

The language law of 1963 addressed both of these issues. This legislation differed from that of 1932 in that it "carried with it the explicit vision of a future in which semi-autonomous sub-nations would coexist in a federation" (Sherman Swing, 1980: 88). These laws defined three monolingual territories (Wallonia, Flanders and the German-speaking areas) and maintained the bilingual status of Brussels. The linguistic border was permanently drawn and, as a consequence, could no longer be altered following census findings. The bilingual agglomeration of Brussels was limited to its existing 19 boroughs. The legislation went as far as to specify that the language of the region had to be used for all official business documents as well as business interactions. With regard to education, these laws maintained monolingual education in each linguistic region and marked the end of the "transmutation classes." This legislation applied to both state and private educational facilities. Furthermore, in Brussels, education in the child's mother tongue was upheld and language inspectors could verify that each child attended an educational facility of the appropriate language. Parents living in Brussels had to wait until 1970 before the principle of the "*Liberte du pere de famille*" was restored, thus permitting them to once again choose the language of their children's education. These 1963 Language Laws, later upheld by the constitutional amendments of 1971 and 1980, not only reaffirmed territorial monolingualism but also stipulated penalties for infringements of the legislation.

As stated above, the nation's capital was confined to its existing 19 boroughs. However, much to the anger of the Flemish community, the laws of 1963 assigned a special administrative status to six additional boroughs situated on the periphery of the capital. These Netherlandic boroughs, known as the "*communes á facilite*," would henceforth have to provide French-speaking administration and education for their French-speaking residents. These *communes á facilite* have been, and continue to be, the center of linguistic disputes. In order to fully understand the controversy enshrouding these boroughs, one must examine the discrepancy between Brussels' official bilingual status and its primarily Francophone population.

Brussels is situated in the Netherlandic-speaking part of the province of Brabant. Prior to French rule, it harbored a predominantly Netherlandic-speaking population. However, during the French era, Brussels became increasingly more Francophone. As success within the city was to a large extent conditional upon one's knowledge of the French language, Gallicization of the population continued throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Whereas the Netherlandic-speakers comprised 66.6% of the capital's population in 1846, they represented 46% in 1910 (Vroede, 1975) and were estimated to represent only 20% in 1979 (Lefèvre, 1979).

In addition to the Frenchification of the Brussels agglomeration, the Flamings watched with growing dismay as the "oil stain" (Vroede, 1975: 71) spread to the boroughs surrounding the capital. As more and more Francophones moved into these suburbs, they began to demand French-speaking administration and education. The Flamings viewed these demands as yet

another sign of "*gebiedsroofd*" (territory theft) which had to be halted at all costs (Levy, 1978). Thus, the militants fought to maintain monolingual Netherlandic administration and education within these boroughs. Despite Flemish activism, the language laws of 1963 granted the above mentioned linguistic privileges to the six suburbs in question. In 1971, their special administrative status was revoked and the boroughs became dependent upon the Netherlandic administrative region of Hal-Vilvoorde. However, the special linguistic rights granted to their French-speaking populations were maintained and remain in vigor to date (CRISP 534: 24).

Constitutional Amendments

The language laws and constitutional amendments that followed the legislation of 1963 upheld the principle of territorial monolingualism previously introduced. However, the constitutional amendments differ from prior legislation in that they embodied in the state's fundamental law the end of Belgium as a unitary nation-state. The very structure of the state was reshaped in that the central government was no longer solely responsible for all legislative and executive acts. These amendments resulted from the pressure exerted through both the traditional party system and the Flemish and Walloon community parties. The inhabitants of Flanders, Wallonia and Brussels respectively fought to safeguard their political and economic interests.

The Constitutional Amendments of 1971 delineated the boundaries of the four linguistic territories of Wallonia, Flanders, the German area, and Brussels. Article "107 quarter" created the three economic regions of Flanders, Wallonia, and Brussels. The councils of these regions cannot legislate upon linguistic or educational issues. Rather, they focus upon such matters as economic development, the environment, urban development, and unemployment. Of relevance to the subject at hand is Article "3 ter" which recognized three Cultural Communities: the French Cultural Community, the Netherlandic Cultural Community, and the German Cultural Community. These Communities differ from the "Regions" in that the "regions are geographical concepts, whereas the communities are linguistic and cultural entities" (Fitzmaurice, 1983: 111). The French and Netherlandic Cultural Communities were endowed with Cultural Councils which have the power to pass decrees, holding the same weight as laws passed by the national government, in the following areas: national and international defense; the use and illustration of the language of that community; some aspects of language use in schools; language use in public administration with the exception of the judiciary and military domains; language use in the social relations between employers and their personnel as well as in all official business transactions. In sum, the Cultural Communities were granted the right to share with the national government the power to legislate on language matters. With regard to such Community legislation, it is not surprising that the Council of the Flemish Cultural Community has tended to pass more decrees concerning language use than the Council of the French Cultural Community.

The Constitutional Amendments of 1980 further clarified and refined the devolution of power to the community and regional levels. The Communities, the term "Cultural" having been eliminated in 1980, were granted more rights to pass decrees. The institutions of the Flemish Community and Region were combined into one. Thus, they use only one set of institutions: the Flemish Council and the Flemish Executive. The French Community and the Walloon region remained separate with their own institutions: the Council of the French Community and the Executive of the French Community, the Walloon Regional Council and the Walloon Regional Executive. With regard to Brussels, it was stipulated that the Flemish Community would oversee the capital's monolingual Netherlandic institutions whereas the French Community would look after its monolingual French institutions. The national government would be responsible for the capital's bilingual institutions, as well as for language legislation concerning the six *communes á facilitate*. Hence, the linguistic rights, granted to these boroughs by the language laws of 1963 cannot be modified by decrees of the Flemish Community Council. Furthermore, the national government remained responsible for linguistic legislation affecting the constitutionally recognized linguistic minorities contiguous to the east-west language border, as well as for the country's German-speaking area.

Conclusion

When examining the language planning activities undertaken by Belgium's government, it becomes evident that the goals of the linguistic legislation have changed over the years. As such, this legislation reflects the evolution and the complex interplay of the social, cultural, political, and economic characteristics specific to this nation-state.

Initially the language legislation stemmed from the demands of the Flemish militants seeking to defend and promote their language in the northern provinces. Their linguistic demands neither aimed to make Flanders monolingual in Netherlandic nor to impose Netherlandic in Wallonia. As such, the Flamings' demands did not initially question, nor jeopardize, the linguistic rights of the nation's Francophones.

Once the right to use Netherlandic in Flanders had been granted, the government was pressured into instituting territorial monolingualism in Flanders and Wallonia while protecting the bilingual status of Brussels. This legislation did not merely jeopardize the linguistic rights of the Francophones residing within the northern provinces but eventually led to the eradication of these privileges.

During the third wave of language planning activities, language legislation became embodied in the nation's Constitution. Due to the growing strength of the Flemish and Walloon movements, the state was restructured and the French and Netherlandic ethnolinguistic communities were granted a measure of power over language planning activities. Language

planning in Belgium is now characterized by a situation in which there is neither complete delegation of power to the various linguistic groups nor total centralization of legislative powers. It should be pointed out that throughout the second and third waves of language planning activities, Brussels has remained a bone of contention that has yet to be resolved to the satisfaction of the Flemish, Walloons, and Bruxellois.

In summary, Belgium is now constitutionally divided into four linguistic territories, three linguistic and cultural communities, and three economic regions. Presently, territorial monolingualism has made it possible for Netherlandic to be used in all of the domains in Flanders that had once been monopolized by French. Although French-Netherlandic bilingualism remains significantly more common among the inhabitants of the northern provinces as compared to their southern counterparts, the Flemish now have the option of choosing whether or not they will learn Belgium's "other language."

¹This paper was written for a class on language planning taught by Dr. Nancy Hornberger.

²Activities associated with corpus planning for French, Netherlandic, or German will not be addressed. It should be noted that speakers of these three languages look to France, Holland and Germany respectively for the linguistic norm to be adopted. Hence, corpus planning activities in Belgium have been limited.

Appendix I:
Legislation affecting language use

- 1831: Voting of the Constitution. Article 23: "The use of language shall be optional. The matter may be regulated only by law and only for acts of public authority and judicial proceedings."
- 1831: Decree stipulating that only the French version of laws has official recognition. The Netherlandic or German translations have no legal value.
- 1864: Royal decree stating that the standardized version of Dutch Netherlandic is to be adopted as the linguistic norm in Flanders.
- 1873: Netherlandic can be used in the lower courts of Flanders.
- 1878: Netherlandic can be used in public administration of Flanders.
- 1884: Postage stamps become bilingual.
- 1886: Founding of the Royal Flemish Academy of Languages and Literature in Ghent.
- 1886: Netherlandic can be used in the Belgium Parliament.
- 1888: The first Netherlandic speech is made in the Belgian Chamber.
- 1893: Constitutional Amendment which establishes a general, multiple franchise. Every male citizen of 25 is granted at least one vote. Depending upon property owned and professional qualifications, each voter can have up to 3 votes.
- 1898: The Equality Act: French and Netherlandic texts of law and royal decrees are granted equal legal validity.
- 1918: King Albert's speech in which he assures the Flemish population that both national languages would be treated equally, and that the issue of a Netherlandic-speaking university would be addressed.
- 1919: The treaty of Versailles grants Belgium the German-speaking areas to the east of Liège.
- 1921: Constitutional Amendment: universal equal male suffrage is instituted. Proportional representation and compulsory voting are maintained.
- 1921: Language laws stating that all business conducted between Ministers and provincial authorities has to take place in the language of the region.
The military forces are divided into two sections: one French section and one Netherlandic section.
- 1928: Voting of a bill concerning the language used in the army. French-speaking and Netherlandic-speaking recruits are placed in different units. The recruits receive their training in the language that they commonly use.
- 1929: A general amnesty is proclaimed for activists.
- 1931: A member of parliament makes the first proposal concerning a constitutional amendment which would make the unitary state into a federal state.

1932: Language laws are passed stipulating:

- the creation of two monolingual regions: Flanders and Wallonia; and one bilingual region: Brussels;
- that public administration, army, and law courts would use only Netherlandic in Flanders and only French in Wallonia;
- that the administration of the nation's capital was to be bilingual;
- that each government ministry would include French and Flemish sections;
- the official recognition of the language frontier;
- that census findings would be used in determining the language to be used in administration.

No penalties are stipulated for infringement of these laws.

1935: Flemish courts of law would use Netherlandic. The law stipulates that court proceedings using French in Flanders would not be considered valid.

1938: Royal decree creates two advisory cultural councils (Flemish and French).

1938: Law stressing monolingualism in the army.

1947: Last census including questions concerning languages spoken. Results released in 1954.

1959: The government puts into effect its economic recovery program.

1960: Radio and television services are separated into two autonomous sections: BRT (Netherlandic) and RTB (French).

1961: Law stipulating that no more questions concerning language use would be asked in census questionnaires.

1962: Law concerning the Belgium diplomatic corps. A special effort will be made to hire Netherlandic-speaking diplomats.

1962: Bill concerning the language border. Certain areas are transferred from Flanders to Wallonia, and other areas are transferred from Wallonia to Flanders.

1963: Language laws stipulating:

- the creation of three monolingual regions: Flanders, Wallonia, and the German areas in which all public administration is to take place in the language of that region;
- that Brussels remains bilingual;
- that the six "*Communes périphériques*" (six *communes à facilité*) are granted a special administrative status. The boroughs' Francophone inhabitants are granted special linguistic rights in terms of French-speaking education and administration;
- that the language border would no longer change because of census findings.

1967: The constitution is officially translated into Netherlandic.

1971: Constitutional amendments specify that:

- the four linguistic territories are constitutionally recognized;
- Belgium be divided into three economic regions: Flanders, Wallonia, and Brussels.
- Belgium be divided into three cultural communities: French, Netherlandic, and German.

- Cultural autonomy is granted to the French community, the Netherlandic community, and the German community.
- henceforth the cabinet has to have the same number of French-speaking and Netherlandic-speaking ministers.

- 1971:** The special administrative status of the six *communes à facilité* is revoked. However, the special linguistic rights granted to their French-speaking populations are maintained.
- 1973:** Decree of the Flemish Cultural Council stipulating that all business in Flanders should be conducted in Netherlandic.
- 1977:** Each of the three regions (Flanders, Wallonia, Brussels) is granted considerable economic autonomy. Each region is granted its own assembly.
- 1980:** Constitutional amendments which give more power to each of the three communities.

Appendix II:
Language laws and education

- 1835: Louvain University is officially opened as a monolingual French institute of higher education.
- 1842: Primary schools in Flanders are allowed to teach in Netherlandic.
- 1850: Flemish secondary school system has to teach Netherlandic as the second language.
- 1883: Netherlandic becomes the sole language of instruction during the first two years of secondary schooling in Flanders. Instruction in French has to be provided for those students desirous of continuing their education at the university level. Instruction in French has to be provided for students who did not speak Netherlandic.
- 1890: Louvain University introduces its first Netherlandic courses.
- 1910: Law stipulating that private Catholic schools in Flanders have to use Netherlandic when teaching certain subjects in the secondary schools.
- 1914: Schooling becomes compulsory.
- 1916-1918: The Germans open Ghent University as a monolingual Netherlandic institute, known as "von Bissing's University."
- 1921: All *athenees* (secondary schools) in Flanders have to provide a Netherlandic section.
- 1921: Education at both the primary and the secondary levels are to be conducted in the language of the region. Brussels has to ensure that Netherlandic-speaking schools are available for Netherlandic-speaking students.
- 1923: The University of Ghent becomes bilingual.
- 1926: Netherlandic becomes the obligatory language of instruction in the Flemish lower secondary school level.
- 1930: University of Ghent becomes a monolingual Netherlandic institute of higher education.
- 1932: Education laws are passed stipulating that:
- primary education has to be given in the language of the region;
 - the regional language become the vehicular language of secondary schools;
 - transmutation classes are permitted;
 - children in Brussels would be taught in their mother tongue;
 - the first modern language of all schools is to be the language of the other region;
 - Walloon sections of secondary schools are allowed to continue;
 - The French-speaking minority in Flanders keep their linguistic rights.
- 1963: The Ministry of Education is separated into a French ministry and a Netherlandic ministry.
- 1963: Language Laws are passed stipulating that:
- regional monolingualism is mandatory for both state and private schools;
 - transmutation classes are eradicated;
 - children residing in Brussels would be educated in their mother tongue.

- 1966:** The French and Netherlandic sections of Louvain University become autonomous.
- 1968:** The linguistic disputes concerning the University of Louvain lead to the fall of Vanden Boeynants' government. It is decided that the French section of the university would move to a new campus in the French section of the province.
- 1968:** European Court of Human Rights decides that the Belgian government has the right to impose monolingualism in education.
- 1969:** The Free University of Brussels splits into two separate monolingual universities: the U.L.B. (French), and the V.U.B. (Netherlandic).
- 1971:** Parents living in Brussels can choose their children's language of education.

References

- Augustinus Ter Hoeven, P.J. (1978). The social basis of Flemish nationalism. International Journal fo the Sociology of Language. 15, 21-33.
- De Schryver, R. (1981). The Belgian revolution and the emergence of Belgium's biculturalism. In A. Lijphart (Ed.), Conflict and Coexistence in Belgium. Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, University of California, pp. 13-33.
- De Smet, W. (1974). L'emploi des langues dans l'enseignement universitaire in Belgique. Monda Lingua-Probl. Vol. 6: 95-106.
- Fitzmaurice, J. (1983). The Politics of Belgium: Crisis and Compromise in a Plural Society. London: C. Hurst and Company.
- Gérard-Libois, J., and Mabilie, X. (1981). Belgian electoral politics. In A. Lijphart (Ed.), Conflict and Coexistence in Belgium. Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, University of California, pp. 127-138.
- Gutmans, T. (1969). Langues et ethnies in Belgique. Monda Lingua-Probl. Vol. 1, 116-119.
- Gutmans, T. (1973). L'autonomie culturelle en pays flamand. Monda Lingua-Probl. Vol. 5, 104-106.
- Haegendoren, M. van (1969). The origins of language shift in Flanders. Monda Lingua-Probl. Vol. 1: 31-36.
- Haegendoren, M. van (1970). Belgium and its double language boundary. Monda Lingua-Probl. Vol. 2: 17-20.
- Huggett, F. (1969). Modern Belgium. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers.
- Kossmann, E. (1978). The Low Countries 1780-1940. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lefèvre, J. A. (1979). Nationalisme linguistique et identification linguistique: Le cas do la Belgique. International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 37-58.
- Lefèvre, J. A. (1971). Les Six Communes 'A Facilites' do la Peripherie Bruxelloise (Situation 1970-1971). Courrier Hebdomadaire 535 Bruxelles: CRISP.
- Levy, P. M. (1978). Linguistic and semantic borders in Belgium. International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 15, 9-19.
- Louckx, F. (1978). Linguistic ambivalence of the Brussels indigenous population. International Journal of the Sociology of Language 15, 53-61.
- Lyon, M. (1971). Belgium. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Mabilie, X. (1986). Histoire Politique de la Belgique. Brussels: CRISP.
- Mallinson, V. (1970). Belgium. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Mughan, A. (1978). Modernization and ethnic conflict in Belgium. Political Studies Vol. 27, No. 1: 21-37.

- Polasky, J. (1981). Liberalism and biculturalism. In A. Lijphart (Ed.), Conflict and Coexistence in Belgium. Berkeley: Institute of International Studies, University of California, pp. 34-45.
- Rousseau, F. (1977). Wallonie, Terre Romance. Charleroi: Edition Jules Destree.
- Ruys, M. (1981). Les Flamands, un Peuple en Mouvement, une Nation en Devenir. Belgium: Editions Lannoo, Tielt et Bussum.
- Sherman Swing, E. (1980). Bilingualism and Linguistic Segregation in the Schools of Brussels. Québec: Centre International de Recherche sur le Bilinguisme.
- Urwin, D. (1970). Social cleavages and political parties in Belgium: Problems of institutionalization. Political Studies Vol 18, No. 3: 320-340.
- Verdoodt, A. (1978). Belgium. International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 15: 5-8.
- Vilrocx, J. (1978). The Flemish elite in an embattled situation. International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 15: 61-70.
- Vroede, M. de. (1975). The Flemish Movement in Belgium. Brussels: Flemish Cultural Council.
- Wardaugh, R. (1987). Languages in Competition. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Wilmotte, M. (1912). La Culture Francaise en Belgique. Paris: Librairie Ancienne .
- Witte, E. (1984). Cinq ans de recherches se rapportant au problème de Bruxelles. In Witte, E. et al (Eds.), Le Bilinguisme en Belgique: Le Cas de Bruxelles. Brussels: Editions de l'Université de Bruxelles.