
Language Policies: Policies on Language in Europe

R de Cillia and B Busch, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

© 2006 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Theoretical Framework, Terminology

Language Policies, Language Politics, Policies on Language

Questions of language politics and policy on language are always present in society, even when one is not aware of them: it is immaterial whether it is a question of international communication or conflicts to do with minority languages, new minorities and migration, gender-neutral formulations or politically correct use of language. Nevertheless, scientific interest in language policies is relatively young, and the research on language policies has not resulted in the development of any unified theory so far. Even in the area of terminology, there are many ambiguities (Labrie, 1996: 828), complicated by the fact that the
field, to some extent, has a different terminological structure in different languages.

The beginning of scientific reflection on language policies and politics (LPP) as an independent field was undertaken particularly in the 1960s (Ricento, 2000: 10; Labrie, 1996: 828), in publications such as Haugen (1966), Kloss (1966) or Fishman (1968), and in these the focus was initially on the aspect of language planning. Ricento (2000) distinguishes a total of three stages in the evolution of language policy and planning as an area of research: what is characteristic of early work is the interest in decolonization and state formation, the predominance of structuralism in social sciences and of pragmatism as a strategic orientation. The second phase focused – under the influence of critical sociolinguistics – on social, economic, and political effects of language contact. In the 1990s, linguistic human rights became a strategic aim; postmodern and critical theories foreground language ideologies. On the contemporary situation he comments: “whether the ecology of languages paradigm emerges as the most important conceptual framework for LPP research remains to be seen” (Ricento, 2000: 22).

In any event, the conceptualizations and theoretical approaches of different scholars are different, and the boundaries they draw between their own and related questions are fluid or dependent on their particular conceptualization. Language policy is sometimes seen, for example, as a subdivision of political linguistics (Politische Sprachwissenschaft; Maas, 1989). Language and politics are, at any rate, two overlapping subjects. Terms and phrases such as ‘social security scroungers,’ ‘economic migrants,’ ‘ethnic cleansing’ or – to cite examples from the Second Iraq War – ‘intelligent weapons,’ ‘smart bombs,’ ‘collateral damage’ convey a specific approach to reality and are, to some extent, consciously created for this purpose. In a sense, these are also measures of language policies.

A first approximation to a definition of language policy is as follows: language policies deal with political measures targeted at an individual language (e.g., the prohibition to use certain terms) or the relations between different languages, their social importance, function, relevance in international communication, etc. It is therefore a question of an interdisciplinary area of research, and a theory of LP (which has still to be developed) would have to embrace such disciplines as (sociolinguistics, political science, sociology and history, and jurisprudence.

On the one hand, therefore, the object area includes phenomena and measures that are directed at the internal system of a single language, politically rule-governed language use, and on the other hand, political phenomena in respect of the status and social functions of languages. It may involve conscious or deliberate actions, or naturally arising developments that are not consciously controlled by politics. And it also includes the level of theoretical concepts and underlying linguistic ideologies with regard to languages, questions of linguistic political theory, and language planning (language planning theory), but also questions of the concrete implementation of such concepts in practice (language planning practice; Fishman, 1994) by means of more or less conscious language-policy measures. Different languages have different conceptual structures for this area: this latter differentiation, therefore, does not exist in German, whereas in English the former is called language politics and the latter language policy or policies; this corresponds to the distinction in French between la politique linguistique and une politique linguistique (Labrie, 1996: 828–829). Labrie adds a third analytical level of idéologie linguistique ‘linguistic ideologies,’ but this usually remains implicit. The differentiation between measures for the political regulation of language use and phenomena related to the social function of languages is conceptualized in German by most authors as Sprachpolitik versus Sprachenpolitik.

A number of authors use ‘language policy’ to refer only to deliberate political measures (e.g., Labrie, 1996), while for other authors it is also important to deal with nondeliberate phenomena, or laissez-faire politics (Ricento, 2000). Finally, language planning (in French planification linguistique, but also aménagement linguistique, and in German Sprachplanung) is sometimes construed as the broader and more comprehensive area (cf., the authors listed by Labrie, 1996: 830), while others treat language policy as the superordinate level. For example, Christ (1991) or Ricento (2000), who says: “I deliberately use ‘Language policy’ as a superordinate term which subsumes, ‘language planning.’ Language policy research is concerned not only with official and unofficial acts of governmental and other institutional entities, but also with the historical and cultural events and processes that have influenced, and continue to influence, societal attitude and practices with regard to language use, acquisition and status” (Ricento, 2000: 23).

The most important question to be addressed today by researchers is, according to Ricento: “Why do individuals opt to use (or cease to use) particular languages and varieties for specified functions in different domains, and how do these choices influence – and how are they influenced by – institutional language policy decision-making (local to national and supranational)” (Ricento, 2000: 23).
The German scholar and specialist LP researcher Herbert Christ defines language policy (in the sense of German Sprachpolitik) as any public influence on the communicative radius of languages: “the sum total of all those political initiatives ‘from above’ and ‘from below,’ by means of which a particular language or languages are supported in their public currency, their functioning and their dissemination. Like all policies it is subject to conflict, and must be permanently reordered through constant discussion and constant debate” (Christ, 1991: 55). This broad definition of language policy, which we subscribe to, comprises aspects such as language promotion, language maintenance, language conflicts, language wars, language enforcement, linguistic imperialism, and linguistic colonialism.

Language policy may appear in very different forms: as a consciously planned policy in relation to linguistic phenomena, resulting in laws and political measures (e.g., legislation on minorities in European states); as policy on languages that is implicit in existing laws and regulations (e.g., educational laws, curriculum, consumer protection laws); as laissez-faire politics that simply let things go and intervene in cases of virulent linguistic conflict; as language policy obscurantism, which simply denies the existence of the phenomena.

Similarly, the area of language policy research in its broadest sense incorporates the phenomena that are labeled Sprachpolitik in German, such as politically regulated language use, or the enforcement of measures that serve to exert political control over language use. One extreme example of this was the political creed of National Socialism and its terminological justification in the form of the racist terminology that followed the Nurnberg Race Laws (‘Jew,’ ‘Half-Jew,’ German Jude, Halbjude, etc.).

**Language Planning**

Language planning is understood to refer to political activities that are used in an attempt to exert conscious and targeted influence on systems of social communication, to introduce desirable changes or to avoid undesirable changes. In other words, it refers to a conscious practical language policy. Here a distinction is made between two areas: corpus planning and status planning. Corpus planning is understood to refer to activities related to the quality and productivity of a language, or its corpus. This includes all measures to do with codification and the setting of norms, which serve to create, or maintain and develop, a standard language, such as questions of the written form, or the development of scientific and literary language. In connection with the development and further expansion of a language, particularly in the area of terminology, the term ‘language development’ is also used. ‘Acquisition planning,’ a term used by some scholars, is concerned with policy measures that regulate language teaching and learning.

‘Status planning’ is understood to refer to those activities that relate to the status of a language: language prestige, the consumer value or market value of a language in international or national communication. Particular languages are preferred in communication or given official backing in their function: for example, at the national level as the state language, official language, and so on (with regulations according to which particular languages are used in offices, schools, law courts, town name boards, and the like); or at an international level as the language of diplomacy and international treaties or as the working language in international organizations such as the United Nations or the Council of Europe.

In the context of status planning the term ‘language expansion policy’ is also used, and this refers to the spread of a particular language or standard as opposed to other varieties at the national level, or to the spread of a particular language as opposed to other languages at the international level. An example of the former would be the promotion in France of the dialect of the Île de France, the langue d’oil, as the French national language, at the expense of other varieties, from the 16th century onwards. This happened in particular at the expense of the langue d’oc, which had been the language of a highly developed culture in the Middle Ages. Language dissemination policy, or Language promotion policy, at an international level aims primarily at promoting the status of one language with regard to other nations or the official languages of other nations. One central agency in language expansion at the national level is the school, which plays a decisive role in the spread of standard languages and national languages, but also in the suppression of minority languages and the spread of particular foreign languages rather than others. At the international level, the cultural institutes play an important role in the implementation of the external language policies or expansion policies of particular nations (e.g., United States Information Agencies/Services, British Council, Institut Français, Goethe Institut, Österreich Institut, Instituto Cervantes, Istituto Italiano) (cf., Christ and de Cillia, 2003).

**The Analysis of National and International Language Policies**

Traditionally, a distinction is made between national and international language policies, although of
course the boundaries between are also fluid. To analyze LP on a national level, one should investigate the following questions: What language policy and language planning measures, and what language laws are set up in relation to the role, meaning, and status of languages that are spoken by the inhabitants of a particular state (as first, second, or foreign languages)? This includes all measures that affect the standardization, dissemination, and promotion of the relevant languages, within but also beyond the territory of the state in question. The first task, therefore, would be to investigate which languages, varieties, and codes are used by the population living in the territory of a particular state. What status do the languages in question have in the particular society? What forms of bilingualism and diglossia exist, and what is the functional distribution of the individual languages in diglossic and/or multilingual situations? What language conflicts exist?

The analysis of language attitudes needs special attention, as attitudes toward languages/language varieties, language use and toward the speakers of particular languages/varieties allow extrapolations on expectations, acceptance, and efficiency concerning language policies (Garret et al., 2003; see also Language Attitudes).

Another important question is the relationship between language policy and language legislation: what linguistic regulations are in existence (in the constitution, consumer protection laws, educational laws, laws controlling the media, regulations on official and legal language(s), military laws, topographical notices, etc.)? Further, there must be an investigation into whether there is a coordinated national language policy that provides for a development and implementation of the legal requirements on language according to scholarly standards, and whether there is any body that is responsible for the development of an explicit language policy (political body, panel of experts, or a similar organization). One must also ask what contradictions there are between linguistic rights guaranteed by law and language policy in practice. In principle, all political fields may be analyzed with this in mind: i.e., education and school policy (medium of instruction, minority languages and foreign languages in the curriculum), media policy, consumer policy, cultural policy, foreign policy, migration policy, and so on. Finally, it is necessary to analyze the measures implemented in a particular state on language planning: what corpus planning and status planning measures are implemented/not implemented in respect of the languages in question. Are there academies as bodies that set norms, are there dictionaries, grammars, codices for the particular languages, are there measures for terminological development (e.g., in the areas of modern technology, the Internet)? With regard to status planning, one should ask what measures are taken there to enhance or guarantee the consumer value of the particular languages on the national and international language markets?

Concerning the analysis of international language policies, a first step is the analysis of measures that have been incorporated into the foreign and cultural policy of individual states to safeguard the role of languages in international and supranational communication, i.e., as languages of regional, supraregional, and international communication, as foreign languages in other countries, as working languages in international organizations, at bilateral or multilateral international meetings, as the language of international treaties, and so on.

Beyond the analysis of the above-mentioned questions of international policies, the international status of languages is of the utmost importance. It can be characterized by means of a number of different factors. The first, of course, is the number of speakers who have a particular language as their first language. (Here Mandarin Chinese comes before Hindi, English, Spanish, Arabic, Bengali, Portuguese, Russian, Japanese, German, and French, according to Grimes (2004) or as a second language (Chinese before English, Spanish, Hindi, Russian, French, German, Portuguese, again according to Grimes (2004). No figures are given for Arabic). Other criteria are the importance of languages in politics and diplomacy (with English as national or official language in 58 countries, French 32, Spanish 22, German eight, Portuguese seven (Grimes, 2004). No figures are given for Arabic, but it presumably has this status in some 20 states.) As a working language, we find English in 16 international organizations, French in 12, Spanish in nine, Russian in five, Arabic in two and German in one organization (Ammon, 1999: 111). Further criteria are the economic importance of languages that can be expressed, for example, in their economic strength, in the Gross Social Product that members of a particular language community achieve worldwide. Here, English is ahead of Japanese, German, Spanish, and French (Ammon, 1999: 101); or their role as academic languages (in 1996, 90.7% of all publications in the natural sciences were in English, 2.1% in Russian, 1.7% in Japanese, 1.3% in French, and 1.2% in German (Ammon, 1999: 109); and as an Internet language. One source estimates the number of English web pages at 56.4%, German 7.7%, French 5.6%, Japanese 4.9%, Spanish 3.0%, and Chinese 2.4%. The statistics for languages used for searches (using the Google search engine) are as follows:
English 57%, German 12%, Japanese 7%, Spanish 6%, French 5%, and Chinese 3% (StADaF, 2003: 4).

Different sources give somewhat different figures for all these criteria, but the relationships are always more or less the same. About a dozen major languages, with 100 million or more speakers, play an important role in international language politics, English plays a dominant role as a global language in all areas, and in politics and diplomacy French, which in relation to the number of its speakers, still has great significance.

A central role in the maintenance, improvement, or protection of the status of a language at the international level belongs to the language expansion policy outlined above. Several states therefore maintain cultural institutes in many parts of the world. For instance, there are 200 US Information Agencies in 143 different countries, 160 British Council centers in 109 countries, 151 Instituts Français in 92 countries, 126 Goethe Institute in 76 countries, 90 Istituti Italiani di Cultura in 61 countries and 40 Institutos Cervantes in 20 countries (Müller, 2004: 152). France – the only nation in the world – even has an independent department within the foreign ministry that is responsible for external language policy (Direction Générale de la Coopération Internationale et du Développement).

The boundaries between language dissemination policy and linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992) are fluid, and this policy is justified by various ideologies such as the supposedly natural superiority of a particular language, the ideology of a neutral lingua franca (claimed, for example, for English) or the special clarity of a language (clarté de la langue française). For French, a particular feature of all French-speaking countries (la francophonie) is construed discursively (and also politically and economically), and more recently the concept of plurilingualism is being promoted at an international level, since English can no longer be denied the role of the international lingua franca.

**Trends and Tendencies in Inter/national Language Policies**

Present-day developments in language policy are contradictory: on the one hand there is hegemonization and on the other hand differentiation. The figures given above show clearly that English has taken on an ever more dominant role in connection with processes of globalization and processes of political, economic, and cultural hegemonization emanating from the United States.

In the context of globalization, the competences of the nation-state are shrinking at an increasing rate. It is surrendering power to international or supranational bodies, and at the same time allowing new media technologies (Internet, satellite TV, etc.) to create new communication spaces that are less linked to territory than before. Moreover, regional supranational groups and bodies such as the European Union have also arisen together with globalization. Although language policy in the European Union is an area determined by the subsidiarity principle, which leaves relative autonomy to the individual member states, different common regulations and programs exert a considerable influence. On the other hand, cities and regions on a substate level also have gained autonomy in the shaping of their particular social and cultural policies. The process of de-centering the nation–state as a central principle of political organization also makes it necessary to rethink questions of language policy. Here, particular attention has to be given to such market-conditioned language policy players as the language learning, culture, and media industries that previously occupied a less central position (Labrie, 2003; Wright, 2004; Busch, 2004).

In a kind of counter-movement, there are attempts on the part of some states to affirm the role of the nation–state in the area of language policy, for example through strengthening the constitutional role of national languages or through the increasing requirement in European countries for immigrants to be able to demonstrate knowledge of the state language before being granted citizenship, or even the right of permanent residence.

The central role that language policy still plays in the process of affirmation of nation states or in the construction of national identities is shown in the example of former Yugoslavia, where the break-up of the federal state into individual states was accompanied by the deconstruction of the umbrella language of Serbo-Croatian and the establishment of the three languages Serbian (Serbo-Croatian), Croatian, and Bosnian as state languages in the three respective states (Bugarski, 2004). There were also processes of differentiation in language policy in the Republic of South Africa where, after the end of the racist apartheid regime, there was an upgrading of African languages and sign language. The establishment of nine African languages as official languages and a comprehensive commitment to a policy of multilingualism are viewed as a central element in the process of social transformation (Alexander, 2001). Further questions of international language policy will be discussed below, using the example of language policy in Europe.
Language Policies in Europe

Languages in Europe

Of the estimated 2500–8000 languages in the world, only a few hundred (230; Grimes, 2004) are spoken in Europe, and laws concerning languages normally distinguish between national languages, autochthonous minority languages such as Basque or Gaelic, and new languages arising from immigration, such as Turkish or Arabic, and sign languages.

Among the national languages, after English and French the most important European languages are Russian (158 million speakers) and German (121 million) (Crystal, 1997: 289). Before May 1, 2004, 24% of EU citizens spoke German, 16% English, French or Italian, and 10% Spanish (Eurobarometer, 2000: 93). Of German speakers, incidentally, 96% live in Europe, compared with 47.6% of French speakers, 10.7% for English, 11.2% for Spanish, and 5.4% for Portuguese (StADaF, 2003: 4). If one includes foreign language knowledge, the following picture emerges: English is spoken by 47%, German 32%, French 26%, Italian 18%, and Spanish 14% (Eurobarometer, 2000: 94).

On the other hand, it has been estimated that in the great European metropolises, approximately one-third of the population conduct their daily lives not only in the national language, but also in a range of other languages. Twelve percent of the 370 million EU citizens use 40–60 (depending on various sources) different minority languages (Krausnecer, 2003: 34).

Official Languages and Language Policies in Europe

For international and supranational communication, there are in principle two different models: the lingua franca/dominant language model, according to which a lingua franca (e.g., English, French, Esperanto) serves as a means of communication between different language communities, and a model of linguistic pluralism, or linguistic diversification, according to which as many different languages as possible are used as means of communication. In Europe, a pluralistic model of communication is pursued, at least among theoreticians, and European multilingualism is accepted as an important element in the European identity.

The basic principle for the institutional language policy in the EU was determined by the Ordinance no. 1 of April 15, 1958 (Language Charter of the EU). It stipulates that the various national languages of the member states are simultaneously “the official and working languages of the organs of the community.” (There are currently 20 languages: Czech, Danish, Dutch, English, Estonian, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Hungarian, Italian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Maltese, Polish, Portuguese, Slovak, Slovenian, Spanish, and Swedish.) The ordinance refers to written documents, and also requires that “ordinances and other written documents of general validity” be published in all official languages, and that the bulletin of the community appear in all of the official languages. To implement this policy, the EU maintains language services in all the different organs (Parliament, Council, Commission, and so on) in which – before the most recent expansion on May 1, 2004 – a total of some 4000 translators and interpreters were employed (language staff make up around 12.6% of total staff). Apart from the interpreting and translation service, as further measures for the promotion of multilingualism the EU has developed special programs at three different levels: assistance in machine translation (e.g., Systran), terminology databases (e.g., EURODICAUTOM, EUTERPE), and promotional programs for language learning such as LINGUA, SOKRATES, and LEONARDO DA VINCI.

The analysis of actual communication in the EU demonstrates that the policy of multilingualism is most fully implemented at the level of the internal working languages in the European Parliament, and then in the European Court of Justice in external communication. (The internal language here is French.) In the European Council and Commission, most work and negotiation is done in English and French, and to a lesser extent in German. Here English is becoming ever more important as the internal working language at the expense of French: in 1986, for example, 58% of the Commission’s primary texts were written in French, 26% in English, 11% in German and 5% in other languages. In 1997, the figures were as follows: English 45.4%, French 40.4%, German 5%, other languages 9.2% (Truchot, 2001: 27).

The translation service and its costs are often advanced as an argument in favor of a dominant language communication model, where English would be adopted as the only internal working language of the EU. On the other hand, language policy experts consider the (political) costs of monolingualism to be too high and plead for a more conscious and clearly defined EU policy of multilingualism (cf., Phillipson, 2003; de Cillia et al., 2003, and the contributions documented therein.)

Language Policies in Education

A central role in European language policy is played by school language policy, since foreign language
competence is acquired first and foremost in the school system (59% of Europeans gained their knowledge of a first foreign language in their secondary school (Eurobaromètre, 2001: 23)). In the year 2000, approximately half the population throughout the EU had no foreign language knowledge at all (an average of 47% throughout the EU, while 26% of Europeans spoke two foreign languages). The most important foreign language is English (41%), ahead of French (19%), German (10%), Spanish (7%), and Italian (3%) (Eurobaromètre, 2001: 2). This has a direct relationship to the foreign languages that are taught in schools: in 1999–2000, 87% of students in secondary schools in 27 European countries were learning English, 25% French, 15% German, and 7% Spanish (European Commission et al., 2002: H-17). In the new EU member states, the language teaching policy is probably diversifying more strongly than in the old member states. For example in the Czech Republic, in the 1998–1999 academic year, 390,518 pupils were learning English, 344,247 German, and 8744 French in elementary schools (age range, 6–15) (Nekvapil, 2003: 78).

Research into language policy and language learning in the last few decades has produced a series of proposals for intensifying and diversifying foreign language teaching in Europe, and have made it their objective that pupils should learn two foreign languages during their compulsory education and three in postcompulsory education. To implement a foreign language policy leading to multilingualism, specialists have proposed a whole range of measures at the levels of school organization and teaching methodology. For instance, foreign language teaching should, in general, start early; use of the foreign language as a medium of instruction should increase; curricula should be more flexible; passive multilingualism should be encouraged, and multilingualism available in classrooms should be exploited, involving the languages of both old and new minorities (see Besters-Dilger et al., 2003: 282; de Cillia et al., 2003: 11).

**Minority Languages**

The majority of Europe’s legal systems recognize within the borders of particular states a number of minority languages. Which languages are recognized as minority languages, how their status is defined, and in which domains these languages may be used varies considerably from country to country and depends very much on particular political constellations. There is also a considerable fuzziness concerning terminology in the field: in some contexts, minority languages are referred to as regional languages, in others as lesser used languages or as autochthonous minority languages.

The Council of Europe’s Charter for Regional or Minority Languages (Council of Europe, 1992), which came into force in 1998, is the first legally binding and individually enforceable international instrument in the field of language policy. On the subject of minority languages, the Charter marks a change of paradigms concerning the attitude toward minority languages: whereas earlier international treaties protected speakers of minority languages only through nondiscrimination clauses limiting state influence, the Charter puts the ratifying states under an obligation to give active protection and support for minority languages. In 2004, only 17 of the 45 member states of the Council of Europe had ratified the Charter. The European Union has established an Office for Regional and Lesser Used Languages, which protects the interests of speakers of minority languages within the EU.

In the 1970s, minority languages became an important topic in sociolinguistic research when, in a counter-move to the previous centralizing tendencies, regionalization was not only supported at the political level, but also by social movements that began to demand rights for minorities.

A new approach to borders in Europe, resulting from the end of the bi-polar division in the world, the process of European integration, and globalization in the world economy, have, since the 1990s, not only brought about new minority–majority configurations, but have also triggered a rethinking of language policies in the field. Since that time, greater interest has been taken in the rights of speakers and the development of nonterritorial languages, particularly Romany. Other minority languages are increasingly seen as regional languages that can function as lingua francas in cross-border situations. Frequently, such functions are not fulfilled by national standard languages, which tend to emphasize differences, but by regional dialects or vernaculars that are intelligible on both sides of a border and that are therefore undergoing a process of revival (Raasch, 2002: 205).

The interest in migrant languages began in the domain of language in education when it became obvious in Western Europe that migration could not be considered a temporary phenomenon. Early research within the multicultural paradigm was mainly concerned with language acquisition and bi-or multilingual education. For the most part, migration and mobility are no longer seen as temporary phenomena but as a consequence of the process of globalization. Research interest has shifted in recent years and
focuses more on (hybrid) youth codes, and on languages in cultural expression and in the media. Although it is claimed that linguistic diversity should be considered a resource, migrant languages remain for the moment low-status languages in most cases, and there are no linguistic rights granted to their speakers, although some of these linguistic groups are statistically more important than autochthonous minorities.

One group that is even more victimized within the EU than speakers of minority languages is users of sign languages (SL): no official document deals with the right of SL users, and no official statistics give any information about them. Deaf people are seen as disabled, whereas they consider themselves to be a linguistic/cultural minority. For example, the EUD (European Union of the Deaf), their central representative organization in Europe, regards the aspect of being handicapped rather as a lack of access to resources. The number of deaf sign language users has been estimated at nearly half a million people (Krausneker, 2003: 15). Resolutions in the European Parliament (from 1988 and 1998) for the recognition of sign languages have so far had little effect (at present sign languages are recognized in the following European countries: Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Norway, Portugal, and Sweden). In educational policy, oral models still dominate, rather than a bilingual form of instruction that would support language acquisition.

Recent documents by the European Union and the Council of Europe have begun to question the differentiation into autochthonous and allochthonous minority languages. In this sense, the action plan promoting language learning and linguistic diversity, an EU 2004–2006 action plan, (Commission of the European Communities, 2003) is now explicitly opening programs that encompass a language policy dimension (such as the above-mentioned SOCRATES Program), not only for the official languages of member states and lesser used EU languages, but also for the languages of migrants, sign languages, and the languages of the EU’s most important trade partners.
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