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The present report consists of case studies of language planning in different regions of the world. Two nations relevant from a language planning standpoint have been chosen from the five regions of the world as defined by UNESCO. The regions and countries studied are as follows: in Africa: Burkina Faso and Tanzania, in the Arab States: Morocco and Lebanon, in Asia and the Pacific: Cambodia and India, in Europe and North America: Finland and Spain; and in Latin America and the Caribbean: Guatemala and Bolivia. The countries evaluated have been chosen because they present a complex linguistic situation. Since the evaluation has been limited to two countries per region, a large number of interesting cases have had to be excluded, but it is hoped that the countries selected are as representative as possible. Language planning activities in the countries in question have been evaluated with the help of existing literature and information from experts in the field. The investigation has particularly focused on the status and corpus of endogenous (indigenous) and endangered languages and on the role of the educational system in language planning.

1. Introduction: Preliminaries and definitions

Our initial reaction to the term “language planning” may be that it is an unnecessary or even impossible activity. We perhaps look upon language as something that cannot be planned, and we may ask ourselves why people cannot communicate with each other as they have always done. The fact is that people cannot communicate with each other today as they used to do in the past. Society is developing and language has to adjust to reality. Political decisions are taken and this may mean that new communities are created which may lack a common means of communication. In cases such as these, language planning is desirable and indeed necessary.

Language planning has been characterized by Bamgbose (1991:109), referring to Fishman (1974:79), as “the organized pursuit of solutions to language problems”. Related notions are “language cultivation”, “language policy”, and “language politics”. In the French literature, we find terms such as aménagement linguistique, gestion linguistique, planification linguistique, politique linguistique. In English, less conscious instances of language planning are sometimes designated as “language treatment”. The “language problems” evoked in the above quotation could include such phenomena as the lack of a common language in a politically defined unit, the absence of a writing system, the lack of technical vocabulary, the shortage of school textbooks, and so on. Presumably every multilingual political unit, in which some languages are stronger and others are weaker (which often means that the latter are endangered), can be called a linguistically problematic area. Even in monolingual nations, the insufficiency of the national language in any domain has to be regarded as being a linguistic problem. In fact, every region in the world where languages come into contact, such as through invasion, migration, or the creation of new nations, is relevant in this context.

Bamgbose (ib.) also raises the question of the classical division between “status planning” and “corpus planning”, which he largely but not completely equates with activities having to do with language policy and implementation respectively. In the light of the above discussion of terms, status planning would be equated merely with language policy or language politics, whereas corpus planning largely overlaps with language cultivation. Status planning, for example, involves the allocation of languages to different societal domains, such as the official sphere, education, business, media, etc. The explicit proclamation of a language as the official medium of communication naturally enhances its importance to a significant extent, but the introduction of a particular language in schools, for example, can have far-reaching consequences. Corpus planning refers to such activities as the production of grammars and dictionaries, the design of orthographies, the choice of script, spelling
reforms, the production of primers and readers, etc. In normal practice, a policy decision aimed at granting status to a given language in a particular societal domain is first taken, and is then implemented in some way, to the extent that some kind of concrete language material is produced. As Bamgbose (1991:110) points out, policy-making without implementation does not lead to much progress, whereas implementation without policy decisions is difficult to achieve (although Bamgbose observes that the lack of a policy in some countries has worked to the advantage of linguists and missionaries who have been able to describe and codify “exotic” languages without the intervention of the authorities). In fact, Bamgbose (1991:133) points out that “it would appear that there is a correlation between the strength of a country’s language policy and the nature of its implementation machinery.”

A third distinction singled out by Bamgbose is that of Noss (1971:25), who observes that policies exist at three levels: official, educational, and general. Official policy is concerned with what language(s) is/are to be used at governmental level; educational policy deals with the question of language use in different kinds of schools; while general language policy refers to language use in mass communication, business and contacts with foreigners (Bamgbose 1991:111). Naturally, a country which recognizes more than one language at the official level is already automatically involved in far-reaching language planning. It should be noted, however, that many countries do not mention explicitly in their Constitution which official language(s) they recognize. In such cases, as Garabaghi (1983:1) points out, the language in which the Constitution is drafted is to be considered the official language. Languages other than the official one(s) are obviously often found in the educational system, let alone in informal settings.

A final theoretical distinction originally suggested by Haugen (1974) is the four-stage model for language planning: a norm is selected by modifying or creating a variety; the norm is then codified (the orthography, pronunciation, grammar and lexicon are established); its function is elaborated (for example, by coining the necessary lexical items), and, last but not least, its acceptance in the community is ensured.

When it comes to the question as to which language(s) to promote, Poth (1997a:17) reminds us of the following important parameters: the number of speakers, the dialectal variation, the degree of similarity with neighbouring languages, the available resources and the didactic coefficient.

The following societal domains are important when it comes to the status planning of a language. The larger number of domains in which a language is recognized, the higher its status:

- government;
- assembly/parliament;
- courts;
- administration;
- education;
- business;
- media;

The following corpus planning activities are necessary for language planning to produce tangible results (following Bamgbose 1991:110):

- design of orthography or reform of the existing spelling system;
- standardization/harmonization of spelling/word forms;
- determination of word pronunciation;
- choice of script;
- terminology, vocabulary expansion;
- change in grammatical structure (such as the introduction of the decimal system);
- creation of simplified registers for special purposes;
- dialect levelling;
- cultivation and counselling in respect of different styles and genres;
- production of primers, readers, manuals in connection with literacy training/schooling;
- translations of various kinds, of the Bible, for example;
- dictionaries, grammars;
- fiction and other creative arts, including language;
- other forms of production of written and oral texts in the broad sense;
- creation of institutions dealing with language questions only (such as language commissions).

The so-called preparatory activities included in language planning also have to be considered (cf. Bamgbose 1991:121 ff.):

- sociolinguistic surveys;
- descriptive studies;
- pilot projects;
- commissions (governmental);
- conferences (Bamgbose (1991:125) distinguishes between UNESCO-initiated ones and others);
- resolutions by international organizations (these are very important according to Bamgbose (1991:127), since the countries concerned are usually also members of the organizations in question).

A. Gatéra of the UNESCO Secretariat designed a questionnaire to investigate status and corpus planning which was distributed to sub-Saharan countries in connection with the UNESCO-organized Intergovernmental Conference on Language Policies in Africa, held in Harare in 1997. The questionnaire is based on the Charte de la Langue Française in Québec, which regulates the use of French in that Canadian province. The questionnaire is reproduced here because it gives a good picture of the different areas relevant to language planning in respect of both the status and corpus of languages. The replies from a number of countries in the questionnaire reproduced below have been used in the present report to evaluate language planning.
POLITUQUES ET PRATIQUES LINGUISTIQUES EN AFRIQUE/Linguistic policies and practices in Africa

**Country** (append a list with the complete address of the centres or institutions involved in African languages research and promotion of their main publications)

1. **General situation**
   1.1 Population (at last census followed by latest population estimate)
   1.2 Majority language (spoken by more than 50% of speakers on the national territory. Give the numbers or estimates of speakers (in % with alternative name(s) of the language (if any))
   1.3 Minority languages (spoken by less than 50% on the national territory. Give the name of the languages with alternative name(s) in use ranked in decreasing order according to the number or estimates of speakers (in % in the national territory)

2. Legal status of languages
   2.1 Official languages
   2.2 Other languages with defined status
   2.3 Texts defining the status

3. **Use of languages in legislation** (give the names of the languages in decreasing order depending upon the degree of their use, stating “oral” if the use of a language is only oral)
   3.1 Languages used in parliamentary debate
   3.2 Languages used in the writing of laws
   3.3 Languages used in promulgation of laws
   3.4 Texts defining their use

4. **Use of languages in the judicial system**
   4.1 Authorized languages
   4.2 Languages ordinarily used
   4.3 Language of judgements
   4.4 Texts defining their use

5. **Use of languages in administration**
   5.1 Languages of the executive
   5.2 Languages used in official mailings to regional or local governments (if any)
   5.3 Languages used in official mailings to foreign governments
   5.4 Languages used in regional (province, etc.) or local (town, etc.) administration
   5.5 Languages used in election campaign meetings
   5.6 Texts defining their use

6. **Use of languages in education**
   6.1 Languages used in nursery school and kindergarten
   6.2 Languages used in primary schools (grades, subjects concerned)
   6.3 Languages used in secondary schools
   6.4 Languages used in institutions of higher learning (universities etc.)
   6.5 Languages used in adult literacy programmes
   6.6 Languages taught (in primary school, secondary school and institutions of higher learning, stating “compulsory” or “optional” (subject taught))
   6.7 Texts defining their use

7. **Use of languages in business**
   7.1 Languages used in commercial advertisements
   7.2 Languages used in administrative announcements
   7.3 Languages used in labelling
   7.4 Languages used in instruction manuals
   7.5 Languages used in commercial printed matter
   7.6 Texts defining their use

8. **Use of languages in the media**
   8.1 Languages used in the written press (append a list of main journals or periodicals with for each: name, frequency, average circulation and the African language(s) used)
   8.2 Languages used on the radio (hrs/week)
   8.3 Languages used on television (hrs/week)
   8.4 Texts defining their use
Language planning covering all the above conditions has to be considered to be successful. In the case studies below, we shall see how well they are met in the respective countries.

2. Geopolitical facts bearing on language planning

The present study analyses a number of language planning cases from the four corners of the globe. The different case studies are selected from the five regions of the world as defined by the UNESCO General Conference. As already mentioned, the geopolitical regions established by UNESCO are Africa, the Arab states (roughly corresponding to the Maghreb and the Middle East), Asia and the Pacific, Europe and North America (including Canada, Israel and several ex-Soviet republics but excluding the U.S.A.), and Latin America and the Caribbean. It should already be pointed out that these regions are quite dissimilar in terms of their respective socio-linguistic situations, which means that language planning will differ from one region to another, if they can be discussed at such a general level at all.

Before we embark on this geopolitical subject, a few terminological comments have to be made. We have already mentioned terms connected with language planning proper. In addition, we shall often have reason to evoke the distinction majority versus minority language. This dichotomy does not give rise to any problem if it is used in a mathematical sense, i.e. a majority language is spoken (as a first language?) by more than 50% of the population in a given country. In the Americas and Africa, there is often a need to distinguish between the languages imposed by the colonizers and the languages spoken in situ before colonization. Sometimes, the former are called colonial, ex-colonial, or post-colonial languages. The latter may be referred to as “indigenous” languages, but the term is not an altogether happy one, since in some contexts it carries certain connotations of low prestige (e.g. in Portuguese-speaking Africa, where “indigenous” has been associated with “primitive”). “Endogenous” is actually a more suitable term, in that it also has a scientific usage which is precisely that sought here. This term is often used in the present paper. It should be noted that indigenous or endogenous languages can both be a majority (such as Somali in Somalia) or a minority (cf. Saami in Finland). The label “autochthonous” is sometimes encountered and, from our point of view, this is also preferable to “indigenous”. Another term which some people have advocated for “indigenous language” is “heritage language”. The terms “original population” or “original language” are also found. In fact, the United Nations identifies original populations as being a special kind of community (see the section on Finland below). Here, however, it is difficult to know when a population should be counted as original. Bantu people have lived in Southern Africa for more than a thousand years and are normally considered “indigenous”, but the area was originally inhabited by the Khoisan people, who have now been pushed back to the south-westernmost part of the continent.

The best solution to these terminological problems is probably to use the genetically established names of languages and language families. By using neutral terms like Indo-European, Niger-Congo, Amerindian etc. languages, it is possible to refer to the languages in question without having to worry about undesirable connotations such as those discussed above.

2.1 The Americas

The countries of the Americas are fairly monolingual, with a heavy dominance of English, Spanish and Portuguese in their respective ex-colonies. It should be noted, however, that the U.S.A., with its mix of immigrant languages, Amerindian languages and English is not a Member State of UNESCO, and that Canada is grouped with the European States in the UNESCO classification.

As a result of the European colonization of the Americas, indigenous languages more or less disappeared. There are some exceptions, such as Quechua, which will be discussed below, but in general it seems fair to say that the pre-Colombian languages in the Americas are now seriously endangered. The Caribbean is a somewhat special case, in that a very wide variety of Creole languages are spoken in that region. The relationship between these languages and their European lexifier languages is not always straightforward.

However, in the countries of the Americas generally, language planning would rather appear to be a question of safeguarding the Amerindian languages. It has been claimed (Malherbe 1995:254) that 900 different Amerindian languages were spoken in the Americas in the 16th century, whereas less than 50 are now used in everyday life. The situation is rather similar in the case of Australia and New Zealand, where English dominates heavily and endogenous languages are seriously endangered (see the section on Australia below). It is characteristic of both the Americas and Australia that at the time the European colonial powers arrived on these continents, they were sparsely populated. Europeans subsequently arrived in comparatively large numbers and this fact, together with the systematic extermination of the Amerindians, led to a rapid weakening of endogenous cultures and languages (see further Janson, 1998). By contrast, in Africa and Asia, Europeans have always been very much in the minority, and their languages have not in any way been able to spread in the same way as in the Americas, Australia and Oceania.

2.2 Europe

The European continent itself presents a picture where many countries host a single widespread national language, such as Sweden (Swedish), Portugal (Portuguese), Greece (Greek), etc. However, it should not be forgotten that Europe also includes a number of minority languages, among which mention can be made of the Celtic languages in the United Kingdom,
The European colonizers chiefly established forts and countries. These newly-created republics also host internal conflicts in these newly-born countries. Unfortunately, there are a host of internal conflicts in these newly-born countries. The Arab-speaking countries represent something different from that in the Americas and Australia. The European colonizers chiefly established forts and trading posts in Asia, but did not attempt actual colonization. Thus, although European languages are present today in Asia, as a rule they are not used very widely in everyday life by the Chinese, Japanese and other peoples (except in certain sectors such as the business world). Even so, there are countries in Asia where European languages have official status, and these are discussed further below. Many Asian countries resemble European ones to the extent that they host a widely spoken national language (such as Japanese in Japan, Chinese in China, Thai in Thailand, etc.). This does not mean that Asia has no language minorities. In some countries such as China, Nepal, and Laos, for example, there are dozens of minorities (see further below). Many endangered languages can likewise be found in Siberia and the Arctic.

The Arab-speaking countries represent something of a separate case, and, as we have seen, form a specific region in the UNESCO classification. In this region, the Arabic language is highly dominant, but it should be noted that the varieties of spoken Arabic differ from one country to another, whereas Standard Arabic cuts across national borders (cf. also Africa below). However, the role of European languages does not seem to be the most important issue in language planning in Asia.

2.4 Australia and Oceania
As pointed out above, the language situation in Australia and New Zealand closely resembles that in English-speaking America. New Zealand hosts an important Maori population, but its language and culture are endangered. In the Pacific, the endogenous Melanesian and Polynesian peoples may have survived better than those of the Americas and Australia. Endogenous languages may therefore be less threatened by extinction, but the presence of European languages and European-derived pidgins and Creoles in Oceania is also a notable factor. The Pacific languages are actually in permanent danger owing to the mere fact that they are spoken by so few people numerically and are seldom officially recognized.

2.5 Africa
In Africa, there are a very large number of endogenous languages. Most of them belong to the Niger-Congo family, but regions are also found where Nilo-Saharan and Khoisan languages are spoken. Arabic, which is widespread in Northern Africa, is not normally considered an African language. European languages are present everywhere because of Africa's colonial history. These languages are not endogenous, of course, but there are some borderline cases such as Afrikaans and European-derived Creoles. In Northern Africa, Arabic is often the official language, sometimes in competition with French. In the rest of the continent, many countries have a European language as their official language. As opposed to what was found in the Americas and Australia, however, relatively few people in Africa speak a European language as their native tongue. Admittedly, European languages are important as second languages in Africa, but the number of first-language speakers remains very limited. In this respect, Africa resembles Asia, with the difference that, in Asia, European languages do not normally have official status, whereas this tends to be the case in Africa, as already stated. The African countries with the highest number of native speakers of a European language are Liberia and South Africa but, even there, the percentage of L1 speakers of English hardly exceeds 10% (Schmied 1991). It is also characteristic of Africa that cultural borders do not overlap with geographic ones. The outcome is a difficult situation, where many African countries have accorded official status to a post-colonial language which is not very well known among the population. What is worse, in many African countries there is no evident national language which could assume the official role, but rather a spectrum of minority languages which are not mutually comprehensible. Language planning accordingly seems to be particularly urgent on the African continent.

2.6 Conclusion of the geopolitical survey
If we translate the regions as defined by UNESCO to the traditional continents, as we did above, we obtain the following broad picture:
1. The Americas: Indo-European languages rule; Amerindian languages are endangered.
2. Australia and Oceania: Indo-European languages rule; aboriginal languages are endangered.
3. Asia: several "nation states" but also many minorities; Arabic is a language of wider communication in the Middle East; European languages are not widely spoken.
4. Europe: several "nation states" but also many linguistic minorities.
5. Africa: Arabic and European languages officially important, but African languages are normally spoken as first languages.

It would thus seem that language planning is important in Africa for facilitating national communication, and in the Americas and Australia in an endeavour to contribute to safeguarding languages threatened by extinction.

We shall now turn to the various UNESCO regions and examine two countries in each of them which represent important examples of language planning.

3. Countries of particular language-planning interest

We shall discuss below two cases in each of the regions defined by UNESCO which are particularly relevant from a language planning perspective. In fact, given that language planning is "the organized pursuit of solutions to language problems" as stated at the outset, we are not primarily interested in linguistically homogeneous countries (if such countries exist) but rather in countries with linguistic diversity and/or speech communities in conflict.

4. Africa

As already pointed out on several occasions, Africa is the continent where language planning is most urgent. The following typology of African countries can be established as far as their linguistic situations are concerned (following the working document of UNESCO for the Intergovernmental Conference on Language Policies in Africa, Harare 1997). It will be noted that only sub-Saharan Africa is covered:

(a) More or less monolingual countries where the language in question is spoken:

1. as the mother tongue:
   Somalia (Somali), Lesotho (Sesotho), Swaziland (Siswati), Burundi (Kirundi), Rwanda (Kinyarwanda) and presumably Botswana (Setswana). For some reason the document does not mention Madagascar, where virtually the entire population speaks Malagasy. This may be because the country is not considered as belonging to sub-Saharan Africa or that Malagasy is not counted as being an African language (in fact, it belongs to the Austronesian family).

2. as a lingua franca:
   Kenya, Tanzania (Kiswahili), République Centrafricaine (Sango), Mali (Bambara), Senegal (Wolof), Sudan (Arabic), Ethiopia (Amharic/Amarinya).

It would also be interesting to know to what extent these languages are also spoken as mother tongues.

(b) Countries with one dominant language: Ghana (Akan-Twi), Burkina Faso (Mossi/Mooré), Niger (Hausa), Zimbabwe (Chishona), Togo (Ewe), Benin ( Fon-Gbe), Malawi (Chichewa/Chinyanja).

(c) Countries with several important languages in competition: Nigeria (Hausa, Yoruba, Igbo), Sierra Leone (Temne, Mende), Congo-Kinshasa (Kikongo, Lingala, Chiluba, Kiswahili/Kingwana).

(d) Countries without a dominant language: Cameroon (although Bulu is important in the south and Fulani in the north), Côte d'Ivoire, Mozambique.

The authors of the working document claim that cases (a1), (b) and (c) are most favourable when it comes to promoting an African language to official status. However, the authors are aware of the fact that, in cases (b) and (c), there is a risk of further marginalizing linguistic minorities in the country in question. Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that even in case (a1), we find linguistic minorities which are admittedly sometimes quite small, although this is not always the case (cf. Botswana). It could be ventured that situation (a2) may, in fact, be less conflictual, although it should be borne in mind that even the lingua francas in question have native speakers, who will then be favoured. In this connection, it should be noted that in case (b), it is not unusual for speakers of languages other than the dominant one to master the latter. Although this may be against the wishes of the minorities in question, it undoubtedly facilitates nationwide communication.

In situation (c) and (d), it is often the case that different languages are dominant in different regions of a particular country. It would then be possible to advocate a solution whereby there would be regional official languages. We shall return to this point later. Reproduced below is a table of the above situations in which an attempt is made to examine the advantages and disadvantages of the different language policies:
When it comes to tangible linguistic policies in sub-Saharan Africa, the working document distinguishes three approaches actually taken:

(a) Countries which promote a single language which is

1. exoglossic: French in all French-speaking ex-colonies (!), except the Democratic Republic of Congo; Portuguese in Mozambique, Angola and Guinea-Bissau; English in Liberia (although it has to be asked what variety of English this is and whether no ex-British colony really promotes English, cf. (b2) below);

2. endoglossic (normally in parallel with an Indo-European language): Tanzania (Kiswahili), Ethiopia (Amharic/Amarinya), Somalia (Somali), Republique Centrafricaine (Sango).

(b) Countries which have an exoglossic policy but with endoglossic tendencies promoting

1. one language: Kenya (or in (a1)), Uganda, Malawi, Burundi, Rwanda, Lesotho, Botswana, Swaziland, Republique Centrafricaine (note that all these countries except Uganda have a dominant African language);

2. more than one language: Nigeria, Ghana, Guinea, the Democratic Republic of Congo.

(c) Countries which have an exoglossic policy but use endogenous languages in certain contexts such as primary education, local press, courts, etc.: Zambia, Zimbabwe, Sierra Leone.

Bamgbose (1991:111) also underscores the importance of language planning in Africa and finds that language-policy making in Africa throughout history has been plagued by various problems such as “avoidance, vagueness, arbitrariness, fluctuation, and declaration without implementation”. One example of avoidance is that where a country units to mention its official language(s) in the Constitution or a comparable official document. According to Bamgbose, this is quite common among African countries and tends to lead to a kind of endorsement of acquired communication habits, with too important a role often being assumed by the ex-colonial language. The point made above, whereby the language of the Constitution will then be regarded as the official language by default, should be noted. Vagueness is exemplified by the promotion of Kiswahili in Kenya, which has been advocated in very general terms but has not been followed by implementation. Arbitrariness can be readily seen when language-policy decisions are taken without due respect for the linguistic reality. Bamgbose (1991:114) gives the example of a dictator who proclaims his own (perhaps minority) language as the nation’s official language. However, says Bamgbose, sometimes arbitrary language planning can succeed, such as the choice of Latin script over Arabic and indigenous ones in Somalia. As an example of fluctuation in language planning, he cites the case of Ghana, which has oscillated between supporting and rejecting African languages (mainly Ga, Nzema, Akan, and Ewe) since the beginning of the 1950s. Declaration without implementation is found in many cases. Bamgbose (1991:117) points out that the formulation in the Nigerian Constitution, in which it is stated that Hausa, Yoruba, and Igbo are allowed in the National Assembly “when adequate arrangements have been made therefor”, serves as an escape hatch for engaging in parliamentary discussions in English as has always been the case. The converse can be observed in Tanzania, where the proclamation of Kiswahili as an

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Monolingual” African country</th>
<th>Country with one dominant Afr. Lg</th>
<th>Country with several Afr. lgs competing for domination</th>
<th>Country without a dominant Afr. lg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advantage</td>
<td>Disadvantage</td>
<td>Advantage</td>
<td>Disadvantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-European language as the official language</td>
<td>“Modernity”</td>
<td>“Modern”, since the country already has a natural means of communication, which furthermore privileges the elite</td>
<td>“Modern”, does not privilege any special group (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Artificial, unnatural if nobody speaks it</td>
<td>Unnecessary since the nation already possesses a language known to most people</td>
<td>May privilege native speakers, perhaps no such vehicular language exists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Ethnic” language as the official language</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Limited access to modernity</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Modern”</td>
<td>-Unnecessary, bornetimes practical or unifying force, May act as unifying force in certain contexts.</td>
<td>“Modern”, since the country already has a means of communication spoken by the majority, which furthermore privileges the elite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantage</td>
<td>Disadvantage</td>
<td>Advantage</td>
<td>Disadvantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-European language as the official language</td>
<td>“Modernity”</td>
<td>“Modern”, does not privilege any special group (?)</td>
<td>“Modern”, since the country already has a means of communication spoken by the majority, which furthermore privileges the elite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Artificial, unnatural if nobody speaks it</td>
<td>Unnecessary since the nation already possesses a language known to most people</td>
<td>May privilege native speakers, perhaps no such vehicular language exists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Ethnic” language as the official language</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Limited access to modernity</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Modern”</td>
<td>-Unnecessary, bornetimes practical or unifying force, May act as unifying force in certain contexts.</td>
<td>“Modern”, since the country already has a means of communication spoken by the majority, which furthermore privileges the elite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advantage</td>
<td>Disadvantage</td>
<td>Advantage</td>
<td>Disadvantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-European language as the official language</td>
<td>“Modernity”</td>
<td>“Modern”, does not privilege any special group (?)</td>
<td>“Modern”, since the country already has a means of communication spoken by the majority, which furthermore privileges the elite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Artificial, unnatural if nobody speaks it</td>
<td>Unnecessary since the nation already possesses a language known to most people</td>
<td>May privilege native speakers, perhaps no such vehicular language exists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Ethnic” language as the official language</td>
<td>Natural</td>
<td>Limited access to modernity</td>
<td>Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Modern”</td>
<td>-Unnecessary, bornetimes practical or unifying force, May act as unifying force in certain contexts.</td>
<td>“Modern”, since the country already has a means of communication spoken by the majority, which furthermore privileges the elite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When it comes to tangible linguistic policies in sub-Saharan Africa, the working document distinguishes three approaches actually taken:
official language has been accompanied by practical action. However, as Bamgbose (1991:120) notes, three conditions have to be met if language planning is to be successful: the language in question needs to have an important base of speakers, the political will must exist and the country has to have a strong government capable of implementing language-policy decisions. Somali and Tanzania fulfill these conditions, unlike countries such as Kenya, Senegal, and Congo-Brazzaville which have attempted, but not succeeded, in language planning enterprises. In this connection, the much-discussed three-level distinction concerning language use in Africa also has to be considered: often, one language is used locally, another at the regional or national level, and a third in international contacts. Tanzania is a case in point: one of the 120 smaller languages is normally used locally, Kiswahili is the language of national and regional communication and English is used for international purposes. Language planning has to take situations such as these into account and allow for differentiated legislation and different levels. It is important to keep this in mind because the tendency is often to place language planning activities exclusively at the national level. Yet, why could not language use in provinces, districts or even local communities be planned? Or, conversely, why should language planning not be conducted at a transnational, regional level? In the European Union today, the concept of ‘nation’ has become less important and many decisions concern regions including (parts of) several nations. Language planning could also be conducted in this way, and as we said earlier, in Africa in particular national borders often do not coincide with cultural and linguistic borders.

What makes Somalia and Tanzania efficient (Bamgbose 1991:134) is the fact that there are organizations in these countries responsible for producing school books, textbooks, literacy materials, terminology, dictionaries, literary works, curriculum planning, etc. In a sense, therefore, these countries could be viewed as successful examples of language planning. However, Somalia is a highly monolingual country, something which has greatly facilitated the enforcement of Somali as the national language. In Tanzania, the promotion of Kiswahili, while admittedly successful, has also been at the expense of the 120 small languages, many of which are now threatened with extinction.

In Chaudenson (1993), the following countries are mentioned as relevant to language planning in Africa: Congo-Brazzaville, Democratic Republic of Congo, Guinea (with important languages such as Pulaar (Fulfulde), Maninka, Kpelle, Soso, Iaghâma, Kissi, Wamei, Oneyan), Madagascar, Mali, Mauritius and Togo, to which could be added Senegal and South Africa, to mention only a few. These countries either have a complex linguistic situation (cf. South Africa) or have been very successful in promoting an African language (e.g. Madagascar). The South African project of having 12 official languages comprising ten Bantu languages, English and Afrikaans, is of the utmost interest and represents a real challenge to the promotion of multilingualism, which is something that cannot be said about Tanzania, for example, where the main goal is to develop Kiswahili.

There is thus more or less of an embarras de richesses when it comes to countries in need of language planning in Africa. Out of this embarras, we shall select two countries which will constitute the African case studies on language planning. These are Burkina Faso and Tanzania, the former country as an example of an ambitious approach towards solving the problems created by linguistic diversity, and the latter as a successful example of the implementation of an African language of wider communication in a multilingual country.

4.1 Burkina Faso

French is the only official language in Burkina Faso, but 60 to 70 African languages are spoken among the more than 10 million inhabitants. Kedrebeogo (1997) says that the number of languages is 59, whereas Ethnologue (1996), which is known for frequently identifying separate languages, gives the number as 71. The country is often mentioned in connection with language planning in Africa, and three national languages are specifically promoted, namely Mooré (4.5 million speakers, i.e. half of the population), Fulfulde (250,000; but 768,000 according to Kedrebeogo 1997:5) and Jula (Dioula, over 1 million; 341,000 according to Kedrebeogo). In Kedrebeogo’s list, Gurmanchema is actually ranked above both Fulfulde and Jula and is said to have 430,000 speakers. Mooré is spoken by the Mossi population and Fulfulde and Jula are vehicular languages which cut cross the borders with Mali and Niger. Other languages which are recognized in some way, mostly in education and local radio broadcasts (according to the questionnaire on Politiques et pratiques linguistiques en Afrique), are Bisa, Bobo, Bwamu, Cerma, Dafin (Meekakan), Dagara, Kar, Kasim, Lobiri, Lyele, Nankana, Nuni, San, Senufo, Sisale (Sissala), Sonray, and Tamaashaq. Kedrebeogo (1997:6) notes, however, that most languages in Burkina Faso are not very widely spoken and that the country is a typical nation of minor languages. According to Kedrebeogo (1997:10), about 20 of the Burkinabé languages are used in broadcasts on the national Radio rurale, whereas only Fulfulde, Jula and Mooré are used on television.

When it comes to education, Sources 104 (1998), reports that the educational system in Burkina 20 years ago was felt not to function very well partly because the school taught “des valeurs étrangères dans une langue étrangère, le français.” Mooré, Fulfulde and Jula were then proclaimed national languages. The nationalization of the three languages in question meant that they were allocated certain functions in society. However, this reform did not meet with unanimous support, and some people believed that the replacement of French in schools by Mooré, Fulfulde and Jula would make international careers more difficult for the Burkinabés. Secondly, people speaking languages other than Mooré, Fulfulde and Jula felt side-stepped since their languages were not recognized. Between 1978 and 1983, the three national languages
were used in some elementary schools (Nkongolo 1997:241), and with the advent of the revolutionary government, the promotion of national languages was intensified. National languages were strongly encouraged in government and administration and a Ministry of Education and Mass Literacy was created in 1990 with the goal of eradicating illiteracy by teaching the population to read and write in the Burkinabé languages. In spite of its good intentions, the actions of the revolutionary government did not succeed on a wider scale, notes Kedreogo (1997:16) and he attributes this to the fact that national languages were not accorded recognition at the official level.

At the present time, the system being used appears to be one where Burkinabé languages are used for adult alphabetization in so called écoles satellites, whereas French is used in other sectors of the educational system. According to Kedreogo (1997:13), the current drop-out rate in Burkinabé schools is still alarmingly high, and he attributes this fact to the alienation created by the French oriented educational system. In fact, Kedreogo states (1997:14) that "the language question in francophone Africa has never received the attention it deserves".

In terms of corpus planning, Kedreogo mentions the Commission nationale des langues voltaïques which was created in 1969. It was followed by an Office national pour l'éducation permanente et l'alphabétisation fonctionnelle et sélective, which engaged in alphabetization campaigns among certain professional groups and subsequently in the introduction of the national languages in schools, as mentioned above. The Commission nationale des langues voltaïques had a technical committee responsible for the so-called national alphabet which would allow consistent writing of all Burkinabé national languages. For example, the national anthem and administrative terms were translated into the main Burkinabé languages.

4.1.1 Conclusions on language planning in Burkina Faso

A number of national languages would appear to be fairly well entrenched in adult education and the media in present-day Burkina Faso, but as Kedreogo (1997:16) points out, the main problem is that "unless the language in which literacy is acquired gains some official recognition, be it at local, regional or national levels, literacy in a national language cannot have the expected impact on the masses." Kedreogo advocates a solution on the Indian model, whereby each of the 45 Burkinabé provinces would designate a national language as the provincial regional language (in addition, Fulfulde, Jula and Moorte would be proclaimed "national official languages"). This would not come up against any formal problems, since every province has either a majority "ethnic" language or a likewise African lingua franca. According to Kedreogo (1997:21), 13 or fewer languages would suffice to cover the entire Burkina territory. Perhaps more importantly, he points out that this recognition of provincial official languages "goes in line with an already existing language practice and will only seek to promote it."

4.2 Tanzania

Tanzania has 33 million inhabitants. Kiswahili and English are co-official languages. It is impossible not to include Tanzania as a case study of language planning in Africa, since it is probably the African country which has been most successful in promoting an African lingua franca (with its consequential pros and cons) and it now has several active language-cultivating institutions. Tanzania hosts no fewer than 120 languages from different African language phylae, and the country has managed very successfully in promoting the Bantu language Kiswahili at all levels of society. In a questionnaire requested for the UNESCO survey Linguistic policies and practices in Africa 1998, the Directorate of Arts and National Languages of the Ministry of Education and Culture states that Kiswahili is the majority language and adds that 120 ethnic languages are also spoken in Tanzania. Four so-called foreign languages, English, Arabic, Hindi, and Gujarati, are also listed. Kiswahili is the official language together with English and is used in parliamentary debates, the promulgation of laws, the judicial system, all kinds of administrative activities, at all levels of education (although English is preferred at university level), in business contexts such as commercial advertisements, administrative posters, labelling, instruction manuals, and commercial printed matter. There are eight periodicals published in Kiswahili, namely Uhumu/Mzalendo, Nipashe, Watu, Motomoto, Majira, Sani Burudani, Kiongozi and Meko. Kiswahili programmes are broadcast on the national radio network for 133 hours a week and on private stations for 82 hours a week. On television, 56 programme hours a week are devoted to Kiswahili.

As can be seen, the position of Kiswahili is very strong in Tanzania. However, the other 120 African languages are very little used in more formal contexts. The only reference to these languages in connection with official activities is a passage in the questionnaire in question, where it is stated that "ethnic languages are used for social cultural affairs". It is also claimed that ethnic languages are authorized in the judicial system, presumably in local courts. As a point of fact, a small number of these 120 languages are quite widely spoken. Some of them have a million speakers or more, for example Kichaga, Kihaya, Shimakonde, Kinyamwezi, Kisukuma (5 million), and Chitumbuka.

The use of languages is regulated in an official document entitled "Cultural policy under making". Kiswahili is cultivated primarily through the National Kiswahili Council (BAKITA), which issues the publications Lagha yetu. Ifunze Kiswahili uwanjaghe wengine, and Tafsiri sanfu. In Dar es Salaam, there is also the Institute of Kiswahili Research (TUKI), which is responsible for the publication Mulika as well as for dictionaries such as Kamusi za Fizikia, Kemia, and Biolojia. Zanzibar is the location of the Institute of Kiswahili and Foreign languages (TAKILUKI) as well as of the regional centre EACROTANAL, devoted to the study of oral
African country which has succeeded so well in promoting an African lingua franca. What is perhaps must be considered a success. There is probably no All in all, the status and corpus planning of Kiswahili cultivated, even at advanced levels. However, two drawbacks have been noted in Tanzanian policy: Tanzania, i.e. not more than 1.8% of the population, although this figure will in all probability increase as Kiswahili spreads as a lingua franca. With regard to second language users, Ethnologue (1996) claims that 93.4% of the Tanzanian population speaks Kiswahili as an L2. Together with speakers in adjoining countries, the number of Swahili-speakers amounts to over 30 million.

4.2.1 Conclusions on language planning in Tanzania

All in all, the status and corpus planning of Kiswahili must be considered a success. There is probably no African country which has succeeded so well in promoting an African lingua franca. What is perhaps most impressive about Tanzania is the considerable Kiswahili corpus which is being produced and cultivated, even at advanced levels. However, two drawbacks have been noted in Tanzanian policy: Tanzanians have been alleged not to master English well enough and African languages other than Kiswahili have been neglected. In respect of the first point, we do not think that high proficiency in Kiswahili leads to low standards in English. In principle, there is nothing to prevent people from simultaneously mastering both Kiswahili and English. The second point is more serious and there can be no doubt that several Tanzanian languages are endangered, perhaps at the cost of the promotion of Kiswahili. However, the country has 120 languages and some are bound to be stronger than others. Even so, it should still be possible to implement some kind of India type system (see the section after the next) in Tanzania, in other words a language policy where the different provinces designate a locally important African language as the regional official language. Admittedly, this may not be possible in every province, but it ought to be feasible in some instances. It should be remembered that in the Tanzanian interior Kiswahili is still a second language, and some people speak it quite badly. Normally, people speak the “ethnic” language, which can be quite important (as pointed out above) and have millions of speakers. In those cases, it should be normal to accord the “ethnic” language in question greater official recognition.

5. Arab States

The Arab States are characterized by the omnipresence of Arabic (see below however), one of the major languages of the world and an official language of the United Nations. Arabic is inseparable from the Islamic cultural and religious values conveyed by classical (written) Arabic, as appearing in the Qur’an. In the Arab States, Arabic is also often the language of business. Spoken Arabic is often said to differ significantly from one country to another, but Malherbe (1995:224) points out that the “modern Arabic” used in the media today is more or less understandable for any citizen in the Arab States with a certain level of education.

The following countries are included in the Arab States in the UNESCO list of Member States: Algeria, Bahrein, Djibouti, Egypt, Iraq, Libya, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Malta, Mauritania, Morocco, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates and Yemen, making a total of 21 countries, the same number as the members of the Arab League (but cf. also Palestine). It will be noted that some of these countries are situated in North Africa and some in the Middle East. Malta technically belongs to Europe and is a somewhat untypical Arab country. The languages spoken in Malta are Maltese, which is close to Arabic but is written in the Latin alphabet, and English. Islam extends far south in Africa, and several sub-Saharan nations have Arabic-speaking populations, although Arabic is not an official language.

5.1 African Arab States

The above list includes all African countries which have Arabic as an official language except for Chad, which has both Arabic and French as official languages (and also hosts a number of Afro-Asiatic, Nilo-Saharan and Niger-Congo languages—cf. also Mauritania below). Djibouti has both French and Arabic as official languages, but neither of them is widely spoken by the population, who generally speaks Afar and Somali. The Comoros does not feature in the above list but has three official languages, Arabic, French and Comoran. The last-mentioned is a Bantu language related to Kiswahili, which occupies quite a strong position. Somalia is a special case, in that it appears to be the only Arab State in Africa which does not have Arabic as an official language (although sources disagree on this). In any event, Somali is overwhelmingly the country’s dominant language. Countries like Djibouti, Comoros, and Somalia differ from many other Arab States inasmuch as they have only a tiny minority of native Arabic speakers. The same could be said about Eritrea, if it were considered an Arab State (cf. also the discussion below of Berber in the Maghreb). In these countries the pace of “Arabization” is increasing.
however, and the number of Arabic-speakers can be expected to rise.

Some countries in North Africa also host Afro-Asianic languages other than Arabic such as Berber and/or Nilo-Saharan languages. Berber languages are found in Algeria, Morocco, Mali and Niger. Algeria hosts various Berber languages (among which Kabyle, Chaouia and Tuareg-Tamasheq) and the same is true for Morocco (see below). On the sociolinguistic situation in Algeria, see further Benabdi (1980).

Egypt has both a French and English legacy, but Arabic now dominates and is the official language. Four small Nilo-Saharan languages are spoken and four minor Afro-Asianic ones, among which three are Semitic and one Berber.

In Libya, attempts have been made to introduce English in schools, under a project supported by UNDP. Arabic is otherwise predominant and only a very small number of Afro-Asianic and Nilo-Saharan languages of limited communication are spoken, including Tamasheq. Libya has otherwise been the subject of colonial exploitation by Italy, France, and the United Kingdom, and there may be linguistic remnants from these periods.

Mauritania may be relevant here, since it is sometimes included in the Maghreb. It has been argued that it belongs to the Maghreb area culturally, but it is unclear whether it officially recognizes Arabic, as it does French. Even so, Arabic is numerically important (see further Garabaghi 1983:14).

Sudan states that only 60% of the population uses Arabic, and a number of Berber and Nilo-Saharan languages are also spoken.

In Tunisia, Arabic is the official language but French is also used. Stevens (1974) is a study of bilingualism in Tunisia.

In conclusion, Arabic and, occasionally, other Afro-Asianic and/or Nilo-Saharan languages are found in the Maghreb. French and Arabic can be seen to co-habit in some instances: although Arabic is the only recognized official language, French is used on many formal occasions. Ironically, some Berber activists see the French language as their major obstacle but readily adopt Arabic as their vehicle of communication.

5.2 Asian Arab States

The Asian Arab States display the following language features: Bahrain is entirely Arabic-speaking, Iraq has Arabic as its official and most widely-spoken language, but also has a large Kurdish minority and some Syriac and Armenian speakers. The Kurds in northern Iraq are currently seeking autonomy. Jordan is likewise uniformly Arabic-speaking, as is Kuwait. In Lebanon, apart from Arabic, which is the official and widely-spoken language, French and English are also spoken to some extent. In addition, Lebanon has an Armenian minority. Lebanon is one of the Arab States which will constitute a case study below. Oman is entirely Arab-speaking, as are Qatar, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. Syria is quite homogeneously Arabic-speaking but has small pockets of Kurds and Armenians. Yemen is likewise officially Arabic-speaking but also includes other Semitic languages such as Mahri.

Afghanistan, Iran, and Pakistan are Islamic nations but do not belong linguistically or culturally to the Arab world. The same could probably be said of a number of their neighbouring ex-Soviet republics.

In this instance, the countries chosen as interesting cases of language planning here are Morocco and Lebanon.

5.3 Morocco

The population of Morocco is 29 million, including several hundred thousand people in the Western Sahara, a territory which Morocco has been occupying since 1976. Nine languages are spoken in Morocco. Arabic is the only official language, but French is often used in various formal contexts, although there are only 80,000 native French-speakers in the country, while there are 20,000 Spanish speakers in the former Spanish province of Ifni, which was incorporated into Morocco in 1969. The socio-linguistic situation in Morocco is described in detail in Abbassi (1977). Abbassi focuses on diglossia, bilingualism and code-switching/mixing involving Classical Arabic, Moroccan Arabic and French, but also has a section on Berber languages. Cf. also Forkel (1980).

5.3.1 Arabic

Moroccan Arabic is spoken natively by 19 million people, i.e. 65% of the population, and a further 20% speak it as a second language (Ethnologue 1996). In addition to Moroccan Arabic, Hassaniya (40,000), Judeo-Moroccan (18,000) and Standard Arabic are also spoken (Maho (1998:103) uses the labels East Badawi Arabic, East Madani Arabic, and East Qurawi Arabic for varieties other than Standard Arabic). According to Ethnologue (1996), Hassaniya Arabic is not intelligible with other Arabic varieties, whereas this seems to be the case for Judeo-Moroccan Arabic.

5.3.2 Berber

The Berber languages found in Morocco are: Tachelhit (2.3 million speakers; also in Algeria), Tamazight (1.9 million speakers; also in Algeria), and Tarifit (1.5 million; also in Algeria). According to Ethnologue (1996), Ghomara and Senhaja de Srair also used to be spoken but are now extinct. The total number of Berber-speakers in Morocco is there quite large, amounting to some 5.7 million speakers. However, Berber languages are seemingly not encouraged by the authorities. Malherbe (1995:231) notes the remarkable fact that Berber languages have resisted Arabic assimilation for a thousand years, but regrets that they have suffered dialectal fragmentization in cases where speakers of the language had to withdraw in mountainous regions. In general, Berber languages tend to be associated with rural or village life, whereas Arabic is the language of the city. However, inter intelligibility between Berber languages seems to be more of an ideological issue. On the cover of Mammeri (1976), which is devoted to a grammar of
Lebanese Arabic is spoken as the first language by 93% of the population (Ethnologue 1996) and probably North Levantine Spoken Arabic, also called Lebanese. The Arabic variety spoken in Lebanon is known as Syrian Arabic or Syro-Lebanese Arabic. As the name implies, it is also spoken in Syria. Also, Standard Arabic is present in certain contexts, as noted above. Lebanese Arabic is spoken as the first language by 93% of the population (Ethnologue 1996) and probably as a second language by the remaining percentages.

5.4 Lebanese

Lebanon hosts 4.1 million inhabitants (Bilan du Monde éd. 1999, Le Monde). For a number of years, the economic and political situation in the country has been unstable. The nation belongs to the Arab League and is officially Arabic-speaking, but among the elite knowledge of French and English is also widespread. In addition, Lebanon hosts an important Armenian minority, and there are pockets of Greek, Italian and Russian speakers.

5.4.1 Arabic

The Arabic variety spoken in Lebanon is known as North Levantine Spoken Arabic, also called Lebanese-Syrian Arabic or Syro-Lebanese Arabic. As the name implies, it is also spoken in Syria. Also, Standard Arabic is present in certain contexts, as noted above. Lebanese Arabic is spoken as the first language by 93% of the population (Ethnologue 1996) and probably as a second language by the remaining percentages.

5.4.2 English

During the last decades, English has replaced French as the major foreign language in Lebanon. According to Naaman (1979:162), the American University of Beirut has played an important role in this respect. Today, English is the language of business and banking in the country. An additional reason for the increasing importance of English is the fact that neighbouring countries Syria, Egypt and Israel nowadays use English instead of French as their first foreign language.

5.4.3 French

French has always been important in Lebanon. The country was under French rule between 1920 and 1943, and at that time both French and Arabic were official languages. After independence, French was still considered to have a "privileged status" (Naaman 1979:9), but during recent decades it seems to have lost this position. At the time Naaman (1979) was writing, ten French periodicals were published in Lebanon and the language was supposed to be spoken by 60% of the "educated population" (Naaman 1979:7). The language has always been associated with (private) schools and administrative activities. Naaman also notes that "for some critics", the French literary body in Lebanon equals that of Arabic.

It is unclear what kind of status French has in present-day Lebanon. Naaman (1979:9) says "[...] French in Lebanon is [...] if not doomed to be a language of culture, at least to be seriously compromised". In a more recent work, Abou et al. (1996) claim that French is not declining but that Lebanon is rather developing some kind of trilingualism (see further 5.4.5).

5.4.4 Armenian

Malherbe (1995:195) points out that Armenia was the first nation to proclaim Christianity its state religion. This occurred already in 327 B.C. Since then the Armenian population has been subject to persecutions of various kinds culminating with a genocide during the First World War. Today, 2.5 million Armenians inhabit the ex-Soviet Armenian republic, and around one million people are also spread out in the Middle East where "their communities are very active" (Malherbe 1995:196). Ethnologue (1996) actually claims the number of Armenian speakers in the world to be as high as almost 7 million.

The Armenian language is sometimes considered an isolate within the Indo-European family, but has been argued to have similarities both with Greek and Persian. According to Malherbe (1995:196), the Armenian lexicon has ingredients from both Arabic and Turkish, but also a number of words of unknown heritage, which has made people speculate that the language may even be related to Frygian.

In Lebanon, Armenian is primarily spoken in Burj Hammud and Anjar. Naaman (1979:163) notes that the
population is bilingual in Armenian and Arabic with fragmentary knowledge of English and/or French. Private schools use Armenian as the language of education and half a dozen periodicals exist in the language. It is unclear if and how this has changed since the time of Naaman’s writing.

5.4.5 Conclusions on language planning in Lebanon

Leaving Armenian aside for the moment, let us reflect on the co-existence of Arabic, English and French in Lebanon. Abou et al. (1996:6) suggest from a somewhat pro-French perspective that Lebanon is today developing a kind of trilingualism with “literary Arabic as the official and cultural language, French as the language of communication, education and culture, and English as the language of international communication and information”. Abou et al. are basing their conclusions on the fact that in 1970, 53.2% of the Lebanese population did not know French and 65.8% did not know English. In 1993, the corresponding figures were 41.5% vs. 44.8, i.e. fewer people were unfamiliar with French and English in 1993 than in 1970 (Abou et al. 1996:8). The most notable change concerned English, but the percentage of people not knowing English was still higher than that of people not knowing French. However, these figures only tell us how many people do not know French or English. In another table, Abou et al. (1996:13) include positive figures indicating how many people speak French but not English. For younger people up to 40 years of age, the percentages oscillate between 30% and 40%, which must be considered quite high. However, none of the tables reveal how many people speak English or Arabic but not French and one may suspect that the position of Arabic and French is stronger than what it appears in Abou et al. (1996).

Still, the case of Lebanon shows that in an overwhelmingly Arabic-speaking country, languages like English, French and Armenian can survive and even grow due to the fact that they are associated with specific societal domains.

Before concluding this section, it should be pointed out that it is difficult to say very much about language-planning activities in the Arab States because the area is so homogeneously Arabic-speaking, especially the Asian Arab States. What may be interesting from the general standpoint is the weak status of the former colonial European languages (officially at least). Hence, language planning in this region can in a sense be said to have succeeded to the extent that the promotion of Arabic has been successful. However, the recognition of minority languages such as Berber in North Africa remains virtually non-existent.

6. Asia and the Pacific

UNESCO’s division of the world into regions categorizes Australia among the Pacific countries but, as we have seen, excludes the Arab states from Asia. This region is therefore quite heterogeneous. In Asia east of the Arab States, most countries have a widely spoken national language, such as Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, Maldivian, etc. European languages are, however, present in India, where English is one of the official languages. Pakistan has proclaimed Urdu as its official language, but English is still used in different formal situations. The Philippines recognizes both Tagalog and English as official languages, whereas the position of Spanish is now weak. Tagalog is only spoken by 20% of the population, but is the language of the capital (Malherbe 1995:1704). English is used by 20% of the population. Singapore has no less than four official languages: English, Chinese, Tamil and Malay. French used to be an official language in Cambodia, but the country now only appears to recognize Khmer as having that status.

Minority languages are not uncommon in Asia. In China, for example, although Chinese naturally predominates, 60 minority languages are spoken (Garabaghi 1983:11). The situation is similar in Indonesia. Other Asian countries with a large number of minorities include Laos, Nepal, Philippines and others.

Turning to the Pacific, Papua New Guinea (PNG) is a special case, in that probably some 800 languages are spoken there, making it the country in the world with the highest number of languages. Many of these are of extremely limited communication. The official languages are two English-derived pidgins, Tok Pisin and Hiri Motu, as well as English. Vanuatu in the Pacific is also a highly interesting place, linguistically speaking. This island country hosts 100 languages spoken by not more than 170,000 inhabitants in all. Apart from Melanesian languages, French, English and the English-dominated pidgin language Bislamar are also spoken.

The countries we have chosen to illustrate language planning in this region are Cambodia and India.

6.1 Cambodia

The population of Cambodia amounts to 9 million people. The country used to be a French colony and remnants of French can still be found, such as in the health care system, but otherwise English is becoming important for international contacts. Cambodia also has some 20 minority languages, as well as 340,000 Chinese-speakers.

6.1.1 Khmer

Khmer is the official and national language of Cambodia. It is spoken by 90% of the population (Ethnologue 1996). The origins of Khmer are sometimes disputed and it differs from neighbouring South-East Asian languages in not being a tonal language. Khmer is attested as having existed since the 7th century and the Khmer Empire was at its zenith in the 12th century during the Angkor era (Malherbe 1995:294). The Khmer language has absorbed elements from Thai, Vietnamese and Indian languages, and its script is of Indian origin. In Sources 104 (1998), it is noted that Khmer has been strengthened following
the fall of Pol Pot, and school books in the language have been published. Cf. further Svantesson (1992).

6.1.2 Minority languages in Cambodia

Most of the minority languages in Cambodia belong to the Mon-Khmer branch of the Austro-Asiatic family. The exception is Cham, which is an Austronesian language having 220,000 speakers. According to Ethnologue (1996), Cham uses a Devanagari-based script, but discussions are being held on introducing the Roman alphabet. The Austro-Asiatic minority languages spoken in Cambodia are Brao (5,000), Chong (5,000), Kravet (3,000), Kru'ng 2 (10,000), Kuy (16,000), Lamam (1,000), Mnong (19,000), Pear (1,300), Samre (200), Sa'och (500), Somray (7,000), Stieng (3,600), Suoy (200), and Tampuan (13,500). These Cambodian minority languages are being investigated at the Institute of Cambodian languages in Phnom Penh.

6.1.3 Conclusions on language planning in Cambodia

The Khmer language seems to be successfully launched in Cambodia. European languages such as French and English are on the decline, although the latter is the language of business. Minority languages are not given much attention, but it is encouraging to find that there exists an Institute devoted to their study.

6.2 India

India is a very special case when it comes to language planning. The country has perhaps 1 billion inhabitants and hosts over 400 languages. In fact, India resembles a language planner's nightmare. Hindi and English are the national official languages. There is a Central Institute for Indian Languages, mentioned by Pattanayak (1995:220).

India's language policy, known as the "three language formula", has the effect of covering 90% of the Indian population. According to Kedrengo (1997:17), the Indian model of language planning has proven successful and points to a possible solution for multilingual countries (cf. also South Africa). In addition, Kedrengo (1997:18) states that the English spoken in India is an indigenized variety without colonial connotations, whereas equivalent varieties of French, for example, do not exist in Africa. (Cf. also the detailed treatment of India in Fasold (1984)). Traditionally, the position of English is strong in the higher spheres of society, and the attraction of the language is evident for people with career aspirations. However, few people speak it as a mother tongue.

Hindi was proclaimed the national language of India in 1950, although this met with resistance from the southern parts of the country. Owing to the importance of the Dravidian languages and Bengali, it proved impossible to implement Hindi nation-wide (Malherbe 1995:208). The Constitution was then amended in order to make some twelve languages regional official languages and enabled primary education to be given in the mother tongue. However, the relationship between standardized regional languages and locally spoken varieties has remained unclear (Ghose & Bhog 1995:234).

6.2.1 Hindi

Hindi has 300 million users and is the world's third language. Although it is the national language of India, it is geographically concentrated in the northern provinces, where it is predominant in the educational system. It is the regional official language in Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh and the Delhi territory. Malherbe (1995:209) points out that Hindi is not receiving the international attention it deserves considering its size, but attributes this partly to the fact that the educated classes in India master English as a first language to varying degrees, and this limits outsiders' contacts with Hindi.

Ghose & Bhog (1995:234) note that Hindi is only 100 years old, but includes elements from older languages such as Sanskrit, as well as from regional and local languages. After independence in 1947, Hindi was seen as a symbol of Indian identity and according to Ghose & Bhog (1995:234), the language borrowed from Sanskrit in order to expand its vocabulary and terminology. The variety thus achieved did not reflect actual usage, but was felt to be more precise for developmental purposes.

Hindi has recently also been generating interest in theoretical linguistics. Seminal work has been done by K.P. Mohanan, and the prestigious Generative Linguists of the Old World (GLOW) conference was recently located to Hyderabad.

6.2.2 Indian languages other than Hindi

In addition to Hindi, India hosts the following regional official languages: Assam (10 million speakers), Bengali (50 plus 100 in Bangladesh), Gujarati (30), Kannada (28), Kashmiri (3), Malayalam (35), Marathi (60), Oriya (22), Punjabi (20 plus 64 in Pakistan), Tamil (45), Telugu (60), Urdu (perhaps 75 plus as many in Pakistan). Sanskrit is also an official language but is not actually spoken. Malherbe (1995:1695) calls Hindi "the language of the Union", English "an auxiliary official language" and the other 13 "constitutional languages". The Indian languages are written with 11 different alphabets, namely Devanagari, Bengali, Arabo-Persian, Gurmukhi, Gujarati, Oriya, Telugu-Kannada, Malayalam, Tamil, Latin and Tibetan. The languages in northern India belong to the Indo-European phylum and those in the south to the Dravidian. Apart from these officially recognized languages, India has some 40 other widespread languages and hundreds of languages of more limited communication, such as those spoken by the original Munda and Tibeto-Burman population. According to Malherbe (1995:205), the Indian situation is not as chaotic as it may appear, but rather resembles that of Europe, if the Indian provinces are equated with the European countries. If English becomes the lingua franca of the European Union, the parallel will become even more glaring. Many Indian languages are closely
interrelated and intercomprehensible in both speech and writing.

6.2.3 Conclusions on language planning in India

The Indian model of language planning is quite impressive. What is particularly interesting is that India not only recognizes regional official languages, but also has two national official languages, Hindi and English. In a sense, India thus combines the advantages of Tanzania and South Africa. It shares the Tanzanian property of promoting an endogenous language at the national level (Hindi and Kiswahili respectively), but it avoids the adoption of a discriminatory policy towards minorities by recognizing regional official languages (as South Africa does, although it does not or cannot promote an African language at the national level—unless Afrikaans were to be regarded as an African language). Of course, more than 400 languages in India do not have official status, but it is still impressive to find a country which recognizes 15 languages at some official level.

7. Europe and North America

In spite of its many nation states with their national languages, there are a large number of minorities in Europe and some countries are quite heterogeneous in linguistic terms.

One country in Europe with such linguistic diversity is Luxembourg which, in spite of its small size, hosts Francique (Luxembourgeois), French and German.

Other relevant cases include Belgium (Flemish, French and German), Ireland (with its unsuccessful attempts to revive Irish—as opposed to Welsh in Wales), Finland (Finnish, Swedish, Saami and Balto-Slavic minorities), Israel (which represents a celebrated example of the successful resuscitation of a dead language, Hebrew, but also includes Arabic, Yiddish and English), Cyprus (Greek and Turkish), Switzerland (German, French, Italian and Rhaeto-Romansch), etc. Since North America is also included in this region, mention should be made of the significant language planning taking place in Canada. Over the centuries, this country has been extremely successful in preserving its French-language heritage. In Quebec, the number of French-speakers has centred around 80% over the past 200 years, and there is nothing to suggest that the language is not being continually passed on to new generations. Even so, Québécois complain that they are a “threatened majority.” Legislation in Quebec is very pro French language and actually states that the province is monolingually French-speaking. All the other provinces are officially bilingual in English and French. In addition, the country hosts a number of immigrant languages as well as autochthonous languages.

However, the nations which we shall examine in Europe and North America are Finland and Spain.

7.1 Finland

Finland has 5 million inhabitants. Finnish and Swedish are the country’s two official languages. Finnish is the mother tongue of over 90% of the population, whereas Swedish-speaking Finns account for 6%, amounting to some 300,000 people. This figure has remained stable for the last century, but 100 years ago Swedish-speakers represented over 14% of the population (Liebkind, Broo & Finnäs 1995:63). In addition, Finland has a Saami-speaking minority as well as pockets of speakers of Estonian (6,000), Karelian (10,000), Livonian (Liivi, Livvi, a few tens of thousands), Vote (Vatja) and Ingrian (Ingermanländska) (Pentikäsinen & Anttonen 1995) Finland also hosts small communities of Jews, Roma, Russians and Tatars.

7.1.1 Finnish

Finnish is itself a good example of an originally quite small heritage language which has been modernized and extended to cater for the needs of a modern nation state. It is now spoken by almost everybody in Finland. The Finns used to be bilingual in Finnish and Swedish when Swedish was the first foreign language taught in schools, but today they are less proficient in Swedish. In 1969 the obligation to take Swedish as a school subject was rescinded and 90% of pupils subsequently gave preference to English (Liebkind, Broo & Finnäs 1995:51). Some people see this as being a sign of determined opposition to the domination of Swedish, whereas others are concerned that the loss of competence in Swedish will drive Finland further apart from the Scandinavian community. With regard to the language planning of Finnish, the general observation should again be made that the rise of Finnish to the status of a fully developed national language is a feat in itself. Finnish is cultivated by an authority called Finska språkbyråen (The Bureau of the Finnish Language) which publishes a journal called Kielikello. Another language association, Kotikielen seura (The Society for the Home Language) publishes the important periodical Virittäjä, which until recently had a section giving advice on linguistic correctness. Today Virittäjä is increasingly becoming a forum for Finnish linguistics, which is no less important for the corpus planning of a language. Pielh (1997:55) describes how various activities relating to corpus planning started in Finland at the end of the 19th century. The Finnish language was no longer confined to church and courts, as Pielh puts it, but had to be able to function in all areas of society. Medical and technical associations were engaged in term development, and various predecessors of today’s language cultivation authorities gave advice to the general public on language questions and engaged in text editing. This interest has grown over the years the Finns can now rightly be said to be very involved in language questions and proud of their language.
7.1.2 Swedish

The Finnish Swedes, who used to be able to communicate in Finland by speaking only Swedish, are now bilingual in Swedish and Finnish. The Swedish-speaking Finns are generally found in and around Helsinki on the south coast and in Österbotten (Ostrobotnia). Special mention should also be made of Åland, an archipelago halfway between Helsinki and Stockholm. Åland is an administrative district within Finland with 25,000 inhabitants. The archipelago belongs to Finland but enjoys a considerable measure of independence and has, for example, a separate parliament which has the right to legislate. Furthermore, only Åland-born persons have the right to own land in the archipelago. The inhabitants of Åland are wholly Swedish-speaking and their status is governed by the international law convention adopted by the Council of the League of Nations in Geneva in 1921 (Liebkind, Broo & Finnäs 1995:55). The geographical proximity of Sweden has of course played a role, if only in providing “moral support” for the Swedish-speaking population in Finland (cf. the role played by English-speaking Canada with respect to the minority speaking that language in Québec).

The Swedish-speaking Finns have been called “the most privileged minority in the world”. According to Liebkind, Broo & Finnäs (1995:56–57), a “mixture of territorial and personal principles gives the Swedish-speaking Finns exceptional constitutional rights compared to their relative proportion in the total population” and they go on to say (Liebkind, Broo & Finnäs 1995:58), citing Allardt (1977), that “there is a clear identification with Swedish as their mother tongue and Finland as their homeland”.

Finland was part of the Swedish Kingdom until 1809 and the Swedish language is sometimes associated with the urban ruling classes, although to a large extent it was and is spoken by rural populations earning their living from fishing and farming. The urban Finnish Swedes are to be found in the cities on the south coast of Finland, while the rural population resides in Österbotten (Ostrobotnia) and Åland. Actually, the differences between these two groups are or were greater than their similarities. The former group has been engaged in the development of the whole of Finland and has not been afraid of bilingualism, whereas the latter has formed an isolated, monolingually Swedish community. Andersson & Reuter (1997) note that Finnish Swedes represent a peculiar linguistic minority, in that they are socially, culturally and even linguistically divided into two parts.

By as early as 1919, both Finnish and Swedish were proclaimed national languages in the Constitution Act of Finland (Liebkind, Broo & Finnäs 1995:53). Language use is regulated in detail and the law gives exact guidelines as to which language is to be used in different circumstances. Language legislation further prescribes that a municipality with less than 8% or 3,000 speakers of Swedish or Finnish is to be considered monolingual or else a municipality is otherwise bilingual. In 1993, Finland consisted of 396 monolingual Finnish municipalities, 21 monolingual Swedish municipalities and 43 bilingual municipalities (Liebkind, Broo & Finnäs 1995:54). A number of factors have helped to promote the Swedish language. For example, the Swedish People’s Party is a political force and is firmly committed to the language question. A Swedish-speaking educational system runs in parallel with its Finnish counterpart at all levels. There is even a Swedish-speaking university in Åbo and likewise a School of Economics and College of Social Work and Public Administration. Swedish-speaking Finns form their own parishes within the Lutheran church, and the army has special Swedish-speaking sections. Swedish programmes are broadcast on radio and television, and there is a large Swedish-language press with 30 different newspapers and periodicals. There are four Swedish theatres in the country, as well as publishing-houses catering specially for a Swedish-speaking readership. Swedish folklore is cultivated through arts festivals at which national costumes are worn, and typically Swedish holidays are celebrated. Some business sectors are Swedish-run, and Swedish-speaking Finns have their own banks, associations and foundations, and trade unions. The Swedish language in Finland is cultivated by an authority called Svenska språkbyrå, Finland (The Swedish Language Bureau in Finland). In fact, Swedish-speaking Finns seem to run a society of their own where every Finnish feature has a Swedish counterpart. The only areas where Liebkind, Broo & Finnäs (1995:63) regard the Swedish minority as being weak are sports, such as ice hockey, and pop music. Extremely good care would therefore seem to be taken of the Swedish-speaking minority. Indeed, the temptation is to suspect that Finland actually consists of two nations existing side-by-side. Such an arrangement ought to give rise to considerable social tension (as it has in Québec, for example), but despite some mutual grudges, it would seem that the Swedish- and Finnish-speaking Finns lead surprisingly peaceful lives together.

7.1.3 Saami

Seurujärvi-Kari et al. (1995) state that the number of Saamis in Finland amounts to roughly 6,400. The group is composed of North, Inari and Skolt Saamis, whose language varieties differ somewhat but are mutually intelligible. In 1973, the Saami Consultative Committee submitted a report (Seurujärvi-Kari et al. 1995:137) concerning a parliament, language rights, education, and the right to own and exploit natural resources for the Saami people. However, according to the authors, of all the suggestions made only the Saami parliament was actually implemented. However, in this connection the Saami were declared to be an indigenous people, a status that is more “prestigious” than being a linguistic or cultural minority. The United Nations has a Working Group on Indigenous Populations of which the Saami have been members since 1982. An indigenous population is defined as a people who have resisted colonization for more than 500 years, in other words the populations outside
Europe before the age of colonization (which complicates the picture when it comes to Asia and Africa). The Working Group also includes populations such as Amerindians, Aborigines, Inuits and other autochthonous people.

Saami linguistic rights were not officially recognized by decree until the Saami Language Act was passed in Finland in 1992 (Seurujärvi-Kari et al. 1995:130). This legislation allows the Saami to use their language in various formal contexts such as schools, local administration, and courts, if necessary with the help of interpreters. Since the adoption of the Act, the Saami language has become more visible in the media, on notices in public premises, road signs, etc., according to Seurujärvi-Kari et al. (1995:130). Some 30 schools in northern Finland now offer instruction in or on Saami, compared with only five in the 1970s. However, as Seurujärvi-Kari et al. (1995:131-32) point out, instruction is difficult above the first year of primary school because of lack of good teaching materials. It is possible, however, to take Saami as a university subject at the universities of Helsinki and Oulu, and the University of Lapland in Rovaniemi. Even so, Seurujärvi-Kari et al. (1995:135) note that Saami is not recognized in Finland to the same extent as Finnish and Swedish are, since Saami requires translation in official life, whereas the former are assumed to be widely understood.

7.1.4 Other minorities

Other minorities are less recognized. However, Romani and the Rom (together with other languages) have recently been acknowledged as a linguistic and cultural minority in other parts of Scandinavia, in accordance with the definition of the Committee of Minority Languages of the European Community: if a (sufficiently large) speech community has existed in the country in question for more than 150 years and has continually transmitted its language, then it should be regarded as a linguistic minority.

7.1.5 Conclusions on language planning in Finland

As pointed out above, the status and corpus planning of Finnish, which started as late as in the end of the 19th century, has been a national success. Furthermore, the Swedish-speaking minority in Finland forms an extremely privileged minority. There are historical reasons for its strength, but Swedish-promoting organizations have also shown how important it is to consciously cultivate a language. The most interesting aspect is perhaps the fact that Swedes and Finns in Finland appear to live together in relative harmony. However, it should not be forgotten that other minorities in the country are less well off. The Saami people have won a number of rights but these cannot in any way be compared with those of the Swedish-speaking minority. The situation is far worse for more marginalized minorities, such as Karelians, Romas, Jews, Ingrians and Tatars, among others.

7.2 Spain

The following account depends heavily on the information given in Ethnologue (1996). (Cf. also Lundén (1993)). Spain has 40 million inhabitants and includes a number of important minorities whose independence has been increasing since the fall of the Franco regime. Except for the national language Spanish, Spain hosts important linguistic minorities such as Basque, Catalan and others. However, Spanish is the only official language. Ethnologue (1996) lists no fewer than 14 languages in Spain. The most important ones are examined below. The following descriptions do not include Galé (Iberian Romani), Vlachi Romani, Guanche (a Berber language once spoken in the Canary Islands), Mozarabic, and Quinqui.

7.2.1 Aragonese

This language is similar to Catalan, Occitan, and Gascon. It is spoken by at least 11,000 people as a first language and 20,000 as a second language, but the ethnic group is much larger and comprises perhaps 2 million people. Zaragoza is the home of the Aragonese Speakers’ League (Ligallo de Fablans de l’Aragonés) and the Council of the Aragonese Language (Consello d’a Fabla Aragonesa) is in Huesca. Another half a dozen or so groups engaged in linguistic action exist, and five magazine in Aragonese are published regularly.

7.2.2 Asturian

Asturian has 100,000 L1 speakers and perhaps as many as half a million second-language users. It is not intercomprehensible with Spanish. According to Ethnologue (1996), education is provided in Asturian up to the age of 16, following which it is optional. The language has a considerable literature with a large body of poetry and chivalric novels. There is an Academy of the Asturian Language devoted to the cultivation of the language.

7.2.3 Basque

The Basque Country now enjoys some measure of autonomy within the Spanish nation and has its own government. There are half a million Basque-speakers in Spain, together with others across the border in France. The Basque language is a mystery, inasmuch as it has been impossible to affiliate it to any known family within the Indo-European phylum. The language is well-documented in grammars and dictionaries and has also been the subject of research in theoretical linguistics. Some 588 books were published in Basque before the turn of this century, most of them in the Labourdin dialect spoken in the French part of the País Vasco. The body of literature is steadily growing and in 1989, B. Atxaga became the first author not writing in original Spanish to receive the Spanish National Award for Literature. There is a language cultivation association for the Basque language called Euskaltzaindia, the Royal Academy of
the Basque Language (see Mahlau 1991:79), which publishes the bulletin *Euskara*. This Academy launched its first orthographic proposal together with a wordlist at conferences in the 1960s—a delicate task since dialectal variation in Basque is considerable. This standardized Basque language goes under the name of *Euskaratutx* and is used on radio and television, in schools, as well as in all kinds of written publications. For further references, see Mahlau 1991:91–94).

7.2.4 Catalan-Valencian-Balear

These varieties, which are spoken in Catalonia, Valencia and the Balearic Islands respectively, are treated under one heading in Ethnologue (1996). Catalan has undergone a revival in recent years and literacy is now as high as 60%. In 1913, an orthography for Occitan was developed. Descriptions of the language are numerous and include works by Fabra and Alibert (see further the bibliography in Lamuela 1991:77–78), and it has become a popular topic in Romance linguistics.

7.2.5 Extremaduran

This language is spoken “actively” by 200,000 people and as a second language by another 500,000 in the South-Western part of Spain.

7.2.6 Fala

The Fala language is spoken by 10,000 people in North-Western Spain. It resembles Galician but, according to Ethnologue (1996), Fala speakers do not identify with the former.

7.2.7 Galician

Galician is spoken by over 3 million people in the Galicia province in North-Western Spain. The language lies somewhere between Portuguese and Spanish, but is actually closer to Portuguese. Ethnologue (1996) points out that Galician has its own Academy of the Galician Language and it is extensively used in fiction and humanistic literature. It is also an educational medium at all levels and Galicians take great pride in their language.

7.2.8 Gascón (Aranese)

Gascón is spoken by a few thousand people in Spain but has 250,000 speakers in France, with whom contacts are maintained across the national borders. However, the Spanish variety spoken in Val d’Aran seems to be much more alive than its French siblings. Aranese was officially recognized in the *Llei de normalització lingüística a Catalunya* in 1983. In the same year, its orthography was established by a committee nominated by the Generalitat de Catalunya. The language has been taught in schools since 1984, and a monthly magazine in the language is published. Toponyms have been given Aranese names. The language is further cultivated by the Center for Linguistic Normalization in cooperation with the Institut d’Estudis Occitans. See further Born (1991).

7.2.9 Spanish

Spanish is actually spoken by not more than 28 million Spaniards, i.e. 73% of the population (Ethnologue 1996). The remaining 12 million accordingly speak one of the minority languages.

7.2.10 Conclusions on language planning in Spain

Spain is a country in which linguistic minorities have recently acquired considerable rights. Even so, Spanish is still very dominant, but with the concept of regionalism now fostered in the European Union, it is quite probable that Romance minorities in Spain will be given more attention.

8. Latin America and the Caribbean

The nations chosen in Latin America and the Caribbean are Guatemala and Bolivia. These countries are interesting in so far as they have majority indigenous populations. Indigenous populations normally tend to be thought of as minorities, such as the North American Indians, Inuits, Aborigines and Saami, but the opposite is true in Guatemala and Bolivia. Another possible candidate would be Peru, which is discussed in Sources 104 (1998) which underscores the fact that Quechua, itself originally a vehicular language, has survived for centuries in spite of heavy pressure from Spanish. In Sources, Quechua is baptized a “language of resistance”, a factor with which it has been identified over the years. Other possibilities which could be considered include Guayana (with its endogenous languages) and Paraguay, where Guarani and Spanish are equally widespread. Von Gleich (1995:254) reports on the rights of Amerindian languages in Latin America and notes that Colombia made these co-official with Spanish in the 1991 Constitution, Paraguay proclaimed Guarani as the second administrative language in the 1992 Constitution (in other words, it has official status), and Bolivia, Ecuador and Peru have all had bilingual programmes in education since the beginning of the 1980s. In Peru, Quechua is co-official with Spanish. Peru and Paraguay seem to be the countries in Latin America which are most explicit in according endogenous languages official recognition.

8.1 Guatemala

Guatemala has a population of almost 11 million, 55% of whom are Indian and 44% Mestizo (Ethnologue 1996). In Guatemala, Mayan languages exist side-by-side with Spanish (cf. SIL reports written about endangered languages there), but Spanish is the only language accorded official status. Guatemala was the centre of the Mayan civilization, which reached its zenith between the 3rd and 9th centuries A.D. According to Ethnologue (1996), the country has 51 languages (plus two extinct languages). Malherbe (1995:262) laments the fact that Mayan languages are not allowed in schools in Guatemala, and says that “this position of systematic Hispanization, which neither Peru nor Paraguay have followed, where
Amerindian languages are official or taught, is by all probability one of the reasons for the political instability of the country”. However, a presumably more recent source, von Gleich (1995:256), observes that Guatemala has now officially recognized bilingual intercultural programmes in elementary education.

8.1.1 Mayan

Of the 51 Guatemalan languages, 49 belong to the Mayan phyllum. The other two are Garifuna and Spanish (see below). Many Mayan languages are of quite limited communication and have 10–20,000 speakers, sometimes fewer. Larger languages (<100,000) include Cakchiquel, Kakchiquel, Mam, Quech, and perhaps Tzotzil, some of which consist of clusters of languages.

The Mayan languages were originally written by means of 800 hieroglyphic symbols, but the Latin script is now used. According to Malherbe (1995:262), the differences between the Mayan languages of Guatemala are small enough to allow officialization and teaching of a Mayan “superlanguage”.

8.1.2 Arawakan

The only non-Mayan autochthonous language spoken in Guatemala is Garifuna, an Arawakan language also called Black Carib, whose number of speakers amounts to roughly 17,000. Garifuna is also spoken by smaller communities in Belize and Nicaragua and by as many as 75,000 people in Honduras.

8.1.3 Spanish

Spanish is spoken by four and a half million people in Guatemala, in other words somewhat less than half the population.

8.1.4 Conclusions on language planning in Guatemala

What Guatemala lacks is official recognition of languages other than Spanish. The fact that bilingual education has been introduced is laudable, but the position of the Mayan languages could be much stronger, considering the fact that more than half of the population is Indian. Until now, Spanish has made considerable inroads into the Amerindian languages which, taken together, may currently not be spoken by more than 10% of the population.

8.2 Bolivia

Bolivia is the country of the Americas with the highest percentage of Amerindians, accounting for some 70% of the population (Hyltenstam & Quick 1996:3, and sources quoted therein). The entire population amounts to 8.5 million inhabitants (Ethnologue 1996). Quechua and Aymara are two important endogenous languages in Bolivia and co-exist with Spanish, which is the official language. Quechua is also spoken in Peru, Ecuador and Argentina. The country has some 40 living languages in all. Some of these are quite small and belong to South American language families or are unclassified. 87.4% of the population claim to know Spanish (Hyltenstam & Quock 1996:3), out of whom 40% are monolinguals. 60% speak either Aymara and Quechua, and another 1.6% other Amerindian languages. Among the latter, mention should be made of 66,000 Guarani-speakers. 11.3% of the Amerindian speakers are monolingual, while 45% of the entire population is bilingual.

8.2.1 Aymara

Aymara is one of the more widespread languages in Bolivia, spoken by 1.8 million or 24% of the population. It has also been the subject of language cultivation and several descriptions of the language exist (see Cerrón-Palomino 1991).

8.2.2 Quechua

Quechua is the largest autochthonous language in Bolivia, spoken by some 3 million people. Malherbe (1995:263) suggests that its use as a common vehicle of interaction with neighbouring countries has contributed to its continued existence. The standardization of Quechua is discussed in a paper by Cerrón-Palomino (1991), who is highly critical of the activities of Western linguists in this area, whom he sees as ignorant of Latin American research traditions. As an example of this, Cerrón-Palomino (1991:34) points out that the Bolivian Quechuaist Berrios proposed an orthography and interpunction for the language as early as the beginning of the century. Cerrón-Palomino seems to advocate a more abstract orthography which could be applied to the different varieties of Quechua spoken in Bolivia, Peru, and Ecuador. This approach has its advantages but it does not take the sociolinguistic reality into account.

On the corpus planning side, both Quechua and Aymara has been the subject of a considerable volume of work, some of it going back several centuries. For further references, see the bibliography in Cerrón-Palomino (1991:40–41). Wölck (1991:46) discusses the choice of a standard for Quechua and notes that the Ayacuchano variety spoken in the south-central Andes is mutually intelligible with Cuzqueñan, Bolivian, and Ecuadorian Quechua (in the last case only partially). On the other hand, the Cuzco variety in Peru has the longest historical tradition and is promoted by the Quechua Language Academy. A third solution suggested by Wölck would be to revive the so-called Quechua General, which was already codified by 1583. Wölck himself seems to be in favour of this last solution (1991:47), and draws a parallel with the creation of Nynorsk in Norway a century and a half ago, in which a compromise was reached between a number of diverging dialects.

In the case of the school system, it was only in 1994 that Bolivia adopted a law stipulating that “intercultural features” were to be included in the educational system (Hyltenstam & Quick 1996:5). The idea was to introduce bilingual programmes in primary education in which children were taught to read and write in the Amerindian languages. Before this, materials in Quechua, Aymara, Guarani and certain
Amazonian languages had been produced in mathematics, languages (L1 and L2), and the natural and social sciences within the so-called PEIB (Proyecto Educación Intercultural Bilingüe (Intercultural Bilingual Education Project)). The contents of the textbooks reflect the pupils' experiences, but it has been pointed out that even more material based on traditional oral stories and tales could be included. A number of teachers are regularly sent to continuing education in Andine Linguistics and Education at the Altiplano University at Puno in Peru, and similar activities are being conducted in other locations as well. University-level training in bilingual education exists at the University of San Andrés. The bilingual approach means that Spanish is not neglected but is studied as a second language, as it also is in the schools in question. The intercultural component indicates that the interplay between Amerindian and Spanish cultures is emphasized. In the course of 1996, 332 schools introduced bilingual primary education but it is reckoned that it will take 20 years to implement the system completely. One current problem which has been pointed out by Hyltenstam & Quick (1996:16) is that bilingual education does not extend beyond grade 5, after which pupils are confined to monolingual Spanish schools. Interestingly enough, Hyltenstam & Quick (1996:18) also report that the parents involved have complained about the lack of reading materials to complement school manuals. In the educational reform, it is foreseen that libraries will be opened to cater for this need. Furthermore (p. 21), teachers “felt that the levels of proficiency obtained, especially in reading and writing, often deteriorated when pupils lefts school, as there were generally no materials with which literacy skills could be used or practised”.

### 8.2.3 Spanish

There are 3.5 million Spanish-speakers in Bolivia. This is roughly the same number as Quechua but is less than Quechua and Aymara taken together. Until recently, official life in Bolivia has been characterized by the promotion of Spanish, but with the advent of bilingual education, its grip may be somewhat loosened.

### 8.2.4 Conclusions on language planning in Bolivia

Hyltenstam & Quick (1996:29) point out that bilingual education in Bolivia is an important part of language planning in the country, but that it has to be supplemented by a national language policy enhancing Amerindian languages. Without such a policy, these languages will continue to be confined to informal spheres and family life, no matter how good the bilingual schooling. In fact, the authors state that Bolivia needs a commission on language policy. However, Bolivia seems to be doing more for Amerindian languages than Guatemala. What is lacking in Bolivia is the proclamation of Quechua as an official language at the national level, as is the case in Peru for Quechua and in Paraguay for Guarani.

### 9. Overall conclusions and reflections on successful language planning

How far can language actually be planned? It should first be noted that turning a majority language into a fully developed national language is something very different from coping with a multilingual society where all speech communities require equal rights. The former case can be handled with political will, as Bangbose (1991) has pointed out. In the latter case, the situation is much more complicated, since some languages tend to be strong and others weak, and language planning often becomes a question of supporting linguistic minorities and perhaps even taking action against the threats to the survival of languages. Naturally, if the English language is seen as a threat to all the other languages in the world, then even national languages in monolingual non-English-speaking countries can be regarded as being endangered. When it comes to minority languages, it has to be accepted that it is not possible to legislate on language use. If speakers wish to switch to another language for some reason or other, they will do so and it is none of the linguist’s business. On the other hand, it is, of course, dreadful and contrary to human rights if speakers are denied the possibility of using their mother tongue. The vitality of minority languages will depend on such factors as attitudes, pride on the part of the linguistic speech community, economic power, prestige, and other factors which are difficult to influence by legal action. A great deal can probably be done for the development or survival of languages by taking formal decisions for their benefit. As mentioned earlier in this report, well-intentioned bilingual programmes and similar actions only have symbolic value in the long run if the languages involved are not recognized in other formal contexts. Probably the best way to vitalize underprivileged languages is to create a social need for them, coupled with formal rights granted to the languages in question.

It can be agreed that the aim of language planning is to facilitate communication at three levels: the local level, the regional/national, and the international level. At the local level, it is necessary to facilitate or “accept” the use of mother tongues, in other words the actual opposite of what is now happening in many places in Africa, where people are forced to use the post-colonial language in contexts such as primary school, even though nobody may speak the language at the local level. At the regional/national level, a language of wider communication should be used, preferably not a European one in countries outside Europe. Lastly, at the international level, global languages such as English or French could be used (nor should Spanish, Portuguese, Arabic, Russian and Chinese be forgotten). The goal of language planning must be to enable people to use the languages they want to use, and to encourage multilingualism. Multilingualism is a natural state in most societies. Monolingualism is typical of the Western world and we therefore tend to regard it as the norm, whereas it
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should be the other way round. Multilingual societies and plurilingual people are more dynamic and versatile. It is not a question of either A or B but of both A and B.

We shall conclude by mentioning three crucial points for successful language planning:
1. the language to be planned should be recognized at some official level;
2. the language should be used as medium of instruction in schools at as high a level as possible. In the long run, it should not be confined to experimental programmes or optional courses;
3. the language must have a sufficient body of literature, a grammar and a dictionary.

We shall now examine how well our 10 case studies fare with respect to the above criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Official lgs</th>
<th>Lgs in education</th>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>N° of lgs (according to Ethnologue)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>French, Bissa, Bobo, Bwamu, Cerma, Dagara, Fulfulde, Gulmancema (Gourmanchema), Jula Kar (Karaboro), Kasem, Lobi (Lobiri), Lyélé, Moorlé, Nankana, Nuni, San, Senoufo, Sissala, Songai, Tamashaq (=21)</td>
<td>French, adult literacy material in some 20 lgs</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Kiswahili, English</td>
<td>Kiswahili, English</td>
<td>Kiswahili, English</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Arabic, French, Berber lgs to some extent</td>
<td>Arabic, French, Berber lgs to some extent</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Arabic, English, French, Armenian</td>
<td>Arabic, English, French, Armenian</td>
<td>3 (North Levantine Spoken Arabic, Standard Arabic, Armenian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Khmer</td>
<td>Khmer, French, English</td>
<td>Khmer, French, English</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Hindi, English, Sanskrit, Assam, Bengali, Gujarati, Kannada, Kashmir, Malayalam, Marathi, Oriya, Punjabi, Tamil, Telegu, Urdu</td>
<td>Hindi, English, Sanskrit, Assam, Bengali, Gujarati, Kannada, Kashmir, Malayalam, Marathi, Oriya, Punjabi, Tamil, Telegu, Urdu</td>
<td>Hindi, English, Sanskrit, Assam, Bengali, Gujarati, Kannada, Kashmir, Malayalam, Marathi, Oriya, Punjabi, Tamil, Telegu, Urdu (in certain other lgs)</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Finnish, Swedish</td>
<td>Finnish, Swedish, Saami (partly)</td>
<td>Finnish, Swedish, Saami</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish, Aragonese, Asturian, Basque, Catalan, Extremaduran, Fala, Galician, Gascon (some of these partly)</td>
<td>Spanish, Aragonese, Asturian, Basque, Catalan, Extremaduran, Fala, Galician, Gascon (some of these partly)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish, some Mayan lgs</td>
<td>Spanish, Mayan lgs</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Spanish, Quechua, Aymara, some Amazonian lgs</td>
<td>Spanish, Quechua, Aymara</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is relevant to make the following comments on the foregoing tables. In the first place, it should be noted that Ethnologue tries to establish separate languages wherever possible, with the result that the number of languages it lists is quite high. Furthermore, it follows more or less automatically that if a language is used in education, it has a written corpus of some kind, if only a school primer. Otherwise, it is very difficult to assess what kind of corpora the various languages mentioned above have. There could be languages which are in the majority in a country neighbouring one of those above, in which case they have a “foreign” corpus but may not be school languages in the country we are concerned with. A possible example of this could be Estonian in Finland. With reference to corpora, Ethnologue reports on the work being done on Bible translations, which often represent the only corpus for a “non-official” language. Translation efforts are concentrated on certain areas and still only comprise a minor part of the languages spoken in the world. We have not been able to report on the existence of the Bible translations mentioned above, but in African countries, for example, it can be assumed that a number of languages have a (partial) Bible translation.

It is difficult to compare the above countries, and it is, of course, impossible to rank them in terms of language planning success. It can merely be pointed out that, with the exception of Lebanon, none of them have fewer than nine languages. Lebanon is interesting in that it is almost monolingually Arabic (according to Ethnologue, 1996, the country has 93% L1 speakers of Arabic). However, English and French retain a certain importance although they are not official languages. To this, Armenian should be added. It is a minority language but of a different kind than English and French.

Some of the above countries are truly multilingual, such as Burkina Faso, Tanzania, India, Guatemala and Bolivia. Given this situation, it could be said that the more official languages which any of the above countries recognize, the better. In this respect, India fares best with 15 languages recognized officially. On the other hand, this is not much in percentage terms, considering that India has well over 400 languages. What is probably most important in this context is that languages which are in the majority in a region, not to mention an entire country, should be granted official recognition. For example, Moore ought to be an official language at some level in Burkina Faso, since it is spoken by so many people. As for education, it goes without saying that the more languages used in that sector, the better. However, there is quite a difference between conducting adult literacy campaigns in “non-official” languages and compiling terminological databases, as is being done for Kiswahili. Again, the general observation here must be that basic education in the mother tongue is a human right. In order for basic education to be successful, the language in question must have a corpus, composed both of school textbooks and of an “extramural” body of literature and other written work. The higher the level at which linguistic diversity can survive in education, the better. In this respect (ignoring for the moment the neglect of smaller languages), a country like Tanzania has been very successful in also implementing Kiswahili at advanced levels.
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