

earlier as the dispute between liberation linguistics and deficit linguistics). Are learners supposed to have standard British English as the target, or a local educated variety of English? The conflicting answers to this controversial question provide revealing insight into the nature of professionalism at the local level, as well as at the international 'expert' level. Classroom practice may, of course, continue oblivious of the niceties of academic policy formation, but the answers have implications for the official policy on classroom practice, choice of teaching materials, and learning strategies. The answers also reveal what kind of relationship there is between the core English-speaking area, from which 'international' norms are derived, and the periphery-English areas in question. Key questions are raised: why should norms from Britain be considered 'global' at all? Why should 'experts' from the core English-speaking areas be listened to rather than local people? It is likely that adherence to a British global norm is symptomatic of dependence rather than self-sufficiency. It is also probable that dependence in the ideological sphere is matched and to some extent caused by dependence in the technical, economic, and political spheres. There is a clear link between the target norm that a periphery-English teacher aims at (a vital question at the micro level) and the relative power of the core country in the periphery (a macro-level structural question).

The issues touched on here will be analysed in greater depth later, particularly in Chapters 7 and 8.

Linguistic imperialism and linguisticism

As indicated earlier, there are essentially two competing paradigms for understanding North-South links, modernization theory and imperialism theory. Development aid inspired by western modernization ideals has had to concede that the vision of underdeveloped countries retracing the steps of western democracies on a guaranteed route to prosperity has not come about. This sobering realization applies equally to the massive education 'aid' inspired by human capital theory and the belief that South countries could be galvanized from the top downwards. These empirical facts serve to discredit the modernization paradigm, and possibly to strengthen the claims of imperialism theories which focus on political economy, class structure, the dynamics of capital accumulation within a global matrix, and

the transformation of precapitalist societies by colonial and neo-colonial capitalism. But there are other possible interpretations too which, while accepting many of the claims of imperialism theory, at the same time question some of the underlying assumptions of both theories. Galtung (1988) does this from a comparative philosophical humanistic point of view, criticizing both theories for economism, and suggesting orientally-inspired, more flexible theories which put basic human needs in focus. French (1986) arrives at similar conclusions from a feminist point of view. The science paradigm criticism of Harding (1986) and others can be used to further undermine the credibility of some of the basic unquestioned assumptions of both modernization and imperialism theories. In choosing Galtung's version of imperialism theory as the main starting point and developing notions about linguistic imperialism, I have tried to incorporate some of this criticism and to avoid some of the most obvious reductionist fallacies.

In practical 'aid' terms, the realization that the hopes of the 1960s have not been fulfilled means that the focus of such key bodies as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund has shifted to attempting to supply the 'basic needs' of the underprivileged (Hayter and Watson 1985; Hoogveldt 1982), and more recently, to enforcing 'structural adjustment'. How this is experienced by the poor countries is expressed by ex-President Nyerere of Tanzania, who is quoted in the Danish journal *Kontakt* as saying in a speech in London in 1985:

Instead of gunboats, economic power is used one-sidedly to push through the will of the powerful. The International Monetary Fund has more or less become the rich countries' instrument for the economic and ideological control of the poor countries.

In the elaboration of a theory of linguistic imperialism that follows, a primary source will be Galtung's theoretical work, as this represents an attempt to integrate all the various dimensions of imperialism, and therefore permits linguistic imperialism to be situated in relation to other types of imperialism. Galtung's theory does not refer to linguistic imperialism, but this can be seen as a sub-type of what he refers to as cultural imperialism. Other theorists of cultural imperialism will be drawn on, namely a theory dealing with global incorporation and theories of other sub-types of cultural imperialism, such as media and educational

imperialism. These are relevant in relation to the dissemination of the fundamental teaching norms of ELT, where there is an intermeshing of language and pedagogy.

Galtung's *imperialism theory* posits six mutually interlocking types of imperialism: *economic, political, military, communicative* (here meaning communication and transport), *cultural*, and *social* (1980: 128). Imperialism is 'a type of relationship where-dominant society (or collectivity in more general terms) can dominate another' (ibid.: 107). It is propelled by four mechanisms, the most essential of which is exploitation, the others being penetration, fragmentation, and marginalization. Exploitation involves asymmetric interaction between parties which exchange goods on unequal terms.

Galtung's goal is 'an image of imperialism rich enough to capture a wide variety of phenomena, yet specific enough not to be a tautology' (ibid.: 127). The theory operates with a division of the world into a dominant Centre (the powerful western countries and interests), and dominated Peripheries (the underdeveloped countries). There are centres of power in the Centre and in the Periphery. The Peripheries in both the Centre and the Periphery are exploited by their respective Centres. Elites in the Centres of both the Centre and the Periphery are linked by shared interests within each type of imperialism and, it is claimed here, by language. The norms, whether economic, military, or linguistic, are dictated by the dominant Centre and have been internalized by those in power in the Periphery. The interlocking of the various types of imperialism can be seen in the way cultural imperialism serves to reproduce the material conditions for exploitation (an economic-reproductive function) and to legitimate exploitation (an ideological-reproductive function).

In the early colonial phase of imperialism, the élites in the Periphery consisted of the colonizers themselves, whether settlers or administrators. In present-day neo-colonialism, the élites are to a large extent indigenous, but most of them have strong links with the Centre. Many of them have been educated in Centre countries and/or through the medium of the Centre language, the old colonial language. In this phase international organizations play a key role. These organizations are economic (private or governmental transnational corporations), political (supranational governmental organizations), military (various systems of alliance, treaties), communicational (shipping and air com-

panies, news agencies), and cultural (film companies, book publishers).

In the next phase of imperialism, neo-neo-colonialism, Centre-Periphery interaction will be increasingly by means of international communications. Computer technology will obviate the need for the physical presence of the exploiters. New communications technology will step up the Centre's attempt to control people's consciousness. This will play an ever-increasing role in order to strengthen control over the means of production. For this to be effective requires the Centre's cultural and linguistic penetration of the Periphery.

The progression from one type of imperialist control to another parallels the way power can be exerted by means of sticks (impositional force), carrots (bargaining), and ideas (persuasion). Language is the primary means for communicating ideas. Therefore an increased linguistic penetration of the Periphery is essential for completing the move away from crude means, the sticks of colonial times, and even the more discreet means of the neo-colonialist phase of asymmetrical bargaining, to neo-neo-colonialist control by means of ideas.

Galtung mentions the dissemination of Centre languages in the Periphery and the role of governmental organizations in promoting dominant languages. For our purposes it is necessary to establish *linguistic imperialism* as a distinct type of imperialism, in order to be able to assess its role within an imperialist structure as a whole. Linguistic imperialism permeates all the types of imperialism, for two reasons. The first has to do with form (language as a medium for transmitting ideas), the second with content. As regards the first, language is the primary medium of communication for links in all fields—indeed language is a precondition for most forms of contact other than brute force. Communication presupposes mutual understanding on the basis of a shared code. It is hardly surprising therefore that it is the Centre's language which is used. Secondly, linguistic imperialism dovetails with other types of imperialism and is an integral part of them. Linguistic imperialism is a primary component of cultural imperialism, though it must be remembered that cultural dissemination can also take non-linguistic forms (German music, Italian painting) and can occur in translation (ranging from highbrow works to Walt Disney comics).⁴ Linguistic imperialism is also central to social imperialism, which relates to the transmission of the norms and

behaviour of a model social structure, and these are embedded in language. This occurs wherever a socializing influence is exerted, for instance from the example set by 'aid' personnel in the field. It also occurs wherever English plays a major role in the education system of an underdeveloped country and transmits social values.

Individuals who operate internationally, whether by working abroad or through the dissemination of their ideas in books and other media, can be described as *inter-state actors* (Preiswerk 1978). English language teachers working abroad and applied linguists in their writings both fall into this category.

The working definition of English linguistic imperialism attempts to capture the way one language dominates others, with anglocentricity and professionalism as the central ELT mechanisms operating within a structure in which unequal power and resource allocation is effected and legitimated. *Linguicism* is the central concept here. Linguicism is distinct from other '-isms' such as sexism and racism, in so far as it is language rather than gender or race which is the crucial criterion in the beliefs and structure which result in unequal power and resource allocation.

Sexism has been defined as 'words or actions that arbitrarily assign roles or characteristics to people on the basis of sex. Originally used to refer to practices that discriminated against women, the term now includes any usage that unfairly delimits the aspirations or attributes of either sex' (from the *Guidelines for Nonsexist Use of Language in Publications of the National Association of Teachers of English in the USA*, Nilsen *et al.* 1977: 182). *Racism* involves a similar process of ascription, racialization. One definition of racism is that it is 'both a structural and ideological form in terms of a race relations structure in which the inequalities and differentiation inherent in the wider social structure are related to physical and cultural criteria of an ascriptive kind and are rationalized in terms of deterministic belief systems which tend to make reference to biological science' (Mullard 1980: 7). Miles (1989: 38) notes how the crystallization of racism in the colonial period, drawing on centuries of historical representations of the Other, 'entails a dialectic of representational inclusion and exclusion. By attributing a population with certain characteristics in order to categorize and differentiate it as an Other, those who do so also establish criteria by which they themselves are represented'.

Linguicism involves representation of the dominant language, to which desirable characteristics are attributed, for purposes of inclusion, and the opposite for dominated languages, for purposes of exclusion. The binary opposition language/dialect and the set international language/lingua franca/vernacular already noted are characteristic examples of linguicism discourse. Sample specimens of linguicism discourse, both in the colonial period and in more recent times, will be analysed later.

English linguistic imperialism is one sub-type of *linguicism*. Linguistic imperialism on the part of the speakers of any language exemplifies linguicism. Linguicism may be in operation simultaneously with sexism, racism, or classism, but linguicism refers exclusively to ideologies and structures where language is the means for effecting or maintaining an unequal allocation of power and resources. This could apply, for instance, in a school in which the mother tongues of some children, from an immigrant or indigenous minority background, are ignored, and this has consequences for their learning. Linguicism is also in operation if a teacher stigmatizes the local dialect spoken by the children and this has consequences of a structural kind, that is, there is an unequal division of power and resources as a result. But for linguicism also to constitute *linguistic imperialism* presupposes that the actors in question are supported by an imperialist structure of exploitation of one society or collectivity by another. Thus it is linguistic imperialism if the English language is imposed (by sticks, carrots, or ideas) on the Welsh or the Ugandans, and linguicism is in operation. In the neo-colonial phase of imperialism inter-state actors from the Centre and representatives of the elite in the Periphery (their counterparts and collaborators) are the key agents of this linguistic imperialism. Like racism, linguicism may be conscious or unconscious on the part of the actors, and overt or covert. It may be of an abstract kind (regulations for the use of particular languages) or more concrete (resource allocation to one language but not others).

There is no reason to restrict linguicism to matters of ideology alone, as Miles (1989) does in relation to racism. In order to shed light on the relationship between ELI and imperialism, it is important to identify the structures which are upheld by linguicism as well as linguistic ideologies. Thus, if an African university has 20 posts in English and a minute number in the indigenous languages of the country, then there is *prima facie*

evidence of a linguistic structure, which may well be underpinned by linguistic beliefs. If the country/collectivity in question is part of the global imperialist structure, then linguistic imperialism is in operation. In Galtung's terms, imperialism is effected by penetration and the establishment of a bridgehead, for instance the establishment of a colonialist education system, within an exploitative structure. As English is also used widely for supranational and international links, English linguistic imperialism operates globally as a key medium of Centre-Periphery relations.

Even if the definitions of linguicism and of English linguistic imperialism are explicit and unambiguous enough to permit identification of what is linguistic or linguistic imperialist in a given historically-determined context, this does not mean that English linguistic imperialism and linguicism are straightforward and invariably functional. They operate within a wider socio-political structure which is always itself full of contradictions. Just as Miles regards racism as 'a necessarily contradictory phenomenon rather than that it is functional to the mode of production' (ibid.: 129), linguicism is a set of practices and beliefs which represent an attempt by those involved in language matters to give significance to a complex segment of reality, which itself meshes with political, ideological, and other factors.

Few authors have attempted to define linguistic imperialism. Calvet (1987) refers to linguistic racism, but he does so in a general sense without defining it. The Ghanaian sociolinguist, Gilbert Anstre, describes linguistic imperialism as:

The phenomenon in which the minds and lives of the speakers of a language are dominated by another language to the point where they believe that they can and should use only that foreign language when it comes to transactions dealing with the more advanced aspects of life such as education, philosophy, literature, governments, the administration of justice, etc. . . . Linguistic imperialism has a subtle way of warping the minds, attitudes, and aspirations of even the most noble in a society and of preventing him from appreciating and realizing the full potentialities of the indigenous languages.⁵ (Anstre 1979: 12-13)

Anstre's description has the merit of specifying the types of belief that characterize linguistic imperialism. It fleshes out and animates anglocentricity, and describes the consequences for the

dominant and dominated languages and for the individual. His description is reminiscent of the way in which racism is affirmed and stresses the tenacity of this form of ideological reproduction. The references to the lives of those who have internalized linguistic imperialism and the institutions typically affected stretch the description beyond that of a set of beliefs to the practices involved, and implicitly to structure. On the other hand Anstre's detailed description of linguistic imperialism is not concerned with language pedagogy and imperialism, and it is the particular logic of this professional world that needs scrutiny here.

Cultural imperialism in science, the media, and education

We can now revert to the insights from other areas of imperialism theory which can support the study of English linguistic imperialism. Galtung exemplifies cultural imperialism by a sub-type which he calls *scientific imperialism*:

If the Center always provides the teachers and the definition of what is worthy of being taught (from the gospels of Christianity to the gospels of Technology and Science), and the Periphery always provides the learners, then there is a pattern of imperialism . . . a pattern of scientific teams from the Center who go to Periphery nations to collect data (raw material) in the form of deposits, sediments, flora, fauna, archaeological findings, attitudes, opinions, behavioral patterns, and so on for data processing, data analysis, and theory formation (like industrial processing in general). This takes place in the Center universities (factories), in order to send the finished product, a journal, a book (manufactured goods) back for consumption in the center of the Periphery, first having created a demand for it through demonstration effect, training in the Center country, and some degree of low-level participation in the data-collection team. This parallel is not a joke, it is a structure. (Galtung 1980: 130)

Most of the benefits and spin-offs of this relationship accrue to the Centre, while the Periphery remains in a dependent situation. Linguicism is in operation if the Centre language is always used, and Periphery languages are not accorded enough resources to develop so that the same functions could be performed in them.