Does Belgium’s language policy concerning German fit the population’s needs?
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Abstract

Belgium has three official national languages: Dutch, French and German. The German-speaking Belgians only represent 0.7% of the entire population but are officially recognized as a national language minority with special language rights and a dedicated specific political infrastructure. In spite of the apparently excellent theoretical minority rights, my research, based on a survey conducted in 2008 among 1000 respondents, shows that most Belgians, both German-speaking and non German-speaking, request more attention for German in Belgium. This is mainly the case where public services and the educational system are concerned. There appears to be room for Belgian policy makers to amend specific shortcomings of the current language policy with regard to German and to refine the applicability of the German minority policy according to the demands of the population.
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1 Introduction

On the 7th of February 1831, the Belgian constitution decreed German as one of the official national languages. 175 years later, on the 22nd of April 2006, Bruno Tuybens, State Secretary for public enterprises became the first person ever to answer a question in German in the Belgian legislative Chamber “out of respect for that member of parliament” (the German-speaking senator Bernard Collas [A.V.B.]), according to the Tuybens cabinet. The president of the Chamber, Anne-Marie Lizin, accordingly felt obliged to say some words in German too.” (Het Nieuwsblad, 22-04-2006)
This anecdote illustrates perfectly how the German language is treated in Belgium in the official domain. There is a yawning gap between theory and practice. The question in the Chamber, as a matter of fact, concerned a language issue: why are so few websites of public enterprises available in German – given this is a basic right for German speaking Belgians according to the Belgian constitution (cf. Clement, 2002, 674). Internet websites are considered public communication towards the population, according to the language policy. Therefore they should also be available in German. (cf. Thomas, 2006, 68).

The German-speaking Community was elated with the attention for its mother tongue, but a random visit to a number of public enterprise websites shows that 3 years onwards, the problem still remains. The site of Electrabel, energy supplier and market leader in Belgium is available in Dutch, French and English. Belgacom, the most important Belgian supplier of integrated services in telecommunication, does slightly better: both the company’s general terms and conditions and the operating instructions for some telephones are accessible in German. These typically are documents which can easily be translated by an automatic translation program. However, no other traces of German can be found. The website of the Finance Department eyes hopeful; all links have been translated into German, but unfortunately the texts behind the links are without exception either Dutch or French. My last spot check concerned the pages of SELOR, the federal staff selection office for civil servants. Its website has a handy tool to test one’s language skills in order to prepare for the official language proficiency exams in French and Dutch; there is no similar module for German. As such, Belgian citizens are provided with ‘official’ tools to practice French and Dutch to their heart’s content, but somehow this seems to be impossible for German. German speaking Belgians do have access to a special program to train themselves in Dutch and in French, however, which could be interpreted as a case of ‘positive discrimination’.

In those cases where goodwill is actually shown towards German-speaking Belgians, the actual outcome is often far from satisfactory. The correspondence of Belgacom, reproduced below, shows why German-speaking Belgians tend to prefer the French version of a letter. Luckily, most German-speaking Belgians are bilingual.¹

¹ Results survey 2008: German-speaking inhabitants of Malmedy and Waimes with a good to very good language command of French: 64,7%. In addition, 30,9% state to have French as a second mother tongue. German-speaking inhabitants of the zone of Eupen and Sankt Vith with a good to very good language command of French: 70,4%.
2 Research outline

The situation sketched above inspired our in-depth study concerning the ‘official attention to and position of the German language in Belgium’. In this article, we present an overview of a number of results from that study. In order to allow the reader to assess this data correctly, I will first provide a research outline. Next, I will explain the Belgian state model, the political status of German-speaking Belgium and the Belgian framework regarding language legislation.

2.1 Federal Belgium

Belgium is a federal state since 1993. Belgium consists of language areas, communities and regions. What makes these divisions hard to understand, is the fact that these concepts do not overlap
perfectly and that each of them is a symbol of different responsibilities. In addition, Belgium has three official languages: Dutch, French and German.

The division of Belgium into language areas is based on the principle of territorialism, which forms the foundation of the Belgian language policy. In Brussels however, the person principle applies: inhabitants of Brussels can freely choose between Dutch or French. The principle of territorialism means that the administrative language is determined by the language of the area in which an official administration is located or where the contact with this administration takes place. Therefore, clearly geographically marked language areas are fundamental to the correct application of the language policy.

Since the sixties, Belgium is divided into four language areas:

- The Dutch-speaking area is situated in the north, also called Flanders.
- The French-speaking area is situated in the south, also called Wallonia.
- The German-speaking area is situated in the east, which consists of nine merged municipalities.
- The bilingual area Brussels-Capital is situated centrally in Belgium.

Roughly six million Belgians speak Dutch, four million Belgians speak French and approximately 73,000 Belgians speak German.

---

\textit{Map 1: the four language areas}\textsuperscript{2}

---

\textsuperscript{2} Maps 1 to 7 and map 9 are taken from www.dglive.be (5 November 2008)
Belgium further has two types of federated states: the communities and the regions. The communities are autonomously responsible in the domain of ‘personal and cultural issues’ (education, for example), whereas the regions are qualified for so-called ‘soil-bound’ affairs (traffic and export, for example). The communities and regions overlap and, given that the division in language areas does not match those of the regions and communities, the latter are related to one or more administrative languages.

Consequently, Belgium consists of the Flemish, French and the German-speaking communities and the Flemish, Walloon and the Brussels Capital regions. The Flemish and the French communities both have the authority to take decisions in bilingual Brussels where affairs of their language community in the Brussels Region are concerned. The German-speaking community evidently has its autonomy in community-bound affairs, but where regional affairs on its territory are concerned, the German-speaking community falls within the authority of the Walloon Region. Since 1994, regional responsibilities of the Region of Wallonia can be transferred to the German-speaking Community through bilateral agreements. Until today, this has been the case for three responsibilities (monuments & country planning, employment and the custody and funding of the municipalities).

The structure described above leads to a complex political system with governments and parliaments at the different administrative levels of Communities and Regions and at the federal level.

Map 2: Flemish Community       Map 3: Region of Flanders
2.2 German-speaking Belgium

2.2.1 Historical background

Before they were conquered by French forces at the end of the 18th century and annexed to the French empire, Eupen and Sankt Vith belonged to the Austrian Low Countries, respectively to the Duchy of Limburg and the Duchy of Luxemburg. Malmedy formed a sovereign abbey territory together with Stavelot. After the defeat of Napoleon in 1815, both duchies were split up during the Congress of Vienna between the United Kingdom of the Netherlands and Prussia. Eupen, Sankt Vith and Malmedy became part of Prussia. In 1920, after the end of WWI, Belgium was
acknowledged as a war victim by the Treaty of Versailles and it got the permission to annex the municipalities around Eupen, Sankt Vith and Malmedy. The area was put under the supervision of governor Baltia, who had served in Belgium’s African colony, Congo, and who was asked to govern the German-speaking as he would a colony. He was expected to integrate the newly acquired area quickly into the Belgian administrative, social and juridical structures. This resulted in a drastic ‘frenchification’. Only 20 years later, however, during WWII, the areas were annexed by Germany. After the so-called liberation at the end of WWII, the area returned to Belgium.

1963 marked the constitutional creation and definition of the different language borders and language areas in Belgium and the German language slowly acquired an increased official recognition. The process of federalization further crystallized with the state reforms of 1970, 1980, 1988-89, 1993 and 2001, and caused an ever-growing autonomy of the German-speaking Community. That autonomy, however, was a ‘derivative’ from the negotiations between the Flemish and French Community. The state reforms claimed by Flemish and Walloon negotiators were also implemented with respect to the German-speaking Belgians. As such, the German-speaking Community has had a government of its own since 1984 and a parliament with full legislative power. At the federal (i.e. national) and regional (i.e. Wallonia) level however, German-speaking Belgians have no guaranteed representation\(^3\) in the parliament (Brüll, 2005, 47) and there is no obligation to consult the community either for important law amendments, let alone for state reforms (Thomas, 2006, 72; 77).

2.2.2 The area of Eupen and Sankt Vith

In the east of Belgium, one finds nine merged municipalities: Eupen, Kelmis, Lontzen, Raeren, Amel, Büllingen, Burg-Reuland, Bütgenbach and St. Vith. Together they form the German-speaking Community and the officially recognized German-speaking language area. About 73,000 people live in the area. An estimated 95% of them are native speakers of German.

\(\text{Map 8: The area of Eupen and Sankt Vith}^4\)

\(^3\) However, at the European level, the German-speaking Community in Belgium is considered one electoral district. The German-speaking Belgians have one guaranteed seat in the European Parliament.

In the nine municipalities around Eupen and Sankt Vith, German is the official administrative language. At the local administrative level, the linguistic rights of the German-speaking population are very well protected. In their relations with the Walloon Region and the federal administration, these inhabitants are officially recognized as a language minority. The coordinated language laws with regard to administrative matters (18 July 1966), define language rights for these inhabitants, which grant them the right to use German in their contacts with the administrative services at the regional and federal level without exception – at least theoretically.

2.2.3 The area of Malmedy

Northwest of Sankt Vith one finds the merged municipalities Malmedy and Waimes. These municipalities are located in the French language area and officially belong to the French Community. Estimations about the number of native speakers of German in this area vary from 5% to 25% of the total population of +/- 18,000. Considering that the administration of the German-speaking Community takes 10% as a basis, I join this official guideline and assume that more or less 2,000 German-speaking Belgians live in these municipalities.

Map 9: The area of Malmedy
Since the official administrative language in Malmedy and Waimes is French and the municipalities are located in the French Community, the German-speaking Belgians in these municipalities have to be considered as minorities at all administrative levels; i.e. in their contacts with local, regional and federal administrative services. The German-speaking Belgians do enjoy official ‘language facilities’ at the local administrative level, however, which means they can use German for all purposes in their contacts with the local administration. They can also claim language rights at the regional and national level (as described in the coordinated language laws with regard to administrative matters).

2.3 Language use in administration

German-speaking Belgians (independent of the area they live in) must have access to all Belgian legislative texts in German, just like French- and Dutch speaking citizens have the same right with regard to their respective mother tongues (cf. Thomas, 2006; Muylle & Stangherlin, 2006).

In addition, the Belgian language policy guarantees that German-speaking Belgians living in the French-speaking municipalities Malmedy and Waimes may use German in their contact with the local administration (Art. 12, coordinated law concerning language use in administration, 1966). At the regional and national level, all public services have to be organized in such a way that they can serve all citizens in the three official languages, Dutch, French and German (Art. 34, coordinated law concerning language use in administration, 1966; Van Santen, 2002, 60). To conclude, all public communication from the State to its citizens has to be presented in German to the German-speaking citizens (Art. 40, coordinated law concerning language use in administration, 1966.)
3 Field research

3.1 Discrepancy between theory and practice

When evaluating the theoretical protection measures for German-speaking Belgians, one is prone to label this community as the ‘best protected minority in Europe’. Unfortunately, there is a wide gap between theory and practice as the actual application of the legal regulations is often either too slow or far from sufficient.

First of all, the state has a shortage of civil servants with the required knowledge of German to support the official language policy. We mentioned above that a large number of public services were created to fulfill the requirements of the double-layered federal structure of communities and regions. Any of these services which serve the German-speaking population should be able to do so in German, i.e., its staff members entering into contact with the German community should master the German language. The Belgian legislator already detonated part of this problem by interpreting the language policy in the sense that not every civil servant of the public service, but the ‘service as a whole’ should master German (Van Santen, 2002, 60)\(^5\). At the Pension Department for example, only 2 civil servants master German (Interview Lambertz, 09 07 2007). If those persons are either on a holiday or absent due to illness, the German-speaking inhabitant contacting the service will not be able to conduct their business in German.

Secondly, the Belgian state played an administrative ‘trick’ with regard to the translation of the Belgian federal legislation into German (as decreed in the law of July 1990). Since this law paragraph has been added to the law of 31\(^{st}\) of December 1983 on the reform of the institutions of the German-speaking Community and not to the coordinated laws on language use in the administration of 1966, the German-speaking Belgians have de facto been deprived of their right to institute legal proceedings against the non-application of the 1990 law (Thomas, 2006, 63). The only official body which can treat these complaints concerning the language policy is the Permanent Commission on Language Control; the commission is, however, only qualified for the coordinated language law on the language use in administration of 1966 and not for the law of the 31\(^{st}\) of December 1983 (cf. advice Permanent Commission for Language Control of 14th of April 2003). The ‘accidental’ addition of the concerned paragraph to another law serves as an effective means to conceal many complaints from the German-speaking community. In addition, the paragraph’s effect

\(^{5}\) This also applies for the other national languages.
has been weakened by specifying that the German translation of the legislation has to be done within the ‘budgetary limits’.

3.2 Discrepancy between policy makers and citizens

Linguists and supporters of the German language may be intrigued and worried about the future of German in Belgium, but do the Belgians actually care? To get an insight into the attitudes and expectations among Belgians concerning this topic, I carried out a written survey among 1000 German-speaking (GB) and non German-speaking Belgians (NGB) on the issue whether (and where) more attention is required for the German language in Belgium. There appears to be an overall consensus that more attention for German is needed (Answers ‘no’ or ‘rather no’ to the question: ‘Do you think there is enough attention for German in Belgium?’: NGB: 81.3%, GB Malmedy & Waimes: 72.1%, GB German-speaking community: 79.8%). One is immediately struck, however, by the fact that the replies from the non German-speaking group outscore those of the German-speaking minority from Malmedy and Waimes (which is mostly exposed to the influences of the other national languages) by 9 %. If we look closer at the different situations in which more attention for German is required or requested (see table below), we find that the GB lead the political (46.6 %) and administrative (69%) sphere, as well as public communication (55.5%), with the exception of attention for German during elections. NGB, on the other hand, gave the highest score to more attention for German in the educational system (56.4 %), a surprising answer that runs counter to educational policy and language planning which has so far been pursued for German. Scores for all other domains are low in both groups. It is noteworthy that there is no perceived need for more German in the two domains that are frequently identified as the last remaining binding elements of the Belgian nation: royalty and sports. The respondents also had the chance to add other categories in which they would like to see more attention for German. The group of NGB ignored this option whereas the group of GB mentioned health care, justice, legislation, enterprises, police offices, assurances, energy suppliers, post offices, etc.

Table 1: The attention for German language in Belgium
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>NGB</th>
<th>GB MAWA</th>
<th>GB DG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLITICS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELECTIONS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>79.7</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROYAL FAMILY</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTITLES</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC COMMUNICATION</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOURISM</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROAD SIGNS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPORTS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMY</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>90.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NGB : non German-speaking Belgians
GB MAWA : German-speaking Belgians living in the French-speaking municipalities Malmedy and Waimes
GB DG : German-speaking Belgians living in the municipalities of the German-speaking Communities
These results indicate that there is a discrepancy between the official Belgian language policy regarding German and certain expectations of the citizens.

First, the call for a greater presence of German in the educational system does not agree with the weak(ened) position of German in the Belgian school curriculum, both in Flanders and Wallonia (educational policy is a community matter nowadays, not a national one). Rudolf Kern already wrote in 1999 that „sich das Deutsche als Fremdsprache in Innerbelgien auf einem besorgniserregenden Rückzug befindet“ (Kern, 1999, 44). He identified the educational reform of 1969 as one of the causes. Since that reform was instituted, German is rarely taught as a compulsory subject in the curriculum, the minimum number of pupils per class was raised and the total amount of lessons dropped from 36 to 32 hours; an accumulation of factors which often had nasty effects on the share of German courses (Kern, 1999, 39-48). In 2008, Roland Duhamel reported that the share of French-speaking pupils which study German had dropped to a significantly low 3%, from 22.5% in the school year 1976-1977. Although the situation in Flanders is slightly better, the number of Flemish pupils studying German has dropped below 20% since the school year 2002-2003 (Duhamel, 2008, 33-34). In addition, Kern already warned in 1999 that the insufficient number of German students in Belgium would lead to a lack of man power to implement the official German minority policy; a concern which led him to the dramatic conclusion that “[d]anmit dann der verhängnisvolle Kreislauf vollendet [wäre], aus dem es für das Deutsche ohne gesetzliche Rettungsmaßnahmen kein Entrinnen mehr gibt“ (Kern, 1999, 39-48).

Kern’s analysis spurs the fact that the present-day demand for more attention for German in political contexts among the German-speaking population is at odds with the actual lack of civil servants with a sufficient knowledge of German. Official statistics from the national Civil Service Department attest that, in 2008, only 99 civil servants who worked in federal public administration received a ‘language bonus’ for German. Those 99 persons worked in 3 different departments. Given that, in the remaining 59 federal departments no one received a language bonus for German, one can conclude that there are no civil servants in any of these services with an official certificate that confirms their knowledge of German. Theo Van Santen, staff employee at the Permanent Commission for Language Control (Interview Van Santen, 06 07 2007) confirms that the overall knowledge of German in the national civil service is low. The State shows signs of awareness of this problematic situation. In June 2007 for example, SELOR specifically recruited civil servants with knowledge of German. Of the 60 candidates, however, only 13 passed the language test (Interview Lejoly, 05 06 2007).

---

6 Belgium has a system of financial bonuses for bilingual civil servants; the bilingual status is granted after an official bilingual test at the SELOR offices.
Taking into account the decreasing number of Belgians studying German, it seems unlikely that this situation will improve. The self-reported knowledge of German among Belgians in my survey shows that only 19.8% of the Dutch-speaking population has a good to very good mastery of German; among the French-speaking population that figure drops to 6.2%. The self-reported French language skills of the German-speaking Belgians on the contrary are certainly better (cf. supra) and, as such, it is quite ironic that German-speaking Belgians can practice their French and Dutch command on the SELOR website, whereas Dutch-speaking and French-speaking Belgians can not test and improve their mastery of German.

It is interesting to see that the request for more language support is not limited as such to the German language community. There are several indications that the non German-speaking population is also sensitive to issues related to the status of German in Belgium, and especially so in Wallonia.

As said, 56.4% of this group chose the increased presence of German in the educational system as the priority in the survey mentioned above. However, French-speaking Belgians (with a very poor self-attested command of German) ask significantly more for attention for German in schools ($\rho = 0.015$) than their Dutch-speaking counterparts (inversely proportional relation, $\rho = 0.02$). French-speaking Belgians also are more likely to speak in defense of the representation of German in the administration ($\rho = 0.003$; an inversely proportional relation among Dutch-speaking Belgians), which may be explained by their ‘physical proximity’ to the issue. The German-speaking minority is in fact geographically totally imbedded in the French-speaking language area. A further possible sign of this apparent ‘solidarity’ among French-speaking Belgians towards the Germanophones population was the election of the (German-speaking but bilingual) MP Monika Dethier-Neumann as provisional president of the nearly exclusive French-speaking Walloon regional parliament on the 23rd of June 2009. She was the first German-speaking Belgian ever to have the honor of occupying this official position.

A more detailed analysis of our data sample taken in the German-speaking Community allows us to distinguish further subgroups which are more likely to strive for an increased attention for German than others. It concerns the subgroups with a lower education level ($\rho = 0.003$) and a lower knowledge of French ($\rho = 0.001$); both parameters often go together. They are joined by German-speaking Belgians who express a ‘weaker’ Belgian identity. A ‘Belgian identity’ is a parameter constructed on the basis of two variables, ‘royalism’ and ‘patriotism’. The inversely proportional relations for those variables for this group were, respectively, 0.003 and 0.000.

When asked for the need of a greater attention to German in political contexts, the younger generations (age 20-36) of German-speaking Belgians especially manifest themselves (relation with
attention for German in politics: $\rho = 0.006$; relation with attention for German during elections: $\rho = 0.030$). The support for German in these subgroups seems to originate from either necessity (i.e. one does not master the other national language(s)) or from the wish to assert one’s own regional identity.

### 3.3 Added value of the German language in Belgium

There are a number of strong and objective factors that should encourage Belgium to foster the presence of German in its linguistic repertoire. Irrespective of the dominance of English as a global lingua franca, German remains a major language which has the largest number of native speakers of any language in the EU (more than 100 million). Germany further is one of the biggest economies in the world, second only to the United States and Japan (cf. Duhamel, 2008). One quarter of Belgium’s export is in effect directed at German-speaking countries. In addition to the obvious economical added value that a good knowledge of German presents, one can also refer to the significant cultural and scientific heritage that can be accessed through German. And yet, the executive director of the German-Belgian-Luxemburgish Chamber of Commerce complains about the fact that so little employees with knowledge of German can be found in Belgium (Interview Maurer, 13 07 2006). According to José Cajot, German honorary consul in Limburg, a lack of knowledge of German could even harm Belgian commerce and industry in the long run. One cannot help but wonder what German businessmen and -women think when arriving at the Brussels national airport and reading on every door: „*Willkommen am Brussels Airport, ein 100% rauchfreier Flughafen*“.

### 4 Conclusion

Both German-speaking and non German-speaking, asked for more attention to the German language in Belgium. This is mainly the case where public services and the educational system are concerned. There is a discrepancy between the official Belgian language policy regarding German and certain expectations of the citizens. Firstly, the call for a greater presence of German in the educational system among the non German-speaking population does not agree with the weak(ened) position of German in the Belgian school curriculum. Secondly, our survey showed that the German-speaking population as a whole asks for an equal respect for their constitutional linguistic rights. However, their demand for more attention for German in political contexts among the
German-speaking population is at odds with the actual lack of civil servants with a sufficient knowledge of German.

Acknowledging the macro-geographical importance of German is one thing, adapting Belgian government structures and national staff quota to the linguistic needs of less than 1% of the Belgian population is another, especially when this group proves to be fluent in French. At this stage, however, the debate not only turns to issues of linguistic human rights and discrimination, but also to the fundamental questions of how high a state values its own constitutional linguistic rights. In other words: is Belgium willing to make the necessary efforts to ensure that its language policy towards the German-speaking Belgians can actually be implemented? Belgian policy makers would do well if they responded to this call, not only in terms of constitutional good governance but also in view of an economic and human surplus for the entire society.
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