Language Planning and the Development of an Australian Aboriginal Creole

by John Sandefur*

The major language problem of Aborigines in the north of Australia, as perceived by non-Aboriginal people for almost a century, is that they do not speak "correct" English. Language treatment before the 1970s involved mainly attempts to replace Aboriginal forms of speech with English. Since such treatment was deliberate, government-sponsored language change that focused on a defined problem, it could be considered to have been language planning by definition. However, it could not be said to have been characterized by the formulation and evaluation of optimal alternatives, and members of the community affected did not have opportunity for input through the political process (cf. Rubin and Jernudd 1975; Jernudd 1982).

The situation changed significantly in 1972 when the Australian government announced a new policy that allowed Aboriginal children the right to have their primary education in their own language rather than in English only (see Sandefur 1977). Under this new policy, the Aboriginal language problem needing treatment is still perceived by most non-Aboriginal people as being the lack of English competence. The treatment, however, no longer demands the elimination of Aboriginal languages. In addition, the planning process relevant to specific Aboriginal languages requires a great deal of input from the speakers of the language.

The language policy change took place in the context of broader policy and practice changes in the Aboriginal affairs arena. Assimilationist policies that sought to impose a lifestyle on the Aboriginal people in which all vestiges of traditional culture and values were supplanted with Western ones were replaced with self-determination policies that allowed Aboriginal people to choose for themselves the composition of the life-style toward which they would move. The cumulative result has been a phenomenal rise in "Aboriginality"—a societywide reassertion of Aboriginal heritage, including recognition of the legitimacy and importance of Aboriginal languages.

The issue I wish to address in this paper is the role language planning, in both the pre- and post-1972 periods, has played in the emergence and development of a nontraditional Aboriginal language—Kriol.

The emergence and spread of creole

A creole came into existence in the Roper River area of the Northern Territory shortly after the establishment of an Anglican mission in 1908. Pidgin had been present in the area for some thirty-five years prior to the arrival of the missionaries, and the emergence of the creole occurred following a period of violence that had extreme social and linguistic consequences for the Aboriginal groups of the Roper River area.

The adults of these groups were typically multilingual, becoming fluent in each other's languages over the course of a lifetime of meeting for ceremonial and other purposes each year. The fifty to seventy children who attended the school at the mission, however, were forced into contact with other children whose languages they had not yet had time to learn. Their parents could communicate with other adults by speaking languages, but the children could not. What they had in common was the English pidgin (Continued on page 2)
used between Aboriginal and European people and the English they were hearing in school. With this limited input, this younger generation, in the course of their lifetimes, created the creole, manipulating the lexical resources available to them and drawing on linguistic universals to create a language that catered to their communicative needs (Harris and Sandefur 1984:15).

Creole emerged at Roper River in spite of the efforts of the missionaries to stamp it out. The mission had an active language policy that discouraged the use of pidgin and focused on teaching Aborigines to speak correct English. Many of the Aborigines who grew up at the original mission did in fact learn to speak English fluently. English did not, however, supplant the language they created for their first language.

The emergence and development of creole at Roper River were not direct consequences of the language treatment activities of the Anglican missionaries. They had applied their language policy at all their missions, but it was only at Roper River Mission that it was unsuccessful. At Emerald River Mission on Groote Eylandt 200 kilometers to the northeast, for example, no creole ever emerged. A creole failed to develop there because the sociolinguistic context of the community was such that there was no need for a creole to develop. The Groote Eylandters already had their own language, and they had no need to develop a first language in the mission community.

The creole is not restricted to the Roper River area but is currently spoken by an estimated 20,000 Aborigines in about 150 Aboriginal communities in the three states of north Australia. A complex of social changes brought about by World War II was largely responsible for the unintentional emergence of the creole as a first language in most of those communities.

**Status planning**

Until the 1970s the creole was almost universally held in low esteem by non-Aboriginal people as well as the speakers themselves. Commonly it was viewed as being a structureless, bastardized version of English that was capable of being used for only the barest of communication, a form of speech that hindered the cognitive development of its speakers. The attitudes of creole speakers toward their language have significantly changed during the last decade with an increasing number of them publicly identifying with the creole. Many non-Aboriginal people have also accepted the creole as a legitimate language in recent years. There has been, in fact, a dramatic rise in the status and social standing of the creole since 1972.

I have elsewhere (Sandefur 1984) discussed in detail the many-faceted aspects of the sociopolitical and sociolinguistic situations of the last decade that have been instrumental in bringing about the rise in status of the creoles. I will limit my discussion here to the two most significant developments that have directly affected the creole—namely, the establishment by the Northern Territory Department of Education of a bilingual education program using the language in the school at Bamyili and the undertaking by the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) of a Bible translation project in the language.

The use of the language in a school program brought with it official government recognition of the creole as a legitimate language, a recognition that filtered down to creole speakers themselves. The school program has also helped raise the status of the language by giving it the name Kriol. This provided the language with an identity and helped reduce prejudices against the language due to the negative connotations of its previous names (e.g., pidgin or bastardized English).

The SIL translation project has been involved in raising the status of Kriol primarily through the dissemination of information about the nature and extent of the language and its implications for education and communication. Prior to the beginning of the project, very few linguistic or sociolinguistic studies had been made of the language. Language planning relating to Kriol was based on virtually no objective information about the language. SIL therefore focused much attention during the 1970s on basic field research and documentation of the Kriol situation.

**Corpus planning**

No language corpus planning activities were directed at Kriol until the early 1970s. Non-Kriol speakers have, of course, always informally affected the expansion of the Kriol lexicon. For example, stockwork has been assimilated by Aborigines into their contemporary lifestyle. As a consequence, vocabulary associated with stockwork has been incorporated by Aborigines into their Kriol speech.

Most of the corpus planning development of Kriol has arisen from the SIL Kriol Bible translation project and the Bamyili Kriol bilingual school program. Their effects in increasing the expressive power of Kriol are evident in three main areas.

Firstly, SIL and Bamyili School have worked together with Kriol speakers in developing a written mode for Kriol. Most of the direct influence of non-Aboriginal people on the written mode relates to the development of orthography. Non-Kriol speakers have also encouraged the development of various written styles, but it is Kriol speakers themselves who...
are doing the writing and thereby developing the particular styles of writing. Because virtually all Kriol writers to date first obtained their literacy skills in English, the influence of English style in Kriol literature is clearly evident. Some Kriol writers show signs, however, of not being constrained by English writing rules.

Secondly, although standardization has not been overtly planned, it is generally supposed that the development of a written Kriol literature will have a standardizing effect upon the language. It should be pointed out, however, that Kriol literature is still very much in an incipient stage and limited to relatively few Aboriginal communities. The standardizing effect of Kriol literature therefore depends upon the continual growth of the body of literature and its widespread distribution.

Thirdly, the Bible translation project is expected to have a standardizing effect on Kriol terminology across dialects. As with the standardizing effect of written literature, this standardizing of terminology is a by-product of the translation process rather than the result of a deliberate or conscious planning process.

Two basic principles of the modus operandi of the Bible translation project should be pointed out. The first principle is the heavy reliance on Kriol speakers who are familiar with English terms that occur in the Bible and have fairly well developed notions as to how to translate them into Kriol. The actual translation is not done by non-Kriol speakers. While SIL personnel assist with the task, their responsibility is primarily to ensure fidelity to the source text. It is the Kriol speakers who translate the source text into Kriol. This principle helps to ensure an idiomatic translation that will sound natural and be understood by Kriol speakers, and it also helps to prevent the unwarranted introduction of English loanwords into the translation.

The Bible translation project was begun at a time when terms and concepts relevant to the Bible were already fairly well developed in Kriol.

The second basic principle of the Kriol translation project is that of the use of Kriol expressions and structures which enjoy wide currency and acceptance. The translation is not being produced in a particular local dialect. The first draft often starts out in a local dialect, but localized constructions are edited out and replaced with more widely used equivalent expressions.

The influence of non-Aboriginal people has thus been mainly restricted to the development of an orthography and subsequent written literature, including the translation of the Bible, and the standardization that is arising from that literature. The enlargement of the expressive power of Kriol has taken place almost in its entirety as a consequence of the spontaneous efforts of Kriol speakers themselves.

Future development

Many Kriol speakers have expressed opposition to the development of Kriol. This is not surprising, for what de Rieux (1980:268) says about creole in the Seychelles is applicable also for Kriol: "The dominant group, speaking the dominant language, [has] managed to persuade the creole-speakers that their 'speech' [is] so inferior in status as to be a 'non-language'."

There is an increasing number of Kriol speakers who are freeing themselves from the negative attitudes toward their language which the white Australian dominant culture has impressed upon them. During the last few years two significant and growing groups of Kriol speakers have emerged. These speakers may well exert a substantial influence on the future development of Kriol.

One of these groups consists of the Kriol speakers who have worked in the Baiiiyi school Kriol bilingual program or been involved in the SIL Kriol Bible translation project. Possibly the most important contribution these two entitles have thus far made has been the development in Kriol speakers of positive attitudes toward their language.

The other significant and influential group of Kriol speakers consists of teachers and teacher trainees. These Kriol speakers are becoming acutely aware of the importance of their pupils' first language in education. As more and more Kriol speakers become trained as teachers, their influence on education policy and programs for their communities will increase.

Summary

To summarize then, Kriol originally emerged in spite of the early language planning efforts of missionaries, and it persisted despite continuous efforts by missionaries and teachers to eradicate it. Since the early 1970s, a number of non-Aboriginal people, including myself, have been heavily involved in raising the status and social standing of Kriol. It is doubtful that Kriol would have risen in status to the degree that it has if it were not for their support and advocacy. Such recent and supportive influence of non-Aboriginal people has been restricted to status changes and has had little bearing on corpus development. The corpus of Kriol arose originally and developed further largely through the spontaneous linguistic creativity of Aboriginal people. I suspect Kriol speakers in the future will become more directly involved in status planning for their language and that corpus development will continue to be carried out
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spontaneously by the speakers rather than through planning.

Note
1. I am indebted to Phil Graher for his helpful comments in the preparation of this paper for publication.
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Study of China’s Policy Toward Ethnic Minorities

Some ethnic minorities in China are in danger of gradually losing their cultural identities, according to Jiann Hsieh, an anthropologist from the Chinese University of Hong Kong who is researching China’s policy toward its national minorities. One aspect of Hsieh’s study examines how language policy affects minorities. Hsieh pointed out that the constitution of China guarantees the right of national minorities to use and develop their own languages and requires that all Chinese learn Mandarin. But in practice, textbooks in some minority dialects are scarce.

To illustrate, Hsieh has described some of the difficulties facing the Samei, a small national minority group in Yunnan province. “Because the children have seldom been exposed to the (dominant) Han society, they don’t understand Mandarin at all,” Hsieh said. “They speak Samei at home. When they go to school, they are expected to change their language immediately. It’s impossible.” Bilingual preschool classes in Mandarin and Samei are intended to introduce children to the new language. “But this requires bilingual teachers, and the expense of the pre-school is borne by the commune.” Thus, while primary education is nearly universal in Yunnan, classes are usually conducted in Mandarin — and minority dialects are being used less outside the home.

Fifty-six national minority groups are currently registered representing about 6.7 percent of the population; the rest are Han. Although their numbers are relatively small, the minorities are widely distributed: roughly 1,500 of China’s 2,200 counties contain national minorities.

(Abstracted from Center Views, March/April, 1984)


Call for Papers for DSNA 1985 Biennial Meeting

The fifth biennial meeting of the Dictionary Society of North America will be held at The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, from Sunday, August 18, to Wednesday, August 21, 1985. The main themes of the meeting will be Desiderata in English Lexicography and Historical Lexicography. Members of the DSNA are invited to submit abstracts of proposed papers before March 1, 1985, to Professor Robert E. Lewis, Middle English Dictionary, 555 South Forest, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104. Further details about the meeting will appear in the spring 1985 DSNA Newsletter.

Editor—Joan Rubin
Associate Editor—Björn H. Jernudd
Editorial Board
M. H. Abels<br>Joshua Fishman<br>Berl Smigel<br>Moshe Vera<br>Jiri Neustupny

Copies are available free of charge. Changes of address and requests to be placed on the mailing list should be addressed to:

Language Planning Newsletter
Institute of Culture and Communication
East-West Center
Honolulu, Hawaii 96824 USA

All other correspondence should be addressed to the editor:
Dr. Joan Rubin
P. O. Box 143
Pinole, CA 94564
USA
Heller describes the relationship between English and French and between Quebec French and European French and discusses the social and stylistic significance of alternate forms. She provides a detailed description of language use in social context in the factory, citing examples from such places as the foreman's office, the laboratories, and the lab coffee breaks. She concludes that the brewery exemplifies the process of redefinition of old boundaries. At the time of writing, the engineering department was a forum for working out the conditions of change and the labs showed what the brewery would be like in a few years' time—"a French social institution where those who not only are bilingual but who are able to effectively use their own language and to influence the assignment of social value to it will dominate the key situations where decisions are made." This dissertation is a valuable illustration of the interaction of macro language planning promotion of language change and micro change where individuals work out their own agenda.


This study, which adds depth to the author's recent lead article in the Language Planning Newsletter (Vol. 10, No. 2), evaluates the acceptance of terminology according to linguistic principles of formation. Musa's textbook (in Bengali) on language planning will be published by the Bangla Academy next year.


This is a discussion of language rights considered from the individual (or neuropsychological) and the geographical perspectives. Some of the individual rights discussed are: the right of speaking, the right to understand and be understood, the right to schooling in one's mother tongue, and the right of language identity. In discussing the territorial issue, the author considers the following solutions: Switzerland, Belgium, Yugoslavia, and Finland, as well as situations with a fixed or changing boundary.

This volume includes authors and chapter titles as follows: J. Maurais—Introduction; N. Gueunier—The Crisis of French in France; J. Maurais—The Crisis of French in Quebec; J.-M. Klinkenberg—Belgium; C. Rubattel—Switzerland; R. Ruiz—The Crisis of English in the U.S.; G. Jolly & R. Robertson—Commonwealth; W. Sauer—Germany; R. Avila—The Spanish of Mexico; G. Salvador—The Spanish of Spain; L. Behaera—The Spanish of Uruguay; K. Rotaetxe & X. Altizbar—The Basque of Spain; A. Bastardas—Catalan; D. Kostic & R. Bugarski—Yugoslavia; R. Hillman—Sweden; E. Hansen—Denmark; G. Gundersen—Norway; A. Sebestyén—Hungary; O. Schwarzwald & R. Herzlich—Israel; J.H. Jeon—Korea; J. Rubin—Indonesia (extract of a text); and A. Rey—Summary.


This cogent article argues the need to recognize language diversity as part of nation-building, and suggests that it is helpful for new nations to recognize, accept, and be prepared to address this diversity. The author offers the “heresy that the reality of all nations, without exception, is that, if there is an intrinsic characteristic which they share, that characteristic is disharmony or national conflict.” The author then suggests that this acknowledgment “for those of us on the brink of independence, (should) serve the useful purpose of preparing us to face the future with less alarmist or pessimistic propensity than is normally the case when our political attitudes gear us only to expect harmony within our nations.”


Vallverdu’s book describes historical changes in the sociocultural position of the Catalan language in nine stages, beginning in the tenth century, and makes several recommendations for a language policy. In particular, the author suggests three lines of action: (1) making Catalan the language of the means of social communication, changing the language of mass communication, public administration, and education; (2) dismantling the cultural colonization, including changing the way in which social relations are presented in education and changing the control of mass communication; and (3) promoting a national popular culture. It is of considerable note that many of the language policy recommendations are currently being implemented; in particular, LPN has published information about recent activities of public administration in promoting the development of Catalan in Spain.


A group of distinguished Canadians gathered at Trent University in 1982 to assess the future of bilingualism in Canada. This special issue of Language and Society features excerpts from a variety of presentations given at the colloquium and highlights the ensuing debates on language reform.

The opening session featured discussion of bilingual districts. Proposed by the B and B Commission and provided for in the federal Official Languages Act, bilingual districts have never been formally proclaimed. Has an opportunity been lost forever? Are the political difficulties that proclamation might bring insuperable? Is there another way to get the same result without running into such difficulties? These and other questions were debated with a mix of pessimism and optimism.

The second session, devoted to language in the public sector, sought to determine the direction that language reform measures should take in the future. Should a major thrust be given to new breakthroughs, particularly in language of work? Should the present system be dismantled? Or should the goal be steady and consistent progress along the lines of current federal and provincial language policies?

The third session dealt with language and business and focused particularly on language of work in Quebec and in other French-speaking regions of Canada. The issues covered included: the language(s)
of corporate headquarters, the responsibility of Crown corporations to act as linguistic trend-setters, the advantages and disadvantages of government intervention in the form of language legislation regulating the private sector, and the overall effects for business and society of Quebec's francization program.

On language and education, the topic of the final session, the discussion unraveled into several quite distinct threads: the impact on educational authorities of the new Charter of Rights and Freedoms; the need for a national language-in-education strategy; a call for universities to set second-language entry and graduation requirements; and the equally important need for Canadians at large to be better informed of educational options vis-à-vis language education.

(Abstracted from pp. 1-2)


In addition to describing educational and linguistic considerations in understanding the process of becoming (or not becoming) a bilingual, the book has one chapter describing some of the social concerns which a country, in particular those in Scandinavian areas, should bear in mind.

The Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language

The Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language

Jack Fellman*

As one of their main tasks in language planning, most language academies are involved in preparing dictionaries for their respective languages. The Hebrew Language Academy is involved in preparing a historical dictionary of Hebrew. Indeed, Hebrew is the only language which is not Indo-European which at present is being so treated by a language academy. Actually, composing a historical dictionary of Hebrew is a most difficult task because Hebrew has more than three thousand years of uninterrupted textual activity and, as such, has the longest historically attested record of any language extant. Nevertheless, because Hebrew died in speech around the year 200, and was only successfully revived as a spoken tongue in Palestine some one hundred years ago, most researchers tended to regard only the early periods of Hebrew—and in particular the Biblical period—as worthy of any serious and extended attention. Anything later was disregarded, or regarded at best as a linguistic curiosity or oddity.

Because of such linguistic prejudice, Elizer Ben Yehuda, the “father of the Hebrew language revival,” took great pains to consider all of Hebrew as one continuous historical progression and to seek to create a historical dictionary of both ancient and modern Hebrew. His single-handed, monumental achievement in the lexicographical sphere, his Thesaurus Totius Hebraeitatis et Veteris et Recentioris, was finished posthumously and published in 1958 in 17 volumes covering some 20,000 words and some half million quotations in a little under 8,000 pages.

Nevertheless, it was clear, even to Ben Yehuda when he was alive, that by the very nature of the case his Thesaurus was not complete. Therefore, in 1959, the Hebrew Language Academy decided to continue in Ben Yehuda’s footsteps and to set up an ongoing project to compose, with the aid of computers, a complete historical dictionary of the Hebrew language of all periods, based on a carefully selected and scientifically prepared and critically edited set of sources ranging from classical (Biblical and post-Biblical) times, through the medieval and pre-modern periods, and down to the creation of the state of Israel in 1948.

Now, some 25 years later, the historical dictionary is in full progress. In a special Ben Yehuda Building of the Hebrew Language Academy on the campus of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, a staff of 16 language specialists and 6 computer specialists prepare the materials for the full realization of Ben Yehuda’s lexicographical dream. At present, concordances and word-lists of the main texts of the classical period (down to ca. 1000), totalling some 5 million words and quotations in more than 80 volumes, are available. Materials of the medieval and modern periods are also available, but in significantly lower proportions. Enough material has already been gathered to enable the publishing in 1982 of a specimen dictionary for one of the most complex roots in Hebrew. This pamphlet was very well received among language specialists, and here one sees clearly the shape the future dictionary will take. The dictionary will ultimately make available the entire history of every Hebrew word: its source, origin, and derivation; its historical and developmental meanings, uses, and collocations; its various spellings, vocalizations, and grammatical forms; and its frequencies of usage, all supported by a long list of chronologically ordered quotations spaced (where possible) over 30-year periods.

*Jack Fellman is a professor of Hebrew and Semitic languages, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, Israel.
THE NEED FOR AN INTERNATIONAL AUXILIARY LANGUAGE

Wendy Ashby*

Many people, many linguists included, believe that in this age of electronic communication humanity needs a constructed international auxiliary language. Modern technology now gives everybody in the world the means to communicate, to speak with and to see any other individual anywhere. The chief obstruction to the easy exchange of information is the existence of thousands of languages. A world that is being knit together into one electronic web demands a world language, a second language that people can learn in addition to their own native tongues.

Such a language must have a potentially infinite vocabulary to keep pace with the accelerating rate of scientific discovery and have no grammar. It must be easy to learn, a language equally suitable for scientist, computer, peasant, and poet.

GLOS A IS THE BEST ADVOCATE

Such a language now exists—Glosa. The vocabulary consists of Latin and Greek words and roots common to the Euro-languages and to scientific and technical terminology which carry them into every part of the modern and modernizing world. There is a central vocabulary of about 1,000 words with which any kind of information can be exchanged. This small, efficient vocabulary is easily learned. The words are brief, have a good alternation of vowels and consonants, and so are easy to pronounce, especially easy for Orientals, who find consonant clusters difficult. Brief words mean rapid writing, rapid reading, rapid thinking, and conservation of paper. There are no homophones, and each word represents only one concept. Therefore, Glosa is ideal for computerization. There are five vowel sounds as in Spanish. Each word can be represented by one to four and sometimes five letters, thus enabling highspeed typing and providing a shorthand system for rapid note taking. In addition to the central vocabulary, there is an extended vocabulary of more than 100,000 words for literature, poetry, and stylistic variety.

GLOS A HAS NO GRAMMAR

Glosa has no grammar in the everyday significance of that term. It has no useless rules and no inflections. It is an isolating language. Instead of an inflection, Glosa uses a functional word, in the same way that English employs shall and did to form the future and past tense of a verb: “I did think” instead of “I thought.” An isolating language is capable of much greater subtlety than an inflected one, for the number of inflexions is limited, but an isolating language has its whole vocabulary available for modification. Glosa is easy, accurate, euphonious, and subtle.

Each word can serve as any part of speech just as in Chinese and increasingly, in English. In “a bottle,” bottle is a noun; in “bottle-green,” an adjective; and in “bottle the wine,” a verb. The only rules Glosa has is word order, which is almost as simple as English; subject–verb–object.

EDUCATIONAL ADVANTAGES OF GLOSA

All Glosa words are etymologically lively and interesting. For example, tree is Dendro, as in the Greek rhodo-dendron (literally, red-tree). Dendro is connected with Druid, dryad, and true. Archi-text is Greek meaning chief-builder. Text occurs in tectonic plates, and from the same root is technos, meaning skill, art as in technology. The Latin text has come to mean one part of a building, the roof, cover, from which we get detect, to uncover. The German words dach and duft come from the same Indo-European root.

Glosa uses the international botanical and zoological names for plants and animals. By studying Glosa 6,000, the student is able to understand the meanings of more than a million scientific words occurring in biology and medicine. Scientists coin thousands of new words each year and almost all are now derived from Greek. All Glosa words are defined by the modern scientific meaning.

Glosa helps enormously in the speedy acquisition of the European vocabularies.

THE NETWORK IS SPREADING

Glosa has been publicized on a small scale for only a short time; however, many linguists and educationalists from around the world are adopting the language with much enthusiasm.

Various dictionaries are available including Glosa 1,000 (basic), Glosa 6,000 (intermediate), and Glosa Advanced, which lists 5,000 rarer Greek and Latin elements which occur in international scientific terminology. The dictionaries contain all the necessary instructions for communicating, immediately, in the language.

The monthly newsletter Plu Glosa Note keeps members up-to-date with Glosa progress and contains articles about linguistics, etymology, science, education, the Third World, and conservation; also letters, penfriends, and puzzles.

Further information is available from:

Glosa
132 Kew Road
Richmond, Surrey
TW9 2AU
ENGLAND

THE EAST-WEST CENTER is a public, nonprofit educational institution with an international board of governors. Some 2,000 research fellows, graduate students, and professionals in business and government each year work with the Center’s international staff in cooperative study, training, and research. They examine major issues related to population, natural resources, the environment, culture, and communication in Asia, the Pacific, and the United States. The Center was established in 1965 by the U.S. Congress, which provides principal funding. Support also comes from more than 20 Asian and Pacific governments, as well as private agencies and corporations.

Situated on 21 acres adjacent to the University of Hawaii’s Manoa Campus, the Center’s facilities include a 300-room office building housing research and administrative offices for an international staff of 250, three residence halls for participants, and a conference center with meeting rooms equipped to provide simultaneous translation and a complete range of audiovisual services.

1777 East-West Road
Honolulu, Hawaii 96848

*The author has been working with Ron Clark to promote a modified version of Professor Lancelot Hogben’s international language Interglossa (1943).