No. 473
H5333



The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

The Harry S. Truman Research Institute for the Advancement of Peace

TRUMAN INSTITUTE REPRINTS

Jacob M. Landau

Language Policy and Political Development in Israel and Turkey

Reprinted ■
from ■ Language Policy and Political Development
Brian Weinstein (ed.)
Ablex Publishing Corp., 1990

7

Language Policy and Political Development in Israel and Turkey

Jacob M. Landau

INTRODUCTION

Most research on language policy focuses on single country cases. Relatively few comparative studies have been published, although Gordon (1985) succeeded in comparing language policy in Algeria and Lebanon. One is justified in attempting such comparisons as the contrasts may underscore and elucidate the main issues. Israel and Turkey embody enough similarities and differences in both general background and in their language situation to warrant such a descriptive comparison (Aksoy, 1982; Rosén, 1969).

Both Turkey and Israel were established as new republics in our century (the latter 25 years later than the former); both states have multiparty regimes with a fairly centralized political leadership; both are developing, industrializing countries with few natural resources and with serious economic problems; both societies display a Western orientation and marked trends towards modernization; in both, the modernization and secularization policies of the elites have brought the Establishment into conflict with the respective traditional, religion-minded sectors of the population; finally, both comprise multilingual societies in which at least the elites of the majority perceive language as a high-priority instrument of nation building and political development which consequently merits special planning.

The differences between Turkey and Israel are no less striking. Turkey is 39 times larger than Israel and has 10 times as many inhabitants; Turkey experienced statehood, in Ottoman times, over several centuries, while Israel became independent only 40 years ago; the majority of Turkey's population has been indigenous for generations, with relatively few immigrants, while most of Israel's inhabitants have arrived during the last 100 years from all corners of the globe; Israel's society is more urbanized than Turkey's with a somewhat higher literacy level (about 90 percent), while Turkey has at least partly maintained its rural character; Turkey's population is approximately 99 percent Muslim, while Israel's, in descending order, is Jewish, Muslim, Christian, and Druze (to mention the larger groups alone); finally, Turkey has only one official language, Turkish, spoken by an overwhelming part of the population, with Kurdish, Arabic, Arme-

nian, Greek, and Judeo-Spanish lagging far behind (Brands, 1974, pp. 182–183), while Israel has two official languages, Hebrew and Arabic, with many others used daily by Jewish newcomers.

First, we present some data about language reform and planning in Israel and Turkey, respectively; secondly, we proceed to focus on major characteristics of language policy in both countries, comparing their functions and measures employed; thirdly, we attempt to relate the above to certain features of political development.

SOME LANGUAGE DATA

Hebrew

The most salient feature concerning the revival of Hebrew in the late 19th and early 20th centuries was the intention to resuscitate a language which had not been spoken, in daily use, for centuries. The entire effort was an imaginative goal of Zionism, the national movement, to provide yet another uniting factor for Jews, focusing on the language of their forefathers in their ancient land, to which this movement strived to gather them. The key figure in this language revival was Eliezer Ben-Yehuda (1858–1922), a Lithuanian-born Jew, who had emigrated to Palestine in 1881 and settled in Jerusalem. Since then, he devoted his entire life to propagating the everyday use of spoken Hebrew—by personal example, articles in the Hebrew press (including newspapers which he edited and published); establishing a "Hebrew Language Committee" (*Va'ad ha-Lashon ha-'Ivrit*) in 1890 to coin new words and terms; and preparing a historical dictionary of Hebrew (of which he finished only five volumes; the complete published work, based on Ben-Yehuda's efforts and research, comprises 17 volumes) (Chomsky, 1969, p. 232; Fellman, 1973). A second idea, which he propounded with equal zeal, was to introduce Hebrew as the language of instruction in all Jewish schools in Palestine.

The uphill struggle continued as the Jews strove to establish the status of Hebrew and promote its daily use in the Babel of languages in Ottoman Palestine (Landau, 1979, Introduction) and then under British administration. In 1922, the British recognized Hebrew as one of the three official languages of Mandate Palestine; the measure of self-rule accorded the Jewish community assured the central place of Hebrew in its educational, cultural, and public life. The establishment of the State of Israel in 1948 rendered Hebrew the main language of the new state, although both Hebrew and Arabic were maintained as its official languages in public use and education, out of deference to Israel's Arab minority (Landau, 1987). In 1949, an "Academy for the Hebrew Language" (*ha-Aqademiyya la-Lashon ha-'Ivrit*) was set up; four years later a law, passed in Parliament, charged the Academy with continuing the work of the former Hebrew Language Committee (Fellman, 1974).

The scope and objectives of language revival, as determined by the Hebrew Language Committee, are indicative of the goals of language policy regarding Hebrew (the earliest definitive version dates from 1912—ha-Aqademiyya la-Lashon ha-'Ivrit, 1970, 31 ff., Fellman, 1973, pp. 82–83): (a) to institute employment of Hebrew as a spoken language in all aspects of life at home, at school, in public life, commerce, industry and crafts, the humanities and sciences; (b) to preserve the Oriental character of the language and its special forms in pronunciation, word-building, and style, augmenting it with the flexibility required for expressing human thought to its fullest extent; (c) to publish words unknown to the public from the earliest Hebrew literature to the present day; (d) to fill the vacuum in the language by coining new words; (e) to encourage Oriental pronunciation of the language; (f) to establish definite patterns of spelling and regulations for punctuation and to correct errors in speech and style; (g) to examine the entire corpus of Hebrew literature for all Hebrew words—avoiding non-Semitic words unless they have acquired a Hebrew form or are in current use; (h) to create necessary words, following the rules of grammar and linguistic analogy, preferably derived from Hebrew roots and otherwise from Arabic (as a first choice), Aramaic, Canaanite, or Egyptian ones; (i) to coin words which are not only grammatically correct but also morphologically sound and harmonious.

These goals had undergone a certain transformation some 40 years later, when a law, passed in Parliament, in 1954, stipulated the aims and organization of the Academy for the Hebrew Language (ha-Aqademiyya la-Lashon ha-'Ivrit 1970, 71 ff.): (a) to compile a thesaurus of the entire Hebrew language throughout all its periods and strata; (b) to study the structure of the Hebrew language, its history and manifestations; (c) to guide the development of the Hebrew language according to its nature, needs and possibilities in every domain of theory and practice—in vocabulary, grammar, writing, spelling, and orthography.

While the basic goals have remained unchanged, one notes that the 1954 law accords the Academy authority to direct not only language research but "to guide the development of the Hebrew language"—a role befitting its newly acquired official status in a nation which had recently attained statehood.

Turkish

The basic circumstances concerning Turkish differed considerably from those of Hebrew. Turkish was widely used in speech and writing and had never been a "dead" language like Hebrew. The basic problem facing language reformers and planners appears to have been the cleavage in vocabulary and phraseology between popularly spoken and literary Turkish, the latter heavily imbued with Arabic and Persian influences. Jews who knew Hebrew were unable to speak the language but could understand its literature, whereas the Turkish masses spoke their language easily but had difficulty understanding literary writings. Consequently, while reformers of Hebrew hardly referred to the virtually nonexistent

spoken Hebrew, using the various strata of literary Hebrew as a point of departure, those dealing with Turkish had to consider both the colloquial and the literary.

Furthermore, discussions governing Turkish were suffused with nationalism. During the final period of the Ottoman Empire and the early years of the Republic of Turkey, homogeneity was perceived as an overriding consideration in the building of a nation-state; hence, reformers and planners felt that some sort of language policy had to be worked out urgently. Statehood itself was considered relevant as well: In various stages, Turkish language reformers attempted to influence not only public opinion, but also decision makers in the state bureaucracy, such as the Ministry of Education. Since 1929, on the establishment of a "Language Committee" (*Dil Heyeti*)—especially since 1932, with the foundation of the "Turkish Language Society" (*Türk Dil Kurumu*, as its name was finally determined four years later)—the official language policy had the full support of the state and the backing of the Gazi himself, President Mustafa Kemal (Heyd, 1954; Lewis, 1984).

The scope and objectives of language reforms, as determined by the Turkish Language Society, reflect the goals of language policy in Turkey. These objectives, revised several times, are characteristically expressed in the Society's 1943 statutes (Türk Dil Kurumu, 1943; Landau, 1986, p. 1100), as follows: (a) to purify the language of foreign accretions and to Turkify it; (b) to accumulate Turkish words used in Turkey and elsewhere and publish them in dictionaries of the Turkish of Turkey and of Turkish dialects; (c) to prepare and publish relevant works along with the above dictionaries; (d) to examine ways and means of coining new words and to prepare a basic grammar of Turkish and a comparative grammar of Turkish dialects; (e) to draw up lists of technical terms for schools and universities and to prepare a dictionary of these Turkish terms; (f) to collect and publish popular proverbs; (g) to investigate the Turkish language from its earliest times and compare it with other languages to prepare etymological dictionaries; (h) to study documents relating to the Turkish language and the development of other languages, with special reference to their vocabularies and the coining of new words; (i) to study modern linguistic works and translate them into Turkish.

The goals underwent some transformation 40 years later, when the Turkish Language Society was incorporated by Law 2876 into the Atatürk Supreme Council for Culture, Language and History (*Atatürk Supreme Council*, 1986, pp. 17–18): (a) To compile lexicons of words and phrases from oral and written sources; (b) to carry out research and studies enabling the Turkish language to retain its essential identity and richness and to bring its etymology to light; to complete and publish dictionaries and guides to spelling; (c) to carry out and publish scientific studies of the Turkish language and its history; (d) to find equivalent Turkish concepts to replace non-Turkish terms and concepts presently used in the arts and sciences; (e) considering the Turkish language's vital role in

unifying the nation, to take measures to cultivate language awareness among the new generation; to prepare materials with this aim in mind and make them available to public organizations, to state and private educational institutions, and to the press; (f) to organize congresses, symposia, lectures, scholarly meetings, field trips and exhibitions on subjects related to the Turkish language; (g) to publish books, periodicals, and the results of research and study; (h) to collaborate with researchers, writers, and artists at home and abroad, and with private and official educational, scholarly, cultural, and artistic institutions, organizations, and research centers; (i) to follow up, study, and evaluate publications at home and abroad related to the objections and functions of the Society and present the conclusions to its Supreme Council; (j) to carry out scholarly studies on facilitating the learning of Turkish by foreigners.

While the basic goals have remained unchanged, one notes that the 1983 law places greater emphasis on scholarly studies, cooperation with organizations abroad, and the teaching of Turkish to foreigners—all signs of the leadership's perceptions of Turkey's new status within the contemporary world community.

FUNCTIONS OF LANGUAGE POLICY IN ISRAEL AND TURKEY

Public bodies concerned with language policy generally fulfill one or more of the following five functions: purification, revival, reform, standardization, and lexical modernization (Nahir, 1973). While several and sometimes all of these functions may be relevant, even simultaneously, one such function is usually emphasized as the most immediate. Emphasis may shift over time, according to changes in circumstances or ideology, but the primary focus will generally be limited to only one major function. These major functions are not always clearly delineated by public agencies and are consequently open to interpretation.

Hebrew

Hebrew language policy may be divided into three main periods (dates are approximate):

1. 1890 to 1920, that is, from the establishment of the first Hebrew Language Committee to the end of Ottoman rule. The *revival* of spoken Hebrew was then a major aim, as a common language was needed for local Jews and new immigrants. As no single language was spoken by a majority of the Jews in Palestine, Hebrew had a good chance of becoming the language of communication among them, due to its traditional status. During this period, emphasis was placed on Semitic roots because of both a nationalist approach and the proximity of Arabic cognates. Hebrew was then promoted as the language of instruction in the Jewish

schools of Palestine; its most signal victory was its having supplanted German at the Polytechnic Institute in Haifa in 1913 (Eisenstadt, 1967).

2. 1928 to 1948, that is, the duration of the British Mandate in Palestine. Now that revival had been achieved successfully, emphasis shifted to *standardization*, that is, rendering Hebrew more efficient, rational and generally applicable. The Hebrew Language Committee, supported by the agencies of the largely autonomous Jewish population, insisted on the standardization of pronunciation and spelling, as well as the dissemination of Hebrew in public and cultural life—in administration, schools, the Hebrew University (established in 1925), the press and theater. This period was characterized by adoption and acceptance of non-Semitic words and the publication of word lists in many domains for standard use.

3. 1948 to the present, that is, since the establishment of the State of Israel. Hebrew, revived and standardized, was the first official language of the land and was in general use in all aspects of life. *Lexical modernization* now became paramount as the final stage of language revival. The Hebrew Language Committee set itself up as an Academy for the Hebrew Language and was institutionalized by law (Medan, 1969). It has consistently grappled with the need to provide new words and terms for the expanding education and technology of a modernizing state, with new organs such as the media, the government bureaucracy, police and military forces. In the late 1960s, in newspaper reporting in Hebrew, about 60 to 70 percent of the words used in Hebrew newspaper reports were found to be Biblical, 15 to 20 percent Mishnaic, and the remainder medieval, newly created or loan-words (Rabin, 1970a). It stands to reason that over the 20-odd years since this observation was made, the share of newly coined words has increased. The Academy's work is aided by the parallel compiling of an historical dictionary, which aims at listing all entries of Hebrew words over the past 3,000 years (over 1.5 million entries are ready) (Tur-Sinai, 1957; Fellman, 1973, p. 70 ff., p. 127 ff.). Many of the new terms have been imparted to the masses of Jewish immigrants (who, as early as 1953, constituted two thirds of the then 2,000,000-strong Jewish population of Israel) by various means, including the extremely successful direct-method or *ulpan* courses.

Since Israel achieved independence, determination of language policy appears to have been shared by the Academy and other state authorities, especially the Ministry of Education, which determined and implemented policies regarding the teaching of Hebrew and other languages (Landau, 1970, p. 725 ff). Another objective assumed by the Academy during this period is *standardization*, especially regarding spelling. In Hebrew as in Arabic, all the short vowels are not written in the same line as the consonants, but above or below it. In actual practice, printers omit these vowels (except in classical texts, poetry, and children's books), which are to be surmised based on one's linguistic expertise. For the hundreds of thousands of new immigrants, keen on learning Hebrew rapidly and well, this practice constituted an additional major obstacle. Consequently, the Academy for the Hebrew Language had to devise a new spelling system, in

which these vowels were inserted between the consonants. For instance *tomer* is now written *tōmer*). The new system was introduced methodically since 1968 (Rabin, 1970a, p. 329), fueling opposition by the traditional-minded and the purists (purification had never been a major function in the reform of Hebrew—especially not during the period under discussion). This "plene" system was then advertised in the media and has been accepted by the press, contemporary prose literature, and government publications; many companies and individuals have been using the new spelling in everyday correspondence as well.

Turkish

Although relevant suggestions for reform of Turkish, like reform of Hebrew, had been voiced during the 19th century, it was only since the early 20th century that an organized, planned language policy emerged. However, it is difficult to divide Turkish language policy into distinct periods, even approximate ones (for the reforms, see Özdemir, 1980; Turan, 1981; Yücel, 1982; Hatiboğlu, 1981).

1. Between 1909 and 1938, emphasis appears to have been placed on *purification*. The proposals of the group of intellectuals known as *Genç Kalemler* ("Young Pens"), some of which were adopted by the Young Turk leadership, were linked with rising nationalist sentiments and designed to breed commonality among the Turkish classes and perhaps foster relations with Turkic groups outside the Ottoman Empire (Landau, 1981). Partisans of these ideas demanded the elimination of Arabic and Persian grammatical rules as well as words and expressions to which Turkish alternatives were easily available. Enver Pasha, the Minister of War, also attempted to modify spelling, thereby rendering the language simpler (Lewis, 1984, pp. 196–197). This behavior paralleled the much later modification of spelling in Hebrew. Enver's proposals, presented and implemented during the First World War, were stillborn, however. It was left to Mustafa Kemal and his associates to push for language purification in the 1920s and 1930s. Language reform constituted part of Mustafa Kemal's broader objectives of designating nationalism, secularism, and modernization as the primary means of creating a new polity and a new nation-state (for a different interpretation, see Nikolsky, 1986, pp. 152 ff). The campaign for *Öz Türkçe*, or "genuine Turkish," was intended to dispense with foreign words and terms, especially those of Islamic origin. Until shortly before Mustafa Kemal's death in 1938, puristic tendencies were much in evidence, although with certain fluctuations. Concentrated efforts were exerted by the Turkish Language Society, established in 1932 by the single party (the People's Party) and its clubs (the People's Houses) to collect materials and replace foreign words with those of Turkish/Turkic origins.

2. By 1928, the period of *reform* and *standardization*, chiefly in orthography, had begun. The major decision taken by Mustafa Kemal and his close associates to substitute a phonetic Latin script for Arabic letters in Turkish was obviously

not dictated solely by considerations of convenience and suitability to the Turkish language. Rather, it was an integral part of the overall conception of *distancing New Turkey from Islam and Arabism/Persianism* and promoting its Westernization and secularization (details in Velidedeoğlu et al., 1979, Ülkütaşir, 1981; see also Chapter 8, this volume). The Koran, at least in its original Arabic version, would become unintelligible almost overnight. Emphasis was placed on linguistic and other ties to pre-Islamic and non-Islamic Turkish/Turkic civilization—all in the spirit of Kemalist-style nationalism. This contrasted sharply with the policy of the Hebrew Language Committee and its successor the Academy for the Hebrew Language, supported by the Jewish/Israeli authorities to draw on overall Jewish and Hebrew tradition—a policy which rejected plans for the adoption of the Latin script for Hebrew. Institution of the new script in Turkish required intensive efforts at standardization in spelling, which were not considered, at that stage, for Hebrew.

3. The period from 1938 to the present, commencing shortly before Mustafa Kemal's death, is marked by retreat from a puristic language policy which was widely (although not universally) considered too extreme. For practical purposes, *lexical modernization* was emphasized as the final stage of the massive language reform in Turkish, particularly since the end of the Second World War, as increasing urbanization and industrialization hastened Turkey's re-entry into world affairs. The campaign to eliminate Arabic and Persian words diminished in intensity (particularly regarding terms which had become Turkified) and numerous words and terms were coined from Turkish literary sources or dialects. According to Turkish official sources, only 35 to 40 percent of the terms used in "formal language" before 1932 (when the Turkish Language Society was established) were Turkish, increasing to 75 to 80 percent by 1983 (Prime Ministry Directorate General, 1983, p. 55). This process has been assisted by the simultaneous compilation of a historical dictionary, prepared by the Turkish Language Society, whose first edition, in four volumes, was published in 1943–1957; a second edition appeared in the 1960s (Hazai, 1970, p. 191). Terms were adopted from European Languages for medicine and the exact sciences, as well as the social sciences and the humanities as well, although perhaps to a somewhat lesser extent. Modernization was also advocated by university professors in several of those disciplines of knowledge, who had been trained abroad (or at least read foreign scholarly materials); for these schools and some of their students, keen on keeping abreast of current research abroad, lexical expansion often meant lexical modernization.

STAGES OF LANGUAGE PLANNING IN ISRAEL AND TURKEY

There are various stages in the selection and application of the language planning which underlie most language policies. We have selected five consecutive stages

and will compare Hebrew and Turkish in each: information, formulation, experimentation, determination, and implementation (Bowen, 1967, p. vi). All five stages should constitute interconnected links in the management of language planning, that is, in the search for optimal organized solutions to language problems (Cooper, 1979, p. 26 ff.).

Information

Obviously, all language planning decisions should be based on adequately solid information—and not merely educated guesses—in order to better assess the situation and thus increase the chances of success and minimize the risk of error. Relevant information for language planning apparently comprises two main components: knowledge of the experience of other peoples and of salient features of the specific situation in the country itself. Such information appears to have been used only to a limited extent by language planners of both Hebrew and Turkish. The Hebrew Language Committee devoted little attention to foreign information, at least during the prestate era, although several members knew (from reading or personal experience) of attempts at language revival in Lithuania and Ireland, which they chose to ignore. The same appears to have been true of the Turkish Language Society, whose scholars did know of other peoples' attempts at language purification and orthographic change, yet did not investigate these in detail.

While language policy makers in both Palestine/Israel and Turkey were also well aware of local information, they certainly did not invest considerable time and efforts in those early years in collecting and investigating all the pertinent relevant data. It should be recalled, however, that the first Turkish population census was carried out shortly before 1928, the year of the change in script, followed by regular annual censuses. Furthermore, one prominent member of the Hebrew Language Committee, Moshe Lunz (1854–1918), wrote and edited numerous collections of data on Palestine (with some emphasis on recent developments) in Jerusalem between 1882 and 1915. Several censuses were conducted during the British Mandate and detailed statistics were published annually, since 1949, after the State of Israel had been established. There is little evidence to indicate that this information was closely evaluated and used by language policy makers. Apparently, a sense of urgency in both Palestine/Israel and Turkey prompted language planners to proceed rapidly.

Formulation

This stage is generally perceived as pinpointing the main problems, drawing up the options to be considered and solutions to be weighed, as well as tentative selection of the preferred direction. Again it appears that language planning of both Hebrew and Turkish accorded only cursory attention to this aspect, as it is

not uncommon in developing countries. In prestatehood years, the Hebrew Language Committee never considered formulating its objectives, which were simply the revival of Hebrew as a spoken language and its diffusion among the Jewish population and schools. Rather, debate focused on the ways and means to achieve results efficiently and speedily. After 1948, discussions regarding formulation of language policy evidently lacked careful consideration of the issues and options.

In the Turkish Republic, there was some deliberation about the formulation of language policy; Mustafa Kemal consulted various experts and advisers, both officially and unofficially at his dinner table. The formulation stage, like its predecessor, was rushed because of the pressures of time: Hebrew language planners sensed the immediate necessity of coining new words and teaching Hebrew to numerous immigrants, thereby molding a new nation, while certain intellectuals felt obligated to accelerate Turkish language reform as an integral component of building a new modernizing state.

Experimentation

This stage follows formulation of the selected policy and consists of examination of its practicality, feasibility, and acceptance. Ideally, policies should be pilot-tested for value and applicability. Again, for both Hebrew and Turkish, little of this early experimentation was carried out. In Turkey most of the experimentation undertaken by Mustafa Kemal and his associates, regarding the change in script (they themselves went out to teach it and subsequently corrected certain flaws, such as the hyphen) concerned a few minor points only and not the overall grand design. In contrast, one intensive *ulpan* for teaching Hebrew to new immigrants was set up in Jerusalem, in 1949, as a pilot project; then others were added. Once this five months' crash course completed its first term and appropriate conclusions were drawn, similar courses were offered on a nationwide scale to new immigrants (Kodesh, 1969).

Determination

Determination of language planning follows careful formulation and pilot experimentation of a preferred option. Only after due deliberation by experts and public authorities should changes be announced in the original formulation, directions, and emphases, as well as ways and means. Such policy decisions were taken by the Hebrew Language Council in the years preceding the First World War, although they lacked thorough consideration of the various options and were not preceded by any real experimentation; on the contrary, the general use of Hebrew throughout all Jewish schools in Palestine was encouraged despite the dearth of teachers and textbooks. Turkish efforts to transform the orthography into a phonetic Latin script, with certain specific patterns, were determined rapidly by

Mustafa Kemal, despite the advice of experts who wished to deliberate and experiment for several years. In both instances, perceived expediency triumphed over possible superior planning. The subsequent vacillating policies of the Turkish Language Society regarding standardization of orthography—particularly after Mustafa Kemal's death—constitute another indication that policy determination did not always follow the above-mentioned rules.

Language planning in Israel, in at least one major area—bilingualism—exhibited similar disregard of careful determination. During the early days of the new state, it was resolved to retain both Hebrew and Arabic as official languages and to translate this decision into everyday use. This implied the employment of both languages in Parliament, Courts, laws, stamps, currency and paper money. In education, Arabic was to be used as the medium of instruction and an Arabic core curriculum was to be instituted in all Arab schools (that is, schools in which the majority of the pupils were Arabs); Hebrew was taught in these schools as a first foreign language (Landau, 1969, pp. 39–41). The decision was taken within a conceptual framework of cultural pluralism in state and society, with the openly declared intention of allowing and even encouraging the Arab minority in Israel to preserve its own cultural heritage. However, no serious research or experimentation was carried out in this crucial matter and no thorough consideration was given to employ Hebrew as the medium of instruction, thereby preparing them for functioning as full members of the Israeli polity. (Moreover Jewish pupils learn Arabic, especially as a foreign language in Hebrew schools, Landau, 1961.) In contrast, Turkish official language planning emphasized a definitely monolingual conception, expressed in all state symbols as well as a determination to limit to the utmost the use of other languages as media of instruction in schools; legal procedures could even be instituted against transgressors. In this situation, there is obviously no place for teaching minority languages in state schools. Some leeway was left, however, for universities such as the Middle East Technical University in Ankara and Robert College—now Boğaziçi University—in Istanbul, both of which teach in English.

Implementation

The judicious application of a policy by various governmental agencies, such as the Ministry of Education, is of course its ultimate test, leading towards success or failure, excellence or mediocrity (Gaeilge, 1974, p. 527 ff.). Hebrew and Turkish have achieved striking advances in the coining of new words, language diffusion (via the media, government offices, etc.) and language teaching (to both children and adults in schools, special courses, the military, etc.). In both cases the relative success of implementation has been all the more remarkable as it was not preceded by a carefully drawn-up language plan—at least not insofar as the above-mentioned stages are concerned. Enthusiasm, however, is no adequate substitute for a well-reasoned, determined language policy. Language plan-

ning has often proved both necessary and useful. The leaders who created both Turkey and Israel as nation-states were acutely aware of the *sine-qua-non* importance of language policy and involved themselves in its implementation no less than in its formulation and determination. Mustafa Kemal formulated language reform and then supervised its implementation; he coined new words himself and frequently spoke and lectured about the subject (for example, see Deligönül, 1982). David Ben-Gurion was less directly involved in language planning, although he frequently recommended, both privately and in public, the revival of Hebrew and its popular diffusion. In a little-known speech, delivered on January 3, 1949, at a preliminary meeting preceding the establishment of the Academy for the Hebrew Language, he called for disseminating Hebrew throughout the whole of Israel's population, including the numerous newcomers, pleading for enrichment of the language not merely with new words of Hebrew origin and form, but also with cultural content (Va'ad ha-Lashon ha-'Ivrit, 1949, pp. 5–7). Ben-Gurion coined no new words himself, but his personal speaking style and phraseology had considerable impact.

Successful implementation of both Turkish and Hebrew language policies may indeed have been due to the vision of popular leaders such as Mustafa Kemal and David Ben-Gurion, respectively, the importance they attached to language and to its national role, the enthusiasm which they succeeded in generating, and the continuation of their respective campaigns by their successors (Ismet Inönü, Turkey's second President, and Moshe Sharet, Israel's second Prime Minister) with the Language Societies and the Ministries of Education following suit. It is no accident that, in Turkey and Israel, both intellectual and popular circles maintain interest in dissemination and improvement of their respective major national languages (for example, Ataç, 1962). The organ of the Turkish Language Society, *Türk Dili* (The Language of the Turks) is widely read and discussed, as are the numerous booklets published by the Society, many of which employ a simple, popular style; teachers may purchase these publications at a discount. Similarly, the Academy for the Hebrew Language and its scholarly publications are highly regarded both in Israel and abroad; the journal *Leshonenu* (Our Language) is valued by Hebraists, Semitists, and general linguists, while the more popular *Leshonenu la-'Am* (Our Language for the People) is read by many teachers, students, and others.

LANGUAGE PLANNING AND POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT: HEBREW AND TURKISH

If political development is perceived as the capability of a political system to solve the problems arising from modernization, language planning has a substantial share in this process, especially in developing countries. Language planning is often used to help solve problems of political development such as identity crisis as an issue of nation building, popular participation, distribution of bene-

fits, penetration of the administration, integration of specialized functions, professional differentiation or secularization of political culture. As language is the primary means of political communication, its planning is frequently considered by such agents of political development as the state leadership, political parties, the military, the intelligentsia, the bureaucracy, and organized labor—which seek to influence their respective political systems. Their language choices nearly always have political consequences (Weinstein, 1983).

As political development proceeds differentially in various countries of the Third World, each with its own particular political institutions and political culture (Palmer & Stern, 1971; Wiarda, 1985), it is extremely difficult—or even impossible—to draw up an overall model of the relevance of language planning in developing countries. However, language policy is frequently an indication of political development: the language policy selected reflects not only the prevailing level of political development but also has an impact on its future character. This relationship is evident in an assessment of the priorities of language policy and planning in Hebrew and Turkish, as well as in their impact on political development, especially the main aspects thereof, such as, forging a new identity as part of nation building; promoting the course of modernization; increasing popular participation in politics; and secularizing political culture.

Forging a New Identity as Part of Nation Building

Creation of a national identity is frequently a top-priority task for the political leadership of peoples on their way to statehood or in recently-established states. The Jews in Palestine/Israel and the Turks in Turkey were no exception. Those who planned the revival, standardization and lexical expansion of Hebrew thought that spoken Hebrew, employed by old-timers and newcomers alike and taught at all levels in school, was a precondition for nationhood and statehood. They also argued that modern Hebrew, while maintaining existing grammatical structures, should draw chiefly on Biblical and Mishnaic sources representing the language of their forefathers, who had lived in the same land long ago. Turkish leaders, who were set on forging a new nation on the ruins of the Ottoman Empire, were equally of the opinion that planning the purification, reform and standardization, and lexical expansion of their language was a precondition for the creation of a new nation with common goals. In their case as well they maintained most grammatical structures, but laid considerable emphasis on increasing their lexicon by drawing on sources from a period which they considered their golden age in pre-Islamic days.

Promoting Modernization

The elites of both the Jews in Palestine/Israel and the Turks in Turkey have appreciated modernization, although the latter considered it of higher priority.

After all, many Jews had emigrated to Palestine/Israel from countries that were already highly modernized. This was not the case in Turkey, however. Mustafa Kemal and his assistants seriously strived to achieve the national objective of reaching the highest level of world civilization rapidly. Language had a crucial role in this process, hence, the script was changed to Latin characters, lexical modernization was introduced and foreign languages were judiciously included in the school curriculum. Modernization as a national goal appears to have carried somewhat less weight in the Jewish community of Palestine/Israel; the Jews refrained from changing the Hebraic script, although they, too, planned and implemented lexical modernization and introduced foreign language teaching at their schools.

Increasing Popular Participation in Politics

The sponsors of both Hebrew and Turkish language planning were well aware of the significance of language in both quantitative and qualitative participation in politics. In Israel, fluency in Hebrew was obviously required for political participation in current politics, such as party life, as well as national and local elections. In Turkey, a special effort seems to have been made by the Kemalists, in the name of "populism," to break down the language barriers between the educated and the common people (Heyd, 1954, p. 20). However, the basic approach to language planning, in this context, appears to have varied—largely accomodationist in Israel and largely assimilationist in Turkey. In Israel, language policy was expressed by an attempt at conflict management, which resulted in the language issue having little or no impact on Jewish-Arab tensions within the State of Israel, while in the Republic of Turkey, it has contributed a potential source of group conflict. This is reflected in a series of recent laws: The 1982 Party Law enjoined the use of Turkish in all the activities of political parties; a 1983 law laid down its use in all official publications; and a 1985 law made it compulsory in education. Nearly all Arabs in Israel now know Hebrew as the language of commerce, industry, and the military forces, but they are even more fluent in Arabic, which is not only the second official language but also the language of their own press, theater, and schooling (Landau, 1987, p. 124). Perhaps as a consequence of this accomodationist policy, the participation of Israeli Arabs in parliamentary elections has been almost consistently higher than that of Israeli Jews (Landau, 1969, pp. 108–155). In present-day Turkey, however, not all Kurds are really fluent in Turkish, although their schools impose it on them as the medium of instruction. This contrast may be due to the much greater differences in vocabulary and grammar between Turkish and Kurdish than between Hebrew and Arabic. Consequently, areas inhabited by the Kurds in Eastern Turkey exhibit relative low political participation (Landau, Özbudun, & Tachau, 1980), reflecting among the local population the potential danger of politicization of linguistic cleavage.

Secularizing Political Culture

The campaign for secularization in the Republic of Turkey, especially during the presidencies of Mustafa Kemal and Ismet Inönü, was an integral component of the drive for modernization, as was disinstitutionalization of the religious Establishment. The Kemalists battled the traditionalists relentlessly; the short-lived Cabinet Coalition, in 1974, between the (Kemalist) Republican People's Party and the (theocratic) National Salvation Party, was doomed to failure and rapid disintegration. The current State President, Kenan Evren, an avowed Kemalist, is watching religious politicians closely to ensure they do not use politics for strengthening the cause of Islam in Turkey. In Israel the secular and the orthodox co-exist, which has enabled them (not without friction, as shown in the 1988 elections) to join in successive coalition cabinets.

Nevertheless, language planning in the two countries appears similar in this respect as well. In both cases, secularist elites set about renewing the language; not surprisingly, traditional circles vehemently opposed their efforts just as they reacted against other secularizing measures (Dodd, 1972, pp. 35–36). Eliezer Ben-Yehuda was ridiculed by ultra-orthodox Jewish circles in Palestine and attacked by their newspapers for profaning the Holy Language by its daily use; later he was even excommunicated by them. The puristic efforts of the Turkish Language Society likewise frequently aroused opposition among Turkey's traditional circles (Heyd, 1954, pp. 44–48; Bazin, 1987). Even at present newspapers connected with religious circles are written in a style *à part* and ignore all (or most) neologisms—reminiscent of prelanguage reform days. Examples include *ha-Qol* (The Voice) and *ha-Modi'a* (the Informant) in Israel and *Millî Gazete* (The National Newspaper) in Turkey. In these circles, the revival of Hebrew or the reform of Turkish (except for the change in script, perhaps) are simply irrelevant. Some conservatives in Turkey strongly oppose the reforms. Such phenomena may have hindered political development within a segment of the population of both countries, yet have neither prevented its overall application nor perceptibly hampered the success of language policy in furthering political development.

REFERENCES

Aksoy, Ö.A. (1982). *Dil gerçeği* (Turkish: The Realities of Language). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.

ha-Aqademiyya la-Lashon ha-'Ivrit. (1970). *Leqet te'udot le-toledot Va'ad ha-Lashon ve-ha-Aqademiyya la-Lashon ha-'Ivrit* (Hebrew: A collection of Documents from the History of the Hebrew Language Committee and the Academy for the Hebrew Language). Jerusalem: ha-Aqademiyya la-Lashon ha-'Ivrit.

Ataç, N. (1962). *Ataç* (i.e., selections from the writings of Nurullah Ataç: in Turkish). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.

Atatürk Supreme Council. (1986). *Atatürk Supreme Council for Culture, Language and History*. Ankara.

Bazin, L. (1987). La réforme linguistique en Turquie. In I. Fodor & C. Hegège (Eds.), *Language reform: History and future* (Vol. I, 155–177). Hamburg: Buske Verlag.

Bowen, J.D. (1967). Introduction. In M. Ramos et al. (Eds.), *The Determination and Implementation of Language Policy* (pp. v–x). Queen City, Philippines: Alemar Phoenix Publications.

Brands, H.W. (1974). Die Sprache. In W. Kündig-Steiner (Ed.), *Die Türkei* (pp. 182–185). Tübingen & Basel: Horst Erdman Verlag (= Ländermonographien, 4).

Chomsky, W. (1969). *Hebrew: The eternal language*. Philadelphia, PA: Jewish Publication Society of America.

Cooper, R.L. (1979). Language planning, language spread, and language change. In J.P. Alatis & G.R. Tucker (Eds.), *Languages in public life* (pp. 23–50). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Deligönül, M. (1982). *Atatürk'ten (seçki)* (Turkish: Selections from Atatürk). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.

Dodd, C.H. (1972). *Political development*. London: Macmillan.

Eisenstadt, S. (1967). *Sefatenu ha-'Ivrit ha-hayya* (Hebrew: Our Living Hebrew Language). Tel-Aviv: Tequma.

Fellman, J. (1973). *The revival of a classical tongue: Eliezer Ben Yehuda and the Modern Hebrew Language*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton.

Fellman, J. (1974). The academy of the Hebrew language: Its history, structure and function. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 1*, 95–103.

Gaeilge, C.N. (1974). Implementing a language policy. In J.A. Fishman (Ed.), *Advances in language planning* (pp. 527–553). The Hague and Paris: Mouton.

Gordon, D.C. (1985). The Arabic language and national identity: The cases of Algeria and of Lebanon. In W.R. Beer & J.E. Jacob (Eds.), *Language policy and national unity* (pp. 134–150). Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Allanheld.

Hatiboğlu, V. (1981). *Ölümsüz Atatürk ve dil devrimi* (Turkish: The Immortal Atatürk and the Language Reform). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.

Hazai, G. (1970). Turkish. In T.A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Modern trends in linguistics* (pp. 183–216). The Hague and Paris: Mouton.

Heyd, U. (1954). *Language reform in Turkey*. Jerusalem: Israel Oriental Society (= Oriental Notes and Studies, 5).

Kodesh, S. (1969). The diffusion of Hebrew. *Ariel* (Jerusalem), *25*, 40–47.

Landau, J.M. (Editor and Contributor). (1961). *Hora'at ha-'Aravit ke-lashon zara* (Hebrew: The Teaching of Arabic As a Foreign Language). Jerusalem: Hebrew University School of Education.

Landau, J.M. (1969). *The Arabs in Israel: A political study*. London: Oxford University Press.

Landau, J.M. (1970). Language Study in Israel. In T.A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Current trends in linguistics* (pp. 721–745). The Hague and Paris: Mouton.

Landau, J.M. (1979). *Abdul Hamid's Palestine*. London: André Deutsch.

Landau, J.M. (1981). *Pan-Turkism in Turkey: A study of irredentism*. London: C. Hurst.

Landau, J.M. (1986). Madjma' 'ilmī. iii. Turkey. *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (2nd ed.: (Leiden)), *5*, 1099–1101.

Landau, J.M. (1987). Hebrew and Arabic in the State of Israel: Political aspects of

the language issue. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 67,* 117–133.

Landau, J.M., Özbudun, E., & Tachau, F. (1980). *Electoral politics in the Middle East: Issues, voters and elites.* London: Croom Helm.

Lewis, G.L. (1984). Atatürk's language reform as an aspect of modernization in the Republic of Turkey. In J.M. Landau (Ed.), *Atatürk and the modernization of Turkey* (pp. 195–213). Boulder, CO: Westview Press; and Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Medan, M. (1969). The academy of the Hebrew language. *Ariel* (Jerusalem), *25,* 40–47.

Nahir, M. (1973). *Language Academies, Language Planning, and the Case of the Hebrew Revival.* Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, PA.

Nikolsky, L.B. (1986). *Yazik v politike i ideologii stran zarubedzhnogo Vostoka.* Moscow: Nauka.

Özdemir, E. (1980). *Dil devrimimiz* (Turkish: Our Language Reform). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.

Palmer, M., & Stern, L. (Eds.). (1971). *Political development in Changing societies.* Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Prime Ministry Directorate General of Press and Information. (1983). *Turkey Yearbook 1983.* Ankara.

Prime Ministry Directorate General of Press and Information. (1986). *Bibliography of Turkey, Turks & Turkish Language.* Ankara.

Rabin, C. (1970a). Hebrew. In T.A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Modern Trends in Linguistics* (pp. 304–346). The Hague and Paris: Mouton.

Rabin, C. (1970b). The role of language in forging a nation: The case of Hebrew. *The Incorporated Linguist, 2*(1).

Rosén, H.B. (1969). Israel language policy, language teaching and linguistics. *Ariel* (Jerusalem), *25,* 92–111.

Turan, Ş. (1981). *Atatürk ve ulusal dil* (Turkish: Atatürk and the National Language). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.

Türk Dil Kurumu. (1943). *Ana tüzüğü, çalişma programi ve iç tüzüğü* (Turkish: Statutes, Working Plans and Internal regulations). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.

Tur-Sinai, N.H. (1957). *Min ha-'avoda ba-millon ha-histori shel ha-lashon ha-'Ivrit* (Hebrew: The Work On the Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language). Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik.

Ülkütaşir, M.Ş. (1981). *Atatürk ve harf devrimi* (Turkish: Atatürk and the Script Reform). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.

Va'ad ha-Lashon ha-'Ivrit be-Erets Israel. (1949). *Le-Yissuda shel ha-Aqademiyya la-Lashon ha-'Ivrit* (Hebrew: Towards the Foundation of the Academy for the Hebrew Language). Jerusalem.

Velidedeoğlu et al. (1979). *Yazi devrimi* (Turkish: The Script Reform). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.

Weinstein, B. (1983). *The civic tongue: Political consequences of language choice.* New York: Longman.

Wiarda, H.J. (1985). Towards a nonethnocentric theory of development: Alternative conceptions from the Third World. In H.J. Wiarda (Ed.), *New directions in comparative politics* (pp. 127–150). Boulder, CO: Westview.

Yücel, T. (1982). *Dil devrimi ve sonuçlari* (Turkish: The Language Reform and Its Consequences). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.