

History of the “Normalization” of Basque in the Public Administration Sphere

Cobarrubias, Juan

Seton Hall University. Educational Leadership Management and Policy. 400 South Orange Avenue, JH # 443. South Orange. New Jersey 07079

Saiakera honek normalizazio kontzeptuaren argibide bat eskaintzen du, eta Hizkuntz Normalizazioa eta Normalizazio Politikoa bereizten ditu. Gainera, Euskal Autonomia Erkidegoan egungo Espainiako Konstituzioaren testuinguruan egín diren hizkuntza-plangintzak deskribatzen ditu. Era berean, Euskal Foru Tradizioaren eta Foru Kulturaren historia politikoaren azalpen soziolinguistikoa bat ematen du, lagungarri baitzaigu Normalizazio Politikoko gaiet buruzko egungo eztabaida ulertzeko.

Giltza-Hitzak: Hizkuntza-normalizazioa. Normalizazio politikoa. Hizkuntza-plangintza. Hizkuntza-plangintzako eredu funtzionala. Foruak. Foru-legea. Foru-kultura. Hedadura funtzionala.

Esta ponencia intenta aclarar el concepto de normalización y distingue entre Normalización Lingüística y Normalización Política. Describe la historia de los esfuerzos por implantar planes lingüísticos en la Comunidad Autónoma del País Vasco en el contexto de la Constitución española actual. Ofrece una perspectiva sociolingüística de la cultura y tradición forales vascas con el objeto de ayudar a entender el diálogo actual en materia de Normalización Política.

Palabras Clave: Normalización Lingüística. Normalización Política. Planificación lingüística. Modelo funcional de la planificación lingüística. Fueros. Derecho foral. Cultura foral. Difusión funcional.

Cet essai propose un éclaircissement du concept de normalisation et distingue entre normalisation linguistique et normalisation politique. Il dresse un historique des efforts de planification linguistique dans la Communauté Autonome du Pays Basque, dans le contexte de la Constitution espagnole en vigueur. Il propose une description sociolinguistique de l'histoire politique de la tradition et de la culture forales basques, description visant à enrichir la compréhension du dialogue actuel portant sur la question de la normalisation politique.

Mots-Clé : Normalisation linguistique. Normalisation politique. Planification linguistique. Modèle fonctionnel de planification linguistique. Fors. Loi forale. Culture forale. Diffusion fonctionnelle.

This paper has been written mainly for the non-specialist audience. The points raised here may also be of interest to the international and Basque audiences. The methodology used is mostly interpretive macro ethnographic and archival.

CLARIFICATION OF THE CONCEPT OF NORMALIZATION: TWO MEANINGS, LINGUISTIC AND POLITICAL

The concept of Normalization has been used in recent times to refer to the recovery of the status of the Basque language from the years of language loss during the Franco era, and it has also been used in the political discourse to express the desire for increased autonomy in the Autonomous Community of the Basque Country, statehood, and independence. There are two meanings of Normalization, one *linguistic*, one *political*. However, the concept has generated considerable confusion in both contexts.

Normalization is a relatively new concept, and it barely appears in the Anglo-Saxon linguistic literature, where the concept of Standardization is most frequently used instead. But they may not be two interchangeable concepts for the reasons that will be described below. According to the data available -from written records and scholarly citations-, the concept of Normalization probably started in the Catalan region and it was used in informal contexts and discussions, during the last years of the Franco regime, on what was to become the future of the regional languages. A change in the status of these languages was imminent. Everyone in the minority language regions, particularly Catalonia and the Basque region, anticipated a change of the status of their regional languages, referred to as the process of language *recovery* (*recuperación del Euskara*), and also anticipated the possibility of planning the recovery of these languages some of which (Basque) had even been proscribed during Franco’s regime.

The discussion became a bit more circumscribed among sociologists and sociolinguists of the Autonomous communities with no apparent experience in empirical work on language planning, but who had read some of the technical literature that had appeared since the mid 1960’s. In these circles, Normalization was perceived as the alternative to language loss, which had been happening to all minority languages in Spain during the Franco dictatorship. This use of the word “normalization” spread rapidly in what today are some of the Autonomous Communities.

Ninyoles writes (1971) a book *Idioma i Prejudici* in which he devotes a chapter to Linguistic Normalization. He says that “Normalization requires *something besides language planning*” (p. 93, my emphasis) though he does not specify -at that point- what it may be, nor does he describe what language planning consists of either, he indicates that “normalization is not a term that can be used in a purely linguistic context” (p. 94). He characterizes normalization as a process consisting of *two* different tasks: “on the *one* hand it means to norm, regulate, codify, standardize a language in order to establish a supradialectal variety; on

the *other* hand it also means to place, or restore a culture to its 'normal' level, to place it at a level of equality among other cultures, at the same level". He, citing Ferguson (1968), indicates that the first task –standardization- is a "requirement of modernization" and it is defined as the process of a language variety for the entire linguistic community as a supradialectal norm" (p. 93-94). In the Basque Autonomous Community (Bizkaia, Guipuzkoa, and Araba) the Euskara Batua, or unified Basque, has been playing this role. It should be noted, though, that tensions still exist to this day in many contexts between the Batua and the Vizcaino variety. Many speakers of Vizcaino feel left out in many decisions pertaining to the unification and modernization of Basque -according to materials collected through ethnographic interviews I have conducted with Vizcaino informants. Nynoles comments that the "acceptance of a supraregional variety is not conceivable without a previous consciousness of community" (p. 95). He adds that "linguistic normalization constitutes a phenomenon of historical proportions" (p. 99).

The *second* task does not consist in formulating "linguistic norms, establish a grammar, a phonetic system and a lexicon but this sense of normalization consists in placing a culture at a 'normal level' and raising it to a level of equality with the other cultures". (p. 100) Nynoles makes reference to the status of the Valencian language as the object of prejudice and discrimination and advocates to abolish the *diglossic* status that it had and to put an end to the hierarchical difference existing at the time (p. 100) between Valencian and Castellan. This sense of "normalization" moves clearly into the political arena. It prompted the formation of "Antidiglossic societies" in many areas of the current Autonomous Communities including the Basque Autonomous Community ("Txillardegui" -personal communication, 1993).

The term "diglossia" was introduced by Ferguson (1959) to distinguish two language varieties existing in a given linguistic community, one of which is used for formal contexts (a High variety) and another used for informal discourse (Low variety). It was not originally a concept presented as conflictive. But it was a good concept to apply to the conflicting situation existing in many communities in Spain during Franco. It was later expanded to the classification of bilingual communities that may be diglossic or not (Fishman 1976).

Most of the initial efforts to combat diglossia as the culprit of language loss were centered in Barcelona, Valencia, and the Basque region. It was not clear what to do first and what steps to follow. But as soon as appropriate legislation was enacted in each Autonomous Community, the issue became clearer and the focus was placed on the constructive aspect of starting the process of Linguistic Normalization.

Many people had heard about Language Planning as a mechanism to revitalize oppressed languages. There were many case studies of international communities where Language Planning had been applied successfully to standardize and empower a language: Indonesia and Quebec, among others. The situation in Quebec was attractive to many administrators in the Basque Autonomous Com-

munity, though there were significant differences. The situation was particularly serious in the Basque Autonomous Community because of the loss that Basque had suffered during the Franco years. Language was lost in a great number of functions, including Public Administration, because it was not used for that purpose for close to forty years or more. It has been estimated that the number of speakers of Basque who could also write it pretty much knew each other and the total did not supersede 3,500 educated adults (Mikel Zalvide 1989–personal communication). This is an amazing fact considering that the total number of Basque speakers at the time of Franco’s death and the 1975 census estimated that there were 631,301 Basque speakers on the Spanish side and 229,383 on the French side of the Basque Country. The total population of the entire Basque Country was 2,594,000. Many more speakers of Basque could read it than write it, but even the figure of how many could read Basque texts in 1975 is not clear. The number is uncertain as it was almost impossible to keep accurate records.

The “Ikastolas” (*Basque schools*) movement had been going on, clandestinely in some areas, for several years before Franco’s death in defiance of Franco’s policies. The first three Ikastolas started in Gipuzkoa in 1960, two more were added in 1962, and six more in 1963, including two in Bizkaia and one in Araba. The number grew steadily and by 1976 there were 148 Ikastolas at work. Many of these schools operated under adverse official conditions and in some cases in private residences rotating their location to avoid repression. There is no *reliable* statistical information on the exact number of students who were able to read and write in Euskara at the beginning of the Basque schools movement, until much later when record keeping became possible. The figures differ considerably.

In a short time, the discourse on political Normalization took another turn. It went from the initial struggle and confusion of seeing the elimination of its perceived *diglossic* status as a main objective, to a more proactive and clearer stance of empowering the Basque language, the identity, and culture of the Basque Autonomous Community. The first step was to attain legal protection that would bring its political status closer to the *foral* legislation that many of the provinces of the Basque Country had enjoyed, including the Basque Autonomous Community, in years preceding the dictatorship. Many politicians, including several presidents of the dominant Basque Nationalist Party (*Partido Nacionalista Vasco*), defined political normalization as status close to statehood.

In the beginning, the discourse was a bit ambiguous and in listening to politicians like Xabier Arzallus (longtime President of the PNV), political normalization sounded like a utopia. But recently the objectives are clearer and stated straightforwardly. President of the Basque Autonomous Community, Juan José Ibarretxe, has indicated that “today we face two major challenges: One to secure peace in the country which has suffered years of violence perpetrated by ETA; the other to attain political normalization through an agreement with the Spanish State that will allow us to put an end to our long-standing political conflict. A political conflict that goes back to the 19th century hemorrhage and must be resolved by political and democratic means, by applying modern principles for formulating the

right to self-determination of peoples as recommended by the United Nations” (Ibarretxe 2008).

In order to understand how the two tasks –linguistic and political- of Normalization differ, we need to understand the nature of the laws that make them possible. Linguistic Normalization was enacted in 1982 by the Basque Parliament that approved the *Normalization Law of the Basque Language* (Law 10/1982). Its scope is clear but no counterpart legislation was enacted concerning political Normalization. The most recent *Political Statute of the Basque Community* approved by the Basque Parliament in 2004 comes close to doing that and to fulfilling the existing legislative gap. However, this law will have to go to a plebiscite. The reason: the linguistic Normalization law hinges upon the Spanish Constitution of 1978 while the Political Statute does not.

Let us review the legislative context first and then discuss linguistic and political normalization as the two distinct processes that they are.

THE LEGAL CONTEXT OF NORMALIZATION

The *Normalization Law of the Basque Language* (Law 10/1982) was approved by the Basque Parliament with a respectable margin of approval. It provides the framework of activities that can be conducted within the jurisdiction of the Basque Autonomous Community in order to *empower* the use of the Basque language and develop it for use in the institutional life of the Community beyond the informal domains, like the family, informal interpersonal relations and other language functions in which it had been used in the era of the dictatorship where control to prevent its use could not be enforced.

The enactment of the *Normalization Law* marks the beginning of a new era unlike any other that preceded. Under this type of legislation, the Basque language could be planned, standardized, and modernized to be used to satisfy the needs of a modern society. First and foremost it could be used and implemented as the language of public administration. This included, additionally, using Basque for relevant legislative purposes within the Basque Autonomous Community and in the courts. It could be used as the language of education. Although Basque had been used in education for some time in the *Ikastolas*, its use was legitimized as of 1982. The Law also cleared the way to implement a formal process of planning the *corpus* of the Basque language for special purposes in domains where it had not been used, such as in the media, security, and public order and public health. It made it possible to consolidate past effective educational practices and develop educational models to serve the needs of the Community.

The *Normalization Law* rests on the *Statutes of Autonomy* and the *Statutes* rest on the *Spanish Constitution of 1978*. The *Spanish Constitution of 1978* states in its Article three the following:

1. Castellan is the official language of the State. All Spaniards have the duty to know it and the right to use it.
2. The other languages of Spain will also be official in their respective autonomous communities according to their statutes.
2. The wealth of the different linguistic modalities in Spain is a cultural patrimony which will be the object of special respect and protection.

(IVAP 1986: 3; translation supplied)

The *Constitution* of 1978 clearly recognizes the multilingual nature of Spain but it also states that no other language will have nation-wide scope but Castellan. It also states that the cultural differences existing in Spain are a national patrimony and will be the object of respect and *protection* (emphasis supplied). It is hard to imagine what protections have been given in the years past after the passage of the Constitution concerning cultural rights in the Basque Autonomous Community.

The Constitution gives the autonomous communities authority to legislate over the teaching of their respective languages. Section 17 of Article 148 states that “the autonomous communities will have competence on the following matters: promotion of culture, research, and, where the case may be, the teaching of the languages of the autonomous community”. The Constitutional Tribunal intervenes in case of conflict.

The autonomous communities moved swiftly toward drafting and passing their respective Statutes. The Basque Autonomous Community approved its Statute on December 18, 1979, Catalonia on the same date and Galicia on April 6, 1981. They all established co-official status of their respective vernacular languages with Castellan.

The *Statute of Autonomy* (1979) promoted the Basque language, for the first time, to an *official status* in the Basque Autonomous Community. It has been argued that, in the past, the absence of a political entity that provided unifying force to support the Basque language as an official language in what today constitutes the Basque Autonomous Community contributed to the ramification of the language into dialects. The majority of the dialects have survived to this day. In most cases known to us, communities forming a nation select a language variety as the norm, the language that represents the community, and the rest of the existing dialects ally themselves with the official variety. This has not been the case of the existing dialects in the Basque Autonomous Community. Each Basque Community (The Basque Autonomous Community and the Foral Community of Navarre) had its own *foral* laws and neither felt the need to come together to choose an official language for all, in spite of the many commonalities they shared.

Political differences also kept them apart many times in their history.

The first three regions that had voted for a statute of autonomy -Catalonia, the Basque Autonomous Community, and Galicia- were designated “historic nation-

alities” and permitted to attain autonomy through a simple procedure. The other regions would be required to take a slower route, although Andalusia was also designated as an exception to this general rule. It was not a “historic nationality,” but there was much evidence, including mass demonstrations of significant popular support for autonomy. As a result, a special, quicker process was created for it.

The various Statutes of Autonomy reorganized Spain politically. By May 1983 the entire state had been divided into seventeen autonomous communities (*comunidades autónomas*): the *Basque Country*, *Catalonia*, *Galicia*, *Andalusia*, *Asturias*, *Aragón*, *Balearic Islands*, *Canary Islands*, *Cantabria*, *Castile and León*, *Castile-La Mancha*, *Extremadura*, *Navarra*, *La Rioja*, and the regions of *Madrid*, *Murcia*, and *Valencia*. In 1995 two autonomous cities, *Ceuta* and *Melilla*, were added.

The basic political institutions of each political community are similar to those of the Spanish state as a whole. Each has a unicameral legislature elected by universal adult suffrage and an executive consisting of a president and a Council of Government responsible to that legislature.

The powers (*competencias*) to be exercised by the regional governments are also stated in the Constitution and in the regional statutes of autonomy. However, there were differences between the “historic nationalities” and the other communities in the extent of the powers that were initially granted to them. They controlled the organization of their institutions, urban planning, public works, housing, environmental protection, cultural affairs, sports and leisure, tourism, health and social welfare, and the cultivation of the regional language (where there was one). After five years these regions could accede to full autonomy, but the meaning of “full autonomy” was not clearly defined. The transfer of powers to the autonomous governments has been determined in an ongoing process of negotiation between the individual communities and the central government that has given rise to repeated disputes. The communities, especially Catalonia and Andalusia, have argued that the central government has dragged its feet in ceding powers and in clarifying financial arrangements. In 2005, the Spanish Parliament, the *Cortes*, granted greater autonomy to Catalonia, declaring the region a *nation* in 2006. This has not been the case with the Basque Autonomous Community (BAC). However, a number of critics have responded that the BAC is the community with the greatest level of autonomy.

The Spanish Constitution of 1978 provides, in its Article 3, a relatively high level of autonomy. To many constitutionalists, it accords a higher level of autonomy than the 1931 Constitution of the Second Republic. An analytical comparison between them shows that the level of autonomy granted in the 1931 Constitution is diffused to say the least. In its Article 4 it states:

- * Spanish is the official language of the Republic
- * Every Spanish citizen has the obligation of knowing the language and the right to use it, without prejudice to rights that the laws of the State recognize to the regional languages or provinces

* Except as disposed by special laws, no citizen is obligated to know or to use any regional language

No mention is made of the cultural patrimony of the regions, just the language. The text is much more loosely written than in the case of the 1978 Constitution which is not without problems. However, the 1931 legislation is the first Constitution that makes explicit mention of regions. Nevertheless, the 1978 Constitution is the first to make a difference between “nationalities” and “regions” (Acosta España 1981:15).

The first Spanish Constitution is the Constitution of 1812. It divided Spain in seventeen possessions within the peninsula and stated that a “more convenient divisions would be done when the political circumstances permitted” (Article 10). The political situation of Spain was very difficult at this time as the war of independence against Napoleon was taking place and the *Cortes* met in Cadiz and not in Madrid. Many have said that this Constitution was probably the most modern in the liberal world.

After the war, Ferdinand VII returned to the country and annulled the Constitution in order to become an absolute monarch, governing by decrees and restoring the Spanish Inquisition that had been abolished by Joseph Bonaparte. Ferdinand VII made some ambiguous concessions to the liberals making them hope for a more liberal legislation in the future. But the absolutist party did not want to lose ground as its members knew that Maria Cristina and Isabella would make liberal reforms. Therefore, they sought another candidate for the throne and they found it in Ferdinand’s brother Carlos. This decision was also based on the *Salic Law* promulgated by Phillip V of Spain, which declared illegal the inheritance of the Spanish crown by women. This was an attempt to thwart the Hapsburgs’ regaining the throne by way of a female dynastic line.

In the Basque Country at the time there was a strong movement to suppress the Basque ‘*Fueros*’, the legislation that had been used both in the Basque Autonomous Community and Navarre since the creation of *foral* legislation. The Basque Provinces and Navarre sided with Carlos because it was perceived that Carlos was close to them and that the Carlist cause in the Basque Country was a *foralist* cause. This view was arbitrary though it was the first indication of Basque nationalism before the ideology of the Arana brothers, Luis and Sabino. Many supporters of the Carlist cause strongly believed that the traditionalist rule would respect ancient *Foral* institutions.

In 1833, Javier de Burgos, minister of Isabel II, divided Spain in forty-nine provinces. This division has been maintained until recently. Spain had a complicated history of changing Constitutions in a relatively short period of time. During the XIX century there were five different Constitutions. Most of them -1833, 1837, 1845, 1868 (deposition of Isabella II) and 1876- did not recognize or mention ‘regions’. In fact, all of them attempted to eradicate regionalisms. The XIX century is a turbulent time of ideological centralism in which Spain loses many of its colonies abroad and struggles to maintain its unity. Most of the historical regions

lose their autonomy, except the Basque Community and Navarre, which retained their traditional autonomy until 1841 and 1876, respectively. The Basque Community and Navarre maintained a considerable degree of autonomy even until 1936 (Olabarri Gortazar 1981). The Carlist Wars are part of these turbulent times. The First Carlist War takes place between 1833 and 1839. The Second Carlist War takes place between 1872 and 1876.

At the end of the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939) Franco becomes a dictator. Franco dies in 1975. Juan Carlos is appointed King in the same year. There are three years of transition to reorganize the country and return Spain to democracy. The 1978 Constitution marks the return to democracy, but it does it with a certain degree of ambivalence. In Article 2, it states the “indivisible unity of the Spanish nation” and at the same time affirms “the right to autonomy of the *nationalities* and *regions* (emphasis supplied)”. To many, this is not surprising as they see the 1978 document as a form of federalism in which the accent was placed on the centralism inherited from centuries past. To many constitutionalists this is a timid form of federalism (Arino Ortiz 1981:21). It leaves a lot of questions unanswered. Though it provides for strong linguistic regional autonomy and paves the way to efforts of language revival, the central administration left unattended and forgotten the aspirations of Basques to regain autonomy commensurate to the times of *foral* culture legislation.

LINGUISTIC NORMALIZATION

The Constitution of 1978 provided the legal base for the *Statutes of Autonomy* through which each region organized itself legally and institutionally. The institutionalization process of language normalization starts shortly after the enactment of the *Normalization Law of the Basque Language* in 1982. This is a period of frantic activity through which the goals and the agenda of Normalization are being drawn. The steps to follow and the priorities are not clear yet, though there is a constructive climate in which people look to contribute to the betterment of the Community. Institutions begin to open to the use of Basque Language, educational models are sought and tested, public administration begins to define levels of language competence for government employees, the media begins to use Basque for broadcasting, but there is uncertainty about how to use limited resources and how to implement the Normalization of the language.

A number of steps were taken that began to change the *status* of the Basque Language between 1978 and 1985. Among the most significant are:

1. Approval of the *Statute of Autonomy of the Basque Country*, December, 18, 1979
2. Creation of the Executive Power of the Basque Government and the Basque Parliament, 1980
3. Creation of the “Advisory Council of the Basque Language”, January 11, 1982

4. Approval of the *Normalization Law of the Basque Language*, November 24, 1982
5. Creation of the *Secretariat of Language Policy*, January 17, 1983
6. Decree of the Department of Education and Culture regulating the use of both official languages in education, excluding Higher Education, July 11, 1983
7. Creation of the *Basque Institute for Public Administration (IVAP)*, July 27, 1983
8. Creation of the *Institute of Adult Literacy and Basquization (HABE)*. Hel-duen Alfabetatze eta Berreuskalduntzerako Erakundea, November 25, 1983
9. Approval of the *Statutes of the University of the Basque Country*, March 18, 1985

Credit should be given to the SIADECO (*Sociedad de Investigacion Aplicada para el Desarrollo Comunitario/Aplied Research Society for Community Development*) group for its efforts to conduct a comprehensive survey research on the status of the Basque Language at the time. It was published in 1977. It was divided in ten volumes comprising a variety of topics; Language Loss (vol. 1), Areas of Contact Between Castellan and Basque (vol. 2), Urban Areas (vol. 3), Maintenance and Loss of Basque (vol. 4), Current Situation of Basque (vol.5), Current Situation of Basque in the Basque Speaking Areas (vol. 6), Ikastolas in the Basque Country (vol. 7), Basque Language in Private and Official Centers (vol. 8), Teaching of Basque to Adults (vol. 9), and Basque Language in the Publishing Industry (vol. 10).

The project had been spearheaded by *Euskaltzaindia (Academy of the Basque Language)* in 1969, but initial plans to finance the project failed. It was finally financed years later by the bank Caja Laboral. Siadeco, Caja Laboral and *Euskaltzaindia* jointly defined the objectives of the study. Siadeco included a reputable group of sociologists, some of whom envisioned the study to be used in future language planning efforts of the Basque Language (Vol. 1, p 39). However, the Siadeco Study did not use language planning in the execution of the project or as its methodology. An abridged version of the 10 volume study is later published by *Euskaltzaindia* with the title *Conflicto Lingüístico en Euskadi* (1979). The Siadeco group included sociologists Javier Aguirre, Ramón Iruetagoiena, Iñaki Larrañaga, two industrial engineers Juan José Gabina, and Juan José Rodríguez and one economist, Ramón Gorostidi. Their work was very comprehensive and also planted the idea that language planning was an important tool to be considered in the efforts of linguistic normalization.

Language Planning emerged as an attractive tool to clear the agenda and became the instrument to be used in linguistic Normalization. This method was not new to the world but it was new to the Basque Country. The first and formal introduction of Language Planning as an effective tool of linguistic Normalization of the Basque Language took place in 1984 at the *First Congress of Sociology of Minoritized Languages*, sponsored by the *Basque Association of Sociology* in Getxo, Bizkaia. The audience included Basque sociologists, politicians, func-

tionaries and members of the other historic communities, Catalonia and Galicia, all of whom were looking for a formula to help the task of 'Normalizing' their respective regional languages. One could say that almost anybody who was somebody was in attendance, including then Basque President Carlos Garaikoetxea. The topics dealt with at this gathering generated considerable interest and were followed by other activities, some of them sponsored later by the Basque Government and other interest groups and scholars (Cobarrubias 1985). The Conference included presentations on a variety of topics including the use of Basque, Catalan, and Galician in education as well as other issues of Normalization.

The presentation of 1984: (1) introduced the audience to the distinction between planning the *status* of the language and planning the *corpus* of the language in any Normalization future efforts; (2) introduced the audience to the model of Language Planning as described by Haugen (1966) and later refined in Haugen (1983); and (3) introduced the audience to the *functional model of language planning* and exposed decision makers and politicians interested in Language Planning to the idea that language operates differently in different domains and that there is a limited number of *functions* that must be implemented in order to attain Normalization. This *functional model* of language planning was new to the Basque Country and was adopted as the tool to start the implementation process of Normalization. Understanding how language is used in various domains clarified a number of priorities by taking into account that not all the functions of the language carry the same weight in protecting the language, increasing its use, and expanding the use of the language to domains in which it had not been previously used.

It is also important to note that the *functional model of language planning* permits to identify what is the minimum number of functions needed in a modern society to prevent language loss. Thus, allocations of resources could be made accordingly and policies for incremental use of the language could be designed for specific *language functions* one by one.

The functions most essential in planning for Normalization are: (1) Legal and Official Use, (2) Education, and (3) Public Administration. Of course, actual Normalization requires the implementation of the use of the language in at least seven other language functions, but the first three cited above are essential to the process. This design was based on the experiences in other communities where successful strategies and policies of language planning had been used. The model had predictive value to change the *status* of Basque and time has demonstrated that the status of Basque has risen to levels of functionality it never had before and it is used in domains it has never been used before, including high functions required in higher education.

This *functional model* also defined the tasks needed in preparing the *corpus* of the language to modernize it and these tasks became urgent in order to pave the way to Normalization. Specific legislative rules were issued for people who were to work in Public Administration. Benchmarks of language proficiency were

identified and a yardstick was proposed in order to be appointed. The level of proficiency necessary for an appointment is called or referred to as the EGA level. An administrative unit of translators was created. Specialized glossaries and dictionaries were developed as part of the task of *codification* of the language. Work on the refinement of educational models took a new dimension. Several research studies were conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of the models that had been in use. The work was overwhelming. But a lot was accomplished comparatively speaking *vis-à-vis* other communities in Spain and abroad.

At least four workshops and conferences sponsored by the Basque Autonomous Community *Secretariat of Language Policy* are worth mentioning here. They were commissioned to this writer who worked as a consultant on Normalization for that office. The reports resulting from these activities have not circulated until recently and are now part of the history of the Normalization process.

The workshops -known as *Jornadas* in the Basque Country- dealt with several topics. The first one, in 1985, took place in Vitoria-Gasteiz. It consisted of general training sessions for high ranking government functionaries on Language Planning analysis. The cases that were the subject of analysis included international communities that had used language planning successfully, including, among others, Philippines, Israel, Quebec, and Indonesia. The second *Jornadas de Vitoria* took place in 1986 and focused on Education. The third *Jornadas de Donostia*, took place in 1987 and focused on Legislation. The fourth *Jornadas de Donostia*, also in 1987, discussed strategies on Language Planning.

The conclusions of the *Jornadas* were presented in various confidential documents as recommendations to the Basque Government via the *Secretariat of Language Policy* (Cobarrubias 1986, Cobarrubias 1987). The confidential nature of the recommendations does not permit to reveal details here, but will allow me to summarize part of the action plan. The decision was reached that the priority of resources should be placed in enhancing the use of Basque in *Public Administration* and *Education*. These were the two *language functions* that would contribute more effectively to the Normalization process. Years later we see that the results of the work in mainly both functions are showing considerable progress in the use of Basque and a number of speakers that have been added to the language despite a decline in the general birthrate in the Basque Country. The results are monitored by the *Vice-counsel Office of Language Policy*, formerly *Secretariat of Language Policy*, through surveys conducted every five years. The last survey, dated 2006, shows that the number of bilingual adults over 16-years of age who know Basque includes 137,299 more than in 1991. Furthermore, the number of monolingual adults who do not speak Basque has diminished in the amount of 139,900 with respect to the same date in 1991 (Eusko Jaurlatiza, 2008).

The *functional model of language planning* was sketched out in 1979 and applied in Quebec, Belgium, and also in Mexico and Peru. It was formally presented for the first time at a conference on the *Progress on Language Planning*

in 1979 organized at William Paterson University. It was later published as a series of case studies and theoretical papers in a book (Cobarrubias 1983). The model identified about ten language functions: (1) Legal and Official Use, (2) Education, (3) Public Administration, (4) Commerce and Industry, (5) Media, (6) Religion and Cult, (7) Security and Public Order, (8) Public Health, (9) Recreation and Environmental Use, (10) Family and Interpersonal Relations. It was also discussed in Cobarrubias (1988).

One interesting discovery that could be transferred to the situation in the Basque Country is the fact that these functions of the language carry a different weight. The entrenchment of the language is stronger in the functions of informal use, the family, and interpersonal relations where, even during the most repressive policies of Franco, control could not be enforced. He could only ban Euskara in the public and institutional use of the language. Another discovery is that the first four functions are the most effective in expanding the language and empowering it. This was the experience in Belgium and it is the reason why I have called the joint use of planning efforts in these four functions simultaneously the *Belgian formula* (Cobarrubias 1988). These findings and others were conveyed to the *Secretariat of Language Planning* in the 1987 report.

A great deal has been accomplished in gathering a cadre of functionaries who meet the standards of quality and linguistic competence in the Basque language considered appropriate to work in Public Administration. Substantial work has been done also in Education, where teacher competence and language proficiency of students and teachers has increased dramatically. Concrete and measurable data produced in the latter function make it worth commenting briefly on this initiative.

Three models of Bilingual Education were adopted in the schools. Model A and model B for Spanish speaking children and model D for Basque speaking children. The data showed that model B was the most effective for Spanish speaking children. It was recommended to allocate adequate resources to increase services in model B, improve teaching strategies in the classroom and identify best practices, as well as improve teacher training and professional development. The models in question are as follows:

Model A
for Spanish speaking children

Objectives	Developing good understanding of Basque. Developing communicative competence to cope with daily routines. Developing positive attitude toward the Basque language. Developing competence to help the child become integrated in Basque speaking circles.
Use of Basque	Basque language instruction: 3 to 4 hours a week.
Use of Spanish	All subjects are taught in Spanish except 3 to 4 hours of Basque.

**Model B
for Spanish speaking children**

Objectives	Use of both official languages as vehicles of instruction. Developing understanding of Basque and communicative competence in Basque. Developing enough language competence to be able to study in Basque.
Use of Basque	Basque language, Social and Natural Sciences. Art.
Use of Spanish	Spanish language arts. Mathematics. Half of the school day in each language.

**Model D
for Spanish speaking children**

Objectives	Enhancing language competence in Basque and use it as the main vehicle of communication and instruction. Strengthening the cohesion of Basque speaking groups in a Castellan speaking environment, and making Basque the vehicle of Basquization in the Basque Country. Developing good knowledge of Castellan.
Use of Basque	All subjects are taught in Basque, except Castellan language classics.
Use of Spanish	Castellan classes.

Several reports on program effectiveness were produced *Euskara irakaskuntzan: faktoreen* E.I.F.E (1984), (EIFE 1986, EIFE 1989, EIFE 1990). Data collected through these longitudinal research reports demonstrated the effectiveness of models B and D. Not only are these two models instructionally effective but they have contributed significantly to raise the number of young students who now are capable of speaking, reading, and writing in Basque. This despite the fact that the population growth of the Basque Autonomous Community is basically negative with only 1.2 % growth when the growth needed to maintain the current percent of the population is somewhere between 2.2 % to 2.3 % per year (Cobarrubias 1999).

In contradistinction, model A can only produce -with respect to the use of Basque- an increase in cultural sensitivity and a certain degree of passive bilingualism, but it does not help participating students in developing functional proficiency in Basque.

The positive and impressive increase in the use of the Basque language documented in recent surveys conducted by the *Vice-counsel Office of Language Pol-*

icy is, in no small measure, the result of following policies recommended in the consultant reports of early years to focus strongly on the allocation of resources in models B and D, as well as in the increase of the use of Basque in Public Administration (Cobarrubias 1986, 1987).

Planning the Corpus of the Basque Language

The expansion of the Basque language to be able to function as the language of a modern society needs planning the *status* as well as the *corpus*. *Euskaltzaindia* (the Academy of the Basque Language) has played a leading role in the codification of the *corpus* of Basque. The *Vice-counsel Office of Language Policy* has responsibility mostly over the *status* of Basque.

The origin of *Euskaltzaindia* can be dated back to 1918, when members of the Deputy of Biscay led by Resurrección María de Azcue proposed the creation of the Academy. Azcue is considered its founder. The other communities, Gipuzkoa, Araba, and Navarre, joined the effort shortly after. It was not until 1976 that the Academy received the distinction of “Real Academy of the Basque Language”. Since its foundation, the Academy has played an active role in the regularization and diffusion of Basque, and effort centered mostly on the expansion of the *Batua* variety of Basque with the purpose of using as the *basilect* for the future standardization of the language. Lately, it has integrated more and more of the Bizkaian lexicon as the work progresses.

The history of the codification of Basque is long and it is not the intention of this paper to provide an account of it. It has not been systematically presented in an organized work yet. The first codification efforts go back to 1729 with the publication of the first grammar *El Imposible Vencido*, by Larramendi. He also published a dictionary, *Diccionario Trilingue de Castellano, Vascuence y Latin* in 1745 addressing, thus, the two most important tasks of language codification. Other important codifiers are Arturo Campión and Azcue. Campión published his *Gramática de los cuatro dialectos literarios de la lengua euskara* in 1884. He concentrated on the written varieties rather than relying on the spoken varieties in the preparation of his dictionary, which showed great vision for the time. He also, being himself Navarrese, strongly favored the Navarrese variety. Azcue published *Euskal Izkindea (Basque Grammar)* in 1891, a dictionary, *Diccionario Vasco-Español-Francés* in 1906, and *Morfología Vasca* in 1925. The dictionary constitutes a monumental work of codification that places Azcue as a first class lexicographer. His dictionary is based on field work and direct contact with speakers of the language. It codifies a great number of dialectal varieties.

Evaluation of Language Planning in the Basque Country

Evaluation has always been an important component of the language planning process as it allows us to redirect strategies (Rubin 1983). The results of language planning can be evaluated by three crucial indicators:

- 1) Demographic spread
- 2) Geographic spread
- 3) Functional spread

This language planning evaluation model was proposed in a report to the *Secretariat of Language Policy* (Cobarrubias 1986) in support of a *Government Plan 1984-88* designed to empower to the Basque Language at the time. The Government Plan was consistent with the content of the *Normalization Law*. The model distinguishes clearly three areas of indicators that can provide a measure of success of language planning efforts and shows the qualitative difference of each one of these three areas. The concern with demographic spread and geographic spread had existed since the Normalization Law was passed. But the notion of Functional not clearly conceived or discuss at the language planning meetings. The model was presented to the Basque Parliament by the *Secretary of Language Policy* in Garmendia 1994 (p. 9). No customary credit was given to the report of 1986 for borrowing the concept from it. Fuctional spread remains a critical area of language spread for the Basque Language. Considerable efforts have been done in the use of Basque in the media and to a significant degree at the university level. However, it remains an area where much more effort needs to be done in the modernization process of Basque.

Over all, language planning efforts in the Basque Country show positive results in all three areas, more in the first two than in the last, where there is still a lot of work to be completed. The most recent Survey conducted by the *Vice-conunsel Office of Language Policy* has gathered data that positively shows sinificant demographic grwoth in the adult population, sixteen and over. The demographic increase from 1991 to 2006 was 137,200 bilingual speakers who know Basque. This growth has taken place in Navarre and the Basque Autonomous Community. The percentage of growth would be greater if we considered all seven Basque speaking areas. However, in the French provinces the use of Basque has decreased, Navarre has maintained its use with a very small percentage increased of 1,6 points, and in the Basque Autonomous Community has increased by 6 points.

Basque has also spread geographically. The Basque language users tend to concentrate in the North East region of the Autonomous Community. As the *Sociolinguistic Maps* prepared by the *Secretariat of Language Policy* (1989) show, the greatest concentration is in Gipuzkoa, Bizkaia to the East of Bilbao, and Navarre close to the Pyrenees. Efforts must be made to map the most recent geographic spread of the language.

The area of *Functional* spread is still the one in need of considerable work. The Basque language is being codified in areas where it has not been used before, in the sciences and in technology, just to mention two critical areas. More work is necessary to equip Basque with the linguistic tools to be used particularly in high functions at the University level, in specific disciplines, and other areas such as health and technical discourse, which require language modernization.

POLITICAL NORMALIZATION

Political Normalization has not been so much the focus of the discourses on Language Planning as has been Linguistic Normalization. It has been the focus in the political discourse and in the interpersonal relation debates at lunch, at the bar scene after work, and in the halls of the Universities and other informal settings.

The Political Normalization process is difficult to grasp and has been clouded by the role that ETA has played since its inception. ETA (Euskadi Ta Askatasuna - Basque Homeland and Freedom) was created in 1959 by a group of young people of the PNV party as a reaction to the oppressive policies and violence of the Franco dictatorship, and, in particular, against Basque Nationalism. ETA has monopolized the attention of the media, national as well as international, when it comes to news about the Basque Country. This has relegated other salient accomplishments in the history of the Basque Country and clouded the way history is told. Some historians have acknowledged that the appearance of ETA is the “most important single historical phenomenon that occurred during the Franco era” (García Cortazar, 2000). The role of ETA requires separate attention and should not be confused with the goal of Political Normalization desired by the Basque Society via the democratic process.

Political Normalization is entrenched in the rights of the past of a *distinct* society rooted in *foral* culture and law. It has been part of the *identity* of the region for many centuries. The return to *foral* culture is a legitimate right and should not be confused with the objectives of ETA. Foral culture has been a way of life deeply ingrained in the Basque people. To reach a level of recognition of this right by the Spanish state and to restore *foral* law and culture is the claim to Political Normalization. To this end, President Ibarretxe has clearly stated that the objective is “to attain political normalization through an agreement with the Spanish state that will allow us to put an end to our long-standing political conflict” (Ibarretxe 2008). He is not referring to the conflict with ETA, which he repudiates, but to the fact that the Spanish state has not finished its own agenda of granting and restoring the level of autonomy that existed for centuries in what today is the Basque Autonomous Community. To this effect, the Basque Parliament has recently enacted the *Political Statute of the Basque Country* (2004) which re-defines the relation of what today is the Basque Autonomous Community with the Spanish state and its surrounding neighbors.

It is important to note here that *foral* culture and law precedes the Spanish state. The Basque Community has existed as a *foral* community for centuries. The *fueros* and *foral* practice and culture existed long before they were codified in writing. The dates of codification will enhance our understanding of how old and deeply rooted *foral* practice was in the Basque Country. The first *fueros* to be codified in writing are the *Fueros de Navarra* in 1418. They were approved in writing at a meeting of the *Cortes* (Parliament) of the Kingdom in that year. This is a strong indicator that the need to have them available in writing was dictated by the need of the Community to make *foral* legislation standard and effective. The *Fuero de Vizcaya* was codified in writing in 1452 and it is followed by a second

written version in 1526. How early is this? People still believed that the earth was flat. And Spain did not exist yet. The *Fueros of Guipuzcoa* take a little longer to be codified in writing and were formally approved in 1696, but they reflected practices that existed much earlier as in the other two communities. For these communities the *fueros* were the main legal document equivalent to a Constitution in other countries. They were the framework of national identity and culture. However, none of the provinces formed a unified state, each one of them functioned as a mini-state. While the Basque territories had never formed an independent state, Navarre had been an independent Kingdom and a powerful one. It may be said that at one point in history the Basque Provinces were part of the Kingdom of Navarre, and of the preceding Kingdom of Pamplona.

The golden age of the Kingdom of Navarre was under King Sancho III, the Great, who, still alive, divided the Kingdom of Navarre in 1035 among his four sons and, thus, fragmented the powerful kingdom. The dynasty of Navarre had its base on the foundation of the Duchy of Vasconia which lasted until 1234 when Sancho the Strong died without descendents. Not even during the kingdom of Sancho the Great did the Basque language reach official status. This would have been a unique historical moment to assign official status to the language of the Kingdom.

The dismemberment happened in stages and not all of them peaceful. Sancho's sons struggled among them. Garcia Sanchez III died in the battle of Atapuerca (1035) near Burgos and the border of the former Kingdom of Pamplona, apparently fighting ambitious Ferdinand of Castile (not to be confused with Ferdinand of Aragon who married Isabela of Castile much later). There were attempts to recover the historic territory of the Kingdom of Pamplona. Garcia Ramirez, known for that reason as the *Restorer* and the first to actually use the title of King of Navarre, and his son Sancho the Wise fought fiercely against Castile to recover the old Pamplona. The dispute between the two was submitted for arbitration to the English King, Henry II. The claim of Navarre was based on "the proven will of the locals". The Castilians based their claims on their merits as crusaders. The English King decided to give each of them what they controlled militarily at the time. Thus, La Rioja goes to Castile; and Araba, Bizkaia and Gipuzkoa to Navarre. As a consequence, the area which is today the Basque Autonomous Community became part of the Kingdom of Navarre. The decision was ignored for two years but finally accepted in 1179. Sancho the Wise (1150-94), King of Navarre, was a learned man -a patron of learning- and an accomplished statesman. He granted *fueros* to a number of towns and regions and was never defeated in battle.

The partition of the Kingdom continued. Alfonso VIII of Castile decided in 1199 to own the coastal area of Navarre which would allow Castile rapid access to European markets and would isolate the rest of Navarre as well. So he launched an assault while Sancho the Strong was in an expedition in what today is Algeria. The cities of Vitoria and Trevino resisted the Castilian assault. But Vitoria surrendered when the Bishop of Pamplona was commissioned to inform that no reinforcements would be sent. Trevino did not surrender and had to be conquered by the arms. By the end of 1200 the conquest of Western Navarre was complete. Castile granted the right to self-rule (*fueros*) to the fragments of the conquered territory (except

rebellious Trevino and other cities that were ruled directly from Castile). This decision was based on the traditions and customs of Navarre, the *fueros*. Araba was made a County, Bizkaia a Lordship, and Gipuzkoa just a Province. This completed what is known as the Second Partition of the Kingdom of Navarre. This may also clarify why the Basque Autonomous Community was never a State.

The partition and disintegration of the Kingdom of Navarre resulted in the expansion of Castile, which during the XVI century would become the foundation of the Spanish state. During the period of disintegration, Navarre was fragile and it got close to be annexed by France. Historian Americo Castro remarks that “Navarre was exposed to be annexed by France and did not belong to Spain until Ferdinand of Aragon annexed it to his Kingdom”. The annexation of Navarre in 1512 completes the project of building the Spanish state and the beginning of the expansion and unification of Castile attempting, at the same time, to delimit other regional languages and ethnicities. The Basque language remained fragmented into the sections of the fragmented Kingdom. Rene Lafon has remarked that “the Basques have not constituted a sovereign state with Basque language as its official language”. The conglomerate of several communities without linguistic uniformity contributed to the proliferation of the dialects that we know in our days. Even though the existence of a Basque state did not materialize, the idea of a people with a common identity and culture persisted and the language was maintained without support of a government.

Castile absorbed Navarre up to the summit of the Pyrenees Mountains during the period 1512-1526. In order to gain Navarrese loyalty, Castile granted *fueros* to Navarre allowing the region to continue to function under its historic laws. In the meantime, Northern Navarre became increasingly tied to France, a process that was completed when a Navarrese prince became King Henry IV of France. Although not without conflicts, until the era of the French Revolution on both sides of the Pyrenees quasi-independent Basque regions successfully maintained their *fueros*.

The relation among *fueros*, other bodies of law (including the role of precedent), and sovereignty is a contentious one that reaches down to the present day. The various Basque Provinces regarded their *fueros* as tantamount to a Constitution, a view that has been accepted by many over the years. In this view, *fueros* are regarded as granting or acknowledging rights. In the contrasting view, *fueros* were privileges granted by a monarch.

During most of the period after 1800, Spain became a highly centralized state that did not recognize the country's regional diversity. The so called “historical territories” were operating in a legislative vacuum. Decades of civil unrest followed Isabella II's accession to the throne in 1833, as conflicts emerged over the role of the Roman Catholic Church, the monarchy itself, and the direction of Spain's economy. Maria Cristina, a Neapolitan Bourbon and mother of Isabella, was Queen-regent when her daughter –aged three- was proclaimed Queen at the death of the King.

Isabella’s throne could only be maintained with the support of the army. The *Cortes* and the Liberals and Progressives, who established a constitutional and parliamentary government, dissolved the religious orders and confiscated their property (including that of the Jesuits). They also attempted to put the finances in good order. After the First Carlist war the Queen-regent, Maria Cristina, resigned to make way for Baldomero Espartero, Prince of Vergara, the most successful and most popular Isabelline general, who remained regent of the crown only for two years.

Espartero’s reign as regent ended because a cabinet formed by two Generals, O’Donnell and Narvaez, induced the *Cortes* to declare Isabella the Queen at age thirteen. Three years later, the so called *Moderado* Party, Castellan Conservative, made the sixteen-year old queen marry her first cousin, Francisco de Asis de Borbon. But the marriage was not a happy one. Persistent rumors had it that few –if any- of her twelve children had been fathered by her King-consort, who was a homosexual. The Carlist party asserted that her son –later King Alfonso XII- had been fathered by Captain Enrique Puig y Molto. Another version says that the biological father was General Francisco Serrano, Captain of the Royal Guard. Isabella died in 1904 at age seventy-three. Only four of her twelve children reached adulthood.

The First Carlist War starts in 1833 and ends in 1839. The war was long and hard and the Carlist forces achieved important victories in the North under the direction of General Zumalacarreui. Carlos conquers Bilbao, which was defended by the British navy, but he runs out of funds to sustain his efforts. Zumalacarreui dies in 1835 and after his death the liberals dominated the scene but were not able to win the war. Carlists became increasingly tired and without financial support and the war ends with the “Abrazo de Vergara”.

At the end of the first Carlist war, Navarre and the other Basque provinces lost their *fueros* and the power to self-government that had been granted since the support to Phillip V in the War of Succession, even though Navarre maintained its rights by decision of the Regent at the time (1841) -General Espartero. But ultimately Espartero mounted an opposition to the Queen and she had to resign. These were turbulent times and Spain maintained a centralist stance which transformed it into a *Constitutional Monarchy* in 1837. Isabella reigned from 1843 to 1868, a period of political intrigues, small political factions influence, and military conspiracies. *Moderados* ruled from 1856 to 1863 and *Progressives* from 1854 to 1856. Then, the *Liberal Union* ruled from 1856 to 1863. Shortly after, *Moderados* and *Liberal Union* replaced each other in power and tried to keep the *Progressives* out of power planting, thus, the seeds of conflict that led to the *Spanish Revolution* of 1868. Isabella was persuaded to abdicate in Paris on June 25, 1870. She abdicated in favor of her son Alfonso XII. But Alfonso will not become a monarch yet.

After the Spanish Revolution, with Isabella II deposed, the *Cortes* decided to reinstate the monarchy but did not want Isabella back and chose a monarch under a new dynasty. They chose Amadeus (Amadeo) as the new King of Spain.

He swore to uphold the Constitution in Madrid on January 2, 1871. Amadeo had to deal with a very unstable Spanish politics, republican conspiracies and *Carlist* uprising, assassination attempts and separatism in Cuba. He could only count with the support of the Progressive Party whose leaders were involved in electoral fraud. The Progressives split into Monarchists and Constitutionalists creating a highly unstable political climate. In 1872 violence hit a peak. There was a *Carlist* uprising in the Basque and Catalan regions as they wanted to free their regions from the “Castilian corpse”, and after that republican uprisings appeared in most urban areas throughout the country. Amadeus abdicated on February 11, 1873 and Spain was proclaimed a *Republic* the same night. Amadeo made an appearance at the *Cortes* stating that the Spanish people were ungovernable. Amadeo’s reign lasted twenty three months.

The Second *Carlist* War, the most significant of the *Carlist* wars, starts in 1873 at the time when the abdication of the King and the proclamation of the Republic created an opportunity. However, the First Republic only lasted one year (1873-1874). Decentralization led to chaos. Alfonso XII was King of Spain from 1875 to 1885 after a *coup d’etat* restored the monarchy and ended the weak First Spanish Republic. Alfonso XII died of tuberculosis at age 38. For the rest of the XIX century, Spain remains relatively stable with industrial centers emerging in the Basque region and in Catalonia.

Alfonso XIII, born in 1886, was proclaimed King at his birth and succeeded Alfonso XII and reigned from 1886-1931. However, his mother, Maria Cristina of Austria –second wife of Alfonso XII- was appointed regent during his minority years. He assumed control of the state on reaching his sixteenth year. Though his reign began well it did not end well. When the *Second Spanish Republic* was proclaimed on April 14, 1931, Alfonso left Spain, but did not abdicate the throne. He moved to Rome, where he lived in the Grand Hotel until 1941. He died in Rome. Before his death, he had abdicated the rights to the Spanish throne in favor of his fourth (but second surviving) son, Juan, father of the current King Juan Carlos.

One of the stated goals of the Second Spanish Republic was to grant autonomy to the regions, as it did to Catalonia and the Basque provinces; however, self-government for these regions was not reinstated after the Spanish Civil War (1936-1939). After the fall of the Second Republic Franco declared Spain to be a monarchy but he did not permit a monarch until his death in 1975.

Franco’s regime was repressive and any degree of autonomy or recognition of the traditional *foral* government was out of the question. Franco considered Bizkaia and Gipuzkoa as “traitor provinces” and cancelled their *fueros*. The pro-Franco provinces, Araba and Navarre, maintained a degree of autonomy unknown to the rest of Spain, with local telephone companies, bailiff police local forces, road works and a selective taxation system. The rest of the Basque Provinces suffered a tough system of food rationing barely sufficient to survive from their allowance instead. The 1937 bombing of Gernika (Guernica in Spanish) was not only the atrocity by Franco that humanity witnessed and deplored, but was also a symbol of the end of *foral* culture during his dictatorship.

The Constitution of 1978 restores democracy to Spain. However, Spain is not a republic but a *Constitutional monarchy*. Occasionally, errors appear in the discourse caused by the way the Spanish language is used and people speak of Prime Minister of Spain, *Presidente del Gobierno* (President of the Government) as if it were a title used in a republic. However, this is not the case and it gives the idea to some people that Spain's status is a republic. It is not.

Before the Spanish Constitution of 1978 and the system of “autonomous communities” mentioned in the Constitution, the Basque Autonomous Community was recognized and called *Provincias Vascongadas*, a name inherited from the time that a previous Spanish Constitution divided the country into Provinces instead of Autonomous Communities as we saw earlier in the division created by Javier de Burgos in 1833. However, the political structure of the autonomous communities is defined in the *Gernika Statute*, which was approved by a majority in a referendum held on October 25, 1979. This is why some autonomous communities feel that the Spanish Constitution of 1978 offers still an unfinished agenda regarding the level and the type of autonomy accorded to the traditionally called “historic territories.” These are distinct societies with a right to maintaining their cultural identity. They have the right to the recognition of their historical rights and culture within a Constitutional framework reformed to accommodate a new political agreement of coexistence. The Basque people feel that they have only recovered *partially* the political autonomy they had in 1936 at the start of the Civil War.

The so called Basque Conflict is a historical and political conflict that has existed in the Basque Country for approximately 170 years, in the opinion of some political analysts. It became crucial toward the end of the First *Carlist* War and the emergence of the first Constitutional monarchy. The Spanish Crown never treated the Basque Country as a single political unit. However, the traditional juridical structures and legislative autonomy were maintained. In the case of the Kingdom of Navarre *foral* legislation was maintained clearly until 1841, when they still coined their own currency with the inscription “Kingdom of Navarre” and retained its own customs with the Kingdom of Spain in the Ebro River. Of course the Basque Country and the Kingdom of Navarre were already two separate political entities. Others will say that the Basque Conflict should at least be dated back to the end of the Second Carlist War (1873-74) when sovereignty was lost in the Basque Country and the *fueros* were abolished.

Resolving the Conflict in its current form requires addressing two qualitatively very different problems, one which is relatively new; and one which is old:

- 1) Solving the problem of violence of ETA
- 2) Solving the problem of the type of relation that should exist between the Basque Country and Spain (Ibarretxe 2008).

Thus, one is the problem of how to end ETA's activities of violence not justifiable in a democratic world. The other is the need of creating a constitutional architecture that will restore the culture and identity to the Basque Country, both

an integral part of its long history. The 1978 Spanish Constitution falls short of doing that. It must be amended and modernized.

The worse form of the Basque Conflict emerged, as everyone knows, during the Spanish Civil War, which created considerable hate among large segments of the population, particularly among frustrated youth who saw their future expectations of peace ripped off. The memories will last to this day. At the request of Franco, the German Luftwaffe (the Condor Legion) tested out for the first time the tactics of “burn earth” in Gernika in April 26, 1937. This day of bombing innocent civilians should also live in “infamy”.

Many days of bombing followed, including Bilbao, which was occupied in June of 1937. The Basque troops surrendered, many executions by firing squad were carried out, and concentration camps were set up in the Basque Country. A mass diaspora followed, calculated around 175,000 people. This is an enormous figure considering that the total population in 1936 was estimated in only 1,300,000 people. The Basque Country was subject to repression; thousands of nationalists were killed or imprisoned. The Basque language was prohibited.

It is in this atmosphere of severe repression that ETA emerged as a violent response to Spanish state violence and dictatorship, which has not been an uncommon response in oppressed communities. Of course this does not justify ETA but explains the dynamics that took place. The ETA of those days is not the same ETA of today. Neither the Basque Country of the time is the Basque Country of today. The 1978 Constitution restored democracy but it did not restore the levels of Autonomy existing prior to the Civil War. The emergence of ETA was caused by the violence exerted by the centralist government of the dictatorship on the Basque Country and, thus, one could create the argument that the central government has inherited a substantial degree of responsibility in solving the current problem of violence with ETA. The need for a partnership between the central government in Madrid and the Basque Government in the solution of this conflict seems clear.

The other side of the Basque Conflict is moving forward toward Political Normalization with the passage of the *Political Statute of the Community of the Basque Country* approved by the Basque Parliament on December 30, 2004 and published in the *Gazette of the Basque Parliament* in January, 2005.

FROM “BASQUE AUTONOMOUS COMMUNITY” TO “BASQUE COUNTRY”

The 2004 *Political Statute of the Basque Country* changes the name of the Country from *Basque Autonomous Community* to *Basque Country*, changing, thus, the political status from one of “Autonomous Community” to one of “self-government.”

In its Preface, the *Political Statute* states that

The Basque People or Euskal Herria is a *People with its own identity within the community of European peoples, repository of a singular historical, social and cultural heritage*, distributed geographically in seven Territories, currently articulated in three different legal-political regions, and located in two different States. (Emphasis supplied)

The *Basque People have the right to decide their own future*, as determined by absolute majority of the Basque Parliament on February 15, 1990, and in accordance with the right to self-determination of all peoples, recognized at an international level in the International Agreement of Civil and Political Rights and in the International Agreement of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. (Emphasis supplied)

The exercise of the right of the *Basque People to decide their own future is based on a respect for the right of the citizens of the different legal-political regions in which it is currently articulated*, to be consulted in order to decide their own future. In other words, by respecting the decisions of the citizens of the present Autonomous Basque Community, the decisions of the citizens of the Autonomous Community of Navarre, and the decisions of the citizens of the Basque Territories of Iparralde –Lapurdi, Behe Nafarroa, and Zuberoa. (Emphasis supplied)

In accordance with these three premises and forming an integral part of the Basque People, the citizens of the present Autonomous Community of the Basque Country, made up of the Provinces of Araba, Bizkaia and Gipuzkoa, in the exercise of our democratic will and in virtue of a respect for and modernization of our historical rights, set out in the Gernika Statute and in the Spanish Constitution, *declare our wish to draw up a new political agreement for Coexistence*. (Emphasis supplied)

The Statute has sixty-nine Articles and *two final provisions*. The First of the last two provisions states that the Statute replaces the Organic Law of 1979 in the Statute of Autonomy of the Basque Country, and reads as follows:

The model and system of political relations between the Community of the Basque Country and the Spanish State, regulated in this Political Statute, shall succeed and replace, when it comes into force, the one passed by Organic Law 3/December 18, 1979 in the Statute of Autonomy for the Basque Country and any laws and provisions that contradict this Statute shall be abolished.

The last provision concerns the publication of the Statute in the Official Gazette of the Basque Country which will replace the *Gazette* of the Basque Parliament. Important changes are articulated in this document, concerning citizenship, language, status of members of the Diaspora, relations with other communities, international relations and other categories. It is not the purpose of this essay to make a detailed enumeration and comment on all the articles of the Statute but to highlight the salient items described in the document. The following can be mentioned.

Briefly stated, Article 1 establishes the *Community of the Basque Country as a self governing body freely associated with the Spanish State*. Article 2 establishes its *Territory*.

The territorial boundaries of the Community of the Basque Country shall include the geographical and administrative limits that correspond to the current boundaries of the Historical Territories of Araba, Bizkaia and Gipuzkoa, without detriment to the stipulation contained in the fourth transitory provision of the Constitution.

Recognition is given to the right of the Basque Territories of Araba, Bizkaia and Gipuzkoa, Lapurdi, Nafarroa, Nafarroa Beherea and Zuberoa to associate within a territorial framework of relations, in accordance with the wishes of their respective inhabitants.

Citizenship and Nationality (Article 4)

1. All those persons residing in any of the municipalities of the Community of the Basque Country has the right to Basque citizenship. All Basque citizens shall have, without any kind of discrimination, the rights and obligations recognized in this Statute and current legislation, within the Community of the Basque Country.

2. Basque nationality is recognized officially for all Basque citizens in accordance with the pluri-national nature of the Spanish State. The acquisition, conservation and loss of Basque nationality, as well as its accreditation, shall be regulated by in the Law of the Basque Parliament in accordance with the same requirements demanded in the Laws of the State for Spanish nationality, so that the enjoyment or accreditation of both shall be compatible and shall have the full legal effects determined through a law.

3. No one may be discriminated against because of their nationality nor be arbitrarily deprived of this.

Basque Diaspora (Article 5)

All persons residing abroad, and their descendants, whose last place of residence was the Community of the Basque Country, and their descendents, may, should they so wish, enjoy Basque nationality and the political rights corresponding to Basque citizens in accordance with the provisions established through a law.

The Basque Language (Article 8)

1. *The Basque language*, the language of the Basque People and the patrimony of all the Basque People, shall, *together with Spanish*, have the status of the *official language in the Basque Country*, and all its inhabitants shall have the right to speak and use both languages. (Emphasis supplied)

2. Taking into consideration questions of socio-linguistic diversity, Basque institutions shall guarantee the use of both languages, governing their official nature, and shall furnish and regulate the measures and means necessary to ensure that these are spoken.

3. No one shall be discriminated against on the grounds of language, and therefore the linguistic rights of all Basque citizens shall be respected.

4. The Royal Academy of the Basque Language-*Euskaltzaindia*- is the official Consultative Body in matters relating to the Basque language.

Human rights and liberties (Article 10)

1. Basque citizens are entitled to the fundamental Rights and Obligations set out in the Constitution, the rights and obligations established in the treaties of the European Union, that correspond to them as European citizens, as well as the

human, individual and collective rights recognized internationally and, especially, those expressly contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Agreement on Civil and Political Rights, the International Agreement of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and the European Agreement for the protection of Human Rights and the Fundamental Liberties.

To complete the highlights here, I will mention one more important innovation in this document.

Regime of Free Association (Article 12)

The citizens of the Community of the Basque Country, in the free exercise of their right to self-determination and in accordance with a respect for and modernization of the historical rights included in the first additional provision of the Constitution, accede to self-government through a singular regime of political relations with the Spanish State, based on free association. The Community of the Basque Country and its representative institutions, establish the aforementioned relationship of free association according to precepts of respect and mutual recognition, and without detriment to its revision, as established in this Political Statute, which, for this purpose, shall represent its basic institutional directive.

The *Political Statute of the Basque Country* approved by the Basque Parliament is a new challenge to Madrid. But it is also a challenge to Basque society itself. To the non-allied political parties; to a large section of the population who does not feel integrated into the new institutions of the Basque Country that have emerged as the result of policies of the current *Statute of Autonomy*; to a segment of the population that does not feel represented by the current leadership; and of course it is a challenge to ETA, still considered the major obstacle to democratic progress and to peace.

The future of the *Political Statute of the Basque Country* will be decided at a Plebiscite on October 25, 2008. But first there is a debate going on concerning the vote to go to a referendum. At a radio interview on 6/25/2008 (*Euskadi Irratia*), President Ibarretxe said: "For the first time in history, a government and a Basque premier are going to present a Referendum project to let Basques from Alava, Bizkaia and Gipuzkoa decide their future, and it is going to be a historical debate." He also stated at another forum "the Government passes a law to let the inhabitants of the Basque Country have the final say" on their political future. In order to facilitate the debate, the Government has issued a *White Paper* on Calling and Regulating a Plebiscite. The Plebiscite does not have the status of a Referendum. It contains two questions approved by the Basque Government and by the Basque Parliament:

- 1) Are you in support of a process of a final dialog on violence if ETA manifests in non-equivocal manner its will to put an end to violence for ever? : YES/NO
- 2) Are you in agreement that the political Basque parties, without exclusions, start a process of negotiation to reach a Democratic Agreement concerning the right of the Basque people to decide and that such agreement be submitted to a Referendum before the end of 2010? : YES/NO

The statutes of other communities like Catalonia and Andalusia allow them the authority to carry out similar consultations. The Basque Government wants to have at least the same rights. To carry this type of consultations does not require authorization from the Spanish State. The Plebiscite will not be legally binding. The Plebiscite will be carried out in accordance with the laws of the Basque Parliament. This is an issue that keeps changing from time to time. For an update on the situation of the dialog and the Plebiscite the official web site can be consulted at www.euskadi.net.

FEW GLOTTOPOLITICAL REMARKS

The rights to *identity* and *culture* claimed by the Basque Country are legitimated by the international community and international institutions. They need now to be recognized by Madrid.

The UNESCO Project Concerning the *Declaration of Cultural Rights* defines *Cultural identity* as the “aggregate of those factors on the basis of which individuals or groups, define and express themselves and by which they wish to be recognized; it embraces the liberties inherent to human dignity and brings together, in a permanent process, cultural diversity, the particular and the universal, memory and aspiration. Choosing one’s cultural identity also includes the freedom of choosing one’s collective identity; therefore, participation in the collective cultural rights of the community is a person’s individual human right as well” www.unesco.org.

The restoration of *foral* culture in the Basque Country is a legitimate cultural and identity right. So is the restoration of the Basque language. It is important to note that the Basque language is out of the list of “Endangered Languages” (www.unesco.org) thanks to the recovery efforts done mainly in specific language functions, such as public administration, education and, to some degree, the media. Significant gains have been made considering the timeframe of the effort and the level of governmental investment in these language functions. But other functions remain to be addressed and they define the future agenda of language planning and policy planning. Among them are commerce and industry, public health, and several others where the recovery is still very slow.

In addition to UNESCO, the *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages* drafted specific protections for coexistence, culture, and linguistic rights of nationalities within the legal framework of the *Council of Europe*. It provided guidelines to governments to enhance the coexistence of minority groups within a state. The concept of minority is left undefined within the document; and therefore, it leaves the option open to apply it to group rights or individual rights. Language is, in this document, the most important element to preserve identity and describes specific obligations of the states to that effect (Kovacs 1993).

As stated earlier, participation in the collective cultural rights of the community constitutes an individual right as well. Very frequently, though, the definition of cultural community identifies it with ethnic community. The end result is that

the issue of claiming a cultural identity and cultural rights gets transferred to the political arena. This move often clouds the issue of claiming cultural rights as a claim of political rights. They should not be equated because they are two different categories of rights (Felfoldi 2001).

This difference becomes important in the debate of the *Political Statute of the Basque Country* and what it claims, given the diversity of the population of the Basque Country. In constitutional terms, it is much harder to defend the level of autonomy articulated in the *Political Statute* as an *ethnic claim* than it is to defend it as a *cultural right*. As we know, the Basque Country is not a homogeneous community. The role of migration, both immigration and outmigration, has been critical in shaping up the current Basque community. For example, immigration rises during the period of 1900-1936 by 50% mostly due to industrialization, and mainly in Bizkaia, definitely more than in Gipuzkoa. The population of Bilbao alone grew by 95.2% in the period 1900-1930. The urban centers were most impacted by immigration. The birthrate and mortality index were high (30% and 20% respectively) but started to fall -slowly at first, drastically in recent times. The net growth added at least 60,000 people. The total population of the Basque Country rose from about 600,000 in 1900 and 890,000 in 1930. The outmigration at the end of the Spanish Civil War, as it was indicated earlier, was about 170,000, and included a large segment of native Basques, in a total population estimated at 1,300,000.

Through most of the twentieth century, the thriving Basque economy, centered on the steel and the shipbuilding industries of Bizkaia and the metal-processing shops in Gipuzkoa, attracted thousands of Spaniards who migrated there in search of jobs and a better way of life. Between 1900 and 1980, the number of people moving into the Basque Country exceeded those who left by nearly 450,000 with the heaviest flow occurring during the decade of the 1960s. In the 1970s, the flow began to reverse itself because of political upheaval and economic decline. Between 1977 and 1984, the net outflow was nearly 51,000. The consequence of this heavy in-migration was a population in the late 1980s that was only marginally ethnic Basque and that in many urban areas was clearly non-Basque in both language and identity. One authoritative source showed data indicating that only 52 % of the population had been born in the Basque region of parents also born there, 11 % had been born in the region of parents born elsewhere, and 35.5 % had been born outside the Basque Country (*Censo de la población y vivienda de la Comunidad Autónoma de Euskadi, Movimientos Migratorios*; (1981); *Censo de Archivos del País Vasco, Alava* (1988); *Censo de Archivos del País Vasco, Bizkaia* (1988); *Censo de Archivos del País Vasco, Guipúzcoa* (1986).

Thus, appealing to the ethnic claim is hard and unclear because of the high percentage of mixed marriages over the years. But we can still make the argument of cultural rights, and claim that altogether the Basque Country is a *Distinct Society* based on its own cultural and unique traditions. This seems an undeniable fact. Tradition blends well with societal forces that have changed the current make up of a modern society that is *culturally unique*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ACOSTA ESPAÑA, R. et al. (1981) *La España de las Autonomías*, Vol. I and Vol. 2, Madrid, Espasa Calpe.
- ARINO ORTIZ, G. (1981) El Estado de las Autonomías: realidad política, interpretación jurídica. In Acosta España, R. et al. (1981) *La España de las Autonomías*, Vol. I and Vol. 2, Madrid, Espasa Calpe.
- CASTRO, Américo (1984) *España en su historia. Cristianos, Moros y Judíos*. Editorial Crítica, Barcelona.
- Censo de la población y vivienda de la Comunidad Autónoma de Euskadi, Movimientos Migratorios/Euskadiko Komunitate Autonomoko Etxebizitzten eta Biztanleen Zentzua, Migrazio Mugimenduak* (1981) Eusko Jaurlaritza, Dirección de Estadística.
- Censo de Archivos del País Vasco, Alava* (1988). Eusko Ikaskuntza, Eusko Jaurlaritza.
- Censo de Archivos del País Vasco, Bizkaia* (1988). Eusko Ikaskuntza, Eusko Jaurlaritza.
- Censo de Archivos del País Vasco, Guipúzcoa* (1986). Eusko Ikaskuntza, Eusko Jaurlaritza.
- COBARRUBIAS, J. (1983) Ethical Issues in Status Planning. In J. Cobarrubias and J. Fishman (eds) *Progress in Language Planning*. Mouton, The Hague.
- COBARRUBIAS, J. (1985) Status de las lenguas minorizadas. In Ruiz de Olabuenaga, J. I. and Ozamiz, J. A. (eds.) *Sociología de las lenguas minorizadas/Hizkuntza Minorizatuen Soziología*. Ttartalo, S. A.
- COBARRUBIAS, J. (1986) (mimeo) *Report on Educational Planning in the Basque Country*. Eusko Jaurlaritza.
- COBARRUBIAS, J. (1987) (mimeo) *Report on Normalization and Language Planning in the Basque Country*. Eusko Jaurlaritza.
- COBARRUBIAS, J. (1988) Normalización y Planificación Lingüística en el País Vasco. In *Euskera Biltzarra*. Vol. II, Eusko Jaurlaritza.
- COBARRUBIAS, J. (1999) Viability of the Basque Language in the Next Millennium. In Douglas, W., Carmelo Urza, Linda White, Joseba Zulaika (eds.) *Basque Cultural Studies*. University of Nevada, Reno.
- DOUGLAS, W., Carmelo Urza, Linda White, Joseba Zulaika (eds.) (1999) *Basque Cultural Studies*. University of Nevada, Reno
- Euskara irakaskuntzan: faktoreen* E.I.F.E (1984) (known as the EIFE reports) Eusko Jaurlaritza.
- Euskara irakaskuntzan: faktoreen* E.I.F.E (1986) (known as the EIFE reports) Eusko Jaurlaritza.
- Euskara irakaskuntzan: faktoreen* E.I.F.E (1989) (known as the EIFE reports) Eusko Jaurlaritza.
- Euskara irakaskuntzan: faktoreen* E.I.F.E (1990) (known as the EIFE reports) Eusko Jaurlaritza.
- Euskaltzaindia (Real Academia de la Lengua Vasca) (1977) *El Libro Blanco del Euskara*. Bilbao.
- Euskaltzaindia (Real Academia de la Lengua Vasca) (1979) *Conflicto lingüístico en Euskadi*. Ediciones Vascas, Bilbao.
- Eusko Jaurlaritza (2008) *IV Encuesta Sociolingüística*.

- FELFOLDI, E. (2001) Minority Rights, Cultural Identity of Minorities, and Cultural Rights in International Law. In: *Minority Politics and Minority Rights*, Minorities Research, Hungary.
- FERGUSON, C. A. (1968) *Language Development*. Reprinted in Anwar Dill (ed.) (1971) *Language Structure and Language Use*.
- FERGUSON, C. A. (1959) *Diglossia*. Reprinted in Anwar Dill (ed.) (1971) *Language Structure and Language Use*.
- FISHMAN, J. (1976) The Sociology of Language. In Fishman (ed.) (1976) *Advances in the Sociology of Language*. Mouton, The Hague.
- GARCÍA DE CORTÁZAR, José Manuel, GONZALEZ VESGA (2000) *Breve historia de España*, Madrid, Alianza.
- GARMENDIA, M.C. (1994) Comparecencia de la Secretaría General de Política Lingüística del Gobierno Vasco ante la Comisión de Instituciones e Interior del Parlamento Vasco.
- HAUGEN (1966), Linguistics and Language Planning. In William Bright *Sociolinguistics*, The Hague, Mouton.
- HAUGEN (1983), The Implementation of Corpus Planning: Theory and Practice. In J. Cobarrubias and J. Fishman (eds) *Progress in Language Planning*. Mouton, The Hague.
- IBARRETXE, J. J. (2008) Lecture at Stanford University, California, February 14, 2008.
- IVAP (1986) Instituto Vasco de Administración Pública. *Normativa Sobre el Euskera*. Eusko Jaurlaritza.
- KOVÁCS, P. (1993) La protection des langues des minorités ou la nouvelle approche de la protection des minorités?, In *Revue générale de droit internationale public*, No. 2, 411-418.
- LAFON, René "La lengua vasca". *Enciclopedia lingüística hispánica*. Ed. M. Alvar, A. Badía, R. de Balbín, L.F. Lindley Cintra. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1970. 67-97.
- NINYOLES, R. L. (1971) *Idioma i Prejuici*. Palma de Mallorca, Spain, Editorial Moll.
- NINYOLES, R. L. (1972) *Idioma y Poder Social*. Madrid, Tecnos.
- OLABARRI GORTAZAR, I. (1981) La cuestión regional en España, 1908-1939. In Acosta España, R. et al. (1981) *La España de las Autonomías*, Vol. 1 and Vol. 2, Madrid, Espasa Calpe.
- RUBIN, J. (1983) Evaluation of Language Planning: What Has the Past Decade Accomplished. In J. Cobarrubias and J. Fishman (eds) *Progress in Language Planning*. Mouton, The Hague.
- Secretariat of Language Planning (1989) *Análisis Demolingüístico de la Comunidad Autónoma Vasca del Padrón de 1986*. Vitoria-Gasteiz. Servicio Central del Gobierno Vasco.
- SIADeco (*Sociedad de Investigación Aplicada para el Desarrollo Comunitario/Aplied Research Society for Community Development*) (1977) Volume 1-10. *Estudio Socio Lingüístico del Euskara*. Siadeco, San Sebastian.
- UNESCO (United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization) *Project of Declaration on Cultural Rights*, at www.unesco.org
- YRIZAR, P. (1981) *Contribución a la Dialectología de la Lengua Vasca*. Donostia, Caja de Ahorros Provincial.