soviet Union.

The Roms arrived in Europe from India in the first half of this millennium. By the 14th and first half of the 15th century we find frequent references to them as they moved through a number of countries, first tolerated but later expressly unwelcome or banned (Liégeois 1987). Although the language and folklore of the Roms unequivocally points to India, the Roms themselves have lost the knowledge of their origin (Hancock 1988). Their traditional trades and skills have almost everywhere been replaced by unqualified manual work. In the post-communist countries the economic changes towards a free economy have often left them jobless and there is little hope that this situation

will change in the near future. The only Rom group reported to be doing well is the relatively small Polish community (approximately 20,000 people) the members of which recently became successful merchants and small manufacturers.

During World War II many Roms, including almost all Roms from Bohemia and Moravia, were exterminated in Hitler's concentration camps (Nečas 1990). The communist regimes of the post-war period gave Roms work and social security, but pursued a relentless paternalistic policy of assimilation (Information 1991). Nevertheless, the results of these policies were undistinguished, with the Rom communities perhaps losing some of their traditional culture but gaining little instead. As most of those concerned with Rom matters realise, a potentially highly explosive situation is developing in most Central and East European countries which have a sizable Rom population (Information 1991).

Although the perspective adopted in this paper covers all Central and East European Roms, my information primarily derives from former Czechoslovakia and does not allow general conclusions for other varieties of Romani. The theoretical framework applied here is normally described as "language management" (cf. Jernudd and Neustupný 1987, 1991). Though it basically works within the same paradigm as "language planning", it differs in a number of points. Some of these points are: the requirement to consider linguistic problems within the more general area of sociolinguistic and socioeconomic problems, the commencement of the study of language problems in discourse, and the need to consider positive as well as negative evaluations of language.

2. LINGUISTIC, SOCIOLINGUISTIC AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

The issue of language can only be dealt with if we accept the primacy of socioeconomic and sociolinguistic (communicative) problems over linguistic ones (Neustupný 1977, 1983). Without a solution of the former there can be no solution to the latter. Language problems cannot be removed through working on language alone.

As an example, we can consider the mastery of various languages by the Roms. They employ a whole repertoire of varieties of language: apart from Romani (the competence in which, of course, varies) there is the system of varieties of the matrix (European) languages (some of them pidginized or creolized by the Roms), regional dialects and foreign languages. The

presence or absence of these varieties in the language system of particular speakers depends on the range of communicative situations in which the speakers participate, on the extension of their communicative networks, topics of conversation, and other circumstances. These are sociolinguistic (communicative) facts which, in turn, depend on a whole range of socioeconomic activities, social networks, employment, etc. Or, in the case of competence in reading and writing² (linguistic facts), the availability of texts and presence of reading habits (sociolinguistic, i.e., communicative) facts, and the need to read and write in the execution of the speakers' employment and everyday life (socioeconomic facts) are all interconnected.

If we start from individual socioeconomic (SE), sociolinguistic (SL) or linguistic (LG) facts, it is possible to establish clusters ("interaction clusters") of features that depend on each other. In this paper I shall discuss several clusters which start from the following SE areas:

1. Structural problems
2. The Rom culture
3. Deculturation and
4. Attitudes of the matrix population.

1. Structural problems

In this group I propose to include problems that cannot be fully accounted for by contemporary differences in culture. The term "structural" refers to the fact that the problems connect with the structure of the Rom society as embedded within the context of the matrix society. Cluster A1 commences from the relative economic, social and cultural underdevelopment of the Roms. They frequently have no work (Information 1991) and if they do, such work is limited to positions which require almost no qualifications. Many Roms live in urban slums, others in separate settlements (Gypsy colonies) with few facilities, little running water, sometimes at a considerable distance from schools and shops. There is a high incidence of illegal activities. Their representation in political life is very limited.

Roms did not place themselves in this position. The political regimes of the past have not done enough or have been unsuccessful in removing these conditions which are clearly perceived as social problems, both by the present governments and by the Roms themselves. When the Roms speak about their situation, they mostly refer to this group of socioeconomic problems.

In the sociolinguistic (communicative) area these problems imply that the Roms can only participate in a limited number of communicative situations (Hübschmannová, forthcoming). However, this also means that the language they speak, be it Romani or the national languages of the matrix communities, remains lexically and stylistically underdeveloped. In order to develop the language, it is necessary to start by changing the socioeconomic features of the cluster, which will give rise to more communication needs and will eventually result in the development of linguistic segments: the lexicon and syntactic and hypersyntactic means. Limiting action to the creation of vocabularies, translation work, or language teaching would not provide the remedy that is needed. The sociolinguistic and socioeconomic problems must be attended to at the same time. The cluster A1 can be represented as:

SE: underdevelopment

SL: limited needs and participation

LG: lexical and stylistic underdevelopment.

Furthermore, the features of underdevelopment limit the possibility of generating communicative networks with either members of other Rom communities or members of the matrix society. This creates the cluster A2, related to cluster A1; due to the SE and SL components, language (LG), too, is affected. The process of standardisation of Romani naturally lags behind. Rom adults develop pidgins and children develop creoles (Information 1991; Hübschmannová, forthcoming) rather than master the matrix language. This cluster can be formulated as:

SE: underdevelopment

SL: limited networks

LG: lack of linguistic integration.

It is of interest to note that according to Hübschmannová (1979), mistakes in Czech in the speech of Rom children are not reduced when they speak Czech or Czech only. Grammatical and other mistakes were recorded in the Rokycany community (Western Bohemia) where 82 percent of children reported speaking Romani at home, but the rate of error increased in a Prague location where 94 percent of children reported speaking Czech, or sometimes Romani and sometimes Czech. In other words, to speak Czech most of the time, or to speak practically no Romani, does not guarantee that the speaker's Czech will be fully grammatical. In order to rectify this situation, sociolinguistic (communicative) policies are needed to broaden the children's networks, but these cannot be successful unless a socioeconomic pressure is induced to support them and remove the underdevelopment of the Roms.

The post-communist governments of Central and Eastern Europe can relegate responsibility for the current situation of the Roms to their political predecessors. However, in a decade or less people will ask what these governments themselves have done to change the structural features of the Rom problem.

2. Rom culture

The way in which most Roms work and conduct daily life is different from the host societies. Evidence abounds in reports on their "deviant" behaviour, erratic attendance at work, lack of manual skills, the handling of apartments and other dwellings, attitudes to children's education, etc. These factors are cultural in character.

The Roms possess not only extensive culture in the sense of traditional tales, proverbs, music and more recently also painting and modern literature (cf. the journal *Slovenský národopis* 36/1, 1988; also Hübschmannová 1991 and Mann (ed.) for the conduct of daily life and the life cycle (cf. Mann 1988) and a traditional value system. It is their culture in the latter sense what accounts for much of their "deviance".

The distinction between the structural and cultural features is important. Children may be unable to attend school because of the distance, poor clothing, inability of the parent to provide notebooks, pencils, etc. These are structural conditions. However, the problem may be aggravated due to the value system of the parents and children themselves and these cultural features are not easily removed.

A letter to the editor of the Rom weekly *Romano l'il* (No.34, 13-19 April 1992, published in Prešov, Slovakia, translation by JVN) documents at least some of these concerns:

"I am a Romani woman and a subscriber to *Romano l'il*. You write much truth about Roms and their problems. I agree with you on many points and this is why I am writing to you.

The place where I live is Zvolen and I can see how many Roms live here. They have never worked. They do not want to go to work and, instead, live from social security or family allowances. These Roms praise the democratic system but a decent Rom, who liked to work (when work was available), who still wants to work and live at a reasonable level, has got no work now, or unemployment benefits.

At Zvolen, too, we have a number of backward Roms, who make a bad name for us. The Whites have bad experiences with these people. I live in a prefabricated apartment house. There are three Rom families here but we have never had any conflict with the others nor have they with us. On the contrary, we visit each other on the basis of equality.

However, what is the situation in the case of Roms who live in timber houses? These houses were dormitories for single people and are located in good surroundings. However, now when Rom families have moved in, they look like after an explosion. It is simply a catastrophe. The flats are demolished, the surroundings dirty, there is lot of rubbish everywhere, in front of each flat you can see a lot of unused old things.

With regard to parents and the education of children, the situation is very bad. The children are badly dressed, dirty, the parents simply do not look after them. They attend school at their whim. The most important thing for the parents is that they go, instead of attending school, to look up things in rubbish bins sometimes with their parents and buy for their parents apple wines, which the parents give to children to drink from an early age. I can see Rom children who smoke and drink beer from bottles, and their parents do not mind. How can they live in this way?...

Alena Čipčalová, Zvolen"

Although this letter to the editor seems to reproduce stereotypes about the Roms, the stereotypes, in this case agree with reality. Note that the writer charges all socioeconomic problems to the account of culture. In her perception, the problems are not the result of conditions imposed by the matrix society but can be explained by the acquired cultural features of the Roms. While complaining about structural conditions ("we are not given conditions equal to those of the matrix society") is typical for Rom activists, accounting for problems by cultural factors is typical for members of the matrix societies. As we see in the above text, such people are joined by Roms who are eager to integrate.

The main argument here is that the culture of the Roms "makes a bad name" for them and thus limits their access to networks and, what is not said by Čipčalová in the letter, to linguistic models. We can speak here of cluster B1 which can be expressed by the formula

SE: culture

SL: limited networks

LG: lack of linguistic integration

If networks are to be widened and the acquisition of language facilitated, an active policy will be needed. Such a policy, in accordance with the current ideology of interethnic variation, is unlikely to be an assimilation policy or its variety (such as an "integration"). However, even if we apply a "multicultural" policy, the fact is that the Roms will continue living within the same societies with other people, and that it will be difficult to assume that the matrix society is the only one that should change its value system.

3. Deculturation

Deculturation refers to problems caused by the loss of the traditional culture which is not being replaced by another culture (Information 1991). Traditional work and living skills are being lost and only partly replaced by new skills. The family and community largely decompose. New types of illegal activities emerge. These SE facts give rise to cluster C1.

Sociolinguistic (communicative) conditions change first. In the new situation where TV is available in virtually each family, the traditional tale-telling is prone to be forgotten. The dispersion of families and communities within urban environments only supports this trend.

Further, the weakening of the feeling that the linguistic traditions of the community should be maintained seriously affects the maintenance of the Romani language. Except in those communities where isolation has been imposed by the matrix society, children understand the language but often do not speak it any more (Hübschmannová et al. 1991). In many communities this situation extends to the middle generation. The cluster involved, cluster C1, can be formulated as

SE: loss of traditional culture

SL: loss of situations of Romani use

LG: language shift.

The attitude will no doubt change as the ethnic consciousness grows, but this is at present quite low. Note that, as mentioned above, out of more than 500 000 Roms in former Czechoslovakia only 114 000 declared in 1991 their ethnic origin as Romani. Many Rom politicians and ordinary citizens quite frankly claim that they do not need the Romani language - either because they want their children to be assimilated or because their Romness (romipen) does not depend on the language. Even the leading Romani poet Dezider Banga (writing both in Romani and Slovak) is an active member of an organisation that proposes the assimilation of Roms (Hübschmannová, forthcoming). However, from the fact that the language is still strong and from the analogy of other cultures we can predict that it is unlikely to disappear easily. Attempts at its introduction to schools, initially as an auxiliary language for children who arrive with no knowledge of the matrix society language, are currently underway. As the growth of the Rom middle class proceeds, there will be a need for a symbol for Rom ethnic self-identification and it would be strange if language would not assume an important position there.

To invest money into the teaching and development of the language without countering at the same time the factors that lead to its massive loss would be futile. The whole cluster must be addressed. A sociolinguistic (communicative) policy that makes people use the language, and a general socioeconomic policy that removes the "deculturation" of the Roms, must run at the same time or prior to language teaching programs.

4. Attitudes of the matrix population

A number of problems (cluster D1) derive from the attitudes of the matrix population towards the Roms. In general, in Central and Eastern Europe the attitudes are currently utterly negative. Ondrušek (1992) reports that

".....one of recent representative public opinion polls (with 2.5 thousand polled participants) came to the conclusion that more than 75% of the population would object to having any members of the Romany (Gipsy) community as neighbours.... Similarly, even among social workers and people in helping professions the situation is not much better..."

Among Slovak social workers 62% rejected Roms as neighbours, 81% as a son or daughter-in-law and 19% thought that they did not have equal right to work as Slovaks.

Effects of these attitudes overlap with those of a number of clusters already mentioned above: they further limit the scope of social situations and networks of the Roms and, by limiting models of culture and language, correlate with deculturation. In order to remove the language problems which result, a policy affecting the attitudes of the matrix population must be adopted.

Such policies, however, are not common. The idea of the matrix population is that it is the Roms who have created the problems and who should remove them by either "returning wherever they can from" or promptly assimilating. Mann (1992b) quotes Bačová's survey in which 45.2% of subjects in the Slovak city of Košice said that they would like to exclude Roms from their country. A more enlightened version of assimilation is called integration but "multiculturalism" with no hierarchically arranged pecking order between a "majority" (with historical rights) and a "minority", is a concept that has started being applied only very recently.

It thus appears that any language policy dealing with the Romani problems must include a policy directed towards the socioeconomic and sociolinguistic attitudes of the matrix populations. This policy is as vital as policies directed towards the Roms themselves. It should be addressed to the government, economic and social organisations and the public in general.

3. WHERE ARE THE PROBLEMS?

Until very recently, what constitutes a language problem was normally defined by specialists who acted on the basis of their own informal experience and evaluation criteria. The existence of some problems, such as illiteracy or language shift was never questioned. However, under particular conditions, illiteracy may not constitute a problem - it may be non-literacy which receives no negative evaluation (cf. Srivastava 1984). Similarly, language shift, such as the abandonment of the Romani language, may not be evaluated negatively by participants in the process. This is not to say that the negative evaluation by participants is the only criterion for an issue being designated as a language problem. However, it is an important fact and its absence must be seriously considered. Obviously, it is necessary to commence the listing of problems by an examination of what is or is not considered to be a problem by individual participants in individual discourse (Neustupný 1983).

This procedure has so far not been systematically followed for any community of the world. At least three methods of investigation can be used. The first method for the listing of language problems requires recordings of interactive situations and their analysis. A "follow-up interview" after the recording is normally used to find whether participants evaluated segments negatively (Neustupný 1990). A second and third method are an interaction interview and an examination of verbalisations of negative evaluations. In the former instance we conduct extensive interviews that map actual behaviour of participants in particular events and also examine their evaluation of speech. In the latter case, unsolicited reactions to speech, normally written down, are assembled and analysed. This is a kind of "content analysis" which keeps in mind that not all verbalisations of negative evaluations are the result of the writer's evaluation in

the given situation: some may have been derived from ideological considerations or from the system of topics in the communication system concerned.

Two comments should be made here. Firstly, there is a general lack of research on the Rom culture, society and on contact situations between members of the matrix culture and the Roms - a lack that is not frequently noted. For example, not a single group or interdisciplinary project in the area has been recorded for former Czechoslovakia. Still less exists from what a listing of evaluations and the final listing of problems can be produced.

My second comment is that research should concern itself with all three types of problems mentioned above: socioeconomic, sociolinguistic and linguistic.

The study of socioeconomic problems must start in actual processes of interaction through recording or interaction interviews. Since the intervention of ideologies is likely to be strong in written materials, content analysis will be difficult to apply. Let me emphasize again that negative evaluations either by Romani or non-Romani participants will not automatically produce the final list of interaction problems; however, they must stand at the beginning of any listing.

The study of sociolinguistic (communication) problems represents a necessary link between the socioeconomic and linguistic areas. Until the 1960s no models existed that would allow us to survey the whole range of sociolinguistic problems. Thanks mainly to Dell Hymes (Hymes 1962, Neustupný 1987) we now know what it is necessary to look for: norms pertaining to the initiation of situations, the control of variation, the various functions performed, participation of personnel, handling of content, arrangement of messages and the use of channels and the management of discourse.

<i>Editors</i>	:	E. Annamalai, Mysore Björn H. Jernudd, Hong Kong.
<i>Editorial Board</i>	:	Jirí Neustupný, Australia. Francis Gomes De Matos, Brazil. Ulrich Ammon, Germany Mart Rannut, CIS David F. Marshall, USA Richard A. Benton, New Zealand. Laurent Metzger, Singapore.
<i>Assistant Editors</i>	:	K. S. Rajyashree, Mysore Jennifer Bayer, Mysore

All correspondence including changes of address and requests to be placed on the mailing list should be addressed to the Editor:

E. Annamalai
Director
Central Institute of Indian Languages
Manasagangotri
Mysore - 570 006, India.

In contact situations between Roms and the matrix population the most important problems, as mentioned above, are probably those of the violation of socioeconomic norms, but much "misunderstanding" (including the misunderstanding of intentions, attitudes, personality, etc.) probably also derives from the way people communicate: for example, who speaks to whom, about what, and many others. A popular belief is that the Roms never laugh and lack the sense of humour. Such suggestions obviously originate in the experience of the matrix population in communicating with the Roms in contact situations where the need to control linguistic competence leads to strong pidginization of communicative behaviour by Rom participants. Which other areas are typically characterised by communication problems? They must receive proper attention within any future project that aims at solving interaction problems between the Roms and a matrix population.

The study of linguistic norms in the narrow sense of the word, in other words, the study of grammatical, lexical, phonological and graphical competence in contact situations, is equally important. Are there any typical interaction problems that derive from deviations from norms of this type? What is actually the situation with regard to pidginization and creolization of the matrix languages? A host of issues awaits future researchers.

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper the management model (Jernudd and Neustupný 1987, 1991) of the solution of language problems has been used to discuss some issues faced by the Roms. The model has been extended by suggesting a new component: the "interaction cluster".

Whatever may eventually happen to the Romani language, at present it is still very much alive. Those who had the opportunity to listen to speeches given in Romani at conferences such as at Stupava³, speeches in which a polished variety of the language⁴, with no uncontrolled borrowing used, are likely to believe that the future for the language is bright. We should not forget that even if language shift proceeds over the next decade or so, the growth of ethnic consciousness will give Romani a strong stimulus for maintenance. Although it is difficult to imagine that Romani would be developed to serve as a tool in all domains of communication, it is also unlikely that it will completely disappear. Within the process of maintaining and developing the language, the attitudes of the matrix societies will be as important as those of the Roms themselves.

In integrated Europe the multicultural model should widely apply and the Roms will not remain the only ethnic group of their kind. Although the mixing of groups will not - at least not initially - be of the magnitude that monolingual and monocultural areas would disappear, there will be mixing, and the fact that the Roms lack a continuous territory of their own may lose much of its significance. They will be just another widely dispersed group which may maintain its language for some communicative functions exactly because of its dispersion and mobility.

In the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, approved in 1992 by the Council of Europe, languages other than national languages are divided into "territorial" and "non-territorial". The latter group includes languages that "although traditionally used within the territory of the state,

cannot be identified with a particular area thereof". The document implies that non-territorial languages, of which Romani is given as an example, will enjoy a lower degree of protection than the "territorial" ones. It seems that the distinction is not made because of Romani. The document, whether intentionally or not, excludes the languages of the guest workers and Romani happens to be caught in the same net. Perhaps another factor in the decision was the fact that the character of the Rom population in Western Europe is different. However, with the emergence of the new Europe, encompassing contemporary Central and Eastern Europe, the problem of the status of Romani will necessarily be raised again.

REFERENCES

- HANCOCK, I.F. 1975. *Problems in the Creation of a Standard Dialect of Romanes*. Working Papers in Sociolinguistics 25 (Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, Austin, Texas).
- HANCOCK, I.F. (ed) 1979. *Romani Sociolinguistics*. (International Journal of the Sociology of Language 19). The Hague: Mouton.
- HANCOCK, I.F. 1988. *The development of Romani linguistics. Languages and Cultures: Studies in Honor of Edgar C. Polomé*, ed. by M.A. Jazayeri and W. Winter, pp. 183-223. Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
- HÜBSCHMANNOVÁ, M. 1979. *Bilingualism among the Slovak Rom*. In Hancock 1979, pp. 33-50.
- HÜBSCHMANNOVÁ, M. 1991. Birth of Romani literature in Czechoslovakia. *Cahier de littérature orale*, No 30 (Oralité Tzigane), pp.91-97.
- HÜBSCHMANNOVÁ, M. forthcoming. *Glimpses at the Romani language*. To be published in Languages of Diaspora (Special issue of Plurilinguismes) published by the University of Paris V.
- HÜBSCHMANNOVÁ, M. et al. 1991. *Romsko-český slovník* [Romani-Czech Dictionary]. Prague.
- INFORMATION 1991. *Informace pro členy vlády* [Information for members of the Cabinet]. A document prepared by the Federal Ministry for Work and Social Issues. Prague.
- JERNUDD, B.H. and J.V. NEUSTUPNÝ 1987. *Language planning: for whom? Proceedings of the International Symposium on Language Planning*, ed. by L. Laforge, pp. 69-84. Ottawa: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.
- JERNUDD, B.H. and J.V. NEUSTUPNÝ 1991. *Multi-disciplined language planning. Language Planning - Focusschrift in Honor of Joshua A. Fishman*, ed. by D.F. Marshall, pp. 29-36. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- KENRICK, D. 1979. *Romani English*. In Hancock 1979, pp. 111-120.
- LIÉGELOIS, J.-P. 1987. *Gypsies and Travellers*. Strasbourg: Council for Cultural Co-operation.
- MANN, A.B. 1988. *Obyčaje pri úmrtí u Cigánov-Rómov v troch spišských obciach* [Rom customs on the occasion of death in three Spiš villages]. *Slovenský národopis* 36/1, pp.192-202.
- MANN, A.B. 1992A. *The Roma - an ethnic minority in Slovakia*. Paper submitted to the conference Rómovia vo východnej a strednej Európe, Stupava (Slovakia), 30 April -2 May 1992.
- MANN, A.B. 1992b. *Formovanie etnickej identity Rómov na Slovensku* [Formation of ethnic identity of Roms in Slovakia].

Paper submitted to the conference Rómovia vo východnej a strednej Európe, Stupava (Slovakia), 30 April - 2 May 1992.

MANN, A.B.(ed.) forthcoming. *Neznámi Rómovia* [Unknown Roms]. Bratislava: Ister Science Press. SAV.

NEČAS, C. 1990. *Vyhlazení českých Romů* [The extermination of Czech Roms]. Laško lav 4/90, pp.1-4.

NEUSTUPNÝ, J.V. 1977. *Language planning for Australia*. Language Sciences 45, pp. 28-31.

NEUSTUPNÝ, J.V. 1983. *Towards a paradigm of language planning*. Language Planning Newsletter 9/4, pp.1-4.

NEUSTUPNÝ, J.V. 1987. *Communicating with the Japanese*. Tokyo: The Japan Times.

NEUSTUPNÝ, J.V. 1990. *The follow-up interview*. Japanese Studies Association of Australia Newsletter 10/2, pp.31-34.

ONDRUŠEK, D. 1992. *Necessary assumptions for mediation of the ethnic conflicts in Central European postcommunist countries*. Paper submitted to the conference Romovia vo východnej a strednej Európe, Stupava (Slovakia), 30 April-2 May 1992.

SRIVASTAVA, R.N. 1984. *Consequences of initiating literacy in the second language*. Linguistic Minorities and Literacy, ed. by F. Coulmas, pp. 29-37.

¹ An earlier version of this paper appeared in Research Reports of the Center for Theoretical Study, Charles University, Prague. I wish to thank the Centre and its Director, Professor Ivan Havel, for making this research possible, I am also grateful to Dr. Milena Hübschmannová and Dr. Björn Jernudd for reading my manuscript and providing useful comments and to Ing. Petre Víšek and Ms. Jitka Gjuričová for important materials and discussions.

² According to the 1970 census, 70 percent of the older generation of Roms residing in Czechoslovakia were illiterate (Hübschmannová et al. 1991, p.6). With members of the younger generation the situation has since then improved.

³ The conference Rómovia vo východnej a strednej Európe (The Roms in Eastern and Central Europe) was organised at Stupava in Slovakia from 30th April to 2nd May 1992 by the Federal Government of Czechoslovakia and the Slovak and Czech Governments with the support of the Project on Ethnic Relations (USA).

³ cf. equally positive comments on the language of such public speaking in Hübschmannová, forthcoming.

J.V.NEUSTUPNÝ

Department of Japanese Studies

Monash University

Clayton, Melbourne

Victoria 3168, Australia.

THE KANNADA DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, KARNATAKA, INDIA

The State Government of Karnataka, India, as per the Karnataka Official Language Act 1963, Section 2, has declared Kannada the Official language of Karnataka. The Government has constituted the Kannada Development Authority to monitor its effective implementation.

The Authority

- will examine the action taken by the different departments, public sector undertakings, all institutions and local bodies and the institutions obtaining grant-in-aid from the Government, for the implementation of the Government's Official Language Policy.
- will take suitable action for the effective implementation of the recommendations of Sarojini Mahishi Report accepted by the Government.
- will identify the obstacles in the implementation of the use of Kannada in administration and take suitable steps to remove such obstacles.
- will examine from time to time, the Kannada (service examination) system, the examinations being conducted for evaluating knowledge of Kannada and the present syllabi and the syllabi to be designed in future; will suggest revisions, modifications and innovations to the Government, if required; will undertake study and will deliberate issues regarding the manufacture, purchase and distribution of Kannada typewriters, the use of Kannada in computers, telex and teleprinters etc, which are meant for the modernisation of offices; and in this regard will take decisions which would help the use of Kannada for all purpose and will implement the same.
- will arrange training programmes, workshops, exhibitions and seminars for officers and employees to facilitate the use of Kannada and will organise programmes for non-Kannada speakers to learn Kannada; and also the syllabus and materials for the same will be prepared.
- will publish, purchase and distribute the relevant publications for the development of Kannada.
- will ensure that all the forms used in the offices are printed only in Kannada and to grant permission for the printing of forms in other languages, wherever necessary only after examining the forms, publications, and registers.
- will examine whether the central government offices, banks, post offices and other offices having more public contacts use Kannada forms, notes, name boards etc. in the regional language. Also in accordance with the central government language policy will correspond with those offices in this regard.
- will take decisions regarding preparation of administrative materials, its revision, printing and distribution; and will suggest suitable action by surveying the progress in these areas from time to time.

FORTHCOMING PROGRAMMES

AILA 1993, The Tenth World Congress of Applied Linguistics, Amsterdam, August 8-14, 1993.

Of significance is the Symposium "Multilingualism for All", organised by AILA's Scientific commission on Language and Education in Multilingual settings.

For more information on the CONTENT of the Symposium, please contact : The convenor, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, University of Roskilde, Department of Languages and Culture, 3.2.4, P.O.Box 260, DK-4000 Roskilde, Denmark, phone 45-46-75 77 11/2376 (or private 45-53-46 44 12), fax 45-46-75 44 10, E-mail TOVESK@SNOW.RUC.DK.

Third International Congress on Terminology and Knowledge Engineering. August 25-27, 1993. Cologne. Federal Republic of Germany.

For further information contact: Prof. Dr.Klaus-Dirk Schmitz, Fachhochschule Köln, Fachbereich Sprachen, Mainzer StraBe 5, D.5000 Köln 1, Germany.

International Conference on the Maintainance of Indian Languages and Culture Abroad at Central Institute of Indian Languages, Mysore, India. (Jan.5-9, 1994).

The main objectives of the Conference are:

1. To study the historical, economic and political contexts of the existance and evolution of the Indian Languages and Culture in Overseas communities.
2. To examine the concept of the Indian Heritage with particular reference to religion, folklore, customs and language in overseas Indian communities.
3. To study the presence of Indian languages and culture in different domains of life in overseas Indian communities.
4. To study the role Indian languages and culture play in the formation of ethnic and political identity, and social and economic mobility in overseas Indian communities.
5. To study the programs faced in maintainance and development of Indian languages and culture by the overseas Indian Communities.
6. To formulate strategies and plans on short and long term basis for the ove seas Indian communities to maintain their languages and culture.

For further information contact : The Director, Central Institute of Indian Languages, Manasagangothri, Mysore - 570 006, Karnataka, India.

NOW AVAILABLE

Omkar N.Koul (Theme Editor) 1992. *The Administrator* Vol.XXXVII No.4 October-December (Quarterly Journal)Lal Bahadur Shastri Academy of Administration, Mussoorie. India.

This issue is devoted to various language and linguistic issues of India which are of interest to administrators and policy makers. Most of the papers are related to theoretical and practical aspects of language development, language policy and language planning.

Lars S.Vikør. 1993. *The Nordic Languages: Their Status and Interrelations*. Nordic Language Secretariat. Publication No.14. Novus Press. Oslo.

The term "Nordic Languages" in this book means "the indigenous languages of the Nordic countries". from west to east: Greenlandic, Icelandic, Faroese, Norwegian, Danish, Swedish, Sami, and Finnish. The main part of the book is concerned with the "ecology" of these languages, i.e., their interrelations with each other and with their environments: the communities in which they function.

The book is written for students of one or more of these languages, for people with a general interest in the Nordic countries and their cultures, and for those interested in the sociology of language and language planning.

Michael C. Beveridge and Gordon Reddiford 1992. *Language, Culture and Education*. Vol.6:2, 3& 4. *Multilingual Matters*. Frankfurt Lodge, Clevedon Hall, Victoria Road, Clevedon, Avon B521. 75J, UK.

Language Policy, Literacy and Culture. 1992. Round Table. International Conference on Education, Geneva. UNESCO. 7, Place de Fontenoy, 75352 Paris 07-SP.

The Politics of Language in Australia, by Uldis Ozolins (Cambridge UP, \$35). A detailed account of the development of language policy in Australia since WWII, and of related changes in educational programs, broadcasting, industrial relations and so on. Language is placed in the context of multicultural politics, revealing marked shifts in policy and attitudes that have occurred during the period. Innovations of international significance, linked especially to the National Language Policy statement of 1987, are noted and examined. This book is a worthy addition to CUP's excellent current series on Australian language and culture.

Herri-Administrazion Hizkuntz Plangintza/*Language Planning in Public Administration*: Papers from the conference of the above title held in Donostia/San Sebastian 2-4 November 1988. Published by Herr-Arduralaritzaren Euskal Erakundea. Includes papers in different languages on language planning in European lesser used language regions. Available from: Servicio de Publicaciones del Gobierno Vasco, Becolarra 4, Vittoria-Gasteiz, Basque Country. ISBN 84-7777-079-4.

New Welsh Language Manifesto, published by the Welsh Language Society is an invitation to those interested in safeguarding the Welsh language to come together in an effort to encourage those who believe in community values and cooperation and to set realistic targets for the Welsh language in today's modern world. Further information from: Cymdeithas yr Iaith Gymraeg, pen Roc, Rhodfa'r, Aberystwyth, Dyfed, Wales. Tel:+44.970.624501.

Discovering Welshness:editors-Oliver Davies and Fiona Bowie. Published by Gwasg Gomer, Llandysul, Dyfed, Wales. 181 pages; price UK£8.95. The 30-odd contributions come from many different background, nationalities and cultures who have all made a conscious quest for the heart of Welshness through learning the language.

Acts of the International Congress on Studies of the Language, History and Culture of the Albanians of Italy (Mannheim, Germany, 25-26 June 1987), 300 pages. Further information from: Cattedra Di Lingua e Letteratura Albanese dell'Universita della Calabria, I-87036 Arcavacata (CS), Italy. Tel:+39.984.493122. Fax:+39.984.493023.

An Encyclopedic Dictionary of Language and Languages-David Crystal: A succinct and comprehensive guide to linguistic concepts and names. Terms are drawn from the various applied areas of language study and the dictionary sets out to answer questions such as "Which language is spoken in such a country", and "how many people speak X" etc. 'With over 2,700 entries and more than 5,000 cross-reference, it is an easy-to-use, quick source of reference to all facets of the subject, and ideal for anyone interested in language or languages. Published by Blackwell Publishers, 108 Cowley Road, Oxford OX4 1JF, England (ISBN 0-631-17652-7).

NEWS ITEM

Language an Issue in Kazakh Charter

Parliament adopted Kazakhstan's first constitution as an independent state on Thursday, despite fears that articles dealing with language rights could alienate the huge Russian minority.

Kazakh legislators, who hold a majority in parliament despite representing less than half the population, overrode complaints by Russian legislators. Lawmakers approved articles of the constitution making Kazakh the official state language and ruling that the state president has to have a fluent command of the language. Few Russians, who make up 39 percent of the republic's population of 17 million, speak Kazakh.

The new constitution, however, gives special status to Russian as "the social language between peoples." It describes Kazakhstan as "democratic, secular and unitary state" and grants full rights to all citizens. -ALMA-ATA, Kazakhstan (Reuters)-(29.01.93)

Tongue Listing

Hindi ranks among the top 20 languages spoken in the United

States, according to a Census Bureau report. As a matter of fact, five Indian languages rank among the top 50 non-English languages spoken in the US. The report shows that Hindi ranks 15th among all languages spoken in the country, including English. It is followed by Gujarati (26th), Punjabi(39), Bengali(44th) and Malayalam(48th). Spanish ranks 1st among non-English languages, followed by French, German, Italian, Chinese, Polish, Korean, Vietnamese, Portuguese, Japanese, Greek, Arabic Tagalog and then Hindi.

-Illustrated Weekly, May 8-14, 1993. India.

Call for articles/information on Planning for Languages of the Indigenous People.

The UN has declared "1993" as the International Year of the Indigenous People. In keeping with the spirit of recognition of the rights of the Indigenous People, we welcome articles /information on Planning for the languages of the indigenous people to be published in NLPN.

-Editor

ON INDIA GOVERNMENT SERVICE

BOOK-POST - Printed Matter

To

If undelivered, please return to:

Editor

NLPN

Central Institute of Indian Languages

Manasagangotri

Mysore 570 006, India.

CENTRAL INSTITUTE OF INDIAN LANGUAGES [Ministry of Human Resource Development - Govt. of India] Manasagangotri, Mysore - 570 006

The Central Institute of Indian Languages is concerned with the development of Indian Languages. The development of Indian languages can take place by their use in new domains, which requires development of materials and methods and manpower to work in the areas of codification, standardisation and modernisation. The work of the Institute encompasses basic research, material production and inservice training. The Institute is also entrusted with the responsibility of assisting and improving the teaching of Indian languages at various levels by developing new methods, models and materials and by making use of modern technology. The six Regional Language Centres are engaged in regular language teaching programmes. These programmes help to perpetuate multilingualism in the country. The Institute is also a clearing house of information relating to Indian languages.

The major domains in which the Institute works are of education, administration, and mass communication. The Institute is involved in the description and codification of smaller languages and to develop models, methods, materials and manpower for their use in education. It is concerned with the status of major Indian languages and the implementation of policies as regards their use as medium of

instruction and administration at all levels. The process of modernisation of Indian languages to become effective vehicles of modern society is studied intensively at the Institute. Being committed to multilingualism, it is concerned with patterns of communication in different social and occupational situations and emergence of link languages at different levels. The effect of medium of instruction on various aspects of human development in formal education is a major research programme. The Institute is developing a bank of standardized tests in Indian languages for use by educators and employers. The use of educational technology from audio cassettes to computer disks to meet the needs of language education is another programme of the Institute.

The Institute has a well equipped multimedia Library, Audio and Video studio, Language laboratory, Phonetic laboratory, Computer laboratory and Cartographic section. It is developing a computerized data base on Indian languages.

The Institute is in a unique position of implementing language policies as well as bringing new thinking into policies through its experience of implementation.