



universität
wien

MASTER THESIS

Titel der Master Thesis / Title of the Master's Thesis

„The discourse on language(s) in the EU: language and multilingualism in the Europe 2020 strategy“

verfasst von / submitted by

Maximilian Gruber, BA BA

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Advanced International Studies (M.A.I.S.)

Wien 2020 / Vienna 2020

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt
Postgraduate programme code as it appears
on the student record sheet:

A 992 940

Universitätslehrgang lt. Studienblatt
Postgraduate programme as it appears on the
student record sheet:

Internationale Studien / International Studies

Betreut von / Supervisor:

Prof. Julien Navarro, PhD



diplomatische
akademie wien
Vienna School of International Studies
École des Hautes Études Internationales de Vienne

Vienna, 17 July 2020.

On my honor of a student of the Diplomatische Akademie Wien, I submit this work in good faith and pledge that I have neither given nor received unauthorized assistance on in.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Maximilian Gruber', with a stylized, flowing script. The signature is positioned above the printed name.

Maximilian Gruber

*This is dedicated to language.
My best friend,
my last resort,
my first love.*

Abstract

The European Union and its predecessor organizations have dealt with the question of what the languages of the Union should be ever since their emergence in the 1950s. Currently, in a EU of 27 Member States, there are 24 official and working languages, though the linguistic reality of the EU institutions tells a different story: several EU institutions have reduced their actual working languages for a variety of reasons, and therefore do not live up to the Union's ideal of multilingualism.

This paper looks at recent developments with regards to European language and multilingualism policy (EULMP). After a theoretical overview on crucial linguistic concepts and a presentation of the historical and legal context of the language question in the EU, this paper will provide a descriptive analysis of the Union's current development strategy, *Europe 2020*, and of salient documents that were drafted in its wake. The goal is to see what concepts are relevant in the EU's EULMP discourse and what argumentative background they have.

Zusammenfassung

Die Europäische Union und ihre Vorgängerorganisationen setzen sich bereits seit ihrer Entstehung in den 1950er Jahren mit der Frage nach den Sprachen der Union auseinander. Gegenwärtig gelten 24 Sprachen als Amts- und Arbeitssprachen einer EU mit 27 Mitgliedsländern, obwohl die sprachliche Realität der EU-Institutionen eine andere Geschichte erzählt: Eine Reihe von EU-Institutionen hat die Zahl ihrer tatsächlichen Arbeitssprachen aus einer Reihe von Gründen reduziert, sodass sie nunmehr nicht dem von der Union angestrebten Ideal des Multilingualismus gerecht werden.

Diese Arbeit wirft einen Blick auf rezente Entwicklungen in Bezug auf die Europäische Sprach- und Mehrsprachigkeitspolitik. Nach einem theoretischen Überblick über relevante linguistische Konzepte und einer Präsentation des historischen und rechtlichen Kontextes der Sprachenfrage in der EU, richtet sich diese Arbeit auf eine deskriptive Analyse der aktuellen Entwicklungsstrategie der Union, *Europe 2020*, sowie von hervorstechenden Dokumenten, die in ihr nachfolgten. Ziel ist zu sehen, welche Konzepte von Relevanz für den Sprach- und Mehrsprachigkeitsdiskurs der EU sind und welchen argumentativen Hintergrund diese aufweisen.

Abrégé

L'Union Européenne ainsi que les organisations qui l'ont précédée s'occupent depuis leur fondation aux années 50 de la question des langues de l'Union. À présent, on compte 24 langues officielles et de travail dans une Union de 28 États membres, mais la réalité linguistique des institutions européennes raconte une tout autre histoire : plusieurs institutions européennes ont réduit le nombre de langues effectivement en usage pour une série de raisons, et, par conséquent, elles ne sont pas à la hauteur de l'idéal multilingue de l'Union.

Ce mémoire s'occupe des développements récents par rapport à la politique linguistique et multilingue de l'UE. Après un panorama théorique des pertinents concepts linguistiques, et une présentation du contexte historique et légal de la question de langues de l'UE, ce travail se penchera sur une analyse descriptive de l'actuelle stratégie de développement de l'Union, *Europe 2020*, ainsi que d'un nombre de documents qui l'ont suivie. Le but est de voir quels sont les concepts de pertinence pour le discours linguistique et multilingue de l'UE et quel fondation argumentative ils représentent.

1. Introduction	2
2. Theoretical reflections / literature review	3
3. Historical and legal context	17
3.1 What's covered by Regulation No 1...	17
3.2 ... and what's left out	21
3.3 Democracy	24
4. Growth above everything: Europe 2020	30
4.1 Sample analysis	40
4.2 Social inclusion	42
4.3 Citizen's rights & legal system	42
4.4 Research, development and innovation	43
4.5 Culture	46
4.6 Education	48
4.7 EULMP	53
4.8 Miscellaneous	59
5. Conclusion	60
6. Bibliography	64
7. Annex	71

1. Introduction

Polish MEP Danuta Hübner was quick to state that English would no longer be an official language of the EU, after Brexit had become a reality for both the UK and the Union after the referendum in 2016.¹ The EU Commission was equally quick to deny this assumption and claimed as early as June 2016 that English would not cease to have official status within the European Union.² The EU and its languages are nonetheless a frequent cause of friction on the diplomatic level. In 2018, French envoy Philippe Légi-se-Costa walked out of the Coreper meeting on the EU long term budget because documents were provided only in English.³ Tensions of this kind arise because of the divergence between the EU's theoretically multilingual approach that recognizes 24 official and working languages, and the actual linguistic practice within EU's institutions that de facto reduce the number of working languages for various reasons.

It is this divergence that this paper wants to take a closer look at. The main question it tries to answer is what concepts are dominant in the EU's discourse on language and multilingualism policy (EULMP), and what argumentation they rely on. To do so, we will in the first place provide an extensive review of the existing literature on the matter and clarify certain concepts with regards to language policy and multilingualism that are crucial for the understanding of the existing discourse. These concepts include the widespread notion of language regime, language ideology and multilingualism itself. In a second step, it will be important to take a look at the historic and legal context of EULMP to understand the current situation in which the EU's institutions do not or cannot entirely live up to the Union's overall inscription to multilingualism as a guiding principle. In the first place, we will provide an overview on the historic development of EU politics concerning the Union's languages. In a second step, we will also take a look at the current legal situation itself to see why the European Union has come to the point to have 24 office and working languages. This will also include a look at the EU's

¹ Goulard, Hortense: „English will not be an official EU language after Brexit, says senior MEP“, from: politico.eu, 27 June 2016.

² European Commission, Representation in Ireland: EU languages: Statement on behalf of the European Commission Representation in Ireland, from: ec.europa.eu, 27 June 2016.

³ Baume, Maïa de la / Herszenshorn, David: „English only? Try au revoir, French ambassador tells Council“, from: politico.eu, 27 April 2018.

approach to democracy in order to understand what ‚democratic‘ can mean with regards to Union action in general, and with regards to EULMP in particular. Finally, we shall provide a descriptive analysis of the latest EU development strategy, *Europe 2020*, to see what have been the elements, approaches and goals of the Union’s overall policy program during the last ten years and what role multilingualism and language skills play therein. Furthermore, we will analyze a number of documents issued by the Council of Ministers, the institution that, as we shall see, is mainly responsible for the implementation of the strategy. Our corpus has been collected via the eur-lex.eu database; documents, unless indicated differently, were obtained via that resource.

2. Theoretical reflections / literature review

The current EU development agenda, *Europe 2020*, is not the first one of its kind. Its predecessor was the so-called Lisbon Strategy, which covered the decade 2000-2010 - a decade that was most notably characterized by a series of enlargements of the European Union. These enlargements came along with numerous challenges that added to the many construction sites an ever more economic and political union was working on already. In the first place, the main challenges seemingly lay in the economic sphere: eight of the ten countries that joined the Union in 2004 formerly belonged to the Soviet block or Yugoslavia respectively. Romania and Bulgaria joined in 2007. Besides their communist past, these countries had and have in common their eligibility for structural funds of the EU. That is to say they are all home to regions with a GDP per capita lower than 75% of the EU average.⁴ However, there was also a linguistic dimension to these enlargements, since the common practice of introducing each Member State’s national language as an official language of the Union (based on Regulation 1, 1958) was also put to use in the before mentioned cases, culminating in a total of 23 official EU languages.⁵

The developments of this decade with regards to language policies have been subject of extensive research, most notably in political science and linguistics. In their 2011 ar-

⁴ Map: Annex 1.

⁵ Since Croatia joined in 2013, the EU has had 24 official languages.

ticle, Wodak and Krzyżanowski analyze the links between political strategies and language policies with regards to the European Union between 2000 and 2010. Their main focus is on EULMP, the European Language and Multilingualism Policy, and its interplay with the Lisbon Strategy.⁶ By applying a discourse-historic approach in the tradition of conceptual history (or, as they specify, the germanophone *Begriffsgeschichte*), they first focus on the notion of **language ideologies**. They perceive language policies “as regulatory tools governing how languages should coexist and be used in specific social political and economic contexts” and as “inherent representations of different language ideologies, i.e. beliefs, visions and conceptions of the role of certain language(s) held by different (most commonly institutional) social actors”.⁷ These presuppositions, they argue in reference to Susan Gal, are crucial for the framing and assessment of linguistic practices by various social actors and groups.⁸ These practices are constantly redefined and negotiated in debates on language(s) that express and re-frame language ideologies.⁹ Though in substance they refrain from the notion, the authors agree that the EU has become a “typical late-modern *sociolinguistic regime*”¹⁰ whose perception of its own multilingualism, no matter how officially inscribed it may be, is rather constrained. As far as the increased linguistic diversity of the Union is concerned, this sociolinguistic regime has its expression in top down processes of standardization similar to those applied by nation-states with regards to the relationship of their national- and minority languages; the case of the EU, however, can be seen as one of multilingual standardization.¹¹ According to the authors, the language ideologies as represented within the Lisbon Strategy were heavily influenced by the concept of a Knowledge Based Economy (KBE), channeling the discourse around language policies in the direction of “employment policies, employability, and the skills and tools which seem to be necessary to achieve economic targets”, aspects to which other language-

⁶ Krzyżanowski / Wodak: 2011, 115-136.

⁷ Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 118.

⁸ Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 119; Gal 2006, 13.

⁹ Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 119.; Blommaert 1999, 1.

¹⁰ Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 118.

¹¹ Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 119; Gal 2010.

related values are subordinated.¹² This development can be seen within a larger process of politicization of the European Union after the end of Soviet influence and the subsequent democratization and economic opening of former socialist states. This process was echoed by voices that stated a democratic deficit within the EU as well as a certain distance between its institutions and its citizens and, because of that, rising Euro-skepticism. After a series of revised treaties (Amsterdam 1996, Nice 2000) “deemed insufficient by the European public”¹³, the Union initiated some more pro-active measures such as the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, and, finally, an attempt to draft a constitutional treaty. The rejection by the French and Dutch voters lead to another revision, the result of which was the Lisbon Treaty that has been in force since 2009.¹⁴ However, economic considerations remained central within EU policy, with employment and competitiveness as the main targets. The White Paper on Growth, Competitiveness and Jobs in 1994 and the Luxembourg Employment Agenda in 1997 are the most evident expressions of this orientation, followed by policies aiming to raise the EU’s internal efficiency and external competitiveness, culminating in the Lisbon Strategy in 2000.¹⁵

In their analysis of the *Lisbon Strategy* and its implementation, the authors focus on several key texts published between 2000 and 2010, containing both the original document of the Strategy, the Presidency Conclusions of the EU Council Meeting in Lisbon held on 23–24 March 2000¹⁶, and the re-assessments of the Strategy that followed, such as the Kok-report of 2004¹⁷. Overall, there are three policy areas in which the *Lisbon Strategy* sought improvement: in the first place, its goals lay in the economic sphere, where the Strategy aimed at making the EU the globally most competitive

¹² Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 119.

¹³ Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 120.

¹⁴ For further information on the failed constitution cf. Krzyżanowski, Michał / Oberhuber, Florian: *(Un)Doing Europe: Discourses and practices of negotiating the EU constitution*. Brussels: 2007.

¹⁵ Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 121.

¹⁶ European Council: *Presidency conclusions—Lisbon. European council 23–24 March 2000*. Brussels: 2000; from europarl.europa.eu.

¹⁷ Kok Report: *Facing the challenge: The Lisbon strategy for growth and employment. Report from the high level group chaired by Wim Kok*. Luxembourg: 2004.

knowledge-based economy.¹⁸ Second, the fight against social exclusion was also a central point, aiming at a modernization of the European social model.¹⁹ Third, ecological policies already played a role, since the *Strategy* aimed to create policies that ensured both economic growth and ecological sustainability.²⁰ It is particularly the second point, social cohesion, that conjointly with aspects regarding European society as a whole and the European Social Model (ESM) in particular are of relevance with regards to languages and multilingualism according to the author's analysis.²¹ However, social cohesion gradually disappeared from the analyzed documents after the Kok report. Contemporarily, languages and multilingualism became sort of instrumentalized in other ways. Overall, the authors distinguish three different stages of EULMP under the impact of the Lisbon Strategy.

As their semantic analysis of key documents shows, there was a first stage (2000-2004) in which multilingualism was not discussed as such, but rather was part of a more general and conceptual discourse about languages, language learning and teaching, as well as language skills.²² Based on statistical data provided by Eurobarometer, "the profiling [of] Europe's linguistic diversity" and the development of language-related policy fields are targeted for the most part. While language skills are semantically linked to people's ability to participate in the single market in that period, there are also documents that reinforce the idea of languages and linguistic diversity as part of Europe's culture and civilization, thus assuming the importance of these aspects for the construction of a European identity.²³ A notable text excerpt stems, for instance, from Decision No. 1934/2000/EC of the European Council and Parliament that states: "All the European languages, in their spoken and written forms, are equal in value and

¹⁸ Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 122; European Council 2000, pt.5.

¹⁹ Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 122.

²⁰ *ibid.*

²¹ Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 123; the original Lisbon-strategy, however, does not speak of multilingualism at all and of languages (in form of foreign language skills) only once. The authors' conclusion thus results from their analysis of subsequent policy papers and official documents issued in the wake of the Lisbon-strategy.

²² Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 126.

²³ Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 127.

dignity from the cultural point of view and form an integral part of European cultures and civilisation.”²⁴ Although the authors do not examine this statement in detail, it is linguistically quite considerable; first of all, all European languages, with no further limitation on national-languages and thus including minority languages, are regarded with equality. However, this equality exists only “from the cultural point of view”, clearly excluding the political sphere. Despite occasional statements like this, the aspect of languages as professional skills remains prevalent in the discourse of this first stage.

In a second phase that the authors localize after the intermediary Kok report (2005-2007), multilingualism received a policy relevant definition for the first time in EU documents, as illustrated by the key text “‘The New Framework Strategy for Multilingualism’ issued by the European Commission (2005).²⁵ It is also in this second period that a multilingualism portfolio was added to the responsibilities of the Commissioner on Education and Culture. While almost adopting the academic distinction between personal and social multilingualism, the Commission’s text urges member states to take measures to promote mostly individual multilingualism because of its importance for economic competitiveness and prosperity, an idea clearly fitting a KBE-oriented discourse.²⁶ The idea of a multilingualism „from the point of view of a ‚multilingual economy‘ is linked to ‘multilingual society’ and ‘multilingualism in the Commission’s contacts with the Citizens’”²⁷, which is where a ‘democratic aspect ‘ comes in: multilingualism is connected not only to participation in the single market, but also to participation in political processes. In the documents of this period, this participation is however a one-sided one, since it is predominantly the EU’s institutions’ commitment to fulfill EU citizens’ right to communicate in their (national) languages with them that these texts are occupied with.²⁸

²⁴ *ibid.*; European Parliament/European Council: . *Decision No. 1934/2000/EC of the European parliament and of the council of 17 July 2000 on the European year of languages 2001*. Official Journal of the European Communities L/232/1 of 14/9/2000.

²⁵ Document 52005DC0596: Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions - A New Framework Strategy for Multilingualism. European Commission: 22/11/2005.

²⁶ Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 128.

²⁷ Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 128.

²⁸ Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 129.

The third period of the analyzed decade is initiated by the creation of a distinct portfolio of multilingualism in 2007. Contrary to what could be expected from that step, this period in its initial phase is characterized by framing EULMP exclusively via the Lisbon Strategy and, thus, economic arguments, while the democracy-related discourse is muted. Also, the importance of language skills as professional skills returns, as for instance in the Commission's "Framework for the European survey on language competences"²⁹. Around the year 2008, multilingualism was conceptualized in a much broader way, starting with a Public Consultation on Multilingualism that covered the whole EU.³⁰ This consultation displayed a huge amount of dissatisfaction of EU citizens with the economic orientation of EULMP.³¹ Accordingly, a document issued by the Commission in 2008 called for "the reinstatement of social and intercultural aspects of multilingualism."³² In this document, the valorization of minority languages played a role for the first time, and the authors also notice a 'democratic' element in the references to the overcoming language barriers in local communities. The standard KBE-related topics of life-long learning and multilingualism as a factor of economic prosperity are also present; however, new media and technologies are also linked to multilingualism by the combination of both 'economic' and 'democratic' arguments.³³ Finally, the document identifies also "external dimensions of multilingualism"³⁴; it acknowledges Europe's experience with its multilingual environment and states that it is not something that only Europe has to offer; linguistic diversity and multilingualism are not uniquely European phenomena and, thus, the respect for diversity and the promotion of language skills are considered to be of value for the EU's foreign relations. The authors draw a connection to the general policy of the EU at that time that consisted of a restructuring

²⁹ Document 52007DC0184: Communication from the Commission to the Council: Framework for the European survey on language competences. European Commission: 13/04/2007.

³⁰ European Commission: Outcomes of the European commission's public consultation on multilingualism, 14 September–15 November 2007. Brussels: 2008.

³¹ Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 130.

³² European Commission: Multilingualism: An asset for Europe and a shared commitment. Brussels: 2008, 18/09/2008b; cf. Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 130.

³³ Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 131.

³⁴ European Commission 2008, 14.

process of its foreign policies, most notably by the revaluation of a High Representative of the EU by the Lisbon Treaty in 2009. Although the authors take this broadening of the discourse at the very end of the period analyzed by them into account, they assess that most of the provisions going beyond the Lisbon Strategy had not yet been implemented by the time of their publication - a failure which they attribute to the 2008 Financial Crisis and the merging of the Multilingualism Portfolio with the Portfolio on Education, Culture and Youth (2010).

All in all the article has an interesting approach and some even more interesting findings. However, concepts such as 'language policy' are not convincingly defined and others such as the EULMP are taken more or less for granted. The same can be said of 'democracy' or 'democratic' elements that the authors identify within their corpus. Only as far as 'language ideologies' are concerned, the article offers more precise theorization.

The concept of language policy, however, is crucial for our analysis and therefore demands some further explanation. From what we have seen so far, it is not clear what exactly is meant by language policy neither in theory nor in practice. A comprehensive assessment covering several existing definitions of the term stems from Joseph Lo Bianco (2010). Lo Bianco approximates language policy to **language planning** by citing a standard definition by Cooper (1989), according to which „[l]anguage planning refers to deliberate efforts to influence the behavior of others with respect to the acquisition, structure, or functional allocation of their language codes“³⁵. Clearly, there are different layers of the concept of language planning within this broad definition. „[D]eliberate efforts to influence“ the linguistic behavior of others can be understood to cover political measures with a legal dimension, as for instance the attribution of a certain status of (a) language(s) within political entities such as states or supranational organizations. However, there is also a more ‚practical‘ dimension to this definition if we think of such deliberate efforts as measures within educational systems, such as language teaching, which makes schools a core environment for language planning. A narrower definition explicitly looking at **language policy** as such is provided by McGroarty (1997). Accor-

³⁵ Cooper, Robert: *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: 1989, 45.; cf. Lo Bianco, Joseph: "Language Policy and Planning", in: Hornberger N.H. / McKay, S.L.: *Sociolinguistics and language education*. Clevedon: 2010, 145.

ding to this definition, „[l]anguage policy can be defined as the combination of official decisions and prevailing public practices related to language-education and use“³⁶. Again, what we called the ‚practical‘ dimension of language planning and policy is underlined here in relation to language-education.

In other models, the language behavior of individuals „such as self correction, personal verbal monitoring and management of one’s expressive alternatives“ are taken into account, thereby introducing a psychological dimension.³⁷ By opening to individual language behavior, political elites and authorities acting intentionally and deliberately are no longer the only agents of language planning and policy as in a more traditional definition, since the agency of speakers altogether is taken into account.

This, however, bears the risk of being too broad a definition, since a full analysis of speakers’ language behavior is not imaginable even with the most sophisticated quantitative or qualitative methodology at least for the scope of our analysis.

While some authors make no distinction between language policy and planning, others perceive language planning as being part of language policy, thus as only one expression of policies that somehow target languages.³⁸ A frequent distinction is also made between the relevance of language policy for the status of a specific language and the subsequent impact of language planning resulting from that policy on this language.³⁹ Yet, another approach regards language policy as the outcome, and not the source, of language planning.⁴⁰ Language planning here includes three fields of activity: status, acquisition and corpus. These are also the three types of language planning as represented in Hornberger’s „integrative framework“⁴¹ of language policy and planning in which she combines several existing theories about the issue as well as a whole nomenclature for the types and goals of language policy and planning.⁴²

³⁶ McGroarty 1997, 1.

³⁷ Lo Bianco 2010, 146.

³⁸ cf. Berthoud/ Lüdi 2011, 479.

³⁹ cf. Grin 1998, 18.

⁴⁰ cf. Kaplan / Baldauf 1997, xi.

⁴¹ Hornberger 2006, 6-11, 24.

⁴² Matrix: Annex 2.

As far as the types of language planning are concerned in her matrix, status planning englobes those measures that try to establish certain functions for languages, whereas corpus planning targets the „adequacy of the form or structure of languages“⁴³. Acquisition planning on the other hand comprises ‚educational‘ measures in the broadest sense of the meaning, encompassing both „means of creating or improving opportunity or incentive to learn them“⁴⁴. However, the matrix also provides a horizontal axis that represents a distinction made in early literature on language planning. The distinction here lies not in types of language planning, but in two different approaches to it. These are policy planning on the one and cultivation planning on the other hand. Policy planning is understood as an approach where language planning targets the formal aspects of languages, whereas the functional aspects are dealt with from the cultivation approach. The distinction between policy and status planning on the one, and cultivation and corpus planning on the other hand is not obvious at first sight. It becomes clearer if we look at the goals of language planning that Hornberger identifies by combining the two axes. What is particularly important for our analysis is the intersection of status planning with the horizontal axis. Here, Hornberger distinguishes as possible goals of a policy planning approach the officialization and nationalization of languages as well as the standardization of their status, the latter of which can also include the proscription of languages.⁴⁵ Coming from a cultivation approach to status planning, language policy and planning can target the revival of languages, their maintenance and spread, as well as interlingual communication, both on the internal or domestic and the international level.⁴⁶ Goals emerging from the intersection of acquisition planning and the horizontal axis, contain among other things foreign language education, mass media language and languages at work.

Another useful distinction can be made between explicit and implicit language policies.⁴⁷ While explicit language policies comprise legislation that directly targets the

⁴³ Hornberger 2006, 6.

⁴⁴ Hornberger 2006, 6.

⁴⁵ Hornberger 2006, 9.

⁴⁶ Hornberger 2006, 8.

⁴⁷ Knechtelsdorfer 2013, 5; Berthoud / Lüdi 2011, 479; Kremnitz 1994, 80.

status or prescribes the use of languages and defines linguistic rights, implicit language policies do not come along as legislation in the first place. They are measures that for instance push the dominance of a certain language indirectly. As far as the European Union is concerned, both concepts seem equally important.

So far we have come to see several approaches to the issue of language policies. Very connected to that term is the notion of **language regime**, which in every day language as well as in political and administrative terminology is used to describe the language-centered guidelines that regulate the usage of different languages in institutional contexts.⁴⁸ An example for this would be the rules within EU institutions from and into which languages translations are provided. A frequent distinction here is made between a symmetric and an asymmetric language regime; whereas a symmetric regime as far as the EU is concerned means translations from all 24 official languages into all 24 official languages, an asymmetric regime describes a situation in which more languages are spoken in a meeting or reunion than translations provided. Though this definition and the distinction between symmetric and asymmetric can be of use, it is too unsharp as to serve as a scientific concept of language regime - as we have seen, not all language policies are explicit which indicates that there must be something to a language regime that goes beyond mere guidelines about language usage. It nonetheless remains a definition often found in academic literature. In her 2012 article „Democracy and linguistic justice in the European Union“ Buchmüller-Codoni refers to different aspects of the language situation in the EU as language regime. The article, as its title indicates, targets mostly the connection between linguistic justice and democracy and the future role of the concepts of both multilingualism and *lingua franca*, thus the communicative needs of an ever closer political, social and economic union, aspects at which we shall have a closer look at a later stage. Her more specific research question is as to „what a fair language regime would look like and whether having only one official language would be tolerable with respect to the democratic principles of the Union.“⁴⁹ However, it is crucial to see that whereas the author does use a more or less consistent concept of multilingualism and even provides a theoretical approximation to

⁴⁸ Busch 2013, 135.

⁴⁹ Buchmüller-Codoni, Catherine: „Democracy and linguistic justice in the European Union“, in: *Living Reviews in Democracy* 3 (2012), retrieved from <https://cis.ethz.ch/>; 2012, 1.

the concept of *lingua franca*, this is not the case when she speaks of language regimes. On the one hand, she identifies the situation of „23 official and working languages“⁵⁰ as the EU’s language regime.⁵¹ According to the author, an example for this regime in practice and on the institutional level is the fact that any Member of the European Parliament (MEP) has the right to address the assembly in any of the official and working languages of the Union. It is here where according to Buchmüller-Codoni the dimension of multilingualism, a principle of the EU in its approach to the linguistic diversity of its member states, becomes problematic, given the immense financial resources that are needed in order for an institution like the European Parliament to be able to provide translation and interpretation services.⁵² On the other hand, she also calls language regime or, more precisely, „actual language regime“⁵³, what she identifies as the outcome of a game of balance of power between the economically and politically most influential states within the EU, that is to say the practice to use only three languages (English, French, German) as actual working languages within the Council and the Commission, for example.

In either case, the notion of language regime is restricted to institutional sets of rules and divergent uses from these rule sets. Many other scholars both in political science and law studies operate with the same narrow definition, and even within sociolinguistics some scholars rely on it, for the sake of simplicity, but to the detriment of theoretical sharpness.⁵⁴ Others highlight the factors that go beyond the mere institutional sphere. For Linda Cardinal and Selma Sontag, a language regime is situated at the

⁵⁰ Croatia joined the EU in 2013 which is why its national language is not considered in the text.

⁵¹ Buchmüller-Codoni 2012, 1. Since the article was published before 2013, Croatian is not listed as an official and working language of the EU.

⁵² Buchmüller-Codoni 2012, 2-3.

⁵³ Buchmüller-Codoni 2012,

⁵⁴ For political science cf. eg.: Kraus, Peter / Kazlauskaitė-Gürbüz, Rūta: "Addressing linguistic diversity in the European Union: Strategies and dilemmas", in: *Ethnicities* 14(4), 2014, 517-538, here page 525; Graziadei, Michele: „Law, Language and Multilingualism in Europe: The Call for a New Legal Culture“, in: Šarčević, Susan (ed.): *Language and Culture in EU Law. Multidisciplinary Perspectives*. New York: 2015, 17-31, here page 17 & 18; Volman, Yvo: „The Lisbon Treaty and Linguistic Diversity: Policy and Practice in the European Institutions“, in: *European Studies* 29, 2012, 37-56, here 39.

conjunction of state intervention in the field of language and the linguistic practices of people.⁵⁵ A linguistic regime conceived like this gives coherence to and systematizes the different elements related to language within a political entity. Consequently, the authors assume several dimensions of a language regime, from the constitutional and legal framework concerning languages in a given state or political entity, to language legislation and language rights, whether it is in education, the media, services or in the health and justice system.⁵⁶ They stress the importance of making a clear distinction between the language regime and its multidimensional components: whereas linguistic legislation and language policy and planning refer to state action in the field of language policies, a language regime comprises both state or political intervention and the representations of language in a given society. This approach to the concept of language regime allows for a better understanding of the relations between a political entity and the speakers of a language / certain languages in a specific context.⁵⁷

It is in this sense we can also read Eugène Loos' approach to language regime.⁵⁸ In reliance on a Bourdieuan approach to the notion of symbolic and linguistic capital⁵⁹, Loos does not limit his notion of language regime to languages' status, official rules and the subsequent diverging use of languages within institutional contexts when he talks about the EU and its institutions. He also includes oral communication between individuals working within those institutions, including administrative staff, as well as the legally speaking undefined linguistic rules of formal high-level meetings, in which

⁵⁵ Cardinal, Linda / Sontag, Selma: „Traditions étatiques et régimes linguistiques : comment et pourquoi s'opèrent les choix de politiques linguistiques?“, in: *Revue internationale de politique comparée* 22(1), 2015, 115-131, here 117.

⁵⁶ Cardinal & Sontag 2015, 117; quoted from Cardinal, Linda / Normand, Martin: „Des accents distincts : les régimes linguistiques ontarien et québécois“, in: Savard, Jean-François / Brassard, Alexandre, Côté, Louis (ed.): *Les relations Ontario-Québec : un destin partagé*. Montreal: 2011, p. 131-158.

⁵⁷ Cardinal / Sontag 2015: 118.

⁵⁸ Loos, Eugène: „Language Choice, Linguistic Capital and Symbolic Domination in the European Union“, in: *Language Problems & Language Planning* 24(1), 2000, 37-53, here 42-45.

⁵⁹ Loos 2000, 38-40, quoted from Bourdieu, Pierre: *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: 1992; Bourdieu, Pierre / Boltanski, Luc: Formal Qualifications and Occupational Hierarchies: „The Relationship between the Production System and the Reproduction System“, in: King, E.J.: *Reorganizing Education: Management and Participation for Change*. London/Beverly Hills: 1977.

often the principle of multilingualism is dropped for the sake of a by-default-language, in the EU institutions usually English or French.⁶⁰ Moreover, he generally identifies a constant decline as far as the use of all official and working languages is concerned with regards to the formality of a linguistic setting: the more informal a communicative situation is, the more likely it is to be held in a by-default language.⁶¹ This is also true for informal meetings of members of an institution like the European Parliament in whose plenary discussions „the principle of multilingualism is strictly adopted.“⁶²

These two approaches to the term go beyond the restriction to institutional use and status of languages. By encompassing also individual speakers' attitudes and pragmatic choices of languages, they are close to a sociolinguistic understanding of language regime: a bundle of habits, legal regulations and ideologies that limit speakers in spatially regulated interactions in their language choice.⁶³ In an article published in 2013, Wodak, Krzyżanowski & Forchtner visibly refer to this understanding of language regime when they analyze language choice and code-switching in EU institutions with regards to language ideologies and contextual cues in multilingual interactions.⁶⁴ Language regime here comprises both the official multilingual setting of the EU institutions as laid down in (the amended version of) Regulation No.1⁶⁵ and the diverging practices with their different layers of multilingualism in oral and written communication, often regulated through internal stipulation, e.g. by rules of procedure.⁶⁶ They also introduce the term **language repertoire**, referring to a range of aspects from the linguistic capacities of an individual speaker, and the language regulations and diverging practices thereof within institutions. Likewise, meetings of EU officials possess a certain language reper-

⁶⁰ Loos 2000, 42.

⁶¹ Loos 2000, 44.

⁶² Loos 2000, 44.

⁶³ Busch 2013, 135; quoted from: Coulmas, Florian: „Changing language regimes in globalizing environments“, in: *Journal of the Sociology of Language* 175-176 (2005), 7.

⁶⁴ Wodak, Ruth / Krzyżanowski, Michał / Forchtner, Bernhard: „The interplay of language ideologies and contextual cues in multilingual interactions: Language choice and code-switching in European Union institutions“, in: *Language in Society* 14/2 (2012), 157-186.

⁶⁵ See chapter 3.

⁶⁶ Wodak / Krzyżanowski / Forchtner 2012, 167.

toire that comprises both the language related regulations of the specific institution and the actual languages in use within a specific communicative context.⁶⁷

A reoccurring concept in the literature we have looked at so far is **multilingualism**. Although there are numerous meanings one can intuitively attribute to multilingualism, it is notable that „the term [...] itself is not without contention.“⁶⁸ This contention stems from the many approaches and conceptualizations that the term has undergone in and outside linguistics, which is most visible by the grand variety of alternatives that are proposed for it in the literature, „including partially overlapping terms such as plurilingualism, polylingualism, interlingualism, multiplurilingualism, metrolingualism, superdiversity, translanguaging and crossing“.⁶⁹ The different nuances of these terms are of relevance; however, we will try to propose an alternative definition by collecting the different uses of the term that we have seen so far. On the micro-level, multilingualism can be understood as the capacity of an individual speaker to understand and produce language material in a language other than their first one learnt, usually at either a functional or a relatively advanced level. This encompasses also speakers of more than one first language. On the macro-level, the promotion or limitation of multilingualism can be part of language ideologies that are inherent to language policies. A language regime can be multilingual, in the sense that there is a situation of equal legal status of more than one language, combined with functional code-switching between them performed by speakers, depending on the linguistic capacities of speakers and contexts that allow for it. This includes communication with and within institutions, every-day-communications of people, and the contemporary use of more than one language in education, the media and society as a whole. If we only look at the legal and functional language-setting of an institution or an individual speaker and find more than one language *de iure* or *de facto* in use, we shall speak of an institutional multilingual language repertoire.

⁶⁷ Wodak / Krzyżanowski / Forchtner 2012, 167-168.

⁶⁸ Ungar, Johann / Wodak, Ruth / Krzyżanowski, Michał: „Introduction: Encountering Multilingualism in Europe's Institutions“, in: Ungar, Johann / Wodak, Ruth / Krzyżanowski, Michał: *Multilingual Encounters in Europe's Institutional Spaces*. London: 2014, 3.

⁶⁹ Ungar / Wodak / Krzyżanowski 2014, 3-4.

3. Historical and legal context

Historically, the language-question dates back to the very beginnings of the European Union and its predecessors. It was indeed the first regulation issued by the Council of the European Economic Community, a predecessor of the current Council of the European Union (CCL), that dealt with the question what the official and working languages of the community should be.

3.1 What's covered by Regulation No 1...

In its original version, the document declared „Dutch, French, German and Italian“ to be „the official and working languages of the institutions of the community“⁷⁰, thus creating principal equality between the official languages of the original signatory states to the treaties of Rome and members of the European Communities. This list of languages was amended by each enlargement of the Union that introduced a new Member State with an official language that did not enjoy official status in any member state until then. Several other aspects that are characteristic for the EU's language regime stem from this regulation. Articles 2 and 3 deal with the communications between the Union's institutions on the one, and Member States as well as individuals subject to the jurisdiction of a Member State on the other hand. In detail, article 2 grants the right to Member States and individuals subject to the jurisdiction of a Member State to use any of the official languages when addressing the institutions of the Community and receive answer in that same language. Article 3, on the other hand, establishes rights and obligations for the institutions of the Union: „Documents which an institution of the Community sends to a Member State or to a person subject to the jurisdiction of a Member State shall be drafted in the language of such State.“ (Art.3) As we see here, the institutions of the Union have the obligation to address a Member State or a citizen of that State „in the language of such State“ - that is to say in the language(s) that the specific Member State declared its treaty language towards the EU and its institutions. If we take a look at the current situation as far as official languages of States for their communications with the EU institutions are concerned, we find circumstances widely

⁷⁰ Document 31958R0001: Regulation No 1 determining the languages to be used by the European Economic Community. Council of the European Union: 15/04/1958, Art.1.

differing from State to State. In the amended version of regulation No. 1, 24 languages are cited as official and working languages of the EU.⁷¹ This number is not identical with the number of official languages in EU countries, given that Luxemburgish, one of the three official and the only ‚national‘ language of Luxemburg⁷², has not been named an official language to the EU by Luxemburg - the same is true for Turkish which is the co-official language of Cyprus, but has no official status with regards to EU institutions, since the island country named only Greek as its official EU language.⁷³ These cases are interesting in so far as other countries with more than one official language, such as Belgium and Finland, but also Malta and Ireland, use all their official languages also as official EU languages.⁷⁴ The explanation though is very obvious: in the case of Belgium, all three official languages of the country are also official languages of other Member States of the EU and were, as we have seen, already declared official languages of the Union and its institutions in regulation No 1/1958. In the case of Finland, the country’s co-official language Swedish became an official language of the Union when Sweden joined the EU in 1995 together with Austria and Finland itself.⁷⁵

⁷¹ Document 01958R0001-20130701: Consolidated text: Regulation No 1 determining the languages to be used by the European Economic Community. Council of the European Union: 01/07/2013.

⁷² The Constitution of Luxemburg remains silent on the matter of the official language(s) of the country; according to Article 29, the question of languages to be used for administrative and legal matters is subject to legislation; cf.: „Constitution (du Grand Duché de Luxembourg), texte coordonné à jour au 20 octobre 2016“, retrieved from: www.legilux.lu. In decisions issued by the Grand Duke („arrêtés grand-ducaux“) in 1830, 1832 and 1834, citizens of Luxemburg are principally free to use either German or French for administrative and legal matters. These decisions were abrogated by the language law of 1984 („Loi du 24 février 1984 sur le régime des langues“, Article 5; from www.legilux.lu) that also introduced Luxemburgish, a Moselle Francionian language under the ‚roof‘ of German („Dachsprache“) as ‚national‘ language (Article 1). In the same law, the role of French as the language of legislation was defined (Article 2), and possibility to equal use of French, German & Luxemburgish was guaranteed for citizens with regards to administrative and legal matters (Article 3 & 4). The law remains silent on the question what a ‚national language‘ precisely is and what roles other than the official languages it has.

⁷³ Factsheet of the European Union on Cyprus, retrieved from: europa.eu, „About the EU“ —> „Countries“ —> „Cyprus“.

⁷⁴ Factsheet of the European Union on Finland and Belgium, retrieved from: europa.eu.

⁷⁵ Document 11994NN01/18: Act concerning the conditions of accession of the Kingdom of Norway, the Republic of Austria, the Republic of Finland and the Kingdom of Sweden and the adjustments to the Treaties on which the European Union is founded, Annex I , XVIII, a)-c) (amendments to Regulation No 1/1958, Official Journal C 241 , 29/08/1994 P. 0285); 24/06/1994.

Irish, however, is a special case. Ireland joined the European Communities in 1973 together with Denmark and the United Kingdom.⁷⁶ Although there were ideas even back then for the introduction of Irish as an official and working language of the Union, the Irish government refrained from doing so, although it reached the recognition of Irish as an authentic Treaty language.⁷⁷ Since it did not become an official and working language as did Danish and English, only primary legislation was prescribed to be written down also in Irish.⁷⁸ This status was unaltered until 2007. In 2005, the Council decided to amend Regulation No 1 and granted Irish the status of an official and working language.⁷⁹ This amendment came into force January 1, 2007 as Council regulation (EC) No 920/2005.⁸⁰ Besides adding Irish to the list of the Community's official and working languages, this Regulation also includes provisions regarding the further application of Irish in its newly acquired status. They establish that the amendment is the result of a request by the government of Ireland⁸¹, and that Irish already is an authentic Treaty language as reflected by Art.53 (TEU) (now Art.55). Furthermore, attention is drawn to the fact that the Irish Government's request highlights the role of Irish as a national and first official language of the country in accordance with its constitution⁸². Most crucially, some concessions regarding the use of Irish are made: the Regulation states that „for practical reasons and on a transitional basis“, there is no obligation for the EU in-

⁷⁶ from: europa.eu: „Countries“.

⁷⁷ Document 11972B/TXT: Treaty of Accession of Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom; 22/01/1972, Art.3 & Art.48; cf. Hannay, David (ed.): *Britain's Entry into the European Community: Report by Sir Con O'Neill on the Negotiations of 1970-1972*. Abingdon-on-Thames: 2018, 28/A/12.

⁷⁸ cf. Document 11972B/TXT, Art.155: The Irish language is notably excluded from being applied for texts and acts of the institutions of the Communities, whereas the Danish and English language are explicitly mentioned to be languages to benefit equal status with the four original languages Dutch, French, German & Italian.

⁷⁹ Council of the European Union: *Press Release 9499/05 (Presse 131) on General Affairs, 2667th Council Meeting*. Luxemburg, 13 June 2005: 14.

⁸⁰ Document 32005R0920: Council Regulation (EC) No 920/2005 of 13 June 2005 amending Regulation No 1 of 15 April 1958 determining the language to be used by the European Economic Community and Regulation No 1 of 15 April 1958 determining the language to be used by the European Atomic Energy Community and introducing temporary derogation measures from those Regulations. Council of the European Union: 13/06/2005.

⁸¹ Document 32005R0920, „Whereas“ 1.

⁸² Document 32005R0920: „Whereas“ 3.

stitutions to draft and provide translations for their acts in Irish.⁸³ On top of that, compulsory use of Irish is further restricted:

„It is also appropriate to provide that such a derogation be partial, to exclude from its scope Regulations adopted jointly by the European Parliament and the Council and to empower the Council to determine unanimously, within a period of four years after the date of application of this Regulation and at five-yearly intervals thereafter, whether to put an end to that derogation [.]“

Not only are joint Regulations by the Parliament and the Council excluded from being provided or translated in Irish, but the Council also is granted the prerogative to revise this provision on the basis of a five-years interval. This is the reason why currently, according to Council Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2015/2264, the temporary derogation measures have been extended until the end of 2021.⁸⁴

Similar temporary derogation was given as far as Maltese is concerned in Council Regulation (EC) No 930/2004, with the important difference that Maltese had in the first place been declared an official and working language upon Malta's accession to the EU. Because of this, derogation measures did not demand an amendment to Regulation No 1 /1958 i.e. the version thereof in force. However, derogation was already ceased via Council Regulation (EC) No 1738/2006, formally putting Maltese on an equal level with the other official and working languages of the Union except Irish.

Every question regarding the status of languages as official or working languages necessarily goes back to Regulation No 1/1958. It is crucial also for many other aspects of the language regime of the EU. Art.4 is of high importance for drafting legislation, since it stipulates that „[r]egulations and other documents of general application shall be drafted in the official languages.“⁸⁵ Articles 6 and 7 deal with the questions of language use within institutions: whereas Art.7 explicitly targets the European Court of

⁸³ Document 32005R0920: „Whereas“ 4.

⁸⁴ Document 32015R2264: Council Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2015/2264 of 3 December 2015 extending and phasing out the temporary derogation measures from Regulation No 1 of 15 April 1958 determining the languages to be used by the European Economic Community and Regulation No 1 of 15 April 1958 determining the languages to be used by the European Atomic Energy Community introduced by Regulation (EC) No 920/2005. Council of the European Union: 03/12/2015, Art.3 & 4.

⁸⁵ Document 31958R0001, Art.4.

Justice and attributes it the right and obligation to mention its procedural languages in its rules of procedure („shall be laid down“), the other institutions „may stipulate in their rules of procedure which of the languages are to be used in specific cases“ (Art.6). While the Court of Justice formally has to declare its language repertoire, this is not the case for the other institutions and therefore a much wider scope of informal arrangements on the question of the language(s) in use is possible. As we shall see at a later moment, these arrangements are consequently most heterogenous.

It is notable that Regulation No 1/1958 and its numerous amendments in principle establish equal status for all languages they list as far as the communication between the Union and its institutions on the one, and the Member States and their citizens on the other hand are concerned. This is not the case with regards to the internal use of languages of the EU's institutions, since they formally have the possibility to establish a language repertoire different from the EU's as a whole that comprises 24 official languages.

3.2 ... and what's left out

Other aspects, however, are not touched upon in Regulation No 1/1958. This is particularly the case for minority languages, although the literature suggests that this is more due to a „restrictive interpretation“⁸⁶ of the Regulation's wording than the actual text. Although in reference to Art.1 of the Regulation it is comprehensible what can be understood when the text speaks of „official languages“, Art.3 is much less clear when it comes to documents issued by the Union's institution to a MS or a citizen of that State, „in the language of such State“. Likewise, Art.8 circumvents the issue of directly addressing minority languages, stating that „[i]f a Member State has more than one official language, the language to be used shall, at the request of such State, be governed by the general rules of its law.“ As we have seen, some MS have in practice used the possibility created by this article to name more than one official languages for interactions with the EU's institutions, provided these languages have a co-official status in the entire territory of the respective state e.g. Finland, and also Ireland; due to the Fle-

⁸⁶ Vizi, Balás: „Minority languages and multilingualism in Europe and in the European Union“, in: *European Studies* 29 (2012), 147.

mish-Walloon conflict, its complex political system and language regime, Belgium is a special case that deserves particular attention, but is not part of our analysis. The ways in which the two before mentioned articles have been interpreted by Member States have lead to the exclusion of languages that regionally enjoy official status within the territory of one such state. This leads to the paradox that linguistic communities with a notable size and a wide range of linguistic rights within their respective nation-state, such as Catalan speakers with about 10 million speakers in Spain alone⁸⁷, have only very limited linguistic rights when it comes to communication with and information from EU institutions in their language, whereas Maltese with a speaker community of only above half a million enjoys status as an official EU language.⁸⁸ In recent times, some legal space for the application of such regional and minority languages within the EU institutions has been created. This was the case with the Treaty of Lisbon that came into force in 2009 and made the Charter of Fundamental Rights, first issued as early as 2000, legally binding for EU institutions and national governments.⁸⁹ Article 21 of the Charter prohibits discrimination on the grounds of language (among many other qualities), Article 22 asks the Union to „respect cultural, religious and linguistic diversity.“ The underlying human-rights-discourse of the Charter clearly makes it impossible to distinguish between official and non-official languages of the EU when it comes to fundamental linguistic rights of individuals; however, this focus on individual rather than state rights is the reason why it does not specify how signatory States (and thus Member States of the EU) should pay their respect for linguistic diversity.

This is in line with other outgrowths of Regulation No 1/1958, most notably the passages of the Treaties, that is to say the Treaty on European Union (TEU) and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), both of which also speak on the matter. Article 3 /3 (TEU) equally stipulates that the EU „shall respect its rich cultural and linguistic diversity, and shall ensure that Europe’s cultural heritage is safeguarded and en-

⁸⁷ *Informe Cat. 50 dades sobre la llengua catalana*. Plataforma per la Llengua: 2016, from: www.plataforma-llengua.cat, p.5.

⁸⁸ Number of speakers from: ethnologue.com: *Maltese*; from : European Commission: *Special Eurobarometer 386. Europeans and their Languages*. Brussels: 2012.

⁸⁹ Document 12012P/TX: Charter of fundamental rights of the European Union. 26/06/2012; version currently in force: Document 12016P/TXT, 07/06/2016.

hanced.“ In Article 4/2, the EU is encouraged to „respect the equality of Member States before the Treaties as well as their national identities, [...] inclusive of regional and local self-government.“ The TFEU is more specific about the actual measures the EU can support in these regards. Article 165 (TFEU) deals with education; in the first paragraph, the Union is urged to help Member States develop quality education by fostering cooperation between them and to actively support their action while simultaneously „respecting [...] their cultural and linguistic diversity.“ „[T]he teaching and dissemination of the languages of the Member States“are considered of particular importance when it comes to „developing the European dimension in education“ (TFEU 165/2), which is emphasized by the fact that they are mentioned first when it comes to the aims of Union action in the field of education.

None of the before mentioned Articles explicitly targets minority languages; the EU has nonetheless been supporting teaching and learning of languages other than its official ones. In the EU Commission’s 2019 Eurydice report on the teaching of regional and minority languages in European schools, 11 projects that receive financial support from the EU are listed.⁹⁰ However, the impact of these measures is questionable, since they are for the most part on a small scale as far as the quantity of participants is concerned. They consist of cross-country cooperations between individual schools, co-financed by means of Erasmus+ - there is no specific budget allocated for these supportive actions.

The provisions of Regulation No. 1 on language(s) generally establish *de iure* equality between the 24 official and working languages, despite the concessions we have seen on the level of the individual institutions. The provisions in the Treaties, on the other hand, do not mention any specific languages, but call for respect of the linguistic variety and diversity of the Union. Since these provisions are relatively vague, it is crucial to take a closer look at their context. The wording of the Treaties suggests that the linguistic diversity of the Union is linked to Europe’s cultural plurality and heritage, both of which are also already mentioned in the Preamble of the TEU. Here, the text refers to the „cultural, religious and humanist inheritance of Europe, from which have developed

⁹⁰ European Commission: *The Teaching of Regional or Minority Languages in Schools in Europe. Eurydice Report*. Luxembourg: 2019. Eurydice is „a network of 43 national units based in all 38 countries of the Erasmus+ programme.“ (from eacea.ec.europa.eu)

the universal values of inviolable and inalienable rights of the human person, freedom, democracy, equality and the rule of law.”⁹¹ It goes on to express a desire of the signatory States to „enhance further the democratic and efficient functioning of the institutions so as to enable them better to carry out, within a single institutional framework, the tasks entrusted to them.“ Thus, there is a link between the rich linguistic landscape of Europe and its cultural inheritance that is considered to be at the very basis of what the Preamble calls universal values, including democracy and equality. Democracy also appears as something that the EU and its Member States wish to foster on the institutional level for the sake of an augmented efficiency of the institutions. If we accept that the EU’s understanding of democracy and equality is linked to linguistic diversity, this provision clearly suggests that democratization of the EU’s institutions can among other means be reached by introducing multilingualism as a working principle.

We find similar aspects when we look at the context of Art.3 (TEU). Art.3/1 declares that the promotion of peace, the values of the Union and the well-being of its peoples are the aim of the Union. Before touching upon the language issue, Art.3/3 addresses the creation of an internal market, sustainable development combined with economic growth, economic competitiveness, full employment and social, scientific and technological progress, all of which the Union shall seek to establish; on top of that, the article mentions the combat against social exclusion and discrimination as well as social justice as the Union’s goals before respect for the cultural and linguistic diversity as part of Europe’s heritage is reclaimed.

Since democracy is defined as a value of the Union, its promotion is also part of the EU’s goals. This, however, is embedded in a strong focus on economic aspects, recalling the Union’s original economically oriented nature. If we interpret the promotion of multilingualism as one aspect of the promotion of democracy, we should expect these two concepts to be frequently connected to one another in legal EU texts.

3.3 Democracy

This is indeed the case when we look at Art.165 (TFEU) again. As we have seen, this article formulates relatively clear policy goals as far as education in general and lan-

⁹¹ TEU, Preamble.

guage teaching and learning in particular are concerned. Moreover, it focuses on „encouraging the development of youth exchanges“ and on „encouraging the participation of young people in democratic life in Europe.“⁹² Again, there is a link between the multilingual reality of Europe to its democratic life. In a rather practical manner, language skills, as means to make the Union ‚grow together‘ via exchange programs for example, are in correlation with opportunities of democratic participation. Interestingly, economic aspects do not play a role in Art.165; while mobility is mentioned, it is so only in the sphere of student and teacher mobility.

Democracy in general is a crucial element of EU discourse. It has been argued that the growing political character of the Union has lead to the creation of a "democratic system of the EU." (Art.165/2TFEU) One expression of the democratic system of the EU is the principle of equality as far as official and working languages are concerned, for it in principle creates equality among Member States. However, the democratic character of the EU's current language repertoire, as much as of the EU as a whole, has been subject to a long and still ongoing debate about the deficiencies of the Union. In politics as in academia, people have criticized the EU's multilingual approach to equality on the level of the official and working languages. One argument against a democratic character of such an approach is the elitist aspect of the EU's current language repertoire and parts of its language regime. As Buchmüller-Codoni puts it, „[t]he Union's M+2 principle“ is considered impractical „on the level of its citizens“⁹³. If anybody, people in economically favored strata are much more likely to be able to live up to this ideal, given their easier access to higher education and "protracted language studies.“⁹⁴ The rise of English as a transnational means of communication has put the question on the table as to whether it could serve adequately as a *lingua franca*, that is to say as a language for everybody at the EU-level while people still keeping their national languages on the domestic level. Since it already is the most widely learned foreign language in the EU for a broad set of reasons, some argue English would repre-

⁹² TFEU Art.165/2.

⁹³ Buchmüller-Codoni 2012, 2.

⁹⁴ Buchmüller-Codoni 2012, 2.

sent the most cost-efficient and socially permeable option for such a *lingua franca*.⁹⁵ Its introduction for communication within European institutions, but also among citizens as far as the EU is concerned, would make the EU „independent from interpretation and translation“⁹⁶. Furthermore, some see a better feasibility of well-working democratic processes in such a *lingua-franca*-based language regime, because it would allow for the creation of a community of communication.⁹⁷ Since the de facto language repertoire of most EU institutions at an internal level diverges from the repertoire of 24 official and working languages, the de iure equality principle is not lived up to anyways, they argue. Due to the economic importance of their respective nation-states or thanks to „their relatively higher share in native speakers“⁹⁸, some languages enjoy more influence already; this „logic of the markets“⁹⁹ has already lead to the exclusion of all languages other than the national ones from the language repertoire of the EU and its institutions. This exclusion usually results from the previous exclusion of these same languages during the process of nation-building in the majority of EU Member States when „language restriction was undertaken for different reasons.“¹⁰⁰ As a result, the linguistic plurality of Europe and the EU is much bigger than what is displayed by its repertoire of 24 official and working languages.¹⁰¹ Scholars like Sue Wright and Theo Van Els have therefore asked the question why the solution that was taken for granted on the level of the nation-state, i.e. the limitation to one language as official language,

⁹⁵ Longman, Chris: “English as Lingua Franca: A Challenge to the Doctrine of Multilingualism”, in Castiglione, Dario / Longman, Chris: *The Language Question in Europe and Diverse Societies: Political, Legal, and Social Perspectives*, Oxford: 2007, 189, 190-191, 199-200; Van Parijs, Phillipe: “Europe’s linguistic challenge.”, in: *The Language Question in Europe and Diverse Societies: Political, Legal, and Social Perspectives*, Oxford: 2007, 218-220.

⁹⁶ Van Parijs 2007, 221-222, from: Buchmüller-Codoni 2012, 3.

⁹⁷ Wright, Sue: “Language Rights, Democracy and the European Union ”, in Freeland, Jane / Patrick, Donna (ed.): *Language Rights and Language Survival: Sociolinguistic and Sociocultural Perspectives*. Manchester: 2004, 225-229, from: Buchmüller-Codoni 2012, 3.

⁹⁸ Giordan, Henri: *La question des langues en Europe*. Revised version of a lecture given at the colloquium ‘The Assessment of the European Multilingualism: Reviewing the European Year of Languages 2001’, Tokyo, January 26-27, 2002: 17; from: Buchmüller-Codoni 2012, 3.

⁹⁹ Buchmüller-Codoni 2012, 3.

¹⁰⁰ Buchmüller-Codoni 2012, 5.

¹⁰¹ Longman 2007, 187; from: Buchmüller-Codoni 2012, 5.

is considered disadvantageous and negative compared to linguistic diversity on EU level, given that some languages are favored in practice anyways.¹⁰² Others add that a common feature of European nation-states is their democratic organization, which makes democracy an experience shared by all EU citizens - independently from the number of languages that these nation-states have declared official.¹⁰³

Despite these arguments that see more democratic potential for the EU in a *lingua-franca*-approach, others have found valid arguments in favor of multilingualism. Many of these target a multilingual communication context, in which mutual respect and recognition are being shown by code-switching.¹⁰⁴ Moreover, in a multilingual setting the choice of which language will be used is a matter of negotiation of the interlocutors, „a process of bargaining and interaction [...] that brings people closer together and may develop a feeling of recognition that is not achieved through interaction in one sole language implemented by authorities.“¹⁰⁵ The acquisition of a foreign language also is known to go beyond mere communication skills, but comes at best with intercultural comprehension and awareness - aspects that also play a role for the EU, as we have seen.¹⁰⁶ The question of why minority languages, no matter how big their speaker community might be even when compared to official languages (e.g. Catalan vs. Maltese), should nevertheless be excluded from this multilingual repertoire and regime has been answered by an argument based on sovereignty. Given that the EU represents a political entity whose „sovereignty [is] granted by its member states“¹⁰⁷, many of its competences equally arise from power delegation by its Members. Should a minority

¹⁰² Wright 2004, 224; Van Els, Theo: “Multilingualism in the European Union“, in: *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 15 (3), 2005: 275; from: Buchmüller-Codoni 2012, 5.

¹⁰³ Questiaux, Nicole: “Why Europe? From Contradiction to Refoundation“, in Andrew, Joe / Crook, Malcolm / Waller, Michael: *Why Europe? Problems of Culture and Identity, Vol. I, Political and Historical Dimensions*. Basingstoke: 2000, 21; from: Buchmüller-Codoni 2012, 5.

¹⁰⁴ Kraus, Peter: *Europäische Öffentlichkeit und Sprachpolitik*. Frankfurt: 2004, 197-200, 214-215; from: Buchmüller-Codoni 2012, 5-6.

¹⁰⁵ Buchmüller-Codoni 2012, 6.

¹⁰⁶ Berthoud, Anne-Claude: “Mehrsprachigkeit als Kaleidoskop des Wissens“, in: Lüdi, Georges / Seelmann, Kurt / Sitter-Liver, Beate: *Sprachenvielfalt und Kulturfrieden. Sprachminderheit – Einsprachigkeit – Mehrsprachigkeit: Probleme und Chancen sprachlicher Vielfalt*, Freiburg 2008, 191.

¹⁰⁷ Buchmüller-Codoni 2012, 7.

language receive official status on EU level, it would have to do so on the domestic level of its respective nation-state too - a move that the majority populations and consequently national governments would most possibly not agree to.¹⁰⁸ This can be illustrated by the case of France, which is one of the countries that until today have signed, but not ratified the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages. This document issued by the Council of Europe, but with wide approval and support by the EU, would demand further recognition of regional or minority languages. This in return would require constitutional amendments that are very unlikely to find parliamentary approval. Furthermore, it would be difficult to argue in favor of „an EU dictate [...] on the use of non-national languages.“¹⁰⁹

Another argument in favor of a multilingual approach is the increased possibilities for participation it offers. The often attested lack of connection between EU institutions and citizens is opposed by „the EU’s claim to be democratic.“¹¹⁰ Although specific knowledge is still needed for citizens to comprehend and take part in EU discourse, the current multilingual repertoire of 24 official and working language is - at least in theory - more open for participation. Given that, as shown above, there is somewhat justified criticism because of the social exclusiveness of this approach, education is key in order for a maximum of citizens to be able to participate. Furthermore, the ties between people and the official language of their nation-state must not be underestimated.¹¹¹

There already is a certain distance between the citizens of the EU and its institutions. This can be explained by the fast development the EU has undergone. This development came along with the creation of „a complex system of institutions and administration“¹¹², that with the accession of every new Member State became even more complex and had to deal with ever more issues. Furthermore, the introduction of a single official language, be it English or any other, could be regarded as equally discrimi-

¹⁰⁸ Buchmüller-Codoni 2012, 7.

¹⁰⁹ Buchmüller-Codoni 2012, 7.

¹¹⁰ Buchmüller-Codoni 2012, 8.

¹¹¹ Buchmüller-Codoni 2012, 8.

¹¹² Buchmüller-Codoni, 2012, 8.

nating against States whose educational systems do not provide sufficient teaching in that language. The citizens of such a State would see their communications with and their participation in EU institutions cut, including their electability for the European Parliament, for instance, given that parliamentary debates would equally be hold in that *lingua franca* and that, in a worst case scenario, no translation or interpretation would be provided .¹¹³

On top of the discussions of the democratic character of the EU in general and its language regime and repertoire in particular, democracy itself as a concept also plays an important role in EU discourse. As we have seen Krzyżanowski and Wodak identify it as one of the key narratives of the EU that was particularly salient in the 1990s and early 2000s.¹¹⁴ They analyze „if and how [EULMP] was influenced by KBE-related discourses related to the Lisbon Strategy“¹¹⁵ at what role ‚democratic‘ aspects played with regards to that. The authors come to the conclusion that in the EU’s discourse for the respective time frame, democracy is „linked interdiscursively with EULMP“, because of the importance multilingualism has for political participation in the transnational environment of the EU as well as for the communication with EU citizens.¹¹⁶ On the other hand, they attest a departure from this democracy-oriented discourse on multilingualism in documents form 2007 to 2010, stating that multilingualism in that period became more and more reduced to the mere competence of individuals in foreign languages and the economic - not social - importance of this.¹¹⁷ However, the analyzed timespan was not merely characterized by pro-Lisbon arguments for multilingualism, that is to say by arguments in favor of economically oriented language policies aiming at increased competitiveness, growth and employment. On the contrary, the period is incoherent as far as its argumentation is concerned, for it „displays a quite significant change in the policy content and conceptualisation of multilingualism.“¹¹⁸ As we have

¹¹³ Buchmüller-Codona 2012, 9-10.

¹¹⁴ Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 118, 120.

¹¹⁵ Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 124.

¹¹⁶ Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 129.

¹¹⁷ Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 129-130.

¹¹⁸ Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 130.

seen before, in a salient document issued by the Commission in 2008, the role of the media, new technologies and translation is addressed for the first time with regards to EULMP.¹¹⁹ It is in particular the growing importance of media to overcome language and cultural barriers that is emphasized, „contextualised by hybrid arguments, related to economy [...] and democracy“.¹²⁰ Moreover, the document introduces the element of „external dimensions of multilingualism“¹²¹, as stated before. This went hand in hand with the restructuring of the EU’s foreign relations, most notably by the importance the EU’s High Representative acquired when the Lisbon Treaty came into force in 2009. Despite these newly introduced elements, the discourse on multilingualism is dominated by economic considerations. According to the authors, the *Europe 2020*-program as follow up to the Lisbon-Strategy is fully inscribed in the KBE-oriented argumentation for multilingualism.¹²² It is this strategy we shall take a closer look at as point of departure of our analysis.

4. Growth above everything: *Europe 2020*

Europe 2020 is a strategy proposed by the European Commission in March 2010, covering the years from 2010 to 2020. It is defined as „the EU’s agenda for growth and jobs for the current decade.“¹²³ As such, it is a follow-up to the Lisbon-strategy in delimiting macro-economic and social goals the Union wants to pursue. As its subtitle points out, *Europe 2020* is supposed to be „[a] European strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth“¹²⁴; consequently, growth is the topic that overshadows the entire document and is the goal to which all the others are subordinated. This

¹¹⁹ Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 131.

¹²⁰ Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 131.

¹²¹ Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 131; cf. European Commission: *Multilingualism: An asset for Europe and a shared commitment*. COM (2008) 566, Brussels: 18/09/2008, p.14.

¹²² Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 123.

¹²³ from: <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/europe-2020-indicators>.

¹²⁴ Document 52010DC2020: COMMUNICATION FROM THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION. EUROPE 2020. A European strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth. European Commission: 03/03/2010. Subsequently quoted as „Europe 2020“.

is partially explainable by the fact that the document was drafted in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis, which is why it generally reads like a response plan to the issues prompted by that major event. On the other hand, the strategy equally targets challenges that add up to the financial crisis, like globalization, resource scarceness and societal aging.¹²⁵ Different aspects of growth are touched upon and many elements we have seen before in EU discourse reoccur. In general, the strategy is structured in seven flagship initiatives grouped under the terms of „smart“, „sustainable“ and „inclusive growth“.¹²⁶ These initiatives frame the main objectives the Commission urges the Union to reach until 2020, which is described as the strategy’s thematic approach.¹²⁷ The flagship initiatives found under „smart growth“ are: „[i]nnovation Union“, targeting research and innovation; „Youth on the Move“ with regards to education and labor market access for young people; and a „digital agenda for Europe“, taking into account the challenges of quickly developing and expanding digital markets and technological advancements.¹²⁸ A „[r]esource efficient Europe“ and „[a]n industrial policy for the globalisation (sic!) era“ are labeled as „sustainable growth“.¹²⁹ Finally, the strategy sets an „agenda for new skills and jobs“ aiming at labor market modernization and lifelong-learning, as well as increased labor participation and mobility, and seeks to erect a "European platform against poverty“ in order to improve social inclusion and „to ensure social and territorial cohesion“ - these two initiatives are part of the strategy’s path towards „inclusive growth“.¹³⁰

There also is a strong emphasis on country reporting to help Member States set their particular goals. Additional support will be given both in the form of „[i]ntegrated guidelines [that] will be adopted at EU level to cover the scope of EU priorities and targets“¹³¹, whereas Member States will receive country-specific recommendations.

¹²⁵ Europe 2020, 4.

¹²⁶ Europe 2020, 8.

¹²⁷ Europe 2020, 4.

¹²⁸ Europe 2020, 10-12.

¹²⁹ Europe 2020, 12-16.

¹³⁰ Europe 2020, 16-18.

¹³¹ Europe 2020, 4.

Already at the beginning, a hierarchy with regards to the implementation of the strategy is proposed. The Commission calls the European Council to „have full ownership and [to] be the focal point of “Europe 2020, while the Commission itself will have the function of a monitor and facilitator, and will „make the necessary proposals to steer action“.¹³²

The strategy opens up with a description of the current situation of the Union with special regards to the impact of the 2008 financial crisis. Quite critically, the „structural weaknesses“ of the Union are articulated, ranging from the EU’s relatively low growth rate compared to other international players, its „productivity gap“ and suboptimal investment rate in research and innovation, to “insufficient use of information and communications technologies”.¹³³ Likewise, the EU’s relatively low employment rate and overaged society are criticized.

On top of that, the document addresses the EU’s role in an interconnected world and lists the globalized and interlinked economies of the globe, the fall-backs of „[g]lobal finance“ and „[c]limate and resource challenges“ as dominant issues.¹³⁴ As a universal response, the strategy calls for unity, given the high degree of interdependency between EU States and subsequent spill-over effects in a situation of prosperity as well as crisis. It underlines the positive results EU coordination could achieve in response to the financial crisis, as well as the value the EU can add „on the global scene“¹³⁵ only if its Member States act in unity.

However, the document manages to see the light at the end of the tunnel: before going into the details of the growth plan in general and the flagship initiatives in particular, the strengths of the EU are recalled. Besides a series of economic qualities, some rather abstract aspects are pointed out: „our strong values, democratic institutions, our consideration for economic, social and territorial cohesion and solidarity, our respect for the environment, our cultural diversity“.¹³⁶

¹³² Europe 2020, 4.

¹³³ Europe 2020, 5.

¹³⁴ Europe 2020, 5-6.

¹³⁵ Europe 2020, 6.

¹³⁶ Europe 2020, 7.

If we compare this introduction of *Europe 2020* to what we have seen from previous analyses, several crucial points can already be observed that are expanded throughout the document: first of all, the strong focus on growth, whether it is with regards to employment, productivity, professional skills or social inclusiveness, clearly puts the entire strategy under a KBE-oriented argument. According to Europe 2020, growth has to be „smart [...] - developing an economy based on knowledge and innovation“.¹³⁷ It also sets precise quantitative goals that are to be met by the year 2020: an employment rate of at least 75%; a GDP-share of investment in R&D of 3%; a reduction of greenhouse gas emissions of 20%-30% compared to the 1990-level; a higher rate of educational attainment; and a reduction of the EU-wide poverty rate of 25%.¹³⁸ The interrelationship of these goals as well as their non-exhaustive character is also highlighted. Aspects that are particularly interesting for our analysis can be found in the detailed description of the flagship initiatives grouped under „smart growth“. The term itself is understood as „strengthening knowledge and innovation“¹³⁹ as engines of the EU’s economic growth. As the text states, this comprises:

„[S]trengthening knowledge and innovation as drivers of our future growth. This requires improving the quality of our education, strengthening our research performance, promoting innovation and knowledge transfer throughout the Union, making full use of information and communication technologies and ensuring that innovative ideas can be turned into new products and services that create growth, quality jobs and help address European and global societal challenges. But, to succeed, this must be combined with entrepreneurship, finance, and a focus on user needs and market opportunities.“¹⁴⁰

Again, we see that educational goals are linked to the overall economic approach of the strategy: the general wish for quality improvements in education and increased knowledge transfer targets product and service creation, not the necessarily the development of skills such as language skills. The role of information and communication technologies is emphasized when it comes to preparing the grounds for innovation, which in re-

¹³⁷ Europe 2020, 8.

¹³⁸ Europe 2020, 9.

¹³⁹ Europe 2020, 9.

¹⁴⁰ Europe 2020, 9.-10.

turn is believed to create a market for high skilled labor, yet again without touching upon language issues specifically. Innovation is mainly understood in terms of raising the GDP-share of R&D investment, where the EU lags more than 0.6% and 1.4% behind the US and Japan respectively.¹⁴¹ When it comes to life-long learning, education and training, Europe 2020 calls the EU to act first and foremost to improve pupils' reading competences and the proportion of academics - in order to match the needs of the labor market. Moreover, „smart growth“ translates into a greater piece of the cake of „[t]he global demand for information and communication technologies“¹⁴² and a better coverage of high speed internet, considered a crucial factor in knowledge dissemination and the distribution of goods and services. With regards to education, it is the flagship initiative „youth on the move“ that is of particular interest. The Commission's work with regards to education should include efforts „[t]o integrate and enhance the EU's mobility, university and researchers' programmes“¹⁴³, namely the different branches of the Erasmus-program, and connect them to state resources and programs. Modernizing higher education including curricula, governance and financing with the goal to achieve better academic outcomes on a global level are also part of the strategy. Raising mobility is not only perceived as something of importance for students, but also for young professionals. Another aspect the Commission wishes to emphasize is the recognition of non-formal and informal learning and the facilitation of young people's entry into the labor market.

Although education occupies such an important place in *Europe 2020*, language teaching and learning or multilingualism do not explicitly play a role. Implicitly, however, they are equally present, for it is hardly imaginable how mobility, whether it is in education or in work life, could be possible without language skills. Nonetheless, as we have seen before, the measures of which it is legitimate to assume language teaching and learning to be part of are also subordinated to the overall growth-oriented tone of the strategy.

¹⁴¹ Europe 2020, 13.

¹⁴² Europe 2020, 10.

¹⁴³ Europe 2020, 11.

This becomes more evident if we take a look at the „digital agenda for Europe“: as we have seen in Krzyżanowski and Wodak’s analysis of the Lisbon-strategy and related texts, the role of media and new technologies for overcoming language barriers was first discussed by a Commission document in 2008. Nothing of the sort can be stated for *Europe 2020*. Whereas in the 2008-document, the argumentation for the importance of a digital agenda is grounded on both democratic and economic arguments¹⁴⁴, the democratic dimension essentially disappears in the *Europe 2020*-strategy. Likewise, no language or multilingualism-related arguments can be found. However, there is one point in which at least a cultural dimension comes in, when the texts names as one of the Commissions future actions the creation of „a [...] single market for online content and services“.¹⁴⁵ Among other measures that target the establishment of „a balanced regulatory framework with clear rights regimes“ for the online sector, the Commission also wants to ensure „active support for the digitalisation of Europe’s rich cultural heritage“ on that single market.¹⁴⁶

When we look at what *Europe 2020* understands as „sustainable growth“¹⁴⁷, there are no implications of EULMP whatsoever. As its name indicates, the flagship initiative „resource efficient Europe“ is dedicated to resource efficiency with regards to both financial and natural resources, as well as to decarbonization, the reduction of CO2-emissions, and the strengthening of an independent internal energy market.¹⁴⁸

Although the flagship strategy „an industrial policy for the globalisation era“ could be expected to implicitly touch upon language issues such as foreign language skills, for example, none of these aspects are mentioned. However, an element of democratic inclusion can be found in the Commissions commitment „[t]o work closely with stakeholders in different sectors (business, trade unions, academics, NGOs, consumer organisations“¹⁴⁹ in order „[t]o identify bottlenecks“. The ultimate goal of the Commission is for

¹⁴⁴ European Commission: *Multilingualism: An asset for Europe and a shared commitment*. COM (2008) 566, Brussels: 18/09/2008, 12.

¹⁴⁵ Europe 2020, 12.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid.

¹⁴⁸ Europe 2020, 14.

¹⁴⁹ Europe 2020, 15.

the EU to be a global leader in sustainable development and, as a means to achieve this role, the Commission puts forward KBE-oriented arguments, emphasizing efforts to maintain simultaneously „a strong and knowledge base“. ¹⁵⁰ Here, an international dimension is added to sustainability, since the EU aims at a leading role on the international level. Together with this international dimension comes a certain spirit of competitiveness, given the Commission's goal of a leadership function in sustainability issues compared to other players worldwide.

„Inclusive growth“ englobes efforts to create an „agenda for new skills and jobs“ and to build up a „European Platform against Poverty“, as we have seen. ¹⁵¹ As the initiative's name indicates, the acquisition and development of new skills valuable on the labor market are the main focuses here. While the text is silent on the specific nature of these skills, the initiative is among other aspects inscribed to the facilitation and promotion of labor mobility within the EU and to „the implementation of life-long learning principles“ ¹⁵², which includes cross-sector and cross-level education and training, as well as measures to raise „the attractiveness of vocational education and training.“ ¹⁵³ At European level, social partners are supposed to develop „an initiative of their own in this area.“ ¹⁵⁴ One precise measure the initiative envisages is the creation of „a European Skills, Competences and Occupations framework“ ¹⁵⁵ in order to establish skill recognition on all levels of education as well as comparability by „a common language“ that is applied regarding relevant competences on the labor market. Several aspects of this initiative can be compared to crucial points of the Bologna-declaration (1999), that sought to create, among other elements, „a system of easily readable and comparable degrees“ ¹⁵⁶ with a two-cycle structure for tertiary education among the signatory States, most of which were or have since become members of the EU. These measures are

¹⁵⁰ *ibid.*

¹⁵¹ Europe 2020, 16-17.

¹⁵² Europe 2020, 16.

¹⁵³ *ibid.*

¹⁵⁴ *ibid.*

¹⁵⁵ *ibid.*

¹⁵⁶ *Bologna-declaration*, 1999, 3; retrieved from: magna-charta.org.

aimed at raising the mobility and employability of EU citizens with a focus on the labor market relevance of first cycle degrees. *Europe 2020* extends these goals from the tertiary to the entire education sector and puts an even greater emphasis on employability. Neither in the Commission's commitment nor in its prospects for the Member States language or multilingualism play a specific role.

Finally and contrary to Wodak and Krzyżanowski's assessment of *Europe 2020*, the Commission does focus on „economic, social and territorial cohesion“ in its initiative to create a European platform against poverty.¹⁵⁷ As part of its efforts to fight poverty and to „ensure [...] cohesion“ in the before mentioned fields, the Commission also seeks to establish recognition of „fundamental rights of people experiencing poverty and social exclusion“. ¹⁵⁸ Among other measures, the Commission wants to focus on „providing innovative education training, and employment opportunities for deprived communities“¹⁵⁹ and on fighting discrimination against them, notably also with regards to migrant communities, in order for them to be enabled to „take full advantage of their potential“. ¹⁶⁰ As groups of particular risk, the text cites minorities without further specification except for Roma, the single minority that is explicitly named.¹⁶¹ Other target groups are people with a disability, elderly women, one-parent families and the homeless. Crucial aspects of this strategy focus on the creation of a sustainable social security and pension system for these unfavored groups.

All in all, *Europe 2020* focuses on several points that were of high importance already in the Lisbon-strategy. In general, all measures are dedicated to growth in various fields; especially as far as innovation is concerned, KBE-related arguments are prevalent. Mobility also plays a major role, especially with regards to education and employment of young people. Sustainability and resource efficiency as well as a structural reform of the European industrial sector are intertwined and both connected to skill development and the fight against poverty and social exclusion. Education is a key component of the in-

¹⁵⁷ cf. Krzyżanowski / Wodak 2011, 123: „The Lisbon-based ‘Europe 2020’ Programme [...] does not focus on issues of social cohesion-inclusion at all.“

¹⁵⁸ *Europe 2020*, 17.

¹⁵⁹ *Europe 2020*, 18.

¹⁶⁰ *ibid.*

¹⁶¹ *ibid.*

initiatives the Commission wants to launch. Besides the announced initiatives, the document provides more details on concrete measures. Cohesion is a main policy issue and also the primary target of the financial means the Commission wants to mobilize via the EU budget and private financing.¹⁶² A special emphasis is also given to strengthening the EU's external policy instruments, an aspect that earlier, as shown above, was specifically linked to language skills and multilingualism and their culturally dialogical dimension. In *Europe 2020*, the deployment of the EU's external policy instruments is mainly aimed at the EU's position of an international economic player and its „participation in open and fair markets world wide“¹⁶³ According to this approach, the facilitation of trade and the abolishing of trade barriers are the desired outcome. Another focus is on fostering the economic relations and cooperation with emerging economies while simultaneously taking the „international responsibilities“¹⁶⁴ of the Union seriously in order to not only assure growth and increased European influence, but also to fight against poverty and create incentives for further investment, particularly in Africa.¹⁶⁵ Although the subordination of all measures under the premise of growth is also the rule with regards to external policy, social cohesion, fairness and development also play a role. Contrary to earlier contextualizations of the issue, external relations are not linked to aspects of multilingualism in *Europe 2020*.

This is indeed the case for the entire document: there are no explicit connections between the flagship initiatives and the desired policy outcomes and EULMP in the text. However, implicitly language and multilingualism play a role. As a matter of fact, neither term is mentioned at all. However, the Lisbon-strategy did not contain a huge number of direct references to EULMP either; „foreign languages“¹⁶⁶ are mentioned only once with regards to the modernization of the European social model as part of skills people should acquire during life-long learning processes. An analysis of the policies that follo-

¹⁶² Europe 2020, 20.

¹⁶³ Europe 2020, 21.

¹⁶⁴ Europe 2020, 22.

¹⁶⁵ *ibid.*

¹⁶⁶ European Council: Lisbon European Council, 23 and 24 March 2000: Presidency Conclusions, Art.26. From: europarl.europa.eu.

wed Lisbon could provide a much clearer understanding of the strategy's implication for languages and multilingualism - as it is the case with *Europe 2020*.

Another striking difference between the Lisbon-strategy and the EU's current strategic agenda is the organizational hierarchy *Europe 2020* envisages as far as the strategy's implementation is concerned. As hinted at before, the Commission seeks to turn from the accustomed path with regards to decision-making for *Europe 2020*: as opposed to the current situation in which "the European Council is the last element in the decision-making process of the strategy"¹⁶⁷, it receives „[f]ull ownership“¹⁶⁸ of it, since it „is the body which ensures the integration of policies and manages the interdependence between Member States and the EU“. The European Council is encouraged to „focus on specific themes“ in its upcoming meetings and set impulses for further policies, the implementation of which is attributed to the Council of Ministers in relevant formations.¹⁶⁹ The Commission is supposed to act in a monitor function and to audit „the delivery of the Europe 2020 strategy“¹⁷⁰; as such, it is also entitled to review national country reports and draft recommendations, warnings and policy proposals. The Parliament, on the other hand, is also given „an important role in the strategy“¹⁷¹, that arises both from its function as co-legislator and capacity to potentially mobilize EU citizens and national parliaments. Finally, national, regional and local authorities and civil society are encouraged to participate in *Europe 2020* by establishing a permanent dialogue and by supporting implementation of national reform programs.

The emphasis on the Council is crucial given this institution's composition. The (European Council) consists of the heads of states or government of the EU Member States, „together with its President and the President of the European Commission“ (Art. 15, 2 (TEU) and the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy in special occasions. This consensus-based (Art. 15,4)¹⁷² institution therefore re-

¹⁶⁷ Europe 2020, 27.

¹⁶⁸ Europe 2020, 29.

¹⁶⁹ *ibid.*

¹⁷⁰ *ibid.*

¹⁷¹ *ibid.*

¹⁷² For further specifications on voting within the European Council cf. Art. 235 & 236 (TFEU).

presents the Member States of the Union rather than the Union as a whole or its citizens, roles that are assumed by the Commission and the Parliament respectively. While also representing a Member States element, the Council (of the European Union) or Council of Ministers decides by qualified majority¹⁷³ and acts as a co-legislator with the Parliament. It meets in „different configurations“¹⁷⁴ at the ministerial level and is the second important intergovernmental institution of the EU. Due to its role as co-legislator, the Council of Ministers is attributed the role of implementation of *Europe 2020*, whereas the European Council, although officially possessing full ownership, is supposed to provide guidance and policy impulses. More specifically, the Council of Ministers in its different formations is requested to implement measures proposed by the Commission.¹⁷⁵ We shall thus take a look at a sample of documents issued between 2010 and 2020 by the Council of Ministers to see as to what extent EULMP has been configured on the basis of *Europe 2020*.

4.1 Sample analysis

The original sample contains 44 documents by the Council of Ministers, all of which have been consulted via the eur-lex.eu-database. The parameters for the searched collections include treaties, legal acts, international agreements, preparatory documents, lawmaking procedures and parliamentary questions, though due to the responsibilities and role of the Council not all of these collections are represented in the sample. The corpus is oriented on the date of the specific documents, ranging from January 1, 2010 to May 31, 2020. Other parameters eur-lex.eu offers like the legislative procedure documents can be related to have not been respected in order to assure a picture as broad as possible. Our sample contains documents that bear the terms „multilingualism“ and „language“ in their title and text, which is in line with our overall focus of EULMP (European Language and Multilingualism Policy), but do not make a reference to „budget“ in their title. Although budgetary questions could provide a fruitful insight into

¹⁷³ Art.16, 4 TEU: „[A] qualified majority shall be defined as at least 55% of the members of the Council, comprising at least fifteen of them and representing Member States comprising at least 65% of the population of the Union.“ Further specifications: Art.238 TFEU.

¹⁷⁴ TEU Art.16, 6.

¹⁷⁵ Europe 2020, 30.

very practical implications *Europe 2020* might have had on specifically translation and interpretation budgets, this decision has been taken to keep the corpus in a manageable frame. Yet, the nature of the analyzed documents is heterogeneous; the collection contains proposals for regulations and recommendations, conclusions and decisions, as well as staff working documents. Four of the documents are part of trilogue-preparations. In some cases, texts are represented more than once due to having more than one entry in the database; in other cases, documents are, at least with regards to our terms of analysis, identical with their original versions or proposals thereof or present the same recurring arguments as the document of origin. These two groups combined make up for 20 documents within our sample and will be analyzed together with their documents of origin. One document touches upon EULMP too peripherally as to be considered of any value for this analysis.¹⁷⁶ This lowers the number of texts that will find detailed description and analysis to 23.

In general, the documents of our corpus can be grouped under six key terms that stand for categories in line with the general topic or question the respective documents deal with. Two documents touch upon questions of social inclusion, whereas three documents are mainly concerned with legal aspects to which a language- or multilingualism-related dimension is added. Four texts can be distinguished that deal specifically with research and development (R&D). In general, languages and multilingualism are touched upon only peripherally in these three categories.

In the remaining three categories, EULMP is either dealt with more extensively or is even the topic of the document. Four documents are mostly concerned with culture, clearly distinguishable from those documents that specifically focus on education (5); three documents are directly related to questions of EULMP.

These key terms are, however, not mutually exclusive, with many of the documents spilling over into another category in their content as well as their argumentation.

¹⁷⁶ Document ST 5598 2019 INIT, Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a European Maritime Single Window environment and repealing Directive 2010/65/EU Preparation for the trilogue. Council of the European Union, 31/01/2019.

4.2 Social inclusion

Both documents that according to their title primarily deal with matters of social inclusion only marginally involve multilingualism. In the Council conclusions dating November 27th 2012, multilingualism is seen as an engine of mobility specifically among young migrant generations. Member States are invited to „support the [migrants’] acquisition of the official language(s) in the country where they live“in order for them to be able to participate in social and professional life.¹⁷⁷ An amendment proposal for a regulation concerning the legal framework of the European Solidarity Corps (2018) regards multilingualism as a guiding principle that should be respected in offering „online and offline training and language support“ to participants of the European Solidarity Corps¹⁷⁸.

4.3 Citizen’s rights & legal system

The documents that contain predominantly legal aspects deal with languages and multilingualism in a rather technical way. In its conclusions from April 4, 2011, the Council encourages the introduction of the European Case Law Identifier (ECLI), an online tool developed to help cite judgments from national and European courts.¹⁷⁹ When identifying the tool’s needs, the document considers multilingualism as a somewhat problematic factor for the creation of an online data base.¹⁸⁰ Nonetheless, the tool is to be esta-

¹⁷⁷ Document 42012Y1219(01): Conclusions of the Council and of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting within the Council, of 27 November 2012 on the participation and social inclusion of young people with emphasis on those with a migrant background. Council of the European Union: 27/11/2012; Art.27 & 34.

¹⁷⁸ Document ST 11487 2018 INIT: Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL laying down the legal framework of the European Solidarity Corps and amending Regulations (EU) No 1288/2013, (EU) No 1293/2013, (EU) No 1303/2013, (EU) No 1305/2013, (EU) No 1306/2013 and Decision No 1313/2013/EU – Outcome of the European Parliament’s first reading (Strasbourg 10-13 September 2018). Council of the European Union: 13/09/2018. Art.17; related documents: PE 47 2018 INIT, 32018R1475 PE 47 2018 REV 1.

¹⁷⁹ e-justice.europa.eu —> ECLI.

¹⁸⁰ Document 52011XG0429(01): Council conclusions inviting the introduction of the European Case Law Identifier (ECLI) and a minimum set of uniform metadata for case law. Council of the European Union, 29/04/2011; Art.II, 9.

blished under the principle of multilingualism, since the document states that „[n]ames of the courts should be translated in all languages“¹⁸¹.

A staff working and impact assessment document from June 1st 2018 addresses EULMP in a similarly ‚mechanical‘ way, when multilingualism is taken into account concerning the establishment of an EU Emergency Travel Document (ETD).¹⁸² Multilingualism is regarded as a component of the EU ETD that clearly identifies EU citizens as such and helps them with regards to their EU citizen right in case they are in a third country.¹⁸³

Another staff working document from June 6th 2018 with regards to a regulation concerning judicial and extrajudicial documents in civil or commercial matters deals with EU „legislation on cross-border service of judicial documents and on cooperation in taking of evidence“.¹⁸⁴ Though not specifically tackling multilingualism, the staff working paper calls for translation of documents to all official languages of the EU in order to guarantee the efficiency of the service.¹⁸⁵ Content must be clear regardless of the language of the original text; in case of refusal to testify on the grounds of missing language skills, a language assessment shall be set up.¹⁸⁶

4.4 Research, development and innovation

With regards to R&D and innovation, multilingualism is introduced at several levels. A Council decision from December 3rd 2013 regarding the implementation of *Horizon 2020*, the EU’s current program for research and innovation, speaks of the necessity to

¹⁸¹ 52011XG0429(01), ANNEX 4, 2 (a), (iii).

¹⁸² Document ST 9643 2018 ADD 4: COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT Accompanying the document Proposal for a COUNCIL DIRECTIVE establishing an EU Emergency Travel Document and repealing Decision 96/409/CFSP, 01/06/2019. Related document: ST 9643 2018 ADD 4 REV 1, 02/05/2019.

¹⁸³ ST 9643 2018 ADD 4, p.28.

¹⁸⁴ Document ST 9622 2018 ADD 2: COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT Accompanying the document Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EC) No 1393/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the service in the Member States of judicial and extrajudicial documents in civil or commercial matters (service of documents), 06/06/2018, p.6.

¹⁸⁵ ST 9622 2018 ADD 2, p.98.

¹⁸⁶ ST 9622 2018 ADD 2, p.103.

provide digital content for professionals and citizens that want to engage themselves in the creative industries „in any language“; this is seen under the specter of efforts that want to make Europe a leading provider in the creative industries, supplying „products and services based on individual and business creativity“¹⁸⁷. New tools and technologies in the fields of „„arts, language, learning, [...] web design“ etc. should be provided. However, the decision also seeks to ensure „a greater understanding of Europe, providing solutions and supporting inclusive, innovative and reflective European societies in a context of unprecedented transformations and growing global interdependencies“¹⁸⁸. This includes efforts to raise awareness of Europe’s cultural heritage and and to foster European identity.¹⁸⁹ Multilingualism as part of European heritage and its role for the floating of ideas throughout Europe in the course of history as well as today are acknowledged.¹⁹⁰ Under the premise of „smart, sustainable and inclusive growth“¹⁹¹, the impact of skill acquisition and the protection of human rights are decided to be analyzed by extensive research, particularly with regards to participation opportunities of vulnerable minority groups such as Roma and migrants „in education, society and democracy“¹⁹².

In a regulation from December 11th 2013 that amended the Regulation on the establishment of the European Institute of Innovation and Technology multilingualism is mentioned only peripherally as a basic principle, while the decision on the Institute’s language policy is left open.¹⁹³ The Council conclusions on young creative generations from June 5th 2019, on the other hand, go more into detail on how this basic principle of

¹⁸⁷ Document 32013D0743: Council Decision of 3 December 2013 establishing the specific programme implementing Horizon 2020 - the Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) and repealing Decisions 2006/971/EC, 2006/972/EC, 2006/973/EC, 2006/974/EC and 2006/975/EC; European Council: 03/12/2013; Art.1.1.4.

¹⁸⁸ 32013D0743, Art.3, 3f.

¹⁸⁹ 32013D0743, Annex, 6.3.

¹⁹⁰ 32013D0743, Annex, 6.3.1.

¹⁹¹ 32013D0743, Annex, 6.1.1.

¹⁹² 32013D0743, Annex 6.1.2.

¹⁹³ Document 32013R1292: Regulation (EU) No 1292/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 amending Regulation (EC) No 294/2008 establishing the European Institute of Innovation and Technology Text with EEA relevance. Council of the European Union, 11/12/2013, Section 2.

multilingualism should be understood. In the respective document multilingualism is perceived as a guiding principle to guarantee accessibility specifically to digital resources, as language skills in general are regarded as „essential for mobility in the European Union“¹⁹⁴. Furthermore, multilingualism is regarded as a means to „facilitate active participation in culture“ (Art.1,ii); another priority of the Conclusions are digital technologies (iii) as well as the monitoring of children’s language skills (iv). Yet another important focus is on the promotion of „digital skills and media literacy“ (5) as well as on the reinforcement of „cross-sectoral cooperation“ (2). Teaching young generations to „understand cultural values and diversity“¹⁹⁵ is considered a necessity in a globalized world; the document therefore invites the Commission and Member States to provide accessibility and participation opportunities for young people in the cultural sector „in order to reduce disparities and social inequality“ (1, i) and to simultaneously "ensure the employability of the younger generation“ (5, i) by raising digital skills and media literacy. These conclusions are clearly in line with the *Europe 2020*-strategy and its approach to cross-sectorial growth.

The same is true for a Commission staff working document from April 2018 to the Council on the implementation and functioning of the .eu Top Level-Domain name, accompanying a joint document of the Parliament and the Council. Though very technical in nature, this documents touches upon multilingualism again as a principle or value. Seeking to improve an existing Regulation on the same matter, the document is among other things dedicated to „multilingualism on the Internet“¹⁹⁶. The lack of efforts to keep the domain updated with regards to multilingualism is considered as one of the reasons why registrations are stagnating.¹⁹⁷ The document suggests the domain, like the EU its-

¹⁹⁴ Document 52019XG0605(03): Council conclusions on young creative generations. Council of the European Union, 05/06/2019, „AWARE THAT“.

¹⁹⁵ 52019XG0605(03), „AWARE THAT“.

¹⁹⁶ Document ST 8468 2018 ADD 2: COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT Accompanying the document Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the implementation and functioning of the .eu Top Level Domain name and repealing Regulation (EC) No 733/2002 and Commission Regulation (EC) No 874/2004. Council of the European Union, 27/04/2018, 2.2.1, p.9; related documents: ST 8468 2018 INIT
ST 5882 2019 INIT, PE 84 2018 INIT PE 84 2018 REV 1 32019R0517 PE 84 2018 REV 2.

¹⁹⁷ ST 8468 2018 ADD 2, 2.2.1, p.7.

elf, be inscribed to its „strong sets of values“, consisting of "respect of users' privacy and security, consumer protection, [...] human rights“ and multilingualism.¹⁹⁸ Multilingualism as a value is also brought up when it comes to the effectiveness of the .eu domain, where it is called in one line with the combat against climate change and cyber-security; the domain is also considered a complementary measure to existing EU efforts with regards to „the digital single market“, cyber trust and security, the „promotion of European entrepreneurship and start-ups“ as well as multilingualism.¹⁹⁹ The promotion of multilingualism online is again mentioned as a „priority for the EU“.²⁰⁰ In line with this, the domain is supposed to enable „EU citizens to use their own languages online“²⁰¹, as it already „supports all 24 official languages of the EU“.²⁰² An impact assessing supplement to this document references the 2012 memorandum of understanding signed by UNESCO and EURid (the .eu top level domain registry) as steps that have been taken, as to which EURid is dedicated „to further promote online multilingualism and [...] to support linguistic diversity.“²⁰³ The document underlines the registry's being coherent with EU values and objectives as well as its obligations on linguistic diversity.²⁰⁴ It stresses the registry's ability to provide „customer support and translation of key documents in all 24 official languages“²⁰⁵ of the EU and puts particular emphasis on the fact that this, in line with Art.6(2) of regulation 784/2004, contains also Maltese and Gaelic, which according to the document „are no longer routinely supported by the EU institutions.“²⁰⁶

4.5 Culture

¹⁹⁸ ST 8468 2018 ADD 2, 4.2, p.18.

¹⁹⁹ ST 8468 2018 ADD 2, 6.2 p.39.

²⁰⁰ ST 8468 2018 ADD 2, 6.5, p.47.

²⁰¹ *ibid.*

²⁰² ST 8468 2018 ADD 2, 2.2.1, p.8.

²⁰³ ST 8468 2018 ADD 4, 5.2, p.20.

²⁰⁴ ST 8468 2018 ADD 4, 5.4, p.29.

²⁰⁵ ST 8468 2018 ADD 4, 5.4, p.30.

²⁰⁶ *ibid.*

An area in which multilingualism is much more directly thematized is culture. In their conclusions on the Work Plan for Culture 2011-2014 dating from December 2010, the Council and government representatives of the Member States discern a series of priority areas, entirely inscribed to the *Europe 2020*-strategy.²⁰⁷ These include cultural diversity, intercultural dialogue and accessible and inclusive culture (priority area A), cultural and creative industries (CCIs) (priority area B), skills and mobility (priority area C), cultural heritage (priority area D), culture in external relations (priority area E), and statistics (priority area F).²⁰⁸ As a working method, the Work Plan offers a quite narrow approach to the topic of the promotion of multilingualism, listed in priority area A: the Commission in its monitoring role is encouraged to carry out a study as to what extent „the use of subtitles encourages and facilitates foreign language learning and contributes to the mastery of foreign languages“ and helps create a language-friendly environment.²⁰⁹ Another topic the conclusions focus on is the implementation of a European Heritage Label, which is individually dealt with in a position paper of the Council from July 2011.

The document stipulates the „creation by the Union of a European Heritage Label“²¹⁰ and the implementation thereof. Originally the project of an intergovernmental initiative, the now Union-run label is considered complementary to existing initiatives like the UNESCO Heritage List.²¹¹ Its purpose is to improve the quality of information and of cultural activities throughout Europe. According to the document, the label should be in line with „[a] European agenda for culture in a globalizing world“²¹² and thus it is not specifically designed for site protection; its goals are „the promotion of cultural diversity and

²⁰⁷ Document 42010Y1202(01): Conclusions of the Council and of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting within the Council, on the Work Plan for Culture 2011-2014. European Council: 02/12/2010, 4.

²⁰⁸ 42010Y1202(01), Annex I.

²⁰⁹ *ibid.*

²¹⁰ Henceforth ‚label‘; document 52011AG0009: Position (EU) No 9/2011 of the Council at First Reading with a view to the adoption of a Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a European Union action for the European Heritage Label Adopted by the Council on 19 July 2011. Council of the European Union: 19/07/2011, „Whereas“ 5.

²¹¹ Document 52011AG0009: „Whereas“ 8.

²¹² Document 52011AG0009: „Whereas“ 10.

intercultural dialogue as well as of culture as catalyst for creativity“²¹³, as a means to create an „ever closer union“. ²¹⁴ More explicitly, these goals or objectives are predominantly educational in nature. They include raising awareness for the history of Europe and its cultural heritage as well as its diversity and thereby creating a ‚Union spirit‘. This is linked to the teaching and understanding of democratic values and human rights as integral parts of „the process of European integration“. ²¹⁵ A special emphasis should be on younger generations and intercultural dialogue among them (Art.3/3b & e). Furthermore, the label should be an active contributor „to the to the attractiveness and the economic and sustainable development of regions, in particular through cultural tourism.“ (Art.3/3g) The participation of Member States, however, is voluntary. (Art.4). The promotion of multilingualism and the usage of „several languages of the Union“ are among the criteria for projects submitted by candidate sites (Art.7, 1b, iii).

Likewise, foreign language skills appear as key intercultural competences in Council conclusions from December 2011.²¹⁶

They are barely touched upon in the Council conclusions on the Work Plan for Culture 2019-22. Although multilingualism is one of the topics the work plan is inscribed to, the understanding of the concept here is quite narrow, with a specific emphasis on translation and its key role for increased accessibility of content.²¹⁷

4.6 Education

As we have seen, Council documents that focus on cultural aspects very often have an educational dimension and are concerned with competences such as media literacy, digital skills and languages. However, there is a series of Council documents that deal with specifically educational issues. In its conclusions from December 20015, the Coun-

²¹³ Document 52011AG0009: „Whereas“ 11.

²¹⁴ Document 52011AG0009: „Whereas“ 1.

²¹⁵ Document 52011AG0009: Art.3/1a & 2b.

²¹⁶ Document 52011XG1220(03): Council conclusions on cultural and creative competences and their role in building the intellectual capital of Europe. Council of the European Union: 20/12/2011.

²¹⁷ Document 52018XG1221(01): Council conclusions on the Work Plan for Culture 2019-2022. Council of the European Union: 21/12/2018. Annex I, IV, C.

cil discusses the problem of early school leaving and how to promote success in school. Although it is not a special focus of the document, multilingualism is touched upon. Drawing on the Luxemburg Presidency's conference *Diversity and Multilingualism in Early Childhood Education and Care* (September 2015), the text describes early language learning of the language(s) of instruction as an important foundation for life and success in school while respecting „cultural and linguistic diversity“²¹⁸.

In a staff working document accompanying a proposal for a Council recommendation on key competences for lifelong learning, multilingualism occupies a much more prominent role, notably with regards to communication competences. The document calls into question the distinction between communication in the mother tongue and communication in foreign languages as present in the framework of key competences for lifelong learning; according to the document, these denominations are inadequate given their ambiguity in a context where increasing mobility, migration and bi- and multilingual families throughout Europe are a reality. The document also stresses increased consideration of cultural diversity within the reference framework on key competences for lifelong learning. Furthermore, the text recommends a stronger focus „on literacy and on language development overall.“²¹⁹ Moreover, the document calls for a „broader perspective“ on language competences that takes into consideration also academic language and digital communication. Accordingly, the document presents changes to the reference framework that reflect these considerations on language learning and teaching; the first key competence of the framework is literacy, followed by language competence, englobing both first and acquired language skills.²²⁰ „[C]ultural awareness and expression“ is the last key competence mentioned, being preceded by scientific and technological competence, digital skills as well as „soft skills“ and „civic competence“, the latter

²¹⁸ Document 52015XG1215(03): Council conclusions on reducing early school leaving and promoting success in school. Council of the European Union: 15/12/2015, „Invitation to Member States“, 6 & 7,i.

²¹⁹ Document ST 5464 2018 ADD 2: COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT Accompanying the document Proposal for a COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION on Key Competences for LifeLong Learning. Council of the European Union: 18/01/2018; 3.3, p.33.

²²⁰ Document ST 5464 2018 ADD 2, 3.3, p.33.

of with targets people's sticking to democratic values and human rights in the light of current processes of globalization, giving importance also to entrepreneurship.²²¹

Many of these aspects are also stressed in the „[u]nderlying concepts“ of the framework, that include sustainability in line with the UN development goals, „European common values“, covering not only „human dignity, freedom, democracy, [...] the rule of law and respect for human rights“, but also (gender) equality, minority rights and respect for cultural diversity.²²² When going into detail about its call for openness to cultural diversity, the document clarifies how the terms ‚intercultural‘ and ‚cultural understanding‘ are to be understood. It stresses the idea that ‚intercultural‘ implies a historic dimension, „understanding that cultural heritage is rarely isolated from other cultures and that, over time, languages, traditions and cultural products have influenced each other's development“. ²²³ Further emphasis is given to creativity and innovation as well as media literacy.²²⁴ Language is described as a key skill in all of these fields of action. The close description of what efforts have already been made with regards to literacy (p.44-45) and languages competence (p.46-47) in this document is quite critical, underlining the problem of persisting „[u]nderperformance in literacy“²²⁵ across all age groups in the EU, as well as taking the May 2014 Council conclusions on multilingualism into consideration: according to these, „a majority of young Europeans cannot have a simple conversation in the languages they have studied“²²⁶ despite improvements in recent years. Finally, the document summarizes „[p]olicies and projects supporting competence development in lifelong learning perspective“ that have already come into effect.²²⁷

The adoption of the respective recommendation took place in May 2018 and saw crucial changes in the wording of the original proposal. Most importantly, ‚language compe-

²²¹ Document ST 5464 2018 ADD 2, 3.3, p.34-35.

²²² Document ST 5464 2018 ADD 2, 4.1, p.41-43.

²²³ Document ST 5464 2018 ADD 2, 4.1, p.42.

²²⁴ Document ST 5464 2018 ADD 2, 4.1, p.42-43.

²²⁵ Document ST 5464 2018 ADD 2, 4.1, p.38.

²²⁶ Document ST 5464 2018 ADD 2, 4.1, p.47. The mentioned Council conclusions can be found in document 52014XG0614(06).

²²⁷ Document ST 5464 2018 ADD 2, 6, p.83-103, p.87-88 with regards to languages.

tence' is replaced by 'multilingual competence'.²²⁸ The text also provides a definition of multilingual competence; it understands it as „the ability to use different languages appropriately and effectively for communication“²²⁹ and approximates it to one of the other key competences, literacy. Multilingualism, according to the document,

„is based on the ability to understand, express and interpret concepts, thoughts, feelings, facts and opinions in both oral and written form (listening, speaking, reading and writing) in an appropriate range of societal and cultural contexts according to one's wants or needs.“²³⁰

The historical and intercultural and intermedia-dimensions of language skills are also underlined. Another aspect of multilingualism is brought into play: its potential positive side effects on the development of competences in a person's first language, „as well as the acquisition of a country's official language(s)“²³¹. The different ways of language learning (formal, non-formal, informal) and the understanding thereof are among the essential skills for multilingual competences.²³² Another emphasis is put on the cultural aspect of language learning that, according to the text, goes beyond mere grammar, vocabulary and register knowledges, but comes about with a certain „positive attitude“²³³ towards cultural diversity and intercultural communication. This attitude should also include „respect for each person's individual linguistic profile“ with a special focus on speakers of minority and/or migrant languages and the official language(s) of specific countries.²³⁴ As a means to strengthen the development of multilingual competences, the Council proposal recommends „close cooperation with education, training and learning settings abroad, the mobility of educational staff and learners“, as well as

²²⁸ Document ST 8299 2018 INIT: Proposal for a Council Recommendation on Key Competences for Lifelong Learning - Adoption. Council of the European Union: 02/05/2018; here p.15. Related documents: 32018H0604(01) , ST 9009 2018 INIT.

²²⁹ Document ST 8299 2018 INIT, p.17.

²³⁰ *ibid.*

²³¹ Document ST 8299 2018 INIT, p.17.

²³² *ibid.*

²³³ Document ST 8299 2018 INIT, p.18.

²³⁴ *ibid.*

taking advantage of online tools such as eTwinning or EPAL.²³⁵ Again, this Council proposal approximates the acquisition of key competences in lifelong-learning to the needs of a knowledge based society, and the labor market in a globalized world.²³⁶ The text furthermore stresses the importance of the CEFR for language learning and draws attention to similar frameworks such as the Digital Competence Framework, the Entrepreneurship Competence Framework and the Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture developed by the Council of Europe (and, thus, just as the CEFR originally not by a EU institution).²³⁷ According to the document all of these have proven helpful in competence development.²³⁸ Language competences „in both official and other languages [...] relevant to [people's] working and living situation“²³⁹ is supposed to be beneficial specifically to cross-border communication and mobility. As all key competences, they are inscribed to „personal fulfillment, health, employability and social inclusion“.²⁴⁰

Key skills for lifelong learning also have a central function in the Council conclusions from June 2018 on a European Education Area.²⁴¹ Increased mobility again is regarded as both the reason for the need for and the goal of this skill set; with regards to this, digital skills (10), high quality and inclusive education (12) and language learning (13) appear as „important building block[s] of a European Education Area“, in which there are better opportunities „for personal development, mobility and participation in society and employability.“ (13.1) In line with Council conclusions on multilingualism (2014), the document acknowledges the role of education and culture for raising awareness of what we have called earlier a ‚Union spirit‘, that is to say awareness of Europe's „common cultural and educational heritage“ (4).

²³⁵ Document ST 8299 2018 INIT, p.26-27.

²³⁶ Document ST 8299 2018 INIT, p.4-5, „Whereas“ 7, 9, 12.

²³⁷ Document ST 8299 2018 INIT, p.6., „Whereas“ 15.

²³⁸ *ibid.*

²³⁹ Document ST 8299 2018 INIT, p.9, 2.6.

²⁴⁰ Document ST 8299 2018 INIT, p.3 & 5, „Whereas“ 2 & 12.

²⁴¹ Document 52018XG0607(01): Council conclusions on moving towards a vision of a European Education Area. Council of the European Union: 07/06/2018.

Another crucial document with regards to education is the first reading document of a proposal for a revised regulation on the Erasmus+ program.²⁴² It presents a series of amendments to regulation No 1288/2013 on Erasmus+. Some of them explicitly bring multilingualism into play. In reference to a report issued by European Court of Auditor's on Erasmus+, one entirely new paragraph acknowledges the „demonstrable European added value“ that Erasmus+ has achieved, but asks that „European identity or enhanced multilingualism [...] are being adequately taken into account.“²⁴³ This argument is stressed again in amendment 24 (§17a) and 91 (Art.3a) where multilingualism and intercultural dialogue are cited as only two of the many ways through which ‚European added value‘ should be demonstrated. Another aspect that reappears with regards to ‚European added value‘ is the „promotion of a European sense of belonging and strengthening a common European citizenship.“²⁴⁴ With regards to applications for the Erasmus+ program, multilingual is one of the criteria the proposal wishes to see fulfilled by a yet to develop digital tool.²⁴⁵

4.7 EULMP

A series of documents is particularly concerned with EULMP. In its conclusions from November 2011, the Council is specifically occupied with language competences to enhance mobility. It emphasizes the focal points of earlier decisions, like the Council conclusions on European Indicator of Language Competence (2006) and the 2009 framework for European cooperation in education and training (ET 2020).²⁴⁶ Foreign language skills and knowledge of intercultural dialogue are considered beneficial for the un-

²⁴² Document ST 7928 2019 INIT: Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL establishing 'Erasmus': the Union programme for education, training, youth and sport and repealing Regulation (EU) No 1288/2013 - Outcome of the European Parliament's first reading, (Strasbourg, 25 to 28 March 2019). Council of the European Union, European Parliament: 04/04/2019; related documents: ST 14155 2019 INIT, ST 14791 2019 INIT, ST 15040 2019 INIT: outcome document of ST 7928 2019 .

²⁴³ Document ST 7928 2019 INIT, amendment 6, 7a.

²⁴⁴ Document ST 7928 2019 INIT, amendment 91, Art.3a/2/g.

²⁴⁵ Document ST 7928 2019 INIT, amendment 57, 44a.

²⁴⁶ Document 52011XG1220(05): Council conclusions on language competences to enhance mobility. Council of the European Union: 16/11/2011. „Having regard to“ 1,2 & 7.

derstanding between peoples as well as a prerequisite for a mobile workforce and competitiveness of EU economy.²⁴⁷ Moreover, they are identified as key competences of life-long learning and necessary for „personal fulfilment (sic!), active citizenship, social cohesion and employability in a knowledge society“²⁴⁸, as laid down as early as 2002 in a European Council meeting in Barcelona.²⁴⁹ According to the Lisbon-strategy’s objectives in education and training as well as a Council recommendation from 2008 on youth mobility and a Council resolution on a European strategy for multilingualism (2008), the Council conclusions state once more the necessity for Member States to promote multilingualism as a means to strengthen „social cohesion, intercultural dialogue and the European construction“, the competitiveness of the EU, the mobility and employability of its citizens as well as the promotion of EU languages across the world.²⁵⁰ With regards to *Europe 2020*, the conclusions have special regard to the flagship initiatives „an agenda for new skills and jobs“ and „youth on the move“ which they identify as particularly crucial for language competences. The conclusions welcome a Commission’s report on the implementation of a European strategy for multilingualism (2008) and a document called ‚Inventory of Community actions in the field of multilingualism‘ that maps the activities of different Commission services with regards to multilingualism; it also stresses the idea that multilingualism is beneficial for both mobility and employability.²⁵¹ Other documents mentioned are the policy handbook on ‚language learning at pre-primary school level‘ by the Commission (2011) and a report on ‚providing communication skills for the labor market‘ by a ET 2020-working group, the results of which are reintroduced and reinforced when the conclusions agree on a series of points. They put special emphasis on „[a] broader choice of languages, including less-widely used languages and the languages of neighbouring countries“ which "should be offered at all levels of education in a lifelong learning perspective".²⁵² The document

²⁴⁷ Document 52011XG1220(05), „Having regard to“ 2 & 6.

²⁴⁸ Document 52011XG1220(05), „Having regard to“ 3 & „Recalling that“.

²⁴⁹ Document 52011XG1220(05), „Recalling that“.

²⁵⁰ Document 52011XG1220(05), „Having regard to“ 4-6.

²⁵¹ Document 52011XG1220(05), „Welcomes“.

²⁵² Document 52011XG1220(05), „Agrees that“, 6.

specifically focuses on the languages of migrant or Roma children to guarantee their social inclusion.²⁵³ It underlines the importance of high quality language teaching and learning as essential for the internationalization process of higher education, as well as for raising mobility and employability.²⁵⁴ Member States and the Commission are invited to further and conjoint action. For example, the idea to augment the use of the CEFR is stressed.²⁵⁵ They should consider language learning a priority „in the next generation of EU programmes in the field of education and training.“²⁵⁶

Many of these points reappear in the Council conclusions from May 2014 on multilingualism and the development of language competences. In its opening, the document refers to other legal texts including Art.165 &166 (TFEU), ET 2020, Council conclusions from May 2008 on multilingualism, a Council Resolution of 21 November 2008 European strategy for multilingualism, the before mentioned Council conclusions from November 2011 and the Erasmus+ program (regulation No 1288/2013), highlighting the importance of strengthening linguistic competence, thus enhancing mobility and possessing key competences „in the modern world and labour market“.²⁵⁷ The document does not only take into account the narrative of linguistic diversity as a fundamental component of European culture and intercultural dialogue, but also draws on the complex and diverse linguistic landscape of the EU and to the role of language competences as factors to foster mobility, employability and individual development of EU citizens.²⁵⁸ However, the text also underlines the „national facts influencing language learning and teaching“ as well as the „considerable differences in legislation and practice with regard to these.“²⁵⁹ The document also takes into consideration the role of „classical languages“, namely Ancient Greek and Latin, and emphasizes their role as

²⁵³ Document 52011XG1220(05), „Agrees that“, 7.

²⁵⁴ Document 52011XG1220(05), „Agrees that“, 1, 8.

²⁵⁵ Document 52011XG1220(05), „An invites the Member States and the Commission to“, 6.

²⁵⁶ Document 52011XG1220(05), „An invites the Member States and the Commission to“, 10.

²⁵⁷ Document 52014XG0614(06), Council conclusions of 20 May 2014 on multilingualism and the development of language competences. Council of the European Union: 20/05/2014; „Having regard to“.

²⁵⁸ Document 52014XG0614(06), „And in particular to“ & „Considering that“.

²⁵⁹ Document 52014XG0614(06), „Considering that“ 2.

facilitators in language learning, as well as their cultural value for Europe. Particular attention is drawn on the assessment of language skills. Each country should contribute to the assessment process „in accordance with its national context and circumstances“.²⁶⁰ As for funding, Erasmus+ is called as the major money giver with regards to this assessment, with specifications being laid down in the Annex. When calling for precise action by Member States, the subsidiarity principle is underlined. Among other things, Member States are called to „[m]ake greater use of European transparency tools and initiatives designed to support and promote language learning“, as for instance the CEFR, Europass, the European Language Portfolio and the European Language Label.²⁶¹

Furthermore, the Commission's support is called in when Member States are invited to „[e]xchange experiences and best practices via the Open Method of Coordination, in order to improve the effectiveness and quality of language learning and teaching“ and to recognize the importance of non-formal and informal learning with regards to languages.²⁶² The Commission precisely is attributed a monitor function, in which it is invited to „[e]xplore the feasibility of assessing language competences in the Member States“ supported by an expert group.²⁶³ This monitor role also includes the statistical registration of third language learners.²⁶⁴ As such, the Commission is also invited to cooperate „with other organisations active in this field, such as the Council of Europe and its European Centre for Modern Languages.“²⁶⁵

Yet in another document, a proposal for a Council recommendation on a comprehensive approach to the teaching and learning of languages from October 2018, the importance of language competences for the creation of a European Education Area is emphasised.

²⁶⁰ Document 52014XG0614(06), „Agrees that“ 1.

²⁶¹ Document 52014XG0614(06), „Invites the Member States, with due regard to the principle of subsidiarity and in accordance with national circumstances, to“ 5.

²⁶² Document 52014XG0614(06), „Invites Member States, with support of the Commission, to“ 1 & 2.

²⁶³ Document 52014XG0614(06), „Invites the Commission to“ 1.

²⁶⁴ Document 52014XG0614(06), „Invites the Commission to“ 2.

²⁶⁵ Document 52014XG0614(06), „Invites the Commission to“ 3.

zed.²⁶⁶ The document cites several challenges that make language competences so crucial: in the first place, there is mobility within and migration from outside the Union as well as globalization (3); enhanced and improved language learning is believed to „strengthen the European dimension in teaching“ (4) and support the „development of a European identity in all its diversity“, taking into account „local, regional and national identities and traditions“; this in return could result in a better understanding of the EU and its individual Member States among the EU’s citizens. According to the document, there is currently still a need for increased efforts, given that about half of EU citizens are reported to speak only their first language (5) and „[o]nly four in ten learners in secondary education reach the ‘independent user’ level in the first foreign language, indicating an ability to have a simple conversation“ (6). Consequently, the proposal considers this lack of language competences a major obstacle for citizens to take advantage of the opportunities they find in „European education, training and youth programmes“ (7). This includes also the increased mobility multilingual speakers enjoy especially on the labor market, which Member States should actively support.²⁶⁷ The proposal also equates enhanced language skills with increased employability and competitiveness with regards to business (8), as we have seen several times before in different texts. The socially cohesive aspect, especially with regards to the integration of immigrant people, is also underlined, and a special emphasis is given to the digital and non-formal/informal learning sectors’ importance for language learning (9). The document also acknowledges the existence of regional and minority languages that in many cases „transcend national borders“, as well as their limited recognition „for legal and administrative purposes“(11) within Member States. Migrant languages are explicitly mentioned as completing „the linguistic picture of Europe“. This extends to „[l]anguage awareness in school“ (13), especially regarding those languages that are spoken but not taught there. Therefore, the document recommends Member States to strengthen in particular pupils’ „competence in the language of schooling“²⁶⁸ Other issues that are addressed

²⁶⁶ Document ST 13625 2018 INIT: Proposal for a COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION on a comprehensive approach to the teaching and learning of languages. Council of the European Union: 31/10/2018. Related documents: ST 8638 2019 INIT; 32019H0605(02); ST 9015 2019 INIT.

²⁶⁷ Document ST 13625 2018 INIT, „Recommends that Member States“ 4.

²⁶⁸ Document ST 13625 2018 INIT, „Recommends that Member States“ 4c.

are the lack of qualified teachers in modern foreign languages throughout Europe (14), and the efficiency of „Content and Language Integrated Learning“ (16), including digital tools and teaching of other subjects in foreign languages. Accordingly, „the range of languages“ taught in school should be broadened and complemented by assessment and validation of languages „learners [acquired] elsewhere“²⁶⁹. Languages skills are seen as a life-long learning opportunity; furthermore, a plan by the Commission to create a new „European benchmark on language competences“ (19) is mentioned. Recommendations to the Member States include furthermore the provision according to which pupils in the EU should attain „proficient user level in at least one other European language before the end of upper secondary education“.²⁷⁰ Besides support for language teachers „in the development of language awareness“, the document encourages „research in and use of innovative, inclusive and multilingual pedagogies“ with a specific focus on the digital agenda.²⁷¹ Another emphasis is given to monitoring language competences and reporting via the existing frameworks and tools.²⁷² In the document, the Council also welcomes intentions of the Commission that conjointly with Member States plans to develop guidelines on the application of the CEFR and on „new forms of learning and supportive approaches“²⁷³, including „digital tools for language learning“²⁷⁴ and the professional development of instructors. Furthermore, the Council welcomes the Commission’s will to use the Erasmus+ program and EU funding in form of programs such as *Horizon 2020* to „[s]trengthen the mobility of school pupils and learners“²⁷⁵, again with a specific focus on migrants. The document also presents a positive verdict of the Commission’s cooperation with the Council of Europe, notably with its European Centre for Modern Languages, which is considered an important partner in

²⁶⁹ Document ST 13625 2018 INIT, „Recommends that Member States“ 4c.

²⁷⁰ Document ST 13625 2018 INIT, „Recommends that Member States“ 1.

²⁷¹ Document ST 13625 2018 INIT, „Recommends that Member States“ 5.

²⁷² Document ST 13625 2018 INIT, „Recommends that Member States“ 7-8.

²⁷³ Document ST 13625 2018 INIT, „Hereby welcomes the Commission’s intention to“ 1b.

²⁷⁴ Document ST 13625 2018 INIT, „Hereby welcomes the Commission’s intention to“ 1c.

²⁷⁵ Document ST 13625 2018 INIT, „Hereby welcomes the Commission’s intention to“ 2.

achieving the Council's recommended goals.²⁷⁶ In the annex, the Council recommendation outlines several policy approaches as to how the recommended measures can be implemented. As one aspect of „developing comprehensive approaches to language learning“ (p.11), the Council puts an emphasis on „[m]ultilingualism in schools and training centres“ (p.12). Several aspects we have already seen in previous documents reoccur: the development of „[a] positive attitude towards linguistic diversity“ and the transversal integration of language competence and linguistic awareness „into the curricula“; furthermore, the idea of including languages other than „the main global languages of communication“ with special focus on languages of neighboring EU countries and learners' „language competences acquired outside of formal education“ (p.12). A special focus is put on the creation of early learning facilities (nurseries and schools) „in border regions“ to overcome language barriers within these areas of EU. The „linguistic repertoire“ of learners and the valuation and development support thereof equally receive recognition. When it comes to the efficiency and innovativeness of language learning and support for teachers and trainers, several common places are listed: teacher exchanges with „countries where [...] target language[s] are spoken“, raising language awareness of instructors other than language teachers, the inclusion of language assistants, and providing continuous „professional development opportunities“ for teachers with a focus on digital tools (p.13-14). Finally, the Recommendation calls for partnerships in form of parental cooperation and partnerships „in the wider school environment“ such as cooperations with language and cultural centers, public libraries, universities, but also with employers; these cooperations should ideally cover also „[c]ross-border partnerships between education and training institutions“ (p.14).

4.8 Miscellaneous

Finally, there is one a decision by the Council regarding the European Year of Citizens that does not fit into any of the categories we have looked at so far.²⁷⁷ The document recalls the values the EU is built on, e.g. democracy, pluralism, non-discrimination

²⁷⁶ Document ST 13625 2018 INIT, „Hereby welcomes the Commission's intention to“ 3.

²⁷⁷ Document 32012D1093: Decision No 1093/2012/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 November 2012 on the European Year of Citizens (2013). Council of the European Union, Parliament of the European Union: 21/11/2012.

etc.²⁷⁸ The emphasis of the document is on EU citizenship; multilingualism, connected to student and teacher mobility and regarded as a key competence of lifelong learning, should be promoted, as its participatory dimension and therefore relevance for „direct democracy tools“ are taken into account.²⁷⁹ Language skills are considered as a sort of empowerment for citizens to exercise their citizen's rights comprehensively. Consequently, linguistic services are also supposed to receive the highest share of financial contributions to the project.²⁸⁰

5. Conclusion

Europe 2020 by definition is a strategy on growth. In its argumentation it is mainly oriented on economic aspects, though fields like sustainability, social inclusiveness and education also play a major role. However, skill development and social inclusion are focused on employability and mobility, which in return are subordinated to growth in all its facets. This can be regarded as a result of the fact that the strategy was written in response to the 2008 financial crisis. Given its overall direction and argumentation, *Europe 2020* favors KBE and prolongs existing discourses that already focused on this concept. The strategy generally supports a 'democratic' approach, in the sense that Member States are supposed to develop their own national goals placed under *Europe 2020*, and are indeed the main actors with regards to national implementation. This is also visible by the fact that the European Council has full ownership over the strategy, and that implementation is the responsibility of the Council of Ministers, also a Member States institution.

The digital agenda occupies a major role within skill and competence development, since it is considered most fruitful in order to make the EU more economically competitive, socially inclusive and overall more influential and efficient both internally and globally -

²⁷⁸ Document 32012D1093: „Whereas“ 1.

²⁷⁹ Document 32012D1093: „Whereas“ 19; Art.2d.

²⁸⁰ Document 32012D1093: Annex A.

all of which is considered important in a world of globalization and climate change. Digital skills are an integral part of what the EU considers key competences for lifelong learning - as are language skills. Social inclusiveness and mobility come in mainly with regards to people's employability and the EU is overall competitiveness.

The documents in our corpus generally follow the line of the strategy paper, but they are much more specific especially with regards to EULMP. Throughout all categories, multilingualism is presented as a guiding principle. The interpretation of that principle, however, differs from document to document: whereas some texts show a strikingly narrow and technical understanding of multilingualism, merely connected to language skills for translation or applicable on the job market, a majority of documents also considers its cultural dimension.

This dimension, again, comes in different layers. On the one hand, a main focus throughout the documents is to raise awareness of European history and common European cultural heritage to foster the development of a 'Union spirit' - a focus the EU is inscribed to pursue in its efforts to create a European identity. This narrative 'in the making' needs further research, for one may intuitively think of discourses on nation building as seen in Europe in the 19th century and all around the world throughout the 20th and 21st centuries.

On the other hand, the promotion of culture including multilingualism with regards to cultural affairs is not only pursued with such high ideals. The texts are inscribed to the *Europe 2020* strategy that puts growth above everything, though this also includes growing sustainability and social inclusiveness. Multilingualism, also with regards to culture, is therefore also perceived from a skill-oriented point of view, taking predominantly the communicational dimension of it into account.

Another frequently reappearing argument for multilingualism in the analyzed corpus is its participatory component. Multilingualism is believed to enhance participation opportunities, whether it is in politics, the labor market, civic society or when exercising one's citizen's rights. With regards to this, multilingualism as understood in the corpus has a 'democratic' component, enabling people to voice their opinion and needs, have access to information as well as to move more freely within the Union for studies, work or private life.

Mobility, another important aspect multilingualism and language skills are frequently connected to in our corpus, is considered both an expression and a means to foster a European identity and an awareness of the shared heritage, history and multilingual reality of the Union. It needs multilingual speakers that can take advantage of their right to move, work and live freely within the EU. Although mobility is overall also inscribed to growth, this makes perfect sense not only from a KBE-oriented point of view. To work in another country (and culture) usually implies to also live there and interact with locals on a daily basis. Language skills are needed for all parts of this triangle, that, no matter how economically oriented it may be, also represents a cultural experience for those who find themselves in it.

Although neither the original strategy nor the analyzed corpus show any sign of a shift in the EU's language repertoire, there is a notable change in its overall language regime: especially with regards to the before mentioned participatory and democratic components of EULMP, minority languages and the respective cultures of their speakers are attributed a certain value. Their promotion and inclusion into the education systems of Member States is supported and encouraged on several occasions, most notably with regards to Romanes and migrant languages.

This is particularly important since *Europe 2020* is a Council-carried initiative, an institution whose democratic dimension is based on the equality of its members, that is to say the Heads of State and Government of the EU Member States. Ultimately, this equality extends to the Member States' national languages, given their equal status according to regulation No.1 - national languages, but no other. With the often cited lack of democracy in the EU and its institutions, this focus on languages beyond the EU's current nation-state based repertoire certainly adds democratic value to the over EU language regime.

What is also striking about the analyzed corpus is the texts' „obsession“ with the assessment of language skills, which is present across categories. Interestingly, the documents often times make reference to the CEFR, the reference framework developed by the Council of Europe and not an EU institution. This partnership is underlined by several texts, although new ways of assessment are equally envisaged. The dimension of EULMP with regards to foreign relations is not present as such; however, language

skills are attributed an important role facing globalization, since they are a factor for the EU's competitiveness.

Europe 2020 and the policies in line with it are in a KBE-oriented tone that however allows for the introduction of new elements to the EU's discourse on multilingualism. This is most visible in those texts that are critical of the EU's institutions' efforts and even (linguistically rightfully) call concepts like 'mother tongue' and 'foreign language' into question, since their problematic potential of hindering the creation of a European identity and their inaccuracy regarding the linguistic reality of so many people seem to have been understood. So far, however, the wordings have not been changed.

With *Europe 2020* and the policies inscribed to it, the EU can be described as an actor active in many types and approaches to language planning.

The EU engages in acquisition planning, putting incentives on the table that seek to encourage people to learn languages and become active and culturally aware multilingual individuals. Moreover, the EU has discovered the digital agenda as a field of language application and economic relevance; languages at work are even one of its main concerns. The EU pursues predominantly a cultivation approach, for it is engaged in the creation of a multilingual space, at least on paper, and pushes for intercultural dialogue internally and externally.

Its role as status planner is obvious, although the gap between its multilingual language repertoire and overall goal and incoherences to this in its institutions' language regimes have not disappeared.

6. Bibliography

Berthoud, Anne-Claude: "Mehrsprachigkeit als Kaleidoskop des Wissens", in: Lüdi, Georges / Seelmann, Kurt / Sitter-Liver, Beate: *Sprachenvielfalt und Kulturfrieden. Sprachminderheit – Einsprachigkeit – Mehrsprachigkeit: Probleme und Chancen sprachlicher Vielfalt*, Freiburg 2008, p.189-199.

Berthoud, Anne Claude / Lüdi, Georges: "Language policy and planning", in: Wodak, Ruth / Johnstone, Barbara / Kerswill, Paul. (ed.). *The SAGE handbook of sociolinguistics*. London: 2011, p.479-496.

Blommaert, Jan: "The debate is open", in: Blommaert, Jan (ed.): *Language ideological debates*. Berlin: 1999, p.1-39.

Bourdieu, Pierre: *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: 1992.

Bourdieu, Pierre / Boltanski, Luc: Formal Qualifications and Occupational Hierarchies: „The Relationship between the Production System and the Reproduction System“, in: King, E.J.: *Reorganizing Education: Management and Participation for Change*. London/Beverly Hills: 1977.

Busch, Brigitte: *Mehrsprachigkeit*. Vienna: 2013.

Buchmüller-Codoni, Catherine: „Democracy and linguistic justice in the European Union“, in: *Living Reviews in Democracy* 3 (2012), retrieved from <https://cis.ethz.ch/>.

Cardinal, Linda / Normand, Martin: „Des accents distincts : les régimes linguistiques ontarien et québécois“, in: Savard, Jean-François / Brassard, Alexandre, Côté, Louis (ed.): *Les relations Ontario-Québec : un destin partagé*. Montreal: 2011, p.131-158.

Cardinal, Linda / Sontag, Selma: „Traditions étatiques et régimes linguistiques : comment et pourquoi s'opèrent les choix de politiques linguistiques?“, in: *Revue internationale de politique comparée* 22(1), 2015, p.115-131.

Cooper, Robert: *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: 1989.

Coulmas, Florian: „Changing language regimes in globalizing environments“, in: *Journal of the Sociology of Language* 175-176 (2005), p.3-15.

Gal, Susan: „Migration, minorities and multilingualism“, in: Mar-Molinero, Clare / & Stevenson, Patrick (ed.), *Language ideologies, policies and practices: Language and the future of Europe*. London: 2006, p.13-27.

Gal, Susan: *Linguistic regimes and European diversity*. Keynote Lecture delivered at the Conference 'New Challenges for Multilingualism in Europe', Dubrovnik, 12 April 2010.

Giordan, Henri: *La question des langues en Europe*. Revised version of a lecture given at the colloquium 'The Assessment of the European Multilingualism: Reviewing the European Year of Languages 2001', Tokyo: January 26-27, 2002.

Graziadei, Michele: „Law, Language and Multilingualism in Europe: The Call for a New Legal Culture“, in: Šarčević, Susan (ed.): *Language and Culture in EU Law. Multidisciplinary Perspectives*. New York: 2015, p.17-31.

Grin, Francois: *Language Policy Evaluation and the European Charter for Regional or Minority Language*. New York: 2003.

Hannay, David (ed.): *Britain's Entry into the European Community: Report by Sir Con O'Neill on the Negotiations of 1970-1972*. Abingdon-on-Thames: 2018.

Hornberger, Nancy: „Frameworks and Models in Language Policy and Planning Research“, in: Ricento, Thomas (ed.): *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*. Oxford: 2006, p.24-41.

Kaplan, Robert / Baldauf, Richard: *Language Planning from Practice to Theory*. Clevedon: 1997.

Knechtelsdorfer, Eva: „Monolingual Multilingualism?“ *European Language Policy and the Role of English as a Lingua Franca*. Vienna: 2013.

Kraus, Peter: *Europäische Öffentlichkeit und Sprachpolitik*. Frankfurt: 2004.

Kraus, Peter / Kazlauskaitė-Gürbüz, Rūta: "Addressing linguistic diversity in the European Union: Strategies and dilemmas“, in: *Ethnicities* 14(4), 2014, p.517-538.

Kremnitz, Georg: *Gesellschaftliche Mehrsprachigkeit*. Vienna: 1994.

Krzyżanowski, Michał / Oberhuber, Florian: *(Un)Doing Europe: Discourses and practices of negotiating the EU constitution*. Brussels: 2007.

Krzyżanowski, Michał / Wodak, Ruth: "Political Strategies and languages policies: The EU Lisbon strategy and its implications for the EU's language and multilingualism policy“, in: *Language Policy* 10 (2), 2011, p.115-136.

Lo Bianco, Joseph: "Language Policy and Planning", in: Hornberger N.H. / McKay, S.L.: *Socio-linguistics and language education*. Clevedon: 2010, p.143-176.

Longman, Chris: "English as Lingua Franca: A Challenge to the Doctrine of Multilingualism", in Castiglione, Dario / Longman, Chris: *The Language Question in Europe and Diverse Societies: Political, Legal, and Social Perspectives*, Oxford: 2007, p.185-216.

Loos, Eugène: „Language Choice, Linguistic Capital and Symbolic Domination in the European Union“, in: *Language Problems & Language Planning* 24(1), 2000, p.37-53.

McGroarty, Mary: "Language Planning in the USA“, in Eggington, William / Wren, Helen (ed.) *Language Policy*. Amsterdam: 1997, p.67-90.

Questiaux, Nicole: "Why Europe? From Contradiction to Refoundation“, in Andrew, Joe / Crook, Malcolm / Waller, Michael: *Why Europe? Problems of Culture and Identity, Vol. I, Political and Historical Dimensions*. Basingstoke: 2000, p.19-34.

Schiffman, Harold: *Linguistic Culture and Language Policy*. London: 1998.

Ungar, Johann / Wodak, Ruth / Krzyżanowski, Michał: „Introduction: Encountering Multilingualism in Europe's Institutions“, in: Ungar, Johann / Wodak, Ruth / Krzyżanowski, Michał: *Multilingual Encounters in Europe's Institutional Spaces*. London: 2014, p.1-12.

Van Els, Theo: "Multilingualism in the European Union“, in: *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 15 (3), 2005, p.263-281.

Van Parijs, Phillipe: "Europe's linguistic challenge.", in: *The Language Question in Europe and Diverse Societies: Political, Legal, and Social Perspectives*, Oxford: 2007, p.217-253.

Vizi, Balás: „Minority languages and multilingualism in Europe and in the European Union“, in: *European Studies* 29 (2012), p.135-158.

Volman, Yvo: „The Lisbon Treaty and Linguistic Diversity: Policy and Practice in the European Institutions“, in: *European Studies* 29, 2012, p.37-56.

Wodak, Ruth / Krzyżanowski, Michał / Forchtner, Bernhard: „The interplay of language ideologies and contextual cues in multilingual interactions: Language choice and code-switching in European Union institutions“, in: *Language in Society* 14/2 (2012), p.157-186.

Wright, Sue: "Language Rights, Democracy and the European Union ", in Freeland, Jane / Patrick, Donna (ed.): *Language Rights and Language Survival: Sociolinguistic and Sociocultural Perspectives*. Manchester: 2004, p.225-229.

Online resources

e-justice.europa.eu

ethnologue.com

plataforma-llengua.cat.

ec.europa.eu/eurostat.

politico.eu

legilux.lu

europa.eu

Non-corpus documents

Bologna-declaration, 1999, 3; retrieved from: magna-charta.org.

European Commission: *Special Eurobarometer 386. Europeans and their Languages*. Brussels: 2012.

European Commission: *The Teaching of Regional or Minority Languages in Schools in Europe. Eurydice Report*. Luxemburg: 2019. Eurydice is „a network of 43 national units based in all 38 countries of the Erasmus+ programme. From: eacea.ec.europa.eu.

European Council: *Presidency conclusions—Lisbon. European council 23–24 March 2000*. Brussels: 2000; from: europarl.europa.eu.

European Council: Lisbon European Council, 23 and 24 March 2000: Presidency Conclusions. from: europarl.europa.eu.

European Commission: *Multilingualism: An asset for Europe and a shared commitment*. Brussels: 18/09/2008

Kok Report: *Facing the challenge: The Lisbon strategy for growth and employment. Report from the high level group chaired by Wim Kok*. Luxembourg: 2004.

Corpus documents

Document 31958R0001: Regulation No 1 determining the languages to be used by the European Economic Community. Council of the European Union: 15/04/1958.

Document 01958R0001-20130701: Consolidated text: Regulation No 1 determining the languages to be used by the European Economic Community. Council of the European Union: 01/07/2013.

Document 11972B/TXT: Treaty of Accession of Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom; 22/01/1972.

Document ST 5598 2019 INIT, Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a European Maritime Single Window environment and repealing Directive 2010/65/EU Preparation for the trilogue. Council of the European Union, 31/01/2019.

Document 42012Y1219(01): Conclusions of the Council and of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting within the Council, of 27 November 2012 on the participation and social inclusion of young people with emphasis on those with a migrant background. Council of the European Union: 27/11/2012.

Document ST 11487 2018 INIT: Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down the legal framework of the European Solidarity Corps and amending Regulations (EU) No 1288/2013, (EU) No 1293/2013, (EU) No 1303/2013, (EU) No 1305/2013, (EU) No 1306/2013 and Decision No 1313/2013/EU – Outcome of the European Parliament's first reading (Strasbourg 10-13 September 2018). Council of the European Union: 13/09/2018. Related documents: PE 47 2018 INIT, 32018R1475 PE 47 2018 REV 1.

Document 52011XG0429(01): Council conclusions inviting the introduction of the European Case Law Identifier (ECLI) and a minimum set of uniform metadata for case law. Council of the European Union, 29/04/2011.

Document ST 9643 2018 ADD 4: COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT Accompanying the document Proposal for a COUNCIL DIRECTIVE establishing an EU Emergency Travel Document and repealing Decision 96/409/CFSP, 01/06/2019. Related document: ST 9643 2018 ADD 4 REV 1, 02/05/2019.

Document ST 9622 2018 ADD 2: COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT Accompanying the document Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council amending Regulation (EC) No 1393/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the service in the Member States of judicial and extrajudicial documents in civil or commercial matters (service of documents), 06/06/2018.

Document 32013D0743: Council Decision of 3 December 2013 establishing the specific programme implementing Horizon 2020 - the Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) and repealing Decisions 2006/971/EC, 2006/972/EC, 2006/973/EC, 2006/974/EC and 2006/975/EC; European Council: 03/12/2013.

Document 52019XG0605(03): Council conclusions on young creative generations. Council of the European Union, 05/06/2019.

Document ST 8468 2018 ADD 2: COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT Accompanying the document Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the implementation and functioning of the .eu Top Level Domain name and repealing Regulation (EC) No 733/2002 and Commission Regulation (EC) No 874/2004. Council of the European Union, 27/04/2018, 2.2.1, p.9. Related documents: ST 8468 2018 INIT, ST 5882 2019 INIT, PE 84 2018 INIT PE 84 2018 REV 1 32019R0517 PE 84 2018 REV 2.

Document 42010Y1202(01): Conclusions of the Council and of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States, meeting within the Council, on the Work Plan for Culture 2011-2014. European Council: 02/12/2010.

Document 52011AG0009: Position (EU) No 9/2011 of the Council at First Reading with a view to the adoption of a Decision of the European Parliament and of the Council establishing a European Union action for the European Heritage Label Adopted by the Council on 19 July 2011. Council of the European Union: 19/07/2011.

Document 52011XG1220(03): Council conclusions on cultural and creative competences and their role in building the intellectual capital of Europe. Council of the European Union: 20/12/2011.

Document 52018XG1221(01): Council conclusions on the Work Plan for Culture 2019-2022. Council of the European Union: 21/12/2018.

Document 52015XG1215(03): Council conclusions on reducing early school leaving and promoting success in school. Council of the European Union: 15/12/2015.

Document ST 5464 2018 ADD 2: COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT Accompanying the document Proposal for a COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION on Key Competences for LifeLong Learning. Council of the European Union: 18/01/2018.

Document ST 8299 2018 INIT: Proposal for a Council Recommendation on Key Competences for Lifelong Learning - Adoption. Council of the European Union: 02/05/2018.
Related documents: 32018H0604(01) , ST 9009 2018 INIT.

Document 52018XG0607(01): Council conclusions on moving towards a vision of a European Education Area. Council of the European Union: 07/06/2018.

Document ST 7928 2019 INIT: Proposal for a REGULATION OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL establishing 'Erasmus': the Union programme for education, training, youth and sport and repealing Regulation (EU) No 1288/2013 - Outcome of the European Parliament's first reading, (Strasbourg, 25 to 28 March 2019). Council of the European Union, European Parliament: 04/04/2019.
Related documents: ST 14155 2019 INIT, ST 14791 2019 INIT, ST 15040 2019 INIT: outcome document of ST 7928 2019 .

Document 52011XG1220(05): Council conclusions on language competences to enhance mobility. Council of the European Union: 16/11/2011.

Document 52014XG0614(06), Council conclusions of 20 May 2014 on multilingualism and the development of language competences. Council of the European Union: 20/05/2014.

Document ST 13625 2018 INIT: Proposal for a COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION on a comprehensive approach to the teaching and learning of languages. Council of the European Union: 31/10/2018.

Related documents: ST 8638 2019 INIT; 32019H0605(02); ST 9015 2019 INIT.

Document 32012D1093: Decision No 1093/2012/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 November 2012 on the European Year of Citizens (2013). Council of the European Union, Parliament of the European Union: 21/11/2012.

7. Annex

1)



Structural Funds (ERDF and ESF) eligibility 2014-2020. From ec.europa.eu.

2)

<i>Approaches</i>	<i>Policy Planning (on form)</i>	<i>Cultivation Planning (on function)</i>
Types		
Status Planning (about uses of language)	Officialization Nationalization Standardization of status Proscription	Revival Maintenance Spread Interlingual Communication -- international, intranational
Acquisition Planning (about users of language)	Group Education/School Literary Religious Mass media Work ----- SELECTION <u>Language's formal role in society</u> <i>Extra-Lx aims</i>	Reacquisition Maintenance Shift Foreign language/second language/literacy ----- IMPLEMENTATION <u>Language's functional role in society</u> <i>Extra-Lx Aims</i>
Corpus Planning (about language)	Standardization of corpus Auxiliary code Graphization ----- CODIFICATION <u>Language's form</u> <i>Lx Aims</i>	Modernization (new functions) Lexical Stylistic Renovation (new forms-old functions) Purification Reform Stylistic simplification Terminology unification ----- ELABORATION <u>Language's functions</u> <i>Semi-Lx Aims</i>

Hornberger, Nancy: „Frameworks and Models in Language Policy and Planning Research“, in: Ricento, Thomas (ed.): *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*. Oxford: 2006, p.24.