

## BOOK REVIEW

GRUNDFRAGEN DER ETHNOPOLITIK IM 20. JAHRHUNDERT. (ETHNOS 7 )  
By Heinz Kloss. Braumuller, Vienna-Stuttgart, 1969. pp. 624.

---

Heinz Kloss has devoted several decades to the study of policies on language and nationality rights. These questions have continued to incite bitter conflicts in many old and new nations. In recent years language planning and language maintenance policies have become "fashionable" subjects for sociolinguistic research. With Australia's new tendency to incorporate pluralistic aspects into its integration policy and the gradual development of Papua New Guinea to independent nationhood, there should be much to interest Australian and Niuginian sociolinguists in this excellent handbook of ethnopolitics. Kloss develops a complete theoretical framework richly illustrated with examples from all over the world.

Right from the beginning, Kloss stresses two types of inconsistencies in the policies of various nations:

- a) Tolerance in one respect (e.g. language rights) may be accompanied by intolerance in another (e.g. racial inequality) and vice versa;
- b) Double standards, i.e. basing national boundaries sometimes on language and sometimes on the inhabitants' choice for expansionist purposes. (France, Germany and Italy have all been guilty of this). Where a majority gives language rights to other groups, this must not necessarily be a progressive action, for this may isolate them from progress necessary for their emancipation.

Kloss outlines five emancipational movements - sex (i.e. male/female), race, language, religion and social class, and shows the interrelation between them. He distinguishes between complementary nationalism, in which the same emancipational policies are accepted for all nations, and exclusive nationalism in which other nations are accepted only insofar as one's own interests are not at stake.

The present nations of the world are surveyed in relation to ethnicity and language. Some have created their own (standard) language (Ausbausprache) from a former dialect to

symbolize *nationhood*; some have their own mother tongue(s) as official language(s); still others have imported their official language.

Whereas Europe and Asia comprise mainly Ganznationalstaaten and Ganznationalitätstaaten - nations with language as an integrating factor, in Africa and the Americas language shift is usually an indicator of material progress. However, such affinities, Kloss feels, are subordinate to anti-colonial solidarity, bloc membership, and a lack of understanding of language problems on the part of some European and Asian nations.

Kloss frequently refers to the limit of three to the number of languages that can be given full and equal status in a country. He then views a possible united Europe in terms of three language policies: präsidial (one official language), kollegial (several languages chosen), egalitär (all of equal standing) and shows that there is absolutely no need for a präsidial structure.

Kloss discusses the special problems of tribal states, where it does not matter if one language dominates as long as it is not the L I of any particular tribe. He considers the language rights of ethnic groups - to drop L I, to use L I in private and public sectors, and to pass it on to the second generation. Referring to the two poles of Duldung (tolerance) and Förderung (promotion), Kloss considers three possibilities of language maintenance through schooling - education in L I, half of the subjects taught in L I, L I as subject not medium of instruction, at least at an afternoon or Saturday school. He contrasts the promotion of L I in education for a particular person (teaching subject), for a restricted period (first few school years), and to all levels possible. He demonstrates the dilemma of the basis for equal nationality rights - which could be parity, majority, sole decision of the majority, proportional representation or privilege.

Kloss discusses the factors promoting LS and those "ambivalent" ones which could favour LM or language shift.

He then goes on to contrast the language rights of migrant groups and old settlers. Generally the migrants are given less rights, as it is felt that assimilation is the price for migration. In some places migrants are offered tolerant language rights and settlers promotive ones. However, where L I is an unwritten language (e.g. as in South America) the old settlers are given less LM rights than recent migrants. A similar situation may emerge in Australia, we might add, where new measures (e.g. bilingual education) are gradually being introduced for new arrivals but not available for some Aborigines and for the descendants of

German, Russian, Chinese and Italian settlers. Bilingual education was available in most of the old German settlements up to the First World War, and it is doubtful if - after the subsequent decades of discrimination - such LM opportunities are now desired there. However, while more enlightened policies (favouring the teaching of migrant languages and even bilingual classes in some areas) in some parts of Australia will promote LM, it should be considered whether the same opportunities could be offered to earlier, partially assimilated migrant groups (e.g. Germans, Dutch) as to the more recent ones (e.g. Italians, Greeks, Turks). One promotive factor which could have been given more attention is the acceptance of minority languages and cultures as secondary elements in the nation. If children of majority and minority groups are able to learn the majority and minority languages (or are taught in them) side by side, the language and nationality questions can be separated where this is desirable.

Arguing for instruction through L 1, Kloss asks what use it is to teach children a FL instead of reading and writing in L 1 if they are at school for only two years (as in some African states). I would go a step further and ask if the extension of the education process would not be facilitated by initial L 1 instruction. Kloss refers to the situation in some African countries where many teachers have to teach in a FL in which they are not competent. He states categorically that no language is incapable of becoming a language of education (not even Pidgin and Motu!). Kloss shows that starting education in L 1 gives pupils psychological confidence, a language development comparable to their age, and the ability to objectivize through a language. (This can subsequently be transferred to L 2!). He favours L 1 instruction as a means of "organic assimilation" (especially - I would add - if L 2 is also taught right from the beginning, promoting true bilingualism). Kloss's proposals concur with worldwide research and a UNESCO recommendation of 1951 that "pupils should begin their schooling through the medium of the mother tongue." (Kloss, p.362)

Kloss enumerates some reasons for and against "protecting" languages, using examples of related and unrelated languages. His "compromise solution" is to leave the initiative to the speakers - after receiving some "enlightenment" (so that they do not perpetuate puristic prejudices). Some of the major chapters are followed by proposals for research projects. Kloss suggests investigations, for instance, on what languages are "lebensfähig" and how much a minor language such as Faeroese (30,000 speakers) costs to maintain.

Kloss then directs his attention to the history of nationality rights, giving instances of countries with positive and negative policies. He devotes part of his treatise to the Socialist countries, especially the Soviet Union, which, on the whole, pursues a liberal policy on language rights. In such a large country, Kloss shows, it is not unreasonable to have one general language (although two or three official languages would be possible). National languages are tolerated - even promoted - for the various republics. But although Russian is taught universally to children of other backgrounds, Russian children are not taught, say, Ukrainian. Some other East European countries have exercised ruthless "language rank-ordering" policies. However, the treatment of Sorbian in East Germany could have been cited as an example of positive language rights policy (though perhaps it is being maintained beyond the wishes of some sections of the population). Kloss shows that "territory" is a crucial criterion of language rights in the Soviet Union, hence the discrimination against Yiddish, which does not have a geographically-based speech community. Kloss poses an interesting question with regard to Rumanian - Would Moldavian have been established as an independent language if the USSR had known Rumania would become a Communist State?

The importance of the revitalization of ethnic groups from their major country and of geographical distribution for LM is discussed, as are the advantages of a larger speech community with regard to publishing and other institutionalized forms of LM. Kloss remarks that it is the suppression of minority in the "non-communist" world that sometimes leads to Communism. (Will suppression of Motu lead to a Communist Papua?) He sees minor languages and nations declining in importance in a United Europe.

Kloss deals with his problems realistically and draws on a vast range of instances. He emphasizes the right of each individual to make choices for himself, preserve his identity and develop to the fullest capacity. Too often perhaps, Kloss presupposes an "either-or" alternative. He could have considered more the right to bilingualism, biculturalism and dual nationality - to pluralism within integration.

On reading this fascinating book, a Niuginian may ask himself the questions:

- 1) To what extent can the tribal languages be employed in local administration and early primary education?
- 2) In view of Kloss's data, could an independent Niugini not cope with Pidgin and Motu as national languages on an equal basis? (Would

this be financially feasible?)

- 3) Is the argument levelled against Pidgin that it may be regarded as a variety of English really valid in view of Kloss's theory of Ausbausprachen and the precedent of, say, Papiamentu - Spanish code-switching in the Dutch Antilles for formal situations?<sup>1</sup>

The Australian may ask himself:

- 1) Have we not failed to give our own "minorities" - Aboriginals, European settlers, and European migrants - their minimal language rights?
- 2) What can be done to encourage people (even when they have agreed to assimilate) to maintain their language and cultural tradition?
- 3) How can we make L1 instruction in primary school available to all who desire it - in view of the large number of first languages now represented? And from what point can we take the children's desires seriously, for in many migrant groups the parents are in favour of LM and the children for language shift. The reason for this may lie with an intolerant host society!

M. Clyne  
Monash University

Footnote:

1. Cf. also D. de Camp, Toward a general analysis of a post-creol speech community. In: D. Hymes (ed.), Pidginization and Creolization of Languages. Cambridge, 1971; 349-70.

## BOOK REVIEW

DA KINE TALK. From Pidgin to Standard English in Hawaii. By Elizabeth Ball Carr. Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press. 1972. Pp xvii + 191.

This book was primarily written for the residents of Hawaii. However, the information which it imparts definitely merits a wider audience.

After a concise and explicit history of the rise and development of the varieties of speech found in Hawaii, Carr devotes five chapters to a division of what she considers to be a speech continuum. Her five types of speech are: immigrant speech (I), early creole remnant (II), basic Hawaiian Creole or da kine talk (III), Hawaiian Near-Standard English (IV), and Hawaiian Standard English (V). It is interesting to note that the speech of the immigrants (type I) is telegraphic. This is reminiscent of the telegraphic speech reported by Roger Brown (1970) in his psycholinguistic studies of first language acquisition where unstressed function words are lost and the stressed content words are retained. This correlation is significant because it suggests that the same psychological factors of speech perception may be operative in both cases. The other types of speech in Hawaii reported by Carr are admittedly arbitrary and therefore merit comment. In lieu of the five types of Carr's classification of five speech types, we envisage only three. At one end of the speech spectrum is the immigrant speech, and at the other end is Standard English. In the center of this speech community is Hawaiian Creole or Da Kine Talk. There are several subclasses of this creole which Carr has overlooked. The Portuguese based Pidgin of Hawaii has developed into a creole dialect. The same pattern of development can be found for other dialectal variants of Hawaiian Creole, viz. Japanese based Pidgin, Filipino based Pidgin, Chinese based Pidgin, and Hawaiian based Pidgin. All of these dialectal variants differ from one another in predictable ways. To further complicate matters, there is also the phenomenon of upward or downward shifting. Hence, in a given sociolinguistic situation a creole speaker may find it imperative to shift upward and adjust his speech so that it is a reasonable approximation of Standard English. The converse of downward shifting occurs when a creole speaker communicates with an immigrant. This phenomenon of sociolinguistic adjustment has been misconstrued by some linguists who refer to Hawaiian Creole as a speech continuum (deCamp, 1971). As native speakers of Hawaiian Creole, we have always been cognizant of the fact that a speech continuum does not exist, and we can readily understand how an outsider to the system would fail to adequately characterize the role that shifting plays in Hawaiian Creole, and thereby consistently