(ECO)LINGUISTIC PLANNING
AND LANGUAGE-EXCHANGE MANAGEMENT[1]

Oscar Diaz Fouces

University of Vigo

Robert Neal Baxter (Translation)

Abstract

The author presents a range of policies aimed at maintaining the integrity of the ecolinguistic spaces related to translation, language teaching, the exchange of cultural products and, in general, the management of linguistic interchanges.

Resum

L'autor presenta un ventall de polítiques orientades a mantenir la integritat dels espais ecolingüístics, relacionades amb la traducció, amb l'ensenyament de llengües, amb l'intercanvi de productes culturals i, en general, amb la gestió dels intercanvis lingüístics.

Keywords

Language planning. Ecolinguistics. Globalization. Translation policies. Language management. Language training

Paraules clau

Planificació lingüística. Ecolingüística. Globalització. Polítiques de traducció. Gestió lingüística. Formació lingüística.

---

1. Introduction

1.1. The rational approach to social phenomena

Interest in the scientific study of the rationalization of public actions was probably born in the United States in the wake of World War II, at the same time as scientific management of business production (Taylorism and Fordism) began to expand. It was then that several, highly-influential think-tanks began to apply certain, hitherto little-used multidisciplinary approaches to social research. These new approaches, based on a scientific rationale, included very innovative heuristic tools, such as strategic analysis, cybernetics and game theory, one of the best-known examples being the Rand Corporation, whose work inspired – and still inspires – very important decisions, in the area of public health, terrorism prevention, internet development and even space exploration.

The emergence of certain disciplines such as (Public) Policy Analysis, representing a new model for the study of governments and administration, should be understood within this context. As Robert H. Haveman (1987) states, prior the advent of Policy Analysis, with a regulatory slant, i.e. seeking to alter reality, traditional research in the field of social sciences was essentially positive, i.e. describing reality. The example he provides is highly illustrative: traditional sociological research would address illegal behaviours, trying to determine their scope, nature, causes and consequences, whereas the new approach would analyze the measures available to reduce these behaviours and would gauge them by taking into account their effectiveness, understood in terms of the optimum investment-benefit ratio achieved.

1.2. Language Planning

This type of approach to social phenomena also came to be applied to perhaps the single-most characteristic feature of the human species: language usage. As Heinz Kloss (1967) observed, languages do not sprout up and die like plants, but can be (and often are) the object of human intervention, which can be rationalized and adopt the form of organized programs. If we consider that, above and beyond their status as abstract semiotic systems, languages are communicational and representational tools, it seems clear that any actions taken concerning them and the underlying decisions will affect the daily lives of the people who use them, thereby effectively representing a form of social engineering. The decisions and actions referred to here are the object of interest in a discipline usually referred to as Language Planning, standing as a prime example of a conceptual instrument concerned with the rationalization of public performances, in as much as the purpose of Language Planning is explicitly normative rather than merely descriptive. Unlike other disciplines, such as Morphology, Syntax or, at other levels, Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis which seek to describe linguistic reality, the stated aim of Language Planning is to trigger specific transformations in the linguistic practices of a given human community, therefore effectively causing social change (see Cooper 1989).

Language Planning was born in the 1960s. Significantly, language problems in developing nations was one of the main topics discussed at the founding meeting of the new discipline, the 1966 Airlie House Conference, held in Virginia in the post-war context (see the materials published in Fishman, Ferguson and Das Gupta, 1968), involved the study of the processes leading up to the formation of standard languages, including encoding (lexical, grammatical, spelling) and the analysis of language contact situations, i.e. the coexistence of different linguistic communities in the same physical territory. In fact, the new discipline of Language Planning was born with a markedly prescriptive character: because language is a primary factor in the cohesion and homogenization of human societies, the configuration of an homogeneous

linguistic system (standard) and the rational management of diversity (multilingualism regulation) was, therefore, also an essential tools for emerging nations.

Epistemologically, the study of issues concerned with the rationalization of sociolinguistic processes (the scope of Language Planning) has been based on more "linguistically-based" approaches, especially those dealing with structural aspects, which would explain the academic affiliation of many of its followers. This never would have prevented, nevertheless that these kind of studies have always received preferential treatment from the more established Sociology, as evidenced by the inclusion of sections on Language and Society in manuals, academic programs, and research meetings within that disciplinary framework. For example, amongst other topics, Research Committee 25 for the XVII World Congress of the International Sociological Association organized in 2010 (in http://www.isa-sociology.org/ congress2010/ rc/rc25.htm) includes meetings dealing with "Sociology and Language" and "Minority Languages and Language Policy".

As a methodological tool, Language Planning can be considered "neutral", in as much as there is no reason for the rationalization of actions within a particular sociolinguistic framework to be inherently "progressive" or "reactionary", or even "good" or "bad." It is obvious, however, that the results of such interventions, such as the replacement of one language by another in education and public areas, the prioritization of one dialect over others in setting up the standard, or the replacement of an orthographic representation system, will not go unnoticed and can, of course, have positive or negative effects for the human groups experiencing them.

Unfortunately, Language Planning has failed to address many of the issues related to translation (see Toury 1999), despite the fact that it is clear that any such process of language management plays an important role, all the more so, in fact, in today's globalised world. Although language planning has been little used as a theoretical framework by Translation Studies, there is, nevertheless, a clear confluence between the two disciplines, specifically in the field of sociology of (or *applied to*) the translation (see Diaz Fouces 1996). As noted by Chesterman (2006:17) in a recent attempt to map out this juncture:

> Finally, mention should be made of work in language planning, which is directed towards the application of research-based knowledge to particular social situations and problems. Typical issues concern language and/or translation policies in multilingual countries or institutions, or for minority languages. These issues have obvious relevance for language rights, democracy and political development, all of which lie within the sphere of sociological interest.

1.3. Ecolinguistic perspective

The study of the rationalisation of sociolinguistics processes has resulted in more specific approaches such as Ecolinguistics, with Einar Haugen's work "The Ecology of Language" (Haugen 1972), based on a lecture given in 1970, acknowledged as having laid the foundations for the ecological metaphor as applied to the field of linguistics, where the author defined the title concept as: "the study of interactions between any given language in its environment." Eighteen years later, in 1990, another seminal work was published (Halliday 1990), which opened up a line of research interested in the role that language plays in aggravating or resolving environmental problems and, by extension, other social problems. It is generally agreed that these two lines come together to form the complementary basis for the field of studies known as Ecolinguistics (cf. Fill 1998): the latter is clearly associated with the theoretical framework of Critical Discourse Analysis, whereas the former, which is of interest to us here, could be characterized by using a number of parameters to identify "ecological thinking", e.g.: taking into account external factors (environmental) in the analysis of linguistic systems, rather not just the internal ones; seeing the problems generated by the unilateralism of monocultures; no longer ignoring the fact that natural resources and human capabilities are not unlimited: and omitting the short-term prospects in the analysis and intervention on languages (H. Weinrich 2001:94, cf. Mühlhäusler 2000:308).

Some of the questions raised by this type of approach are far from unimportant: What is the role of linguistic and cultural diversity? On which mechanisms does it depend? Is it possible to optimize it? It should be borne in mind, of course, that approaches exist within the field of Language Planning (especially a certain American tradition), that are not especially interested in the management of diversity and have favoured the study of concepts such as standardization. For obvious reasons, perspectives such as these do not fit in well with the ecological paradigm. As Mühlhäusler (2000: 310) points, sometimes: "The solution to the adherents of the ecological approach is the problem to most traditional language planners".

Linguistic subordination stands as a good example of the break in the ecolinguistic equilibrium, involving a social imbalance between two or more human communities whose primary overt expression is the restriction of any or some of the linguistic practices of the subordinate group or groups in favour of the practices of the hegemonic group or groups. Languages in a subordinate position tend to undergo significant structural attrition that gradually renders them ineffective as tools for communication. Also, interference from the dominant language practices may lead to an erosion of subordinate stylistic system that involves a genuine hybridisation, leading ultimately to creolization. As far as usage is concerned, subordinate languages are characterized by constant incursions on the part of the dominant language in all areas of use, leading to a narrow and limited functionality, creating a vicious circle that feeds on and exacerbates the subordination. The use of these codes often constitutes a marked usage entailing social stigma for people who use them, thereby encouraging them to abandon the language and making it difficult to attract new users. Examples vary substantially, in line with the circumstances in which they occur, e.g. whereas the cases of Occitan in France, Catalan in Italy, Turkish in Germany and Spanish in the United States all share a subordinate status, the actual symptoms and the respective situations and the possibility of providing support or even reversing the subordination are, nevertheless, very different: although Catalan is subordinated in both Italy and Spain, the actual situation differs in either case; the situation of Turkish in Turkey (where it is the dominant language) is very different from the situation in Germany; and, obviously, in overall terms, situation of Occitan differs radically from that of Spanish.

The ecological metaphor would ascribe all of these circumstances to the breakdown of the ecolinguistic habitat of a human group. As Bastardas (2000) points out, the maintenance of linguistic diversity has less to do with implementing measures focused on endangered languages, than with creating new contexts adapted to new situations capable of stimulating their continued usage, i.e. the (re)generation of suitable ecolinguistic habitats. Similarly, de Swaan (2001:54) suggests that:

> A biological species [...] may be saved by safeguarding the environment where it finds its niche. For a language to survive, a considerable number of people must maintain their speech and maybe their ways of life against the inroads of a changing social and linguistic environment – a rather more formidable task.

It is also necessary to bear in mind that we are dealing with social processes where the subjects are beings endowed with reason, which is an important ethical consideration ,effectively appealing to the most simplistic applications of the ecological metaphor. S. Mufwene has criticized the cynicism of certain linguistic trends, which insist on encouraging speakers of endangered languages, especially from the Third World, to continue to use them in the name of "preserving linguistic diversity", despite the fact that language migration could help improve their socioeconomic well-being. As pointed out in an interesting paper (Mufwene 2002:42):

> Languages die gradually and inconspicuously as a consequence of the communicative practices of the relevant population, in ecologies where the speakers themselves can be considered as victims, as they themselves have adapted to change. We cannot just encourage them to maintain their ancestral languages even if only as home varieties without providing the ecologies that can support our prescriptions.

In this paper, we assume that ecolinguistic planning, taken as the rational management of linguistic ecosystems, is a valuable tool for regulating ecolinguistic balance and, additionally, that ecolinguistic policies, necessarily including translation policy, can be a prime tool for this purpose, as we shall see.

2. Linguistic Economy, Globalization and New Rules

Having provided the overall framework for this paper, before going further, a series of conceptual and contextual considerations are required.

2.1. Globalization and Globalism

Firstly, it must be realised that over recent years it has become increasingly difficult to speak of particular ecolinguistic systems. In practice, our species is approaching the point of forming a global constellation of languages (cf. de Swaan 2001), a new global (eco)linguistic system, and no sociolinguistic analysis can escape this. The boundaries between nation-states have become more permeable, in terms of both economic exchange and communication, although this has not always been extended to include the free movement of people. The old markets have been organized into global networks and potential customers are now everywhere. Globalization is the label used to describe this new situation, which also includes (cf. Santos 2006) an economy dominated by a global financial and investment system, flexible production processes and ubiquitous, fiscal and monetary policies aimed at containing inflation and reducing the cost of transport, together with a revolution in information and communications technologies and minimal state intervention in local economies, including reduced expenditure on social policies and the privatization of the entrepreneurial sector.

Like all massive social changes, globalization cannot be understood without the ideological background that underpins it. Steger (2005) uses the term 'globalism' to refer to the ideology driving globalization, based on such familiar assertions as the following: globalization involves the liberalization and global integration of markets (in fact, as noted by Fairclough [2006], globalism identifies globalization with the spread of the free market); globalization is both inevitable and irreversible; globalization does not belong to anybody; globalization is a beneficial process for the whole World; globalization fosters the spread of democracy around the World. The economic corollary of globalism which serves to complement the first assertion is neoliberalism, an ideology/utopia that emphasizes the role of markets over the role of the states, the individual over the community and advocates the commoditisation of all things, including access to the political process.

2.2. Language as Goods

How, then, do these new rules influence ecolinguistic dynamics? We can begin by assuming that any attempt to reduce the scope of classic categories such as linguistic subordination to the limits of a particular nation-state is likely to end in failure: in the new global system, the ecolinguistic balance will also be global, as too will the risk of destabilizing particular ecolinguistic systems, potentially affecting both hegemonic and subordinate languages, albeit to a different extent.

The first question we should ask when analyzing the performance of this "new order" is the true role played by languages in a global market. According to Grin (1994:35), a 'market' is commonly defined in economic studies by four elements: a commodity, i.e. goods or services; a set price; a demand forecast, which represents the volume of goods or services that agents are willing to consume, for each price-bracket; and a forecast of supply, which identifies the volume of goods or services that agents are willing to produce for every price-bracket.

2.2.1. Language-knowledge as Human Capital and as Hypercollective Goods

The characterization of language as a product has, however, some interesting peculiarities. Firstly, languages are collective goods because nobody can be excluded from using them and because the effort of a single individual is not sufficient to maintain them. On the other hand, language understood as goods is not depleted as a result of consumption. Unlike other common consumable commodities where increased consumption will effectively deplete the available stock, thereby leading to a price increase, paradoxically, in the case of language, its value increases as its use increases, without any reduction in of the total volume of product available. The concept of network externalities (e.g. Katz & Shapiro 1986) refers to those goods whose usefulness increases as the number of people who consume them increases. We are referring to the knowledge of a language as goods, or what Chiswik & Miller (1995:248) refers to as "human capital":

> Language skills are an important form of human capital. They satisfy the three basic requirements for human capital: they are embodied in the person; they are productive in the labour market and/or in consumption; and they are created at a sacrifice of time and out-of-pocket resources.

According to Grin & Vallancourt's synthesis (1997), language is a type of human capital (see also Grenier & Vaillancourt 1983:472-474), a form of knowledge useful for individuals, with a supercollective character and whose value increases as the number of people that use it grows, broadening its communication effectiveness. In terms of human communities, the sum of this individual human capital is a form of social capital. We can agree with de Swaan (2001: § 2.1) that, given the (positive) network externality and their collective character, languages can also be seen as a type of hypercollective goods.

2.2.2. The Language as a service, Language as a technology and Negative Externalities

Beyond the concept of language seen in terms of a kind of goods, language must also be considered as a service, as in the case of language teaching and various forms of linguistic mediation (translation, interpretation, subtitling, localization, etc.). Firstly, the desire to have access to the benefits that languages brings with it in order to be able to communicate with a larger number of people everywhere in the case of hypercentral languages, in turn ensures a large body of individuals who have to invest time, money and effort in language learning, thereby leading to the corresponding offer to provide those services. It should be remembered that the incorporation of these people into the community of users of that language results in an immediate profit for the language in question in terms of network externality, thereby automatically increasing its ability to attract new users.

Secondly, it is clear that in the new globalized ecolinguistic framework, many – if not most – of the language products that are within our reach (from cinema and literature, to instruction manuals and commercial labelling, from the written press, to Internet sites and ordinary consumer goods) have been subject to some form or other of linguistic intervention, or have generated it in the respective production processes, labelling, transport in all relevant business transactions, in the communications caused by them, in advertising and merchandising , etc. This language management, where languages are directly a technology, reflects the fact that the markets are now global with potential customers everywhere, making it necessary to adapt all of the products and services on offer both linguistically and culturally.

The ideology underpinnig globalization is geared, on principle, to closely following the logic of the market, and has nothing to do with the preservation of cultural diversity, with cultural and linguistic diversity actually acting as obstacles to the circulation of goods, just like the different track gauges or the variation in formats used for industrial production. In fact, the industrial standards serve to facilitate business activity by reducing uncertainties concerning the production and distribution of goods and the provision of services. From the standpoint of the

agents responsible for creating and managing products and services that call for linguistic-cultural adaptation, as for any other instance of a loss of earnings, the implementation of a basic profit criterion geared to maximizing returns would require that the costs of products and services incurred by language adaptation be severely reduced or eliminated entirely. Bearing in mind that commoditisation is a key feature of globalism, one way to achieve this would be to prioritize the most efficient technologies, which, in practice, means putting a price on languages in line with their use value, definable in terms of their capacity to bring the products closer to a higher number of potential consumers, thereby providing benefits at a lower cost. There is also a series of other criteria that help determine the value of language as a technology, including whether the human group to which the product is adapted is able to guarantee the optimization of the transaction thanks, for example, to their high purchasing power or their demographic weight. In this context, the dominant position of English as the language of globalization is beyond dispute. Behind English, there is a competitive cluster of languages in market terms, ranging from Mandarin, Russian and Hindi to Spanish and Portuguese, etc., that still justify the costs of product adaptation, followed by a series of languages in much a more delicate situation. According to Skutnabb-Kangas (2004): "Only those 40-50 languages will remain in which people can, within the next few years, talk to their stove, fridge and coffee pot, i.e. those languages into which Microsoft software, Nokia mobile phone menus, etc., are being translated".

The provision of language services also requires a pre-existing volume of human capital in the form of linguistic knowledge. In other words, language as knowledge exists prior to language as service. An obvious consequence is the large benefit automatically derived by people who have a widely-spread language, usually by simple geographical coincidence, as their mother tongue which Breton [1998] refers to as *seigniorage of language*. Grin (2004) has listed a series of positive effects for speakers of dominant languages in contact situations which can be extrapolated to dominant languages in the global linguistic market:

- the 'privileged market effect': native speakers of the dominant language enjoy a quasi-monopoly over the markets for translation and interpretation into the dominant language, the market for second language instruction above a certain level, and the market for language editing all of which are tasks in which native-level skills are typically required;
- the 'communication savings effect': native speakers of the dominant language are spared the effort required to translate messages directed to them by speakers of other languages, since the latter will have made the effort to utter them in the dominant language in the first place; reciprocally, native speakers of the dominant language do not need to translate their messages into other languages;
- the 'language learning savings effect': native speakers of the dominant language do not need to invest time and effort in learning other languages; this amounts to a considerable savings. [...]
- the 'alternative human capital investment effect': the money not invested in foreign language acquisition can be diverted to other forms of human capital investment and give native speakers of the dominant language an edge in other areas;
- the 'legitimacy and rhetorical effect': native speakers of the dominant language will generally have an edge in negotiations or arguments with non-native speakers, because these always take place in their language.

The hypercollective nature of language as a service has a series of paradoxical effects which affect value and forecasts for supply and demand. For example, there is no real reason why English courses, as the paradigmatic hypercentral language, or linguistic mediation practices involving English should be more expensive than other language courses or similar linguistic mediation practices in other languages. In fact, by its very definition, network externality entails a negative value for linguistic mediation, with the need for translation decreasing proportionally to an increase in the number of language users (cf. de Swaan 1998: § 2.2). Conversely, in such cases where a shortage/price increase relationship exists, translation to and from less frequent combinations of 'exotic' languages will tend to be more expensive. As far as foreign language

learning is concerned, increased supply in the case of the most popular, hypercentral languages tends to level prices, with governments generally considering language training a strategic sector, including it as an integral part of compulsory education.

3. The Planning and the Preservation of Ecolinguistic Habitats

From a strictly economic point of view, the elements discussed in the previous section could be used as objective criteria to gauge the new global linguistic market, making all decisions quite clear-cut when languages are taken as nothing more than communication tools that fluctuate in the free market (that *will fluctuate* within the context of globalism), which means that it would be fair to argue, for example, that language teaching is more effective than translation practice in multilingual societies. Applying the game theory, Colomer (1996) concludes that in communities with more than five languages, massive teaching of one of them is socially more effective than translation in order to ensure maximum communication effectiveness, and that the teaching of two languages is more effective in communities with more than ten languages, going on to say (1996:   182) that, above and beyond intellectual considerations: "Here language is basically conceived as a tool for communication. [...] However, other dimensions of language, such as expression and its value as an element of cultural environment, should be considered as a crucial complement of my evaluation [...]".

The supposed objectivity of an approach geared solely to economic interests is often based on the idea that the value or 'price' of languages is measured exclusively in commercial rather than representational terms. But as Grin states (2006:81):

> The "hypercollective" nature of language opens up some of the most challenging research avenues in language economics, but it does contain numerous pitfalls. For example, it has been used by some to defend, on allegedly economic grounds, support for the teaching of *majority* languages (Jones, 2000). However, the validity of this proposition crucially rests on one assumption, namely, that language is *only* a tool for communication (sometimes relabelled a "communication technology"). Sociolinguists have known for a long time that this does not do justice to the complexity of language in human experience.

Beyond their more easily assessable economic value, languages act as repositories for the accumulated knowledge of human groups, the bedrock of community practices repeated over time and, most probably, instruments that help shape individual cognition, thereby reflecting and helping to maintain the forms of social cognition. That being so, linguistic diversity could be considered a commodity in its own right on a par with biological diversity, which no doubt explains the fact that Article 3 of the Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity, adopted at the 31st Session of the General Assembly of UNESCO (http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/ 0012/001271/127160m.pdf), states that cultural diversity is a factor for development:

> **ARTICLE 3 Cultural diversity as a factor in development**
> Cultural diversity widens the range of options open to everyone; it is one of the roots of development, understood not simply in terms of economic growth, but also as a means to achieve a more satisfactory intellectual, emotional, moral and spiritual existence.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the Declaration includes the following amongst the main lines of its action plan: "Safeguarding the linguistic heritage of humanity and giving support to expression, creation and dissemination in the greatest possible number of languages." Nevertheless, not all specialists agree with the idea that linguistic diversity should be maintained. In fact, although some specialists do favour the equation between ecological diversity and linguistic diversity (see e.g., Skutnabb-Kangas & Philipson 2008, Maffi 2001), and therefore assume certain language rights, there are also those who believe that granting these linguistic rights, especially when based on the idea that languages have intrinsic value, leads to unacceptable situations from a liberal-democratic view (see Boran 2003, Weinstock 2003).

In practical terms, however, it is nevertheless clear is that if human communities have the capacity to do so, they will tend to set up intervention mechanisms designed to offset the effects of market logic, most probably because the tendency to maintain rather than alter behaviour is a constant in human societies, notwithstanding the incontrovertible right of communities to defend what they see as (hyper)collective goods when threatened, and such actions may be correspond to an overt decision taken by an administrative agency, and may even be the subject of legal sanctions. Cases such as these would be illustrative of genuine policies, whether they are overt or covert and whether they respond to detailed plans or (apparently) unconnected measures, leading to observable and justifiable results. As de Swaan (2001: 55) remarks: "[...] a community with an effective coordinating agency, such as a political authority of its own, is in a much better position to impose its policies than a collectivity that must rely on voluntary compliance".

As stated at the beginning of this paper, translation practices represent an interesting tool in this type of process. In previous works, we referred to the need to try to rationalize translation practices as an object of study when seen as types of social control, as Meylaerts (2009:8-9) suggests:

> Parmi ces mécanismes de contrôle, la traduction joue un rôle de premier plan. La planification en matière de traduction institutionnelle fait effectivement partie intégrante de la politique de langue des sociétés multilingues, au point que cette dernière présuppose une politique de traduction. En d'autres termes, non seulement quelle(s) langue(s) peu(ven)t ou ne peu(ven)t pas être utilisée(s) mais aussi et nécessairement qu'est-ce qui peut (ne peut pas) être traduit par qui, quand et comment dans un contexte géo-temporel et institutionnel défini fait partie de la lutte pour 'qui est dedans' et 'qui est dehors'

We have shown (Diaz Fouces 2001, 2002, 2005) that these mechanisms relate to several different areas, including the relative balance of linguistic-exchanges flows and the professional socialization of people involved in linguistic management, as well as actual linguistic-structural aspects. This paper focuses on the first of these aspects, presenting a first rational outline of the range of policies applied and/or applicable to the management of linguistic exchanges intended to preserve ecolinguistic spaces.

3.1. Policy Types: A proposed Rational Approach

3.1.1. Regulatory Policies for External/Foreign Exchanges

First of all, it is necessary to distinguish policies designed to regulate external exchanges, aiming at preserving and, as far as possible, increasing the use-value of languages understood as (hyper)collective goods, i.e. a social capital which is also the individual capital of all members its community of users. Here we use the term 'community of users' to cover all of the individuals affected to a greater or lesser degree, regardless of whether they actually live within the State(s) where the language in question is dominant, although any public policies will, inevitably, primarily target the group of people within a given administrative jurisdiction, be it regional, national or international. The strategies deployed may involve regulating the balance regarding the exchange of cultural products. The following list provides a description of the main types of policy within this ambit:

1. *Policies for the spread and diffusion abroad (of cultural products)* are based on subsidies to export own linguistic-cultural goods, in order to expand their market;
2. *Policies that restrict imports of cultural products* are protectionist strategies intended to safeguard language value and, therefore, social capital;
3. *Policies to promote teaching of the own language abroad* are intended to increase language value by encouraging the integration of new users who can go on to create positive externalities;
4. *Policies to promote foreign language teaching* help increase the human capital of a community in a selective way;

5. *Policies to promote translation from the own language* constitute protectionist measures designed to support the use of their own language-technology;
6. *Policies to promote translation into the own language* of valuable foreign products help boost individuals self-esteem, thereby preventing linguistic defection.

As we shall go on to see in more detail, the types listed above can be paired off (1-2, 3-4, 5-6) in such a way as to represent two facets of the same phenomenon. The first pair (types 1 and 2) concerns what is usually referred to as 'cultural industries', a term which grew out of the Frankfurt School initially with negative connotations, before going on to gain credence as a fact beyond the philosophical and sociological dimension, with the implementation of trade agreements such as the Canada and United States Free Trade Agreement (CUSFTA), whose Article 2012 defines 'cultural industries' as enterprises engaged in books and periodicals publication, video and films production and music and radio broadcasts (see Neuwirth 2008), referring, in essence, to industries where linguistic content plays an essential role. One paradigmatic and extreme example of the first type of policy is provided by Redner (2004:77) concerning the US film industry and audiovisual products in general:

> The purveyors of global culture, mainly American media companies, practice a commercial strategy that is often little short of cultural dumping. In order to create markets for their commodities they will give away for nothing or next to nothing shows that have already recouped their cost of production and reaped a handsome profit on the wide and wealthy American market. Such shows, once amortized, can then be exported around the world with the main purpose of building audiences, and so creating a demand for such cultural products as will eventually have to be paid for, vastly increasing the profits already gained. […] It would be perfectly legitimate, and not necessarily infringe on free trade practices, to legislate against cultural dumping, as it has been done against every other kind of products-dumping.

This kind of actions would help explain the protectionist responses by communities whose own ecolinguistic space has been encroached upon in a relatively aggressive way. Some time ago, an article in the New York Times gave news coverage to the fact that both France and Spain had set quotas for US films, illustrating type 2 policies. Interestingly, in the Spanish case, one of the measures involved restricting the possibility of showing dubbed material (see http://www.nytimes.com/1993/12/22/movies/france-and-spain-impose-quotas.html and http://www.congreso.es/constitucion/ficheros/leyes_espa/rdl_019_1993.pdf):

> In Spain, the Parliament today approved a law saying that in towns with more than 125,000 inhabitants, every two days cinemas dedicate to American films must be followed by one day for European films. In smaller towns, cinemas will have to show one day of European movies for every three given of American films.
> Proposed by the Socialist Government of Felipe Gonzalez, the law is intended to encourage European films at a time when Hollywood accounts for just less than 80 percent of the Spanish box office.
> The legislation also imposes strict limits on dubbing. A license to dub any foreign film will be given only to a movie distribution company that has already shown European films earning about $143,000 in box-office receipts during the year.
> With the average European film earning about $64,000 in Spain, the law effectively means that a company will have to show three European films before it can obtain a license to dub a Hollywood production. Most American movies in Spain are currently dubbed, and there is little public demand for films with subtitles.

While the Spanish legislation eventually 'softened' these measures (see http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2001/07/10/pdfs/a24904-24909.pdf), the European Union is currently promoting various types of protectionist measures in the form of subsidies to productions by Member States, as in the case of the Decision 1718/2006/EC of the Parliament and the Council of Europe, better

known as the META 2007 Program (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/lexuriserv/site/en/oj/2006/l_327/ l_32720061124en00120029.pdf), which establishes the following global aims:

(a) preserve and enhance European cultural and linguistic diversity and its cinematographic and audiovisual heritage, guarantee its accessibility to the public and promote intercultural dialogue;
(b) increase the circulation and viewership of European audiovisual works inside and outside the European Union, including through greater cooperation between players;
(c) strengthen the competitiveness of the European audiovisual sector in the framework of an open and competitive European market favourable to employment, including by promoting links between audiovisual professionals.

The last of the types listed (type 6) is a similar in its scope, whereby free-market rules often have to be overridden in order to facilitate access for speakers of certain language groups to a significant share of products and services in their own language. Bearing in mind the earlier comments by Skutnabb-Kangas (2004) stating that only communities with large population densities or with high purchasing power attract language management practices provided by large market agents, the prestigious practices of language management would most likely be reserved for the more economically viable languages, thereby effectively forcing other 'less viable' communities to develop protective strategies. A good example of this is the localization into Catalan, Galician and Basque of two Microsoft products, namely the Windows operating system and the Office package, which received important financial support from their respective regional governments in order to compensate for the fact the company itself did not consider the venture profitable, recalling the earlier quote by Skutnabb-Kangas (2006). Considering the fact that all speakers of the above mentioned language communities are also proficient in Spanish, it is clear that the subsidies received can only be justified in symbolic rather than in purely economic terms, in the short-term at least. It is also interesting to note that in all three cases the result was a Language Interface Pack (LPI), which had to be installed in order to use the localized user interface, in practice amounting to little more than a 'patch' (http://www.elcorreogallego.es/index.php?idMenu=10&idNoticia=44960 http://www.microsoft. com/spain/windowsxp/euskera.mspx and http://www.softcatala.org/ el_windows_catala_amor_ imposible). For obvious reasons, protectionist policies give priority to language management practices with a large symbolic load, in this case software packages used worldwide associated with the values of modernity and technology.

In a similar vein, translation practice from subordinated language is associated with significant values, as remarked by O'Connell & Walsh (2006): "Translation into a minority language [...] may be necessary for its very survival, but translation from a minority language is usually important primarily in terms of status and prestige." In fact, this type of export will not only increase the symbolic value of a language, but also its real value as hypercollective goods, which, in turn, would explain the existence of protectionist strategies in the case of subordinated communities whose visibility is lower. It is in this light that the periodic announcement of subsidies from the *Institut Ramon Llull* for the translation of literature and other works from Catalan into other languages (see the Official Journal of the Generalitat of Catalonia, Nº 5294, dated 01/12/2009) or the subsidies from the *Institució de les Lletres Catalanes* (http://cultura.gencat.net/ilc/) for translations into Catalan should be seen, as remarked by Cronin (2003:167):

The problem for minority or endangered languages is not so much the fact of contact as the form of contact. Translation as a particular kind of contact is threatening and oppressive if the speakers of minority languages have no control over the translation process and cannot use translation as an enabling force but have to suffer it as a disabling intrusion.

And (Cronin 2003:169):

Making knowledge and information available in minority languages is not only an effective way of extending the way of usefulness of the languages concerned but it also allows the

regional, the national and the global to be made local in a way that is politically enabling and allows for the beginning of a recovery of control over people's political, economic and cultural fates.

It should be noted, however, that this practice (type 5) is not exclusive to subordinated languages and is, in fact, very common for hegemonic languages, especially those with certain features, such as a small number of speakers that make them uncompetitive in the global market. It is for this reason that specific actions with this purpose have been drawn up for Irish by the Ireland Literature Exchange (http://www.irelandliterature.com/), and it is no less interesting to note to that translations from Dutch literature are subsidized by 70% by the Foundation for the Production and Translation of Dutch Literature (Nederlands Literair Productie- en Vertalingenfonds, http://www.nlpvf.nl/nl/over/) and the governing bodies of the Flemish Community (Linn 2006: 34), and the Ministry of Education of the Iceland Government has a fund for the promotion of literature which seeks, among other things, (http://bella.stjr.is/utgafur/enskan.pdf) to:

> [...] promote Icelandic literature abroad so as to have Icelandic fiction published abroad in foreign languages, and supervision of the participation of Iceland in foreign cultural events and international cooperation in the field of literature. The fund may also make grants to translators of Icelandic literature into other languages in order to enable them to travel to Iceland to work on their translations and are responsible for conferences and work meetings of translators in Iceland.

The Icelandic case would serve to illustrate both types 5 and 6, in as much as the measure described also maintains a specific fund for translation to import works from foreign authors, although this does not prevent younger people from changing their cultural consumption patterns, as indicated by their preference for reading the *Harry Potter* series directly in English (see Hilmarsson-Dunn 2006: 305).

Promoting translation from one's own language is not unique to Western languages, as shown by the first measure of a set of cultural policy proposals set up by the Tanzanian Ministry of Culture (http://www.tzonline.org/pdf/culturalpolicy.pdf):

> 1.2.2 Communities, private and public organisations shall be encouraged to research, write, preserve and translate vernacular languages into other languages. [...]
> 1.3.1 English shall be a compulsory subject in pre-primary, primary and secondary educations levels and shall be encouraged in higher education. In addition the teaching of English shall be strengthened.
> 1.3.2 The teaching of other foreign languages such as French, Portuguese and Russian shall be encouraged.

This example also serves to illustrate how type 2 and 3 measures are related to type 4 policies, in as much as foreign language teaching increases an individual's human capital and, therefore, to some extent the collective social capital. While it should come as no surprise that English, the real world *lingua franca*, is the most chosen, the 2006 ELAN report: Effects on the European Economy of Shortages of Foreign Language Skills in Enterprise (http://ec.europa.eu/education/languages/pdf/doc421_en.pdf) also provides a series of interesting variables:

> Many respondents indicated that they viewed English as a key language for gaining access to export markets and frequent reference was made to its use as a lingua franca. However, the survey results, as well as comments from individual company respondents, suggest that the picture is far more complex than the much-quoted view that English is the world language.
> The backlash against Russian which was noticeable in the former Soviet Bloc countries at the end of the last century is not in evidence and Russian is extensively used in Eastern Europe as a lingua franca (along with German and Polish). French is used to trade with

partners in areas of Africa and Spanish is used similarly in Latin America. Individual respondents mentioned that English might be used for initial market entry, but longer-term business partnerships depended upon relationship-building and relationship-management and, to achieve this, cultural and linguistic knowledge of the target country were essential.

There is, however, no doubt that a society with a good level of language skills has a greater potential to meet the challenges of globalization and, consequently, to generate wealth for the community. Nor should it be assumed that people whose native tongue is the international *lingua franca* necessarily have no reasonable knowledge of other languages and cultures, as shown by the recent US Education for Global Leadership report on The Importance of International Studies and Foreign Language Education for U.S. Economic and National Security (Committee for Economic Development 2006, en http://www.ced.org) and as noted by the General Director for Translation of the European Commission (Lönnroth 2009: 4-5):

> In 2007, the exports of goods from the United Kingdom to the whole of South America – an area with a population of 380 million – were only marginally higher than those to Denmark – a country with a population of 5.5 million. This disappointing performance has been explained by the limited knowledge of Spanish and Portuguese in the United Kingdom business community.

In collective terms, however, language teaching policies have a substantially lower knock-on effect,with negative externalities caused by languages competing for the same ecolinguistic space increasing its use value due to the incorporation of individuals who belong to communities that promote this kind of policies, which may explain why the choice of foreign languages for compulsory education often hinges on a strategic value that responds to broader political and economic interests. This could also account for phenomena such as the attitude swings towards language teaching detected in the United States (see Lantolf & Sunderman 2001), the massive presence of the Russian language in education in the Communist Bloc countries after the World War II, or the recent introduction of Spanish as a compulsory subject in the Brazilian school curriculum (ELAN report cited above also provides clues regarding the results and reasons behind these phenomena). On the other hand, the promotion of the teaching of one's own language abroad (type 3) as carried out by bodies such as the *Goethe-Institute*, the *Instituto Cervantes* or the *Instituto Camões* is a clear source of positive externalities, effectively acting as a tool to bolster their respective ecolinguistic spaces.

3.1.2. Policies for the Regulation of Internal Exchanges

The policy types presented in the previous section are intended to preserve ecolinguistic spaces, avoiding uncontrolled fluctuations in language value, with the corresponding actions designed to achieve an external balance. To a certain extent, type 4 is an exception to the rule, in that it implies a certain level of internal action within the community itself, with the most obvious management of linguistic diversity developed within the framework of the respective political and administrative bodies. Bearing in mind that today's world provides very few examples of sovereign States with an overall linguistic homogeneity, it can reasonably be assumed that one single language – one ecolinguistic space – is usually privileged in (almost) all cases. Governments and administrations can adopt multiple approaches in order to maintain the supremacy of one language within their respective powers spaces. One of the clearest examples are the policies for the regulation of internal exchanges, which seek to regulate the internal communications between an Administration and its own citizens. We shall use the following table as a starting point to go on to discuss this particular type of policies.

	Administration	Citizens
Institutional monolingualism	a. No translation	Mandatory translation
	b. Supportive translation	Frequent mandatory translation
	c. Official translation	Occasional mandatory translation
Institutional multilingualism	d. Total Translation / Zero translation	Zero translation

In general, in multilingual contexts administrations can adopt one of two main strategies, i.e. monolingual or multilingual practices, with a range of intermediate possibilities (cf. Meylaerts 2009:14). A purely multilingual administration (d) communicates directly with its citizens in their own language(s) or the language(s) of their choice, which implies that all of the actions undertaken either have to be systematically translation ('total translation') or originally produced in a multilingual format ('zero translation'). Concrete examples of this practice are rare, even in countries where supposedly equitable multilingualism exists. The European Union might well serve as a relatively close model, in as much as EU legislation and institutional operations are multilingual. What this is means in practice, however, is that all territorial communities whose native language is not one of the official EU languages, as well as the languages spoken by large groups of immigrants and non-territorial communities, e.g. Roma, are effectively excluded. Furthermore, there are also clear indications of expected cut-backs regarding what some people see as the overly-expensive institutional multilingualism of the European Union with only English, French and German already seen as the *de facto* internal working languages of the Commission, with the number of documents originally drafted in English by the Directorate-General for Translation rising from 45.4% in 1997, to 62% in 2004 and 72.5% in 2008. (http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/translation/publications/brochures/translating_eu_ brochure_en.pdf).

At the opposite end of the spectrum (a) are those administrations that ignore the existence of any language other than that granted official status within its borders. Once again, pure examples are uncommon in practice and tend to coincide with authoritarian political systems, and such cases as do exist often tend to coincide with type (b) practices. In Western liberal democracies at least, language policies which target hegemonic groups of individuals on the one hand as opposed to those targeted at non-hegemonic groups on the other differ radically from one another, with public services expected to be provided in the language of the group in question in the first instance, whereas supportive translation tends to be used in the second case, as often happens with immigrants. As Bauböck (2001) states:

> This is particularly important in institutional environments that are experienced as stressful, such as hospitals, police interrogations or courtrooms. In such institutions, immigrants may have a moral right not only to use their native language but also to be understood when they speak it. More generally, public policy in countries of immigration should accommodate immigrant languages by providing a broad range of translation and interpreter services, bilingual forms and ballots, information sheets and public broadcasting in immigrant languages.

One very notable example is the Executive Order 13166 entitled 'Improving access to services for persons with limited English proficiency'(http://www.justice.gov/crt/cor/Pubs/eolep.php), signed by the former president of the United States, Bill Clinton, which was intended to ensure that federal assistance programs for people without a sufficient mastery of English were provided by personnel capable of attending to them in their own language or by providing them with translation services. It is interesting to note that the back-up translation and interpretation option is also often the strategy used when attending to foreign visitors, such as tourists, who require police or hospital attention. In effect, therefore, above and beyond its humanitarian value *per se*, this type of action actually involves symbolically assigning to the group in question a lower status of full citizenship, which could be identified with the correspondence between the

official and their own language. In this case, translation serves to establish a symbolic distance between the administrations and certain individuals and groups, who became 'marked' as 'less citizens'. As far as its official languages are concerned, the European Union itself maintains a type (c) practice vis-à-vis the citizens of its Member States as opposed to a type (b) practice when dealing with immigrants, notwithstanding those fortunate enough to speak languages which happen to be recognised as official EU languages.

Taken from the standpoint of the individual, types (a) and (b) also illustrate what Branchadell (2005) referred to as 'Mandatory Translation', clearly related to Grin's (2004) "communication savings effect" quoted above and defined as follows (Branchadell 2005: 126): "Mandatory translation languages (MLT) are languages whose speakers do not have (or cannot exercise) the right to not translate their acts or words and the right to receive translations into their language of the acts of others." What this means is that people whose native languages do not coincide with the official language of the place they happen to be in have no alternative but to continually translate their personal and public actions. Conversely, however, only in certain rare cases can they expect the corresponding Administration to translate its actions in order to render them understandable or to automatically make provision for the translation/interpretation of certain basic services in order to guarantee access. In the words of Meylaerts (2009:11): "Ainsi, le monolinguisme institutionnel et l'idéologie monolingue reposent sur une combinaison judicieuse de traduction interdite et obligatoire. L'obligation de traduire forme la conditio sine qua non d'un système monolingue."

Interestingly, the situation of subordinate endogenous communities, i.e. full citizens of a State who speak languages other than the dominant language, usually differs from that of immigrants. For example, while it would be relatively common for a Moroccan immigrant accused of a crime to be provided with an interpreter if arrested in the French Republic, the same provision would not be made in the case of an Occitan-speaking French citizen, on the grounds that, as a French citizen, they should be fully proficient in the official language of the country, with no suppostive action being deemed necessary.

This same example leads on to a further series of considerations. It is perfectly possible for a language to be in a state of 'good health' in one place, whilst at the same time a significant number of people who have it as their native tongue cannot use it in their daily lives, outside informal and family situations, as in the case, for example, of Portuguese immigrants living in France, whose language regains its functional value when in their native ecolinguistic habitat when returning to Portugal on holidays. This case illustrates the importance of keeping their own habitat healthy, and a Portuguese-speaker living in France will still be able to access many cultural products in their own language, including books, newspapers, radio, satellite TV, videos, etc., as well as being able to address the European authorities in Portuguese. Conversely, however, the offer available to Occitan-speakers in France is considerably lower despite living – paradoxically – in the territory where their language was born, the only one in the world with a significant demographic density of users; in their ecolinguistic habitat, although its destructuring and degradation is evident.

Type (c) corresponds to States with a certain degree of political and administrative decentralization, as in the case of Belgium, where the official documentation of Federal institutions is bilingual, with translations always available in French and Dutch. However, official status is not always automatic for all minorities, with a state's duty to provide services in a language increasing in proportion to the number of speakers of that language (Henrard 2000), with languages which fail to grow and achieve a significant demographic hardly likely to gain full recognition for their linguistic rights, by definition involving access to collective practices, and at best provided with supportive translation. One case such example is commented on by Meylaerts (2009: 16):

La Belgique n'a en effet jamais considéré une traduction allemande dans ces domaines pour la minorité germanophone vivant dans les cantons de l'Est annexés en 1920 en exécution du traité de Versailles. Parallèlement, on n'a aucune indication d'une pareille politique traductionnelle vis-à-vis des minorités nouvellement immigrées en Belgique [...]

4. Summary and Conclusions

In a globalized world, any human community can find the continuity of their linguistic practices threatened. Applying the ecological metaphor, any ecolinguistic group may at some point suffer a destruction of their habitat as a result of a direct attack or of a shift in their environmental circumstances, with the causes involved ranging from active causes, such as military, political or economic coercion to more passive causes, as in the case of a lack of equitable policies within the framework of *de facto* multilingualism. However, care should be taken to avoid concluding – wrongly in our opinion – that the destruction of ecolinguistic habitats is always exclusively a consequence of actions by an outside agent and that restrictions on linguistic practices are automatic responses. Like all social changes, linguistic transformations are complex processes and 'language migrations' are quite possible, involving the mass abandonment of one linguistic code in favour of another without the need to implement any explicit enforcement mechanism. Inequalities in the processes of modernization, (un)industrialization in some places and social dislocation can all lead to a loss or gain of prestige and as well as the loss or gain of use value involving massive changes in linguistic behaviour patterns.

To avoid or to address such threats, different human communities, be they hegemonic or subordinated, large or small, regional or international, have developed a series of strategies, many of them concerned with regulating linguistic exchanges. On the whole, these strategies involve the decisions that have been taken by the relevant public managers, often set out in regulations and standards as well as laws and decrees. The aim of this paper is to present a first attempt to systematize some of the main strategies aimed at maintaining the appropriate conditions for specific linguistic practices to remain viable in a given ecolinguistic space, i.e. to preserve and, wherever possible, to broaden their own ecolinguistic space. Translation represents a key tool in this task, both with regard to the relationship with other ecolinguistic spaces and to the management of each language's own space. Our analysis also includes language teaching because, notwithstanding other more symbolic considerations, linguistic mediation necessarily takes place between people who speak different languages, and without such mediation communication would be difficult if not impossible. The relationship between these two forms of language as service is obvious, as is its relationship with languages as goods.

Rather than being seen as in any way exhaustive in their scope and handling, both the theoretical list of measures as well as the conceptual tools outlined in this paper are intended to provide a tentative contribution to the study and, as far as possible, rationalization of interactions in the new global ecolinguistic system. The article also paves the way for defining a conceptual abstract of the tools available in order to be able to go on to carry out long-term studies designed to gauge the actual impact of the lasting effectiveness of the measures involved.

Finally, it should also be borne in mind that the practices of restricting individual and collective language rights and protectionist measures are not comparable from an ethical point of view, with the options available to regulate internal exchanges providing genuine commitment to diversity, nor do protectionist practices implemented by a hegemonic community have the same ecological impact as those implemented by a subordinate community. In a globalized world, the boundaries between these two types of communities are increasingly blurred and speakers of languages that are hegemonic today may well find that within in a few years they too need to be translated to be understood.

References

BASTARDAS-BOADA, A. (2000) "Language Planning and Language Ecology: Towards a theoretical integration". *Symposium 30 Years of Ecolinguistics.* <http://www.scribd.com/doc/3025205/Language-Planning-and-Language-Ecology-Towards-a-theoretical-integration?autodown=pdf>

BAUBÖCK, R. (2001) *Public Culture in Societies of Immigration.* Willy Brandt Series of Working Papers in International Migration and Ethnic Relations 1/01. Malmö: School of International Migration and Ethnic Relations - Malmö University. <http://dspace.mah.se:8080/bitstream/2043/684/1/Workingpaper101.pdf>

BORAN, I. (2003) "Global Linguistic Diversity, Public Goods, and the Principle of Fairness". W. Kymlicka & A. Patten (eds) *Language Rights and Political Theory.* New York: Oxford University Press, 189-209.

BRANCHADELL, A. (2005) "Mandatory Translation". A. Branchadell & L.M. West (eds.) *Less Translated Languages.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 125-135.

BRETON, A. (1998) "An Economic Analysis of Language". A. Breton (ed.) *Economic Approaches to Language and Bilingualism.* Ottawa: Canadian Heritage, 1-33.

CHESTERMAN, A. (2006) "Questions in the Sociology of Translation." Ferreira Duarte, J.; A. Assis Rosa & T. Seruya *Translation Studies at the Interface of Disciplines.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 9-28.

CHISWICK, B. & P. MILLER. (1995) "The Endogeneity between Language and Earnings: International Analyses.". *Journal of Labor Economics* 13:2, p. 246-288.

COLOMER, J.M. (1996) "To translate or to learn languages? An evaluation of social efficiency." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 121:181-197.

COOPER, R.L. (1989) *Language Planning and Social Change.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

CRONIN, M. (2003) *Translation and Globalization.* London: Routledge.

DE SWAAN, A. (1998) *In Care of the State: Health Care, Education and Welfare in Europe and the USA in the Modern Era.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

DE SWAAN, A. (2001) *Words of the World. The Global Language System.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

DIAZ FOUCES, O. (1996) "Traducció i *Language Planning*". P. Orero (ed.) *Actes del III Congrés Internacional sobre Traducció.* Bellaterra: Departament de Traducció. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 627–636.

DIAZ FOUCES, O. (2001) "Cal planificar la mediació lingüística? L'exemple de Catalunya." *Revista de Llengua i Dret* 36:121-156.

DIAZ FOUCES, O. (2002) "La planificació de la mediació lingüística". O. Diaz Fouces; M. García González & J. Costa Carreras (eds.) *Traducció i dinàmica sociolingüística.* Barcelona: Llibres de l'índex, 85-110.

DIAZ FOUCES, O. (2005) "Translation Policy for Minority Languages in the European Union. Globalisation and Resistance". A. Branchadell & L. M. West (eds) *Less Translated Languages.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 95-104.

FAIRCLOUGH, N. (2006) *Language and Globalization.* London & New York: Routledge.

FILL, A. (1998) "Ecolinguistics: State of the Art 1998". A. Fill & P. Mühlhäusler (eds) 2001. *The ecolinguistics reader: language, ecology and environment.* London & New York: Continuum, 43-53.

FISHMAN, J., C. FERGUSON, & J. DAS GUPTA (eds). (1968) *Language problems of developing nations.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

GRENIER, G. & F. VAILLANCOURT. (1983) "An Economic Perspective on Learning a Second Language". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 4(6):471-483.

GRIN, F. (1994) "The Economics of Language: Match or Mismatch". *International Political Science Review* 15(1):25-42.

GRIN, F. (2004) "On the costs of cultural diversity". P. van Parijs (ed) *Linguistic Diversity and Economic Solidarity.* Bruxelles: de Boeck-Université, 189-202.

GRIN, F. (2006) "Economic Considerations in Language Policy". T. Ricento, (ed) *An Introduction to Language Policy. Theory and Method.* Oxford: Blackwell, 77-94.

GRIN, F. & F. VALLANCOURT. 1997. "La langue comme capital humain". *Policy Options* July/August 1997, 69-72.

HAUGEN, E. (1972) "The Ecology of Language". A.S. Dil (ed) *The Ecology of Language: Essays by Einar Haugen*. Standford: Stanford University Press, 325-339.

HAVEMAN, R. H. (1987) "Policy Analysis and Evaluation Research after Twenty Years". *Policy Studies Journal* 16(2):191-218.

HALLIDAY, M.A.K. (1990) "New Ways of Meaning. The Challenge of Applied Linguistics". *Journal of Applied Linguistics* 6:7-36.

HENRARD, K. (2000) "Language and the Administration of Justice: The International Framework". *International Journal on Minority and Group Rights* 7(2):75-107.

HILMARSSON-DUNN, A.M. (2006) "Protectionist Language Policies in the face of the forces of English. The case of Iceland." *Language Policy* 5:293-312.

KATZ, M.L & C. SHAPIRO. (1986) "Technology Adoptive in the Presence of Network Externalities". *Journal of Political Economy* 94:822-841.

KLOSS, H. (1967) "*Abstand* languages and *Ausbau* languages". *Anthropological Linguistics* 9(7): 29-41.

LANTOLF, J. P. & G. Sunderman. (2001) "The struggle for a place in the sun: Rationalizing foreign language study in the twentieth century". *The Modern Language Journal* 5(1):5–25.

LINN, S. (2006) "Trends in the translation of a minority language. The case of Dutch". A. Pym, M. Shlesinger & Z. Jettmarová (eds) *Sociocultural Aspects of Translating and Interpreting.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 27-39.

LÖNNROTH, K.-J. (2009) "The Language Industry as a Driver for Technological Change in a Global Economy". *LISA Forum Asia – Global design and innovation. Taipei, 7 April 2009.* <http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/translation/publications/presentations/speeches/20090407_language_industry_lisa_en.pdf>

MAFFI, L. (ed). (2001) *On Biocultural Diversity. Linking Language, Knowledge and the Environment.* Washington: The Smithsonian Institute Press.

MEYLAERTS, R. (2009) "*Et pour les Flamands, la même chose*: quelle politique de traduction pour quelles minorités linguisiques?" *Meta* 54(1):7-21

MUFWENE, S. M. (2002) "Colonisation, Globalisation and the Future of Languages in the Twenty-first Century". *MOST Journal of Multicultural Societies* 4: 2. <http://www.unesco.org/most/vl4n2mufwene.pdf>

MÜHLHÄUSLER, P. (2000) "Language Planning and Language Ecology". *Current Issues in Language Planning* 1(3):306-365.

NEUWIRTH, R. J. (2008) "The Culture Industries: From the Common Market to a Common Sense". D. Ward (ed) *The European Union and the culture industries: regulation and the public interest*. Hampshire: Ashgate, 241-258

O'CONNELL, E. & J. WALSH. (2006) "Translation and language planning in Ireland: Challenges and opportunities". *Mercator International Symposium on Minority Languages and Research.* University of Wales, Aberystwyth, October 2005. <http://www.aberystwyth.ac.uk/mercator/images/OConnellWalsh.pdf>

REDNER, H. (2004) *Conserving cultures: technology, globalization, and the future of local cultures.* Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.

SANTOS, B. DE SOUSA. (2006) "Globalizations". *Theory, Culture & Society* 23:393-399. <http://www.boaventuradesousasantos.pt/media/pdfs/Globalizations_Theory_Culture_and_Society_2006.PDF>

SKUTNABB-KANGAS, T. (2004) Opening Plenary "The right to mother tongue medium education - the hot potato in human rights instruments". *II Simposi Internacional Mercator: Europa 2004: Un nou marc per a totes les llengües? II Mercator International Symposium: Europe 2004: A new framework for all languages?* Tarragona. <http://www.ciemen.org/mercator/pdf/simp-skuttnab.pdf>

SKUTNABB-KANGAS, T. & R. PHILLIPSON. (2008) "A Human Rights Perspective on Language Ecology". A. Creese, P. Martin & N.H. Horngerber (eds) *Ecology of Language*. Vol. 9. *Encyclopaedia of Language and Education.* 2nd ed. New York: Springer, 3-14.

STEGER, M. B. (2005) *Globalism: Market Ideology meets Terrorism*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

TOURY, G. (1999) "Culture Planning and Translation". A. Álvarez & A. Fernández (eds.) *Anovar/Anosar. Estudios de Traducción e Interpretación*. Vigo: Universidade, 13-25.

WEINRICH, H. (2001) "Economy and Ecology in Language". A. Fill & P. Mühlhäusler (eds) 2001. *The ecolinguistics reader: language, ecology and environment.* London & New York: Continuum, 91-100.

WEINSTOCK, D. M. (2003) "The Antinomy of Language Policy". W. Kymlicka & A. Patten (eds) *Language Rights and Political Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press, 250-270.