Language Policy of the European Union – Realization of the Multilingual Policy of the EU

Goran Bandov*

Summary

The focus of this article is an analysis of possibilities of effectuating language regimes in the EU with a review of the implementation of multilingual policy through the language regime *Pure full multilingualism*. EU institutions call for that regime in a whole variety of documents but in practice they tend to implement other regimes (*Monolingualism, Reduced multilingualism, Asymmetric systems, Controlled multilingualism and Full multilingualism with management correctives*) justifying that on the grounds of applying the principles of practicality and efficiency. Though, *Pure full multilingualism* seems to be the best solution because of a variety of its advantages. By carrying out this regime, a full development of linguistic diversity in the European society would be allowed and, also, freedom of mobility and migrations within Europe would be encouraged. Its impact on the promotion of multilingual economy and economic positioning of EU on global economy scene would be consequential. No less important would be that its impact on providing all the citizens with complete access to EU legislation, procedures and information in their own language.

Keywords: multilingualism, language policy, working languages, linguistic diversity

1. Introduction

A whole variety of different regimes of EU language policies is functioning within the EU simultaneously. The main creators of these regimes are EU institutions, which on the one hand, make functioning of institutions simpler, but on the other hand limit the completion of multilingual policy. This article is concentrating on the political analysis of the regimes of EU language policies and their influence on everyday func-

---

*   dr. sc. Goran Bandov, prodekan na Visokoj školi međunarodnih odnosa i diplomacije Dag Hammarskjöld

tioning of the institutions and citizens of EU. The question that arises is: Is there a real need for the EU to function on multilingual basis or is it more practical to set language basis of the EU on monolingual grounds? If it is the case that monolingualism is a more practical solution, then there is a question: Is it possible for it to be implemented? And how could it affect the lives of EU citizens as well as functioning of the EU institutions? The English language is being imposed as a priority candidate but some other languages are hoping for that status too, which is an additional challenge for EU institutions.

Pure full multilingualism seems to be the best (probably also the most efficient) solution for the EU institutions and especially for the citizens of EU.[1] The EU institutions tend to support this regime but themselves are not implementing it completely in their regular activities. Through, the official EU Language policy is directed towards realization of *Pure full multiligualism* regime. In that sense, the European Union has adopted numerous documents that encourage multilingualism in EU institutions but also commits its members to apply them. The article will analyze that kind of EU policy on the basis of its last document regarding this issue (Council Resolution on a European strategy for multilingualism, 2008)[2] and offer answers why (is) a multilingual policy is offered as the best solution for EU.

2. EU official and working languages

A linguistic foundation is of paramount importance in EU integration processes in order to ensure a democratic union.[3] In order to establish the total equality of the languages of the EU member states, the European Union recognizes as its official languages only the official languages of the member states that issue a claim for the acknowledgment of such status within the European Union.[4] By conducting such a po-

---

1 Pure full multilingualism is a language regime which predicts full implementation of all official languages of the EU member states as official language of the EU institutions. More in: Podestá, Guido: The Language Regime: Additional Options – „Working documents 9 for the Podesta Report" SG.EL/01-125.def–PE305.382/BUR, European Parliament, Brussels, 2001; Gazzola, Michelle: Managing multilingualism in the European Union: Language Policy Evaluation for the European Parliament, Language Policy, 2006, p.402.

2 The Council of the European Union: Council Resolution on a European strategy for multilingualism, Brussels, 21.November, 2008.

3 Podestá, Guido: Preparing for the Parliament of the Enlarged European Union PE305.269/BUR/fin, European Parliament, Brussels, 2001; Christiansen, Pia Vanting: Language policy in the European Union: European/English/Elite/Equal/Esperanto Union?; Language Problems & Language Planning, 30:1, 2006, p.22.

4 According to the EU language charter (EEC Council Regulation No.1), each member state has the right to request that any of its national official languages be given the status of official EU language. EEC Council: Regulation No. 1. determining the languages to be used by the European Economic Community, OJ.17, 6.10.1958, p.385–386, Art.1, English special edition: Series I Chapter 1952-1958 P. 0059.

licy, the European Union just applies the language policies of the member states, avoiding to interfere with them and to bring autonomous decisions. The first Community Regulation determining official languages was passeed in 1958 and it specified Dutch, French, German and Italian as the first official and working languages of the EU, these being the languages of the Member States at that time (France, Germany, Italy, Nederland, Belgium and Liechtenstein). Since then, as more countries have become member of the EU, the number of official and working languages has increased. Since 2007 the European Union has 23 official and working languages. They are: Bulgarian, Czech, Danish, Dutch, English, Estonian, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Hungarian, Irish, Italian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Maltese, Polish, Portuguese, Romanian, Slovak, Slovene, Spanish and Swedish.[5] Regional languages that have an official status in the EU are Catalan, Galician and Basque.[6]

As can be seen, the European Union has 27 member states and "only" 23 official languages. This might lead to the conclusion that there are member states whose official language does not have the status of an official language of the European Union, but the reason is different. Some member states of the European Union share the foreign language with other member states. It is true for Belgium, for example, where the official languages are Dutch, French and German, whilst in Cyprus the majority of the population speaks Greek, which has the official status. Cyprus could have asked that Turkish should become the official language of the European Union, but due to political reasons it has not yet happened.

However, the situation is not that simple. The member states have the right to ask for the full implementation of symbolic function of the language and thus protect their national/ethnic/language identity.[7] For example, Austria asked the inclusion of 23 Austrian terms (mainly culinary terms) as equal to existing terms in the official German language of the Federal Republic of Germany in 1995 at Austrian accession to the European Union.[8] The British also insisted that the precedence in language policy should

---

5   European Commission: Multilingualism, EU Languages and Language policy, Languages of Europe, Brussels, 2011: http://ec.europa.eu/education/languages/languages-of-europe/doc135_en.htm (22.04.2011); more on: European Commission: Europe Direct, Brussels, 2011, http://europa.eu/about-eu/countries/index_en.htm (22.04.2011).

6   European Commission: Special Eurobarometer 243/Wave 64.3-TNS Opinion&Social, Brussels, 2006, p.5.

7   The *symbolic function* implies its bond to the collective identities that individuals often perceive as totally inseparable segments of their full identities. More in: Edwards, John: Language, Society and Identity, Oxford, 1985; Gazzola, Michelle: Managing multilingualism in the European Union: Language Policy Evaluation for the European Parliament, Language Policy, 2006, p.394.

8   Hlavač, Jim: Jezična politika i praksa u Europskoj Uniji, Jezik, No. 53, 2006, p.99; De Cillia, Rudolf: Burenwurscht bleibt Burenwurscht. Sprachenpolitik und gesellschaftliche Mehrsprachigkeit in Österreich, Klagenfurt, Drava Verlag, 1998, p.81.

be given to British English over American English which is becoming more widespread and influential in Europe.[9] Both standpoints have their stronghold exclusively in the symbolic function of the language and not in its communication function.[10]

The extremely significant example of the symbolic function of a language, however, can be found in the case of the Irish language. At the Irish accession to the European Union in 1973, Ireland did not mention the language issue. The Irish considered that the English language which was already the official language in the European Union and, at the same time one of the two official languages in Ireland, was fulfilling all language functions in a sufficient way. However, as the European Union was acknowledging ever more official languages that are in most cases mother tongues of their citizens, Ireland began asking the introduction of the Irish language as one of the official EU languages. As a result, the Irish became the official language of the European Union in 2007. That was a unique case because in the Republic of Ireland less than a half of population speaks Irish.[11] Until 2007 and the introduction of the Irish language as the official language in the European Union, all official languages of the European Union were the most wide-spread speaking languages in at least one member state of the European Union.

3. The issue of official and working languages of the European Union – the review of the EU language policies

Obtaining the status of official, and even more working languages is a very sensitive issue. In EU there are two main entitlements for languages with "official and working" status: documents may be sent to EU institutions and a reply received in any of these languages; and EU regulations and other legislative documents are published in the official and working languages, as is the Official Journal.[12] Also, any official EU language may be used in EU parliamentary debates and formal Council proceedings, with interpretation provided in each case into all other official EU languages. Finally, they are meant to be

---

9   Hlavač, Jim: Jezična politika i praksa u Europskoj Uniji, Jezik, No. 53, 2006, p.99.

10 The *communication function* implies the transfer of information in the broadest sense. More in: Edwards, John: Language, Society and Identity, Oxford, 1985; Gazzola, Michelle: Managing multilingualism in the European Union: Language Policy Evaluation for the European Parliament, Language Policy, 2006, p.394.

11 Irish is the first working language of the Union that is not the most widely spoken language in any member state - census returns (2002) in the Republic of Ireland number speakers of Irish at 1,656,790 (41,9%) out of a population of 4,057,646 though the number of fluent speakers is probably closer to 260,000, and much fewer than that make daily community use of the language. Central Statistics Office of the Republic of Ireland: Persons, males and females aged 3 years and over in each Regional Authority Area, classified by ability to speak Irish, 2006.

12 European Commission: Multilingualism, EU Languages and Language policy, Languages of Europe, Brussels, 2011: http://ec.europa.eu/education/languages/languages-of-europe/doc135_en.htm (22.04.2011).

used for communication between the EU institutions and the governments and other institutions of the member states. In that sense, all the official EU languages are, at the same time, EU institutional working languages, and the Council Regulation No. 1, indeed, refers to all of them as "the official languages and the working languages".[13]

However, due to the high budget costs, relatively few working documents are translated into all official languages. Such a practice is enabled by provisions of an Article of the Council Regulation No. 1 which envisions that "the institutions of the Community may stipulate in their rules of procedure which of the languages are to be used in specific cases".[14] For example, the European Commission uses three working-procedural languages, i.e. English, French and German whereas the European Parliament provides translation into different languages according to the needs of its Members.[15] Such circumstances that do not allow fulfilment of both communication and symbolic functions of the majority of official languages of the European Union pose some problems. However, the supporters of decreasing costs and political practitioners are prone to suggestions that are not based on multilingual pluralism, but aim at maximum simplification, for example by limiting the number of official and working languages. For EU institutions, having a single internal working language – for which English is the only candidate – would be the most efficient solution and, to all appearances, in the best interests of each member state and language community whose language is excluded as a working language.[16] However, such a solution would not correspond to the EU's official language policy on the preservation of language diversity.

In the working document *The Language Regime: Additional Options*, that came into being in preparation of the European Union language policy prior to the big accession in 2004, seven different language concepts were proposed.[17] The propositions might give the answer to the issue of official and working languages of the European Union:

---

13 EEC Council: Regulation No. 1. determining the languages to be used by the European Economic Community, OJ.17, 6.10.1958, p.385–386, Art.1, English special edition: Series I Chapter 1952-1958 P. 0059; More in: Ammon, Ulrich: Language conflicts in the European Union. On finding a politically acceptable and practicable solution for EU institutions that satisfies diverging interests, International Journal of Applied Linguistics, Vol.16, No.3, Malden, Bognor Regis, 2006, p.320.

14 EEC Council: Regulation No. 1. determining the languages to be used by the European Economic Community, OJ.17, 6.10.1958, p.385–386, Art.6, English special edition: Series I Chapter 1952-1958, P. 0059.

15 European Commission: Multilingualism, EU Languages and Language policy, Languages of Europe, Brussels 2011: http://ec.europa.eu/education/languages/languages-of-europe/doc135_en.htm (22.04.2011).

16 Ammon, Ulrich: Language conflicts in the European Union. On finding a politically acceptable and practicable solution for EU institutions that satisfies diverging interests, International Journal of Applied Linguistics, Vol.16, No.3, Malden, Bognor Regis, 2006, p.319.

17 Podestá, Guido: The Language Regime: Additional Options – „Working documents 9 for the Podesta Report" SG.EL/01-125.def–PE305.382/BUR, European Parliament, Brussels, 2001; Gazzola, Michelle: Managing multilingualism in the European Union: Language Policy Evaluation for the European Parliament, Language Policy, 2006, p.402.

1. ***Monolingualism:*** use of a single official and working language.[18]
2. ***Nationalization:*** maintenance of the pre-enlargement structure and simple transfer of financial responsibility alone to the Member States, or transfer of the complete work load to the Member States.
3. ***Reduced multilingualism***: use of only six official and working languages.
4. ***Asymmetric systems***: these make it possible to speak/write in all official languages, but listen/read in only a limited number of languages.
5. ***Controlled multilingualism***: this model was proposed to ensure that all Members of the European Parliament (MEPs) had the right to speak / write and to listen/read in the language that they prefer; the difference between this and pure multilingualism resides in the internal process of linguistic mediation. The controlled multilingualism model was based on the systematic adoption of management correctives, sometimes already in use in some multilingual meetings before enlargement of 2004.
6. ***Full multilingualism with management correctives (henceforth 'corrected full multilingualism'):*** that was, the extension to all languages of the former system (till 2004) for 11 languages.
7. ***Pure full multilingualism***: with all official languages, with no kind of management corrective.

The above listed seven different language concepts offer a number of possibilities, but the majority of solutions open new problems for the proclaimed policy of multilingualism of the European Union.[19] The first question to be asked is in what degree particular concepts correspond to the need of execution of the regular communication and simultaneously offer protection of the symbolic function of languages within the European Union. Some of the suggested solutions are not applicable within the policies of the European Union and their meaning can be found only in passing the responsibility from the institutions of the European Union to other protagonists. It is especially true for the language concept of Nationalism. It envisages that all languages are feasible but to the cost of those who support the policy. Consequently, the smaller members and those with a lower

---

18 A number of authors suggest the regime of Monolingualism, but with a different system of functioning and with other areas of communication where it should be applied. For example, Theo von Els' suggested reducing institutional working languages for informal oral consultations to a single one, English: "in oral – and particularly informal – consultations . . . a restriction to a single working language could be the best solution." More in: van Els, Theo: Multilingualism in the European Union, International Journal of Applied Linguistics 15.3, Winterthur, 2005, p.277.

19 Note: this is only one in an array of possible divisions. There is significant discourse on the respective division, even though potential for further elaboration remains. See: Christiansen, Pia Vanting: FLERSPROGETHED – Mehrsprachigkeit - Multilingualism. Sprogpolitik i EU, RUC, MA thesis, Roskilde University, 2002.

GDP would be in a worse position than those that could split their costs (i.e. Germany and Austria). However, there are some issues in connection with German, too; if Austria finances the German language, should it have the right to insist upon the Austrian version of German, the same as Great Britain did when asking that the European Union used British English and not American English which is more suitable to a number of European states. Another question is whether Belgium should participate in the costs of the use of German language. It should be stressed that German is a mother tongue of less than 80.000 citizens of Belgium which has the population of 10.8 million.[20] If the answer is affirmative, the conclusion is that by adopting this policy Belgium would be liable to co-finance the French, German and Dutch languages which would put Belgium in a financially unfavourable position that would consequently question the full equality of the state members of the European Union. Of course, the question is whether Belgium would be liable to equally participate in the costs with Austria, Germany and Luxemburg since less than 0.001% of German native speakers live in Belgium.

The biggest number of the concepts (*Monolingualism, Reduced multilingualism, Asymmetric systems, Controlled multilingualism and Full multilingualism with management correctives*) asks the answer to the question which official language/languages of the European Union that would be, which at the same time, would not violate the rights and equality of other languages that have the status of official languages in other EU member states. Not a single concept allows the choice without disputes on language policies and dissatisfaction of member states with any solution that might be imposed upon them. For EU institutions, having a single internal official and working language (concept *Monolingualism)*, for which English is the priority candidate, would be the most efficient solution and, to all appearances, in the best interests of each member state and language community whose language is excluded as a working language. However, for member states from the large language communities, such a solution seems barely acceptable and, in addition, would not correspond to the EU's official language policy on the preservation of language diversity.[21] The discussions primarily refer to German and French languages, but also to the Spanish, Italian and lately to the Polish as the biggest Slavic language in the European Union. By accession of the countries of the Central Europe, a rise in the number of German speaking population happened, as well as the French language in some countries of the Central Europe (Romania). It should be also mentioned that there was a strong initiative for putting the Dutch lan-

20 European Commission: Communication department of the European Commission: Europa – Gateway to the European Union, Brussels, 2011. http://europa.eu/about-eu/countries/member-countries/belgium/index_en.htm (22.04.2011).

21 Ammon, Ulrich: Language conflicts in the European Union. On finding a politically acceptable and practicable solution for EU institutions that satisfies diverging interests, International Journal of Applied Linguistics, Vol.16, No.3, Malden, Bognor Regis, 2006, p.319.

guage into a selected group of languages after Spanish and Italian accepted for the EU Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market, because in the period before 2004, the Dutch language group was, after the English, German, French, Italian and Spanish, the biggest by the number of native speakers within the European Union.[22]

The language conflict within the European Union on the issue of introduction one or more official languages was significant at the very foundation of the European Union. Although the European Union had official languages of all its member states at the establishment, there were some initiatives to support the monolingualism concept. At the time, the priority candidate was the French language, but it did not get the support of other member states of the European Union.[23] Later, France even conditioned the accession of Great Britain by the adoption of the engagement that the French language would never be in a less favourable position than English.[24]

The German approach was supportive to the domination of other languages in the European Union during the first few decades from the establishment of the European Union. The situation changed significantly with the growth of German political and economic influence after the reunion in 1989 and especially after the accession of the Republic of Austria in the European Union. By accession of a number of Central European states whose citizens are predominantly speakers of German, it seemed almost inevitable that German language became one of the dominant languages in the European Union. Following this development, the German language got the status of one of the three informal working languages of the European Commission already in 1993, but the full implementation of the decision had to wait. The situation escalated during the Finnish presidency of the European Union in 1999 when Germany and Austria boycotted the meeting because Finland refused to translate the informal meetings into the German language.[25]

---

22 More in: Ammon, Ulrich: Language conflicts in the European Union. On finding a politically acceptable and practicable solution for EU institutions that satisfies diverging interests, International Journal of Applied Linguistics, Vol.16, No.3, Malden, Bognor Regis, 2006, p.331.

23 More in: Hemblenne, Bernard: Les problèmes du siège et du régime linguistique des communautées européennes 1950–1967, Jahrbuch für Europäische Verwaltungsgeschichte 4, Baden-Baden, 1992, p.112; in: Ammon, Ulrich: Language conflicts in the European Union. On finding a politically acceptable and practicable solution for EU institutions that satisfies diverging interests, International Journal of Applied Linguistics, Vol.16, No.3, Malden, Bognor Regis, 2006.

24 More in: Stark, Franz: Sprache als Instrument in der Außenpolitik, Die Praxis der Bundesrepublik Deutschland: in Kelz, Heinrich P. (ed.): Die sprachliche Zukunft Europas, Baden Baden: Nomos. 2002, p.53; in: Ammon, Ulrich: Language conflicts in the European Union. On finding a politically acceptable and practicable solution for EU institutions that satisfies diverging interests, International Journal of Applied Linguistics, Vol.16, No.3, Malden, Bognor Regis, 2006.

25 ore in: Kelletat, Andreas F.: Deutschland:Finnland 6:1, Deutsch contra Englisch und Französisch, Zum Dolmetschstreit in der Europäischen Union, Tampere, 2001; in: Ammon, Ulrich: Language conflicts in the European Union. On finding a politically acceptable and practicable solution for EU institutions that satisfies diverging interests, International Journal of Applied Linguistics, Vol.16, No.3, Malden, Bognor Regis, 2006, p.331.

Since the domination of the English language and the indirect support of a number of countries with smaller language groups existed in the EU, France and Germany decided to jointly support the use of their languages in the EU. As a result, the French and German foreign ministers signed an agreement of linguistic cooperation in June 2000 which states that both countries support each other whenever the working status or function of their languages is unduly disregarded. One of several occasions of coordinated action was the proposal by Neil Kinnock, the Commission's Deputy President, in 2001 to draft preparatory papers for the Commission only in English in future. France's and Germany's foreign ministers, Hubert Védrine and Joschka Fischer, protested against this proposal in a joint letter, whereupon the proposal was withdrawn.[26]

Though the choice of the official and working languages is often considered as a purely pragmatic issue, special attention should be paid to fulfilling the symbolic function of all official languages of the members of the European Union. The most obvious are the examples of Malta and Ireland which have English as a second official language, but they insisted on acceptance of their native language as official languages (Maltese and Irish) as the official languages in the European Union in order to completely protect their language identities. Accordingly, it is hard to believe that these countries would be satisfied with a decision of existence of a number of official languages that would not include their language-symbolic interests, too.

Consequently, the realization of the policy of language diversity that the European Union already decided for and which is supported by the majority of members of the European Union, can be realized only through the application of the concept of multilingual policy *Pure full multilingualism*. The very language policies of the European Union show inclination for the development of this concept. However, it is not obvious in practical solutions for the choice of procedural and working languages in the EU institutions because some of the mentioned concepts are often applied there. On the other hand, the conceptual and strategic language policy of the European Union is more prone to realization of the concept *Pure full multilingualism*. As early as the 2002 Presidency Conclusion of the Barcelona European Council called for at least two foreign languages to be taught from a very early age throughout the bloc.[27] In 2003, the Commission committed itself to undertake 45 new actions to encourage national, regional and local authorities to work towards a "major step change in promoting language

---

26 Hoheisel, Reinhard: Die Rolle der deutschen Sprache in der Zukunft der EU aus der Sicht der Europäischen Kommission; in: Lohse, W. Christian (ed.): Die deutsche Sprache in der Europäischen Union. Baden-Baden, 2004, p.77.

27 „…to improve the mastery of basic skills, in particular by teaching at least two foreign languages from a very early age: establishment of a linguistic competence indicator in 2003, …" in: European Council: Presidency conclusion, Barcelona European Council, 15and16 March 2002, SN 100/1/02 REV 1, Barcelona, 2002, Art.44.

learning and linguistic diversity".[28] The last action in this direction was the adoption of *the European strategy for multilingualism* in 2008. Its analysis will be presented in the next part of the text so the significance of *Pure full multilingualism* for functioning of everyday life in EU could be observed.[29]

4. Realization of the multilingual policy of the European Union

In order to realize the planned linguistic diversity, the European Union adopted the strategy for multilingualism as a developmental linguistic concept of the European Union. *European strategy for multilingualism* (2008) defines linguistic and cultural diversity as an inseparable segment of the European identity; it is at once a shared heritage, a wealth, a challenge and an asset for Europe.[30] According to the strategy, multilingualism is a major cross-cutting theme encompassing the social, cultural, economic and therefore educational spheres. Linguistic diversity within Europe is defined as constituting an added value for the development of economic and cultural relations between the European Union and the rest of the world. This is why the European Union set the task of the promotion of less widely used European languages represents as an important contribution to multilingualism.

European strategy for multilingualism (2008) envisages a number of obligations of the EU member states in order to realize the planned goals of promotion of multilingualism.[31] State members need to promote multilingualism with a view to strengthening social cohesion, intercultural dialogue and European construction; strengthen lifelong language learning; to promote EU languages across the world and better promote multilingualism as a factor in the European economy's competitiveness and people's mobility and employability. According to this we can conclude that the EU multilingualism policy has four aims: to encourage language learning and the promotion of linguistic diversity in society; to promote a healthy multilingual economy; to give citizens access to EU legislation, procedures and information in their own language; and to enable the freedom of mobility and migration within the European Union.

---

28 The European Commission: Promoting language learning and linguistic diversity: An action plan 2004-06, Brussels, 2003.

29 The Council of the European Union: Council Resolution on a European strategy for multilingualism, Brussels, 21.November, 2008.

30 The Council of the European Union: Council Resolution on a European strategy for multilingualism, Brussels, 21.November, 2008.

31 The Council of the European Union: Council Resolution on a European strategy for multilingualism, Brussels, 21.November, 2008.

4.1. Encouraging language learning and the promotion of linguistic diversity in EU

When we speak about encouraging language learning and the promotion of linguistic diversity in society EU defines language as an integral part of a person's (national, ethnic and) cultural identity. Language learning definitely contributes to understanding of others and of the different. It is precisely the understanding of others and their cultures that has a positive impact upon obstructing negative sociological processes, such as intolerance, xenophobia and racism. As a conclusion, we might say that the promotion of multilingualism not only adds to linguistic diversity and protection of communication and symbolic protection function of a language but it can also have a crucial influence upon the evasion of potential escalation of conflicts.

The envisaged adoption of linguistic skills by the concept of „*mother tongue plus two foreign languages*" in accordance with decisions from Barcelona, has satisfying effects in some member states (most in Luxembourg, Malta, Slovakia, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Slovenia and Sweden), but the concept has not taken hold in some of the biggest member states, such as Spain and Italy.[32] The same is true for countries such as the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland, in which English is the official language. However, it is clear that there are positive moves towards realization of the language goal from Barcelona. Half of the EU citizens answered in Special Eurobarometer they can hold a conversation in at least one language other than their mother tongue.[33]

The strategy supports an active inclusion of education institutions and envisages possibility of teaching for example mathematics or science, through the medium of a

---

32 The European Commission authorized a Special Eurobarometer on Europeans and their languages (Special Eurobarometer 243/Wave 64.3-TNS Opinion&Social, European Commission, 2006.) one of the objectives of which was to gather information regarding the foreign language ability of Europeans. Fieldwork was completed between November and December 2005 and the results were published in 2006. This macro-survey involved no fewer than 28,694 interviews. The results of the Special Eurobarometer showed that, while 56% of European citizens could hold a conversation in a language other than their L1 and 28% had mastered two other languages, for a remarkable 44% communication in a language other than their mother tongue was highly implausible. There were remarkable differences between countries. 92% of citizens in Luxembourg could speak two languages apart from their L1, but almost every single Luxembourger (99%) could hold a conversation in at least one language apart from the L1. Luxembourg, Malta, Slovakia, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Slovenia and Sweden make up the top 8 of countries where nine out of ten inhabitants can speak at least two languages. More in: European Commission: Special Eurobarometer (243/Wave 64.3-TNS Opinion&Social, European Commission, Brussels, 2006.; More in: Lasagabaster, David: Foreign Language Competence in Content and Language Integrated Courses, The Open Applied Linguistics Journal, 2008, 1, 31-42.

33 At the top of the class come the Luxembourgers (99%), Latvians and Maltese (93%) and Lithuanians (90%), while Hungarians (71%), citizens in the UK (70%), Spain, Italy and Portugal (64% each) tend to master only their mother tongue. European Commission: Special Eurobarometer 243/Wave 64.3-TNS Opinion&Social, European Commission, Brussels, 2006.

foreign language. The realization of this instrument would be, in fact the framing of model B of minority education in the Republic of Croatia in which social sciences are taught in Croatian language, while natural sciences are taught in minority languages.[34] In this case, it would be one of the other languages of the European Union. English language is most often an auxiliary or regular language in the course of study. But, the Strategy warns that the trend in non-English-speaking countries towards teaching through the medium of English instead of through the national or regional language may have "unforeseen consequences" for the vitality of those languages.[35]

A special contribution to realization but also to concretization of the norms of the European strategy for multilingualism was provided by the independent group of intellectuals, who made a report entitled *A Rewarding Challenge: How the multiplicity of languages could strengthen Europe*.[36] This document encouraged EU citizens to learn at least two foreign languages, following the decisions from Barcelona and proposed the concept of the "personal adoptive language".[37] The report envisages every European citizen learning a foreign language for personal reasons, perhaps the language of a spouse or out of a desire to learn about another culture, to be adopted in addition to a first foreign language learnt for the purposes of international communication.[38] The group of intellectuals believes this will ensure that European citizens a speak languages other than their mother tongue or the one they use for professional or communication reasons.

---

34 More in: Bandov, Goran: Die Implementierung der nationalen Gesetzgebung und der internationalen Instrumenten zum Schutz nationaler Minderheiten im Bildungsbereich in der Republik Kroatien, str.10-30, u: Gießmann, Hans Joachim / Schneider, Patricia (ured.): Reformen zur Fridenskonsolidierung, Hamburger Beiträge, Hamburg, 2006.

35 The Council of the European Union: Council Resolution on a European strategy for multilingualism, Brussels, 21.November, 2008.

36 European Commission: A Rewarding Challenge: How the multiplicity of languages could strengthen Europe - Proposals from the Group of Intellectuals for Intercultural Dialogue set up at the initiative of the European Commission, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Brussels, 2008.

37 „The idea is that every European should be encouraged to freely choose a distinctive language, different from his or her language of identity, and also different from his or her language of international communication. … the personal adoptive language would in no way be a second foreign language but, rather, a sort of second mother tongue." in: European Commission: A Rewarding Challenge: How the multiplicity of languages could strengthen Europe - Proposals from the Group of Intellectuals for Intercultural Dialogue set up at the initiative of the European Commission, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Brussels, 2008, p.7.

38 EurActiv: Language use in the EU, Brussels, Published 07 March 2008 - Updated 30 June 2010. http://www.euractiv.com/culture/language-use-eu-linksdossier-188332?display=normal (10.10.2011.)

4.2. The multilingual economy

Knowing of a language and having intercultural skills are prerequisites for success at the international business markets. It is the lack of knowledge of the language and the culture of a particular country that causes significant losses in international operation of European representatives, as shown in the studies conducted.[39] The research clearly revealed the link between languages and export sales, indicating that a language strategy is a significant element of the overall success of every European business. The Commission is well aware of the importance of effective language policies in supporting business development, and calls for language certification to be standardized throughout the EU. Of course, it is not the duty of all the employees to participate in the intercultural communication or that all of them should know the language of a country they make business with, but those who keep in contact should know the language of their hosts and be knowledgeable about basics of intercultural communication. A transitional solution might be hiring native speakers in development of economic processes. However, it should only be a transitional stage because it is extremely important that people who are business decision makers are fully included in all aspects of business communication.

Of course, the question is whether full implementation of multilingualism is necessary in the global economy or it can be bypassed by the use of a language that would be used as *Lingua Franca*. English language seems to be the language of communication because it could be accepted in wide business circles. However, the situation is much more complex than it might seem. Globalization means that English is not enough. The Russian language is widely used in the international communication of the ex-USSR countries as well as Eastern and Central European states. German language seems an option in Eastern and Central Europe as a language of business communication. 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.[40]

When discussing the industry and realization of linguistic diversity, it should be mentioned that the EU's language industry was in 2008 worth €8.4 billion and is set to grow by 10% annually over the next few years after having recorded one of the highest growth rates of any industrial sector despite the economic crisis, according to

---

39 European Commission: ELAN: Effects on the European Economy of Shortages of Foreign Language Skills in Enterprise, the National Centre for Languages, London, December, 2006, p.5.

40 European Commission: ELAN: Effects on the European Economy of Shortages of Foreign Language Skills in Enterprise, the National Centre for Languages, London, December, 2006, p.6.

a European Commission-backed study published in August 2009.[41] For the year 2008, the sector of language technology tools was estimated at €568 millions, the sector subtitling and dubbing at €633 millions, language teaching at €1.6 billions and multilingual support within conference organization at €143 million.[42] The significant financial investments in increasing linguistic diversity have their stronghold in the EU strategies and concepts of realization of multilingualism. Next to the obligation of advancement of communication and symbolic functions of languages they also have the obligation of quality positioning of European businesses on the international business market. Consequently, one may conclude that the openness towards the full implementation of the linguistic regime *Pure full multilingualism* actually presents a contribution to the creation of the framework for the higher economic standard in the EU.

4.3. Giving citizens access to European Union legislation, procedures and information in minimum one of the officials languages of their home country

Enabling access to EU legislation procedures and information in the official language of their home country has the aim of providing access to all documents and information to the widest possible range of EU citizens. As some recent researches have shown, an extremely high percentage of citizens in a number of EU members do not know any foreign languages and they would be deprived of any information that would not be in their mother tongue.[43] Since the right to the language is one of the basic rights of individuals in democratic societies, The EU has the obligation to provide this right to its citizens. The same is true for the European institutions.[44] The most obvious example of this can be seen in *Action plan to improve communicating Europe* by the European Commission (2005): "It is not enough simply to adopt a law: it needs to be communicated in the language the citizens understand".[45]EU can achieve complete success in the area of free access of European citizens to EU legislation, procedures and information of the EU exclusively through progressive multilingual policy.

---

41 European Commission: Study on the size of the language industry in the EU, the Language Technology Center ltd., Kingston Hill, 2009, Executive Summery iii.

42 European Commission: Study on the size of the language industry in the EU, the Language Technology Center ltd., Kingston Hill, 2009, Executive Summery iii.

43 European Commission: Special Eurobarometer 243/Wave 64.3-TNS Opinion&Social, Brussels, 2006.

44 For example: European Commission: Communication on a new framework for cooperation on activities concerning the information and communication policy of the European Union (COM(2001)354), Brussels, 2001; European Commission: Communication on an information and communication strategy for the European Union (COM(2002)350) Brussels, 2002; European Commission: Communication on implementing the information and communication strategy for the European Union (COM(2004)196) Brussels, 2004.

45 European Commission: Action plan to improve communicating Europe by the Commission, Brussels, 2005, p.14.

4.4. Freedom of mobility and migration

The freedom of mobility and migration is impossible without the knowledge of foreign languages and cultures and today's world is impossible without the freedom of mobility and migration. For example, the work market in Germany, one of the most important economies in the world, would face a difficult challenge if all foreign workers were called off. The collapse would be imminent. All the foreign workers have to have at least a basic knowledge of German language and culture. Of course, the process of language and cultural integration should be a two-way process (or multi-way), i.e. the German society should be open to different cultures. Only societies that affirmatively answer these challenges can be progressive. Those that lag behind will also lag behind in democratic and economic development.

This is why some EU member states (Benelux, France and Germany) already in 1985 adopted the Schengen Agreement, which created the so called Schengen Area, which operates very much like a single state for international travel with border controls for travelers travelling in and out of the area, but with no internal border controls.[46] The implementation of the Agreement is verified by the adoption of the Schengen Agreement II document.[47] The Schengen Agreement along with its implementing Convention was implemented in 1995 only for some signatories, but just over two years later during the Amsterdam Intergovernmental Conference, all European Union member states (except the United Kingdom and Ireland), and two non-member states Norway and Iceland (part of the Nordic Passport Union along with EU members Denmark, Finland, and Sweden) had signed the Schengen Agreement. Now that the Schengen Agreement is part of the acquis communautaire, the Agreement has lost the status of a treaty.[48] New EU member states do not sign the Schengen Agreement as such; instead, they are bound to implement the Schengen rules as part of the pre-existing body of EU law, which every new entrant is required to accept.[49] Following the development of the Schengen area as an area of free movement and migration without any control, the EU reached the desired goals in the segment. In order to make it deve-

---

46 The Schengen acquis - Agreement between the Governments of the States of the Benelux Economic Union, the Federal Republic of Germany and the French Republic on the gradual abolition of checks at their common borders, 14/06/1985; Implementation /PROV See. Art.32, 42000A0922(01)

47 Auswärtiges Amtes, Bundesrepublik Deutschland: Schengener Durchführungsübereinkommen (SDÜ), BGBl. 1993, II, S.1010.

48 European Council: The Schengen Acquis, Council Decision, Official Journal of the European Communities, 1999/435/EC of 20 May 1999.

49 All of the EU Member States are currently signatories of the Schengen Area, with United Kingdom, Ireland, Bulgaria and Cyprus being the only signatories which do not present areas without border controls within the Schengen Area. Cyprus will be able to join the Schengen Area only after the resolution of the ongoing Cyprus conflict.

lop further, activities in implementation of measures for the development of multilingualism in the EU are necessary to destroy the barriers between individuals, European cultures and societies.

Conclusion

The European Union faces many challenges in conceiving its language policies. On one hand, there are tendencies of economic pragmatism that makes it reduce the number of working languages to pure monolingualism. On the other hand, the need for protection of symbolic function of the language makes it realize the concept of multilingual diversity. Monolingualism (most probable English language as working and official language) might be acceptable to a narrower circle of bigger countries (primarily the UK) and a wider number of smaller states that would be ready to sacrifice the symbolic function of their languages if it happened to almost all other languages. However, if there were an enlargement of working and official languages, especially if the number of such languages were more than three (English, German and French) there would be a resistance to the application of such a policy, because a question would be raised about criteria that allow certain languages to enter the elite language club. Accordingly, the language concept *Pure full multilingualism* seems to be the right solution for protection of both communication and symbolic protection of languages within the EU. It should be stressed that *Pure full multilingualism* concept does not oppose economic pragmatism because the major part of financial support for its development stays within the EU and helps European economy impose itself as one of the leading economies in the modern global society.

Learning foreign languages, widening language competences of every individual and, by this the society in general is the basics of development of global processes and improvement of individuals and societies. The strategic policy of the EU that is oriented towards the support of the multilingual concept of linguistic diversity is the foundation of open societies that aim at knowing other cultures and economic building up in global circumstances. By applying the concept of *Pure full multilingualism* the EU will efficaciously influence upon the protection of communication and symbolic functions of all its official languages, the accessibility of information and legislature on all EU languages and actively help the improvement of economy and full mobility and migration within the EU.

Literature:

Ammon, Ulrich: Language conflicts in the European Union. On finding a politically acceptable and practicable solution for EU institutions that satisfies diverging interests, International Journal of Applied Linguistics, Vol.16, No.3, Malden, Bognor Regis, 2006, p.319-338.

Auswärtiges Amtes, Bundesrepublik Deutschland: Schengener Durchführungsübereinkommen (SDÜ), BGBl. 1993, II, S.1010.

Bandov, Goran: Die Implementierung der nationalen Gesetzgebung und der internationalen Instrumenten zum Schutz nationaler Minderheiten im Bildungsbereich in der Republik Kroatien, str.10-30, u: Gießmann, Hans Joachim / Schneider, Patricia (ured.): Reformen zur Fridenskonsolidierung, Hamburger Beiträge, Hamburg, 2006.

Christiansen, Pia Vanting: Language policy in the European Union: European/English/ Elite/Equal/Esperanto Union?; Language Problems & Language Planning, 30:1, 2006.

Christiansen, Pia Vanting: FLERSPROGETHED – Mehrsprachigkeit - Multilingualism. Sprogpolitik i EU, RUC, MA thesis, Roskilde University, 2002.

Central Statistics Office of the Republic of Ireland: Persons, males and females aged 3 years and over in each Regional Authority Area, classified by ability to speak Irish, 2006.

The Council of the European Union: Council Resolution on a European strategy for multilingualism, Brussels, 21.November, 2008.

De Cillia, Rudolf: Burenwurscht bleibt Burenwurscht. Sprachenpolitik und gesellschaftliche Mehrsprachigkeit in Österreich, Klagenfurt, Drava Verlag, 1998.

Edwards, John: Language, Society and Identity, Oxford, 1985.

van Els, Theo: Multilingualism in the European Union, International Journal of Applied Linguistics 15.3, Winterthur, 2005, p.263–281.

EurActiv: Language use in the EU, Brussels, Published 07 March 2008 - Updated 30 June 2010. http://www.euractiv.com/culture/language-use-eu-linksdossier-188332?display=normal (10.10.2011.)

European Commission: A Rewarding Challenge: How the multiplicity of languages could strengthen Europe - Proposals from the Group of Intellectuals for Intercultural Dialogue set up at the initiative of the European Commission, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, Brussels, 2008.

European Commission: Action plan to improve communicating Europe by the Commision, Brussels, 2005.

European Commission: Communication department of the European Commission: Europa – Gateway to the European Union, Brussels, 2011. http://europa.eu/about-eu/countries/member-countries/belgium/index_en.htm

European Commission: Communication on a new framework for cooperation on activities concerning the information and communication policy of the European Union (COM(2001)354), Brussels, 2001.

European Commission: Communication on an information and communication strategy for the European Union (COM(2002)350), Brussels, 2002.

European Commission: Communication on implementing the information and communication strategy for the European Union (COM(2004)196), Brussels, 2004.

European Commission: ELAN: Effects on the European Economy of Shortages of Foreign Language Skills in Enterprise, the National Centre for Languages, London, December, 2006.

European Commission: Europe Direct, Brussels, 2011. http://europa.eu/about-eu/countries/index_en.htm

European Commission: Multilingualism, EU Languages and Language policy, Languages of Europe, Brussels, 2011.

http://ec.europa.eu/education/languages/languages-of-europe/doc135_en.htm

The European Commission: Promoting language learning and linguistic diversity: An action plan 2004-06, Brussels, 2003.

European Commission: Special Eurobarometer 243/Wave 64.3-TNS Opinion&Social, Brussels, 2006.

European Commission: Study on the size of the language industry in the EU, the Language Technology Center ltd., Kingston Hill, 2009.

European Council: Presidency conclusion, Barcelona European Council, 15and16 March 2002, SN 100/1/02 REV 1, Barcelona, 2002.

European Council: The Schengen Acquis, Council Decision, Official Journal of the European Communities, 1999/435/EC of 20 May 1999.

EEC Council: Regulation No. 1. determining the languages to be used by the European Economic Community, OJ.17, 6.10.1958, p.385–386, Art.1, English special edition: Series I Chapter 1952-1958 P. 0059.

Gazzola, Michelle: Managing multilingualism in the European Union: Language Policy Evaluation for the European Parliament, Language Policy, 2006, p.393-417.

Hemblenne, Bernard: Les problèmes du siège et du régime linguistique des communautées européennes 1950–1967, Jahrbuch für Europäische Verwaltungsgeschichte 4, Baden-Baden, 1992, p.107–143.

Hlavač, Jim: Jezična politika i praksa u Europskoj Uniji, Jezik, No. 53, 2006.

Hoheisel, Reinhard: Die Rolle der deutschen Sprache in der Zukunft der EU aus der Sicht der Europäischen Kommission; in: Lohse, W. Christian (ed.): Die deutsche Sprache in der Europäischen Union. Baden-Baden, 2004, p.73–84.

Kelletat, Andreas F.: Deutschland:Finnland 6:1, Deutsch contra Englisch und Französisch, Zum Dolmetschstreit in der Europäischen Union, Tampere, 2001.

Lasagabaster, David: Foreign Language Competence in Content and Language Integrated Courses, The Open Applied Linguistics Journal, 2008, 1, 31-42.

Lohse, W. Christian (ed.): Die deutsche Sprache in der Europäischen Union. Baden-Baden, 2004.

Podestá, Guido: Preparing for the Parliament of the Enlarged European Union PE305.269/BUR/fin, European Parliament, Brussels, 2001.

Podestá, Guido: The Language Regime: Additional Options – „Working documents 9 for the Podesta Report" SG.EL/01-125.def–PE305.382/BUR, European Parliament, Brussels, 2001.

The Schengen acquis - Agreement between the Governments of the States of the Benelux Economic Union, the Federal Republic of Germany and the French Republic on the gradual abolition of checks at their common borders, 14/06/1985; Implementation /PROV See. Art.32, 42000A0922(01).

Stark, Franz: Sprache als Instrument in der Außenpolitik, Die Praxis der Bundesrepublik Deutschland: in Kelz, Heinrich P. (ed.): Die sprachliche Zukunft Europas, Baden Baden: Nomos. 2002, p.37–61.

Sažetak:

Ovaj članak usmjeren je na analizu mogućnosti ostvarivanja jezičnih režima u EU, s osvrtom na provedbu višejezične politike kroz jezični režim *Pure full multilingualism*. Institucije EU-a pozivaju se na ovaj režim u brojnim dokumentima, ali u praksi se često provode drugi režimi (*Monolingualism, Reduced multilingualism, Asymmetric systems, Controlled multilingualism and Full multilingualism with management correctives*) opravdavajući to primjenom načela praktičnosti i učinkovitost . Čini se da je režim *Pure full multilingualism* najbolje rješenje zbog niza različitih prednosti koje nudi. Provodeći ovaj režim u europskom društvu biti će moguće puno razvijanje jezične raznolikosti, a isto tako poticati će se sloboda kretanja i migracija u Europi. Posljedica će biti utjecaj režima u promociji višejezičnog gospodarstva i bolje gospodarsko pozicioniranje EU na globalnoj ekonomskoj razini. Ne manje važan njegov utjecaj bio bi pružanje svim građanima potpun pristup zakonodavstvu EU, putem postupaka i informacija na vlastitom jeziku.

Ključne riječi: višejezičnost, jezična politika, radni jezici, jezična raznolikost