Regarding Section 5.7.5

This section appears to be exactly the kind of ethnocentric blindness that the entire Internationalization of Domain Names project is intended to redress. In the case of U+01C3, U+02BB, and U+A78C, the blindness may be on the part of the authors of the standard which bars anything that looks like an English language punctuation mark. But for U+01C0, U+01C1, and U+01C3 that justification is not available.

When Europeans (colonizers and missionaries) encountered native languages which had no writing system, they used symbols from the alphabet that they were familiar with to render the phonemes of those languages. But when native languages included phonemes for which there were no immediately available symbols in European languages, they made up symbols. One can argue, with 20/20 hindsight, about the wısdom of the choices of symbols that they made. But regardless of ıts merits, that ıs the realıty that we have to deal wıth today – and those symbols are letters under any reasonable reading of the Letters Principle.

However, given the decision that the authors have taken, transparency (not to mention honesty) indicates some language like the following should be added at the end of the section:

“In short, it has been determined that the following languages, notwithstanding that several of them are EGDIS 1 or 2, are simply unworthy\*\* of consideration in creating the Maximal Starting Repertoire:

* Chamorro
* Guarani
* Hausa
* Hawaiian
* Khoekhoe
* Tatar
* Tongan
* Uzbek
* Xhosa
* Yapese”

(This is, obviously, only a partial list. The authors will want to engage a linguist specializing in non-European languages to generate a more complete one.)

\*\* The authors may not feel that this is at all what they are trying to say. But rest assured that it is the exactly message that speakers of these languages, and their governments, will take from the authors’ decision.