MORE THAN PHONEMIC PATTERNS:
THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND THE FORMATION OF TRANSLATED MEN

by
Emily Brown Coolidge Toker

Submitted to the Graduate School of Arts and Social Sciences in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Master of Arts
in Cultural Studies

Sabancı University
June 2011

i

MORE THAN PHONEMIC PATTERNS:
THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND THE FORMATION OF TRANSLATED MEN

Approved by:
Professor Dr. Sibel Irzık
(Thesis Supervisor)

Assistant Prof. Dr. Nedim Nomer

Assistant Prof. Dr. Ayşe Parla

Date of approval: June 7, 2011

MORE THAN PHONEMIC PATTERNS:
THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND THE FORMATION OF TRANSLATED MEN

Emily Brown Coolidge Toker

Cultural Studies MA Thesis, 2011

Professor Dr. Sibel Irzık

Keywords: *linguistic globalization; translation; neo-liberalism; Empire; neo-colonialism*

English language teachers and those who train them will frequently and explicitly state that they do not just teach the English language - a statement which, in a postcolonial and ostensibly multiculturalist world, has all but monopolized the work of socially-conscious researchers in the fields of Education and ESL/EFL. While much of this work superficially condemns the undertones of cultural and linguistic imperialism assumed to be inherent in the global spread of English, this thesis questions the usefulness of such an approach. Approaching the matter through the metaphor of translation, this thesis presents an updated conceptualization of the 'Empire' to which the English language is presumed to be connected and explores the geopolitical implications of the language's growing prominence. Rather than positing that the global spread of English indicates an end to the necessity of translation, this thesis draws on the work of Steiner, Derrida and Benjamin to argue instead that what is being projected is a large-scale translation of men.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *çeviri; dilsel küreselleşme; İmparatorluk projesi; neo-liberalizm; neo-sömürgecilik*

İngilizce öğretmenleri ve İngilizce öğretmenlerini yetiştirenler sıkça ve açıkça iddia ederler ki ögrettikleri şey, sadece İngiliz dili değildir. Özellikle post emperyalist ve görünürde çok-kültürlü olan günümüz dünyasında, bu iddia eğitim ve ESL/EFL alanlarında çalışan toplumsal bilinçli araştırmacıların ana teması haline gelmiştir. Bu araştırmacıların çalışmalarında genel olarak karşımıza çıkan yaklaşım, İngilizcenin küresel yayılımının beraberinde getirdiği varsayılan kültürel ve dilsel emperyalizmin yüzeysel eleştirisidir. Bahsi geçen yaklaşımın yetersiz ve yararsız olduğu açıktır. Konuya çeviri istiaresi aracılığıyla yaklaşan bu tez, İngiliz dilinin bağlı olduğu varsayılan "İmparatorluğu" yeniden kavramsallaştıracak ve İngiliz dilinin büyüyen öneminin jeopolitik anlamlarını araştıracaktır. İngilizcenin küresel yayılımını, dillerarası çeviriyi gittikçe gereksiz kılan bir unsur olarak görmek yerine; Steiner, Derrida ve Benjamin'e dayanarak, bahsi geçen yayılımın sonucun aslında büyükçaplı bir insan çevirisi olduğu tezin içeriğinde savunulacaktır.

Preface

This thesis was conceived as a way to approach some of the philosophical questions surrounding the notion of English as a global lingua franca in the neo-colonial context of the twenty-first century, and particularly the possibilities (for change, for establishing control and asserting ownership) afforded by the process of translation in such an environment. The focus on narrative and discourse grew from an early and abiding fascination with the ways in which language shapes our understanding of the world – and in particular, our conception and awareness of the possibilities available to us. While admittedly self-indulgent, the inclusion of literary works and post-structural narratology is nevertheless methodologically justifiable in any consideration of the discursively-bound geopolitics of the English language. I hope my indulgence will be forgiven, because to the extent that man truly is *zōon logon ekhon*, it is the use we make of speech that shapes and defines our selves and our world. And while a certain amount of fidelity to linguistic diversity is natural and indeed necessary, to think of English as an imperialistic aggressor overpowering and subsuming linguistic variation is to accept too readily the popular discourse of neo-liberal multiculturalism that already undermines the ability of anyone, subaltern and "superior" alike, to speak with confidence of universals. Such a relativism indeed denies the very core of translation, that each arbitrary signifier corresponds to a universal signified, be it an elusive Platonic ideal or, in line with the biblical nature of the Babelian narrative, a divine essence. The anxiety of the translator, like the treachery of the translator, points to the opposite, indicating instead the existence of a truth at the origin of the utterance. I have here attempted to acknowledge the double reality of the anxiety and treachery, as well as the inevitability, of translation.

Of course neo-liberalism (as an ideology) does not have, in and of itself, a political agenda - but thinkers the likes of Zizek and Badiou point out how, in a sense, multiculturalism reproduces the inequalities present since the 'age of expansion'. I regret the awkwardness of seeming to attack multiculturalism just at the moment when it seems to be under attack from the likes of Geertz Wilder - and just this year, Angela Merkel and David Cameron have attacked multiculturalism openly and such a position has now become the main line of the EU. Efforts to control immigration in the EU, and to a varying extent in the US, call for immigrants to integrate or leave – with the underlying assumption that true integration is impossible. That's emphatically *not* the translation project supported here; instead, I am trying to articulate something that will move beyond the 'corporate multiculturalism' which is today the dominant incarnation, and in which 'culture,' broadly speaking, is a principal method of differentiating populations against the backdrop of a homogenous nation-state, as discussed by the Chicago Cultural Studies Group.

I suppose that what is explored here is a growing ambiguity about the valorization of the Other, a discourse which has tended to serve imperialistic, sexist and racist purposes. Even now the 'West' seems to be embracing a more-multicultural-than-thou approach to internal and international (socio)politics, preaching respect for and tolerance of the Other while criticizing the Other for *not* being respectful of its other. English today is not creating a universal consciousness – it remains the language of an elite, set apart by their education, their ambitions, or their birth. The promise of seems to reside in second-generation immigrants picking it up and making it their own, while people learning English as a second (third, etc.) language do not seem to find access to the same kind of ownership. I hope we can work past such incomplete perceptions of access and ownership, and to my mind, the metaphor of translation provides just such an opportunity.

Lest the implied connection between neo-liberal multiculturalism, relativism and global capitalism seem ill-founded, I don't mind citing (at some length) a very well-respected philosopher who has already established beautifully and humorously this very connection:

Our world is in no way as "complex" as those who wish to ensure its perpetuation claim. It is even, in its broad outline, perfectly simple. On the one hand, there is an extension of the automatisms of capital, fulfilling one of Marx's inspired predictions: the world finally *configured*, but as a market, as a world-market […] On the other side, there is a process of fragmentation into closed identities, and the cultural and relativist ideology that accompanies this fragmentation. Both processes are perfectly intertwined. For each identification (the creational cobbling together of identity) creates a figure that provides a material for its investment by the market. There is nothing more captive, so far as commercial investment is concerned, nothing more *amenable* to the invention of new figures of monetary homogeneity, than a community and its territory or territories. The semblance of a non-equivalence is required so that equivalence itself can constitute a process. What inexhaustible potential for mercantile investments in this upsurge – taking the form of communities demanding recognition and so-called cultural singularities – of women, homosexuals, the disabled, Arabs! And these infinite combinations of predicative traits, what a godsend! Black homosexuals, disabled Serbs, Catholic pedophiles, moderate Muslims, married priests, ecologist yuppies, the submissive unemployed, prematurely aged youth! Each time a social image authorizes new products, specialized magazines, improved shopping malls, "free" radio stations, targeted advertising networks, and finally, heady "public debates" at peak viewing times. Deleuze put it perfectly: capitalist deterritorialization requires a constant reterritorialization. Capital demands a permanent creation of subjective and territorial identities in order for its principle of movement to homogenize its space of action; identities, moreover, that never demand anything but the right to be exposed in the same way as others to the uniform prerogatives of the market. The capitalist communities or minorities form an articulated whole.
(Alain Badiou *Saint Paul* 9-11)

This certainly seems to be an astute diagnosis of our current situation, which, naturally enough, ought very much to impact the way in which we approach the matter of translation. If we accept translation as inevitable, the question becomes one of whether a translation is (or can be) faithful. A faithful translation, to my mind, involves a constant negotiation between form and content, a constant mindfulness of the variations in distance between idioms – not to mention the relation between audience and translator, and between the norms and expectations of vastly heterogeneous audiences. This requires, at bottom, a complex negotiation between the translator and the source text, and in the receiving language with regard to how to situate the source idiom within the target idiom. Benjamin saw in the core of translation the complementary concepts of fidelity and license: it is this dance which, though largely unacknowledged, I believe can be seen choreographed through the research foci, the debates and parsing of words present in the literature that have grown up around the global franchise of English language teaching, and through the equally (though differently) relevant literary portrayals of the English language in its teachers and students.

In *After Babel*, George Steiner conceives of a three-stage relationship between source and target language in the process of translation, in which trust - something of value recognized in the source text – is quickly overtaken by violence as something in the source is seized by the target language. While many postcolonial writers may find themselves unable to see beyond the undeniable violence, the crucial last of Steiner's stages is one of equally undeniable integration and growth, in which something of the source is embedded in and becomes part of the now further enriched target language. Translation finds the life in literature, in a language, and renders it immortal in a new idiom. Steiner emphasized the dangers of linguistic/idiomatic ossification as a kind of living death from which we can be freed by the constant and inevitable translation through

time or from one idiom to another of all material. A gorgeous example of one possible route, one possible relation between fidelity and license can be found in the faithful and paradoxically uncompromising recreation of the plastic English used in 17th century India of Amitav Ghosh's novel *Sea of Poppies*.

In positing that the increasing globalization of English is a projected large-scale translation of men (rather than, for instance, a simple project of linguistic and cultural imperialism), I recognize that I am forwarding a philosophical theory of translation with which many may conceivably disagree. Far from denying or whitewashing the epistemic violence of colonialism or imperialism, I am instead interested in establishing a conceptualization of this power perhaps more suited to the geopolitical reality of the 21st century, especially with regard to its role as context/site of translation and the extent to which it may impact the relationships outlined above. The inevitability of translation carries with it the universality of translation – broadly understood – which will, I believe, create (also inevitably) a discursive relationship between the 'context' and the processes and products of translation.

It seems there has been a shift, broadly speaking, from the Socratic ideal of self-knowledge towards the Nietzschian ideal of self-creation. To wit, we think less of discovering or strengthening what is at our very core, focusing instead on illusive and variable ideals of what we would like to become. Such a shift, naturally enough, has significant implications for the use made here of the metaphor of translation. The 'processes and products' detailed in the archival and ethnographic narrative analysis of the second chapter are simultaneously *of* translation and *resistant to it*, referring to a true 'core' (linguistic and cultural) which must alternately be advanced or protected. While this is in explicit accord with the theories of translation put forward by Benjamin and Derrida, they were writing (also explicitly) about the translation of *texts* and what is required now is a consideration of a similar process involving a rather different product. It is through such a project that I hope perhaps we can redeem multiculturalism from the sandpits of relativism and find in it a cohesive, if polyvalent, ideology.

Unfortunately, the limitations of this thesis are significant and stem equally from the constraints of time and my own limited linguistic proficiency (with regard to the breadth of literary and ethnographic material it would be possible to incorporate into a narrative discussion of any depth) and the many gaps in my knowledge of translation and narrative theory, both of which I have come to study only recently with any explicit academic intention. Nevertheless, I hope this initial foray will prove in any case entertaining– I have certainly enjoyed writing it.

for Onur

Acknowledgements

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction: Language, Culture and Globalization

> Today more than ever, as productive forces tend to be completely de-localized, completely universal, they produce not only commonalities but also rich and powerful social relationships. These new productive forces have no place, however, because they occupy all places, and they produce and are exploited in this indefinite non-place. The universality of human creativity, the synthesis of freedom, desire, and living labor, is what takes place in the non-place of the postmodern relations of production. Empire is the non-place of world production where labor is exploited.
>
> Hardt and Negri, *Empire* (2000)

> It has become a commonplace of commentary on the worldwide hunger for English that this demand arises historically as an inheritance of the British Empire and, in the contemporary world, from the hegemonic status of the United States across many domains of human life, including the occupational, commercial, and cultural [...] The successes of those who learn English, of course, have reinforced the worldwide dominance of English that motivated the need to learn it in the first place [...] As TESOL professionals, we play our role in this reflexive process: We celebrate our educational successes as our students achieve the levels of English that will enable them to fulfill their educational, professional, and social aspirations, in the knowledge that we simultaneously facilitate multinational globalisation and environmental processes of which we may well disapprove [...] To the extent that the dominance of English-speaking nations is to be imposed by force, English language teachers may now explicitly be perceived as a second wave of imperial troopers. We move in, following 'pacification', with the unspoken role, it can be argued, of facilitating the consent that hegemony requires, so that the fist can be returned to the glove.
>
> Julian Edge, *Imperial Troopers and Servants of the Lord* (2003)

> I'm happy with my talk. They won't understand a thing. It's too laconic. And too written a form. […] Too "French." Or Irish. It's on the verge of being minimal. They want good, clear streams [of cultural capital]. Explain where it comes from, where it goes. A brief introduction. Situate your point in its context. Ernst maintained this, Dick objected that, Ruth explained that the problem was badly stated: phallocentric approach. And Ron, that everybody still thinks in a Western way, when there are others. Ah! Others! That's all they have on their lips. Difference, alterity, multiculturalism. It's their dada.
>
> J. Lyotard, *Verbiages* (1997)

Language has long been recognized as one of the principal features that distinguish human beings from other animals. In particular, it has been noted that language allows human beings to engage in social existence and thereby create cultural, technological and political edifices that transcend the temporal boundaries of our finite animal existence. We still read Shakespeare's sonnets although the man himself – the flesh and blood mammal who went by the name of Shakespeare – is long dead. The classic expression of this thought is to be found in Aristotle's *Politics* (1253a), where we

are told that man (*anthrōpos*) is a "*zōon politikon*", a living being which is by nature suited to social and political association, precisely because he is first and foremost a "*zōon logon ekhon*", an animal which possesses speech.

The traditional Latin rendering of "*zōon logon ekhon*" as "*animal rationale*" is yet another testament to the close connection between language and human rationality. But, of course, a close connection is not the same thing as total identity. Although language (in its abstract capacity as *langue*) is the necessary condition of all human rationality and sociality, it is (in its empirical reality as a multiplicity of *paroles*) also that which hinders the total global realization of this possibility. There is not and, as far as we know, has never been a universal human language - despite the plethora of myths featuring a prelapsarian Edenic speech. At least since the catastrophe at Babel, there has only ever been a multiplicity of idioms serving not only to unite but also to divide the human race: the rise of national languages was made possible at the expense of the international lingua franca (then Latin), and also at the expense of local variance – 'dialects' being forcibly subsumed into familiar lexicons the likes of German, French, Spanish, English.

That words can serve as shibboleths - as markers of ethnic, cultural, religious and class differences - is well known. What is perhaps more puzzling (from a "cosmopolitan" point of view) is the fact that those who have suffered discrimination and persecution as a result of their linguistic differences have often nevertheless *persisted in clinging to their shibboleths*. But indeed, the biblical story of Babel would seem to suggest that this "irrational" desire to cling to one's shibboleth is nothing less than a divinely imposed duty: God destroyed the tower of Babel to tame human ambition - because he did not want the human race to be united as a single techno-linguistic community that would aspire to dominate the heavens and the earth. Henceforth, any attempt to impose linguistic unity on mankind would be a sacrilegious act of violent imperialism.

History, however, does not seem to show a drive towards Babelization. In fact, quite the opposite, as we see our past littered with projects to create a more political, and therefore linguistic, homogeneity, projects driven in part by the desire to create a more efficient, unified and coherent political entity – most notably the rise of Greek and Latin as lingua francas in the empires of the Eastern Mediterranean. It was in this Mediterranean world that a religion with openly universalistic ambitions was born into the heart of Judaism – ambitions tied directly to a project of translation. As one of its first acts of evangelism, this sect of Judaism abandoned its attachment to Semitic shibboleths, embracing the translatability of the Holy Writ and the idea of writing in a language to which one has no particular ethnic tie, thus allowing these evangelists to speak directly to a much

wider and more heterogeneous audience. This sect insisted on the translation of man, a "strange imitative metamorphosis"[1] through which the converted ('translated') and the medium (in this case Christianity) are party to a series of dynamic but mutually constitutive compromises and accommodations. In his discussion of Saint Paul, Toker shows clearly the metaphysical weight given to the ability to translate, the implicit acknowledgement being that "the Pauline prophet-translator accepts the multiplicity of idioms, letters or signifiers in which the word of God finds expression; maintaining, however, that behind all this multiplicity there lies a univocal signified that is forever identically repeatable" (ibid). But while Saint Paul believes in the sanctity of the signified far above the signifier, what of the untranslatable? Derrida, for instance, holds that proper nouns fall into this category: Peter is not Pierre. (Although, of course, the 'forever identically repeatable' has a certain Derridian echo.)

This question is somewhat complicated, however, by the degree to which the proper name signifies belonging, and yet does not entirely belong to language – a slippery and nuanced relationship which can be explored in greater depth through a close reading of Brian Friel's play *Translations* (which will incidentally introduce a number of the other primary themes relevant to the questions circling the globalization of English). All words in a language are like a proper noun to the extent that they signify something or someone's identity, to the extent that the word, the language, marks you as a 'barbarian' to those who cannot understand. This dynamic understanding, as we will see, is also echoed in Friel's play.

This thesis will take as its principal problematic the socio-political implications of English as a global lingua franca, exploring within the geopolitical context of the 21st century the uses made of multiculturalism/tolerance discourses in the many adversarial approaches to and portrayals of English as it is taught to speakers of other languages. In this first chapter we will begin with a critical look at modern governmentality – more specifically, the increasing *privatization* of governmentality – as the basis for our understanding of the 'Empire' posited in the discursive conceptualization of English as a language of imperialism, or with imperialistic undertones. This discussion will perhaps also impact our understanding of the connection between a national language and citizenship, and thus shed some light on the place(s) or role(s) available to a lingua franca. This chapter will also introduce the currently dominant discourse of neo-liberalism (specifically economic, but with distinct implications in socio-political spheres) and look at the twinned phenomena of the privatization of governmentality and the rise and dominance of

---

[1] Toker, 40.

neoliberal discourses in the specific context of higher education in order to better understand the framework within which English (as a lingua franca) is largely understood to dominate.[2] The second chapter will draw from this socio-political contextualization of higher education to focus more closely on English language education (as a foreign, or additional language) as discussed within TESOL[3] publications. The articles chosen for in-depth consideration are those that reflect on the 'mission' of the organization (including the organization's original mission statement, written by Harold B. Allen in 1967), the roles and obligations of the teacher, the place of English, and the native/nonnative speaker dichotomy specifically with respect to language ownership. The second half of the chapter will draw on original ethnographic data derived from classroom observations and interviews with native English-speaking instructors teaching at the university level in Istanbul, Turkey. This case study will be used to illustrate, and to some degree complicate, the approaches typified in the professional literature, as the nature of the interview subjects shifts the emphasis from the development of 'nonnative' ownership of English to the enduring de jure 'native' ownership reflected in hiring practices and salary discrepancies, and in the instructors' approach to their students, their jobs in language education, and their host country. The final chapter will leave behind the concrete world of ethnography and archival analysis to explore more deeply the metaphor of translation, developed through the framework provided by English as a global lingua franca in our neoliberal/neo(post)colonial context. Some effort has been expended to draw to an encouraging conclusion, with the hope that this optimism will be understood as a challenge rather than a wilful simplification. Throughout the work we will be moving between a Pauline/Aristotelian and a Macaulayan/Platonic understanding of translation, a frame which will be explained more clearly over the course of this introduction.

And so, does the labor of translation undo the damage wrought during the fall of Babel? In the Pauline example we have an image of indifference to language, an injunction towards adoption of a lingua franca that strengthens (or edifies, to use the Pauline vocabulary) a community. What we have had since the rise of Christianity is a coexistence of a wide variety of vernacular dialects and alongside/above these, the lingua franca of Latin in the West, both ultimately undermined by the rise of nationalism and the national languages. In for example Chaucer and Dante, we begin to see

---

[2] I am referring here to the common reference to English as the 'language of commerce and education' which we will see had already been established in the discourse at the time TESOL was founded in the 1960s.

[3] Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

major works of literature, philosophy and scholarship being composed in a national language while Latin and Greek increasingly fall out of use.

In fact, it should not escape our notice that most (if not all) of the national languages with which we have become familiar were originally developed through the labor of translation. Martin Luther, working zealously in the 1520s and 30s, created modern German through the translation of the bible, while the philologically-inclined Brothers Grimm, faithfully transcribing their folk tales in the recently dissolved Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, were working assiduously to unite the now autonomous German states (many of them client states of Napoleon) under a common linguistic identity. In 1789, roughly half the population of France spoke French, and many were bilingual. As late as 1844 a translator was necessary at the trial of a man from Normandy convicted of killing his mother and two sisters. Even in 1856, when young Bernadette Soubirous de Lourdes believed she saw the Virgin Mary, translators were required to make her Patois intelligible to the government and church officials sent to verify her visions of the *immaculada concepcion*. Hebrew, extinct as a spoken language by the 4th century and now the national language of Israel, was painstakingly recreated from written liturgical sources in the 1880s[4]. But at the same time, as Europe became more linguistically unified (increasingly literate) and fragmented (standardized national languages making the Frenchman unintelligible to the German etc.), these same nations were creating colonial empires in which they would impose the language of the metropolis over

---

[4] The dramatic revivafication of the Hebrew began under the auspices of growing Jewish nationalism, which in an article entitled 'A Burning Question' (1891) by Ben Yehuda, the principal author of its ultimate revival, is connected from its very inception with the protection of Hebrew literature (Rabin 68). The existence of a common language, albeit a written language, was considered proof of the existence of a Jewish nation. After long struggles with incomplete vocabulary derived from the religious texts (Ben Yehuda himself coined thousands of words), foreign-funded schools, a complete lack of teachers who themselves were quite comfortable in Hebrew, and regional dialects spoken at home, Ben Yehuda and his colleagues finally succeeded: "Between 1900 and 1910 young couples began to enter into matrimony who had gone through the Hebrew school and whose Hebrew speech was fluent and natural. At that time were born the first children in families who spoke nothing but Hebrew in the home, and those babies grew up in Hebrew without anyone making a special effort to assure this. They were the first people, after a lapse of 1,700 years, who knew no language but Hebrew" (73). By the 1916-18 census of the Jewish community in Palestine, 34,000 (40%) claimed Hebrew as their mother tongue (74).

Please see the following for an excellent and accessible history of Hebrew, and the last two chapters in particular for the revival of Hebrew as a spoken language: Rabin, Chaim. (print 1963; electronic 2005). *A Short History of the Hebrew Language*. Also available online at http://www.adath-shalom.ca/rabin_he.htm.

their newly acquired territories. And thus the questions addressed here must also address the post-colonial paradox discussed by and embodied in the likes of Salman Rushdie and V.S. Naipaul.

Because we're also products of the 19th century, we have an attachment to our national language and tend to see the phenomenon of lingua franca as blank and colorless, as lacking the 'heart' of national languages. We forget, of course, that the creation of national languages was itself couched in the violent oppression of local dialects. However, it is hardly strange that we recoil from the widely accepted statistic that a language 'dies' every fourteen minutes and cringe to think that if things carry on as they are, within 90 years the linguistic diversity of the human species will have dropped from six thousand to six hundred living languages – presumably with English (or Chinese) serving as primary intermediary. It is nevertheless increasingly clear, with the 21st century well underway, that those very same forces (namely capitalism) which strengthened the state and necessitated a national language are now driving towards a new lingua franca situation: the capitalist centralization through the state is more or less complete and the new ideal 'balance' for the accumulation of capital requires increasing freedom from national boundaries.

The relation between national language and national identity – though universally intimate – varies wildly in accordance with the history of each nation and its sociopolitical ambitions. Likewise, it is natural to assume that nations and their citizens will not react uniformly to the rise of the English language, already a European lingua franca[5]. Nor should one overlook the complexity of emotions experienced by English speakers, born and bred, with relation to the globalization of their mother tongue. The point of entry that will be dealt with here is that of the lingering linguistic hegemony of English as an indicator of the sociopolitical complexities of the 21st century. As an introduction to many of the central tensions and useful avenues of inquiry, we'll now turn to the play previously mentioned:

Brian Friel's play *Translations,* first presented on September 23, 1980 in Derry, Ireland*,* depicts the Irish-speaking community of Baile Beag/Ballybeg in 1833 grappling with the presence of British troops who have come to map the country as it is absorbed into the United Kingdom. As promised, *Translations* speaks movingly to many of the themes that will prove relevant later: heartbreaking colonial imposition couched in narratives of progress; patriotic individuals who are yet in favor of letting their national language fall by the wayside in favor of English, while others remain staunchly loyal to their cultural and linguistic roots; and, as the land is mapped out and

---

[5] The term 'Eurenglish', for example, has been coined to describe the use of a hodge-podge English as a lingua franca across Europe, most particularly in academia and academic circles.

renamed for more efficient taxation, also touching on aspects of governmentality in the process and aftermath of translation. It is an evocative example of an early attempt to use English to create a country of translated men – and beautifully expresses the creation of a double duplicity in that effort, making it clear that these 'mimic men' are not necessarily the subservient class of interpreters described in Macaulay's *Minute on Indian Education* (1835)[6].

The play begins in the local hedge-school[7], held in a disused barn littered with broken or forgotten farm tools. Here Manus, the school-master's eldest son and unpaid assistant, is working to help Sarah, a local girl between the ages of 17 and 30, overcome a debilitating speech defect. The stage directions read "she has been considered locally dumb and she has accepted this: when she wishes to communicate, she grunts and makes unintelligible nasal sounds" (1). Sarah is making progress in their private lessons, assured by Manus that "nobody's listening, nobody hears you," and the opening scene shows her speaking her own name aloud for the first time in her life. Manus is overjoyed: "Now we're really started! Nothing'll stop us now! Nothing in the wide world! […] Soon you'll be telling me all the secrets that have been in that head of yours all these years" (2-3). Towards the end of the play this exchange is mirrored, though without the warmth and compassion Manus expressed in this opening scene – Sarah dutifully repeats her name, as she does now, though through tears (72). She will lose her power of speech completely when questioned callously by the captain of the British troops, Lancey (81), in heart-wrenching concert with the ultimate rape of her community. Her silence, though, should not be understood as mere acquiescence to oppression: while she may have happily shared "all the secrets that have been in that head of [hers]" with Manus, when it is suggested that she will regain her speech under less trying circumstances she is calm but emphatic that such access will not be granted to the British (83).

Back in the hedge-school, Manus and Sarah are joined by Jimmy Jack Cassie, the elderly

---

6   Macaulay describes the formation of "a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern; a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect" (729). This class of interpreters would be constituted through its double function of interpretation, acting both as 'intermediaries' translating the wishes and demands of the colonizers, and granting access to the local population. This position is explored thoroughly in *Translations*, through the character of Owen.

7   Hedge-schools were run throughout Ireland during the 18th and 19th centuries, established usually by local educated men who would offer classes to the community. Students typically paid a small fee, in cash or kind, per subject, the most commonly offered of which were grammar, English, mathematics, history, Greek and Latin, depending on the expertise available. They will give way to the national schools established by the British government which offered free education in English from the age of 4 or 5 to 12.

'Infant Prodigy' who is "fluent in Latin and Greek but is in no way pedantic – to him it is perfectly normal to speak these tongues [...] The world of the gods and the ancient myths is as real and as immediate as everyday life in the townland of Baile Beag" (2). This quality of unselfconscious simultaneity also touches the Irish landscape (through the incorporation of mythological figures in place-names) and is remarked upon[8] by Lieutenant George Yolland, a 'romantic' British soldier sent to standardize and Anglicize the local place-names. In discussions of the Irish language, frequent forays are made into George Steiner's *After Babel* (1975; third edition 1998), most particularly through the school-master, Hugh, as he wavers between silent condemnation and weary acceptance of the new "landscape of ...fact" - between condemnation of the project undertaken by Yolland and his younger son and concern for their own incomprehension of the colonial project. His character ultimately expresses Steiner's position that interpretation is inherent in understanding and appreciating even one's own culture – the natural extension of which is that therefore the 'translation' of the Irish people and country-side into English creates no more of an inconsistency between language and what it represents than is already present in the mere use of language- Gaelic or English, Latin or Greek.

In response to Yolland's sentimental enthusiasm for the Irish language, Hugh replies with the customary degree of ceremony that indeed it is "a rich language... full of the mythologies of fantasy and hope and self-deception – a syntax opulent with tomorrows. It is our response to mud cabins and a diet of potatoes; our only method of replying to … inevitabilities" (51). He then cautions Yolland, who is overwhelmed with anxiety and pleasure at the prospect of "decoding" the Irish: "I understand your sense of exclusion, of being cut off from life here; and I trust you will find access to us with my son's help. But remember that words are signals, counters. They are not immortal. And it can happen - to use an image you'll be able to understand - that a civilisation can be imprisoned in a linguistic contour which no longer matches the landscape of...fact" (52).

---

[8] On what he felt on arriving in Baile Beag: "The moment you brought me in here, I had a curious sensation. It's difficult to describe. It was a momentary sense of discovery; no – not quite a sense of discovery – a sense of recognition, of confirmation of something I half knew instinctively; as if I had stepped..." Owen: "Back into ancient time?" Yolland: "No, no. It wasn't an awareness of *direction* being changed but of experience being of a totally different order. I had moved into a consciousness that wasn't striving nor agitated, but at ease and with its own conviction and assurance. And when I heard Jimmy Jack and your father swapping stories about Apollo and Cuchulainn and Paris and Ferdia – as if they lived down the road – it was then that I thought – I knew – perhaps I could live here..." (48)
   Quite apart from aesthetic appreciation, Yolland is acknowledging here a complex and manifold expression of the mimetic relationship between 'self' and 'other' explored in postcolonial criticism, most particularly in work heavily based in Said's *Orientalism* (1978).

Another thematic character is Maire, "a strong-minded, strong-bodied woman in her twenties" (7) and the first to introduce the question of English, reciting a phrase she memorized as a child – although the stage notes indicate that "her accent is strange because she is speaking a foreign language and because she does not understand what she is saying" (8). It is clear that she would like to learn the language, and later she declares that:

> We should all be learning to speak English. That's what my mother says. That's what I say. That's what Dan O'Connell[9] said last month in Ennis. He said the sooner we all learn to speak English the better. [...] What he said was this: 'The old language is a barrier to modern progress.' And he's right. I don't want Greek. I don't want Latin. I want English. I want to be able to speak English because I'm going to America as soon as the harvest's all saved. (24-25)

Although the school-master tries to ignore it, her interjection is indicative of the perceived promises of English – of the narrative of progress bound up with the spread of linguistic hegemony. However, after the disappearance of Lieutenant Yolland and in the face of British retribution, she returns, aimless, to the hedge-school and it is Hugh who instinctively offers what she desires. But with a caveat: "don't expect too much. I will provide you with the available words and the available grammar. But will that help you to interpret between privacies? I have no idea. But it's all we have. I have no idea at all" (89-90). The inevitability of translation, this gulf between language and understanding, are themes which will resurface often, and color the entirety of this enterprise. Maire, it is clear from beginning, feels the very real pressures of the benefits of using English – she is able to dissociate the English language from the dominance of the British Empire. Before their boots are on the ground, she is already intent on going to America: she is letting go of Irish.

Returning to the narrative: Owen, Manus's handsome younger brother, enters the hedge-school, having been making his fortune in Dublin for the last six years. He is working for the Royal Engineers, helping them in their map-making and acting as translator ("My job is to translate the quaint, archaic tongue you people persist in speaking into the King's good English" (30)). His return is a triumphant one, and exuberant. He exclaims "I can't believe it. I come back after six years and everything's just as it was! Nothing's changed! Not a thing! Even that smell - that's the same smell this place always had. [...] Honest to God, it's such a delight to be back here with you all again - '*civilised*' people" (27-29). As we can see, Owen's initial attitude towards the land and community

---

[9] Politician Daniel O'Connell, often referred to as 'the Liberator' of 'the Great Emancipator', campaigned for the repeal of the Act of the Union (which legally united Ireland and Great Britain), and fought to improve the opportunities available to Irish Catholics, not least of which being the right to become members of Parliament.

he (thought he) had left behind is one of mild derision and loving condescension, exhorting his brother to speak English in front of the British soldiers (41, 42, and 56) and dismissing his father as "pompous" to Yolland (52).

Owen, however, is not the only one who seems ashamed of the apparent rural poverty. When he introduces the British officers Captain Lancey and Lieutenant Yolland, the atmosphere shifts abruptly: a frantic effort is made by the students, under the direction of their schoolmaster, to hide some of the disorder of the room; the stage directions note that Hugh "becomes expansive, almost courtly, with his visitors" (31). Friel emphasizes the Captain's incredulity that the people he is addressing *really don't speak English*, and it is immediately obvious to the reader that the British soldiers have somehow mistaken Owen's name for 'Roland'. Owen does not correct them because he does not want to embarrass them; one might also suspect that he is reluctant to bring their attention to the mistake because he would himself find the correction embarrassing and prefers to 'play along'. When he does eventually correct Yolland, quite forcefully (54), it is a point which marks Owen's shift towards understanding the depth of linguistic violence being committed and his changing relationship with the British presence in Ireland. More on this later.

The first interaction between the British soldiers and the townspeople is undeniably awkward, but within it one can see many of the familiar tensions present in today's linguistic interactions and so I will detail the scene in its entirety (32-36):

The Captain, trying to explain the British military's project, speaks - "a shade too loudly and enunciating excessively" - as if to imbeciles: "You may have seen me – seen me – working in this section – section? - working. We are here – here – in this place – you understand? - to make a map – a map – a map and -" Here he is interrupted by Jimmy in perfect Latin: "*Nonne Latine loquitur*?", which the Captain, betraying his ignorance, mistakes for Gaelic. Jimmy is silenced by the school-master, who like his son is seemingly keen to avoid embarrassing his 'guests'. Lancey continues: "A map is a representation on paper – a picture – you understand picture? - a paper picture – showing, representing this country – yes? - showing your country in miniature – a scaled drawing on paper of – of – of -" He is interrupted this time by a cascade of sniggers from the students, and Owen quickly jumps in: "It might be better if you *assume* they understand you […] and I'll translate as you go along."

With additional reassurance from Owen, he continues: "His Majesty's government has ordered the first ever comprehensive survey of this entire country – a general triangulation which

will embrace detailed hydrographic and topographic information and which will be executed to a scale of six inches to the English mile." Owen translates: "A new map is being made of the whole country." Lancey, surprised at his brevity, continues: "This enormous task has been embarked on so that the military authorities will be equipped with up-to-date and accurate information on every corner of this part of the Empire." Owen's translation: "This job is being done by soldiers because they are skilled in this work," a mistranslation which perhaps indicates a desire to deny an invasion of autonomy, of the implied regulatory power thus ceded to the British. Lancey continues: "And also so that the entire basis of land valuation can be reassessed for purposes of more equitable taxation." Owen's translation strategically shifts the emphasis: "this new map will take the place of the estate-agent's map so that from now on you will know exactly what is yours in law." Lancey draws his speech to a close, stating: "In conclusion I wish to quote two brief extracts from the white paper which is our governing charter: 'All former surveys of Ireland originated in forfeiture and violent transfer of property; the present survey has for its object the relief which can be afforded to the proprietors and occupiers of land from unequal taxation'." Owen's translation: "The captain hopes that the public will cooperate with the sappers and that the new map will mean that taxes are reduced." Lancey adds the second extract: "'Ireland is privileged. No such survey is being undertaken in England. So this survey cannot but be received as proof of the disposition of this government to advance the interests of Ireland.' My sentiments, too." Owen translates: "This survey demonstrates the government's interest in Ireland and the captain thanks you for listening so attentively to him."

The floor is given over to a very reluctant Lieutenant Yolland who insists that he has nothing to say. Owen, however, intervenes. Speaking to the Irish, he explains, "The captain is the man who actually makes the new map. George's task is to see that the place-names on this map are... correct. (*to Yolland*) Just a few words – they'd like to hear you. (*to class*) Don't you want to hear George, too?" Maire asks, sarcastically, "Has he anything to say?" to which an anxious Yolland tries to respond: "Sorry – sorry?" Owen mistranslates, perhaps falsely opening lines of communication: "She says she's dying to hear you." Yolland addresses himself to Maire, and thanks her. To the class, he says, with painful and endearing honesty, "I can only say that I feel – I feel very foolish to – to – to be working here and not to speak your language. But I intend to rectify that – with Roland's help – indeed I do." Owen is thrilled or incredulous: "He wants me to teach him Irish!" Yolland finishes quickly: "I think your countryside is – is – is very beautiful. I've fallen in love with it already. I hope we're not too – too crude an intrusion on your lives. And I know that I'm

going to be happy, very happy, here." Owen's translation, "He is already a committed Hibernophile", is in the spirit of his father's etymological game, although he does not allow the class to play their part of identifying the word's meaning, shushing their contribution: "All right Jimmy – we know – he loves Baile Beag; and he loves you all." Still commanding the room, Owen acknowledges his (now very drunk) father as the last speaker: "Go ahead, Father. (*hands up for quiet*) Please – please." Hugh maintains the courtly spirit with which he first greeted the two soldiers: "And we, gentlemen, we in turn are very happy to offer you our friendship, our hospitality, and every assistance that you may require. Gentlemen – welcome!" The formalities completed, everyone mingles while downstage Manus confronts his little brother about his duplicity:

> Manus "What sort of translation was that, Owen?"
> Owen "Did I make a mess of it?"
> M "You weren't saying what Lancey was saying!"
> O "'Uncertainly in meaning is incipient poetry' – who said that?"
> M "There was nothing uncertain about what Lancey said: it's a bloody military operation, Owen! And what's Yolland's function? What's 'incorrect' about the place-names we have here?"
> O "Nothing at all. They're just going to be standardised."
> M "You mean changed into English?"
> O "Where there's ambiguity, they'll be Anglicised."
> M "And they call you Roland! They both call you Roland!"
> O "Shhhh. Isn't it ridiculous? They seem to get it wrong from the very beginning – or else they can't pronounce Owen. I was afraid some of you bastards would laugh."
> M "Aren't you going to tell them?"
> O "Yes – yes – soon – soon."
> M "But they..."
> O "Easy, man, easy. Owen – Roland – what the hell. It's only a name. It's the same me, isn't it? Well, isn't it?"
> M "Indeed it is. It's the same Owen."

The sarcasm dripping from Manus's double affirmation seems to signal his understanding of the duplicitous nature of translation, his awareness of the complex relationship his younger brother sees as merely a well-paying job. While initially Owen refuses to attach the significance of Derridian untranslatability to proper names, his attitude changes drastically towards the middle of act two after a discussion in which Yolland rebuffs Owen's attempt to ridicule his father, insisting that Hugh is "an astute man" who "knows what's happening" - though Yolland admits that he himself is not sure what's happening, he has nevertheless become "concerned about [his] part in it. It's an eviction of sorts." Owen retorts: "We're making a six-inch map of the country. Is there something sinister in that? […] And we're taking place-names that are riddled with confusion […] and we're

standardizing those names as accurately and as sensitively as we can" (52). Yolland, however, insists "that something is being eroded" - the people are not confused.

Despite Owen's familiar attitude of half-serious derision generally aimed at his father, to strengthen his argument against Yolland's "romantic" misgivings, he tries to give an example of a totally illogical place-name: Tobair Vree, a crossroads named after a long-vanished well once located in a neighboring field named after a corrupted version of the name of a man (Brian) who was found drowned there. This origin story, Owen says, was told to him by his grandfather - no one else in the community is familiar with it. The implicit expectation being that Yolland will admit there is some practical need for what they are doing – for the labor of translation from the Irish idiom to the English.

Yolland nevertheless refuses to acknowledge his intended point and instead insists that the name's power and meaning is still present and relevant because Owen himself remembers its story. Owen presses him: "I'm asking you: what do we write in the Name-Book?" and after Yolland insists that it remain Tobair Vree, he hesitates: "Even though the well is a hundred yards away from the actual crossroads – and there's no well anyway – and what the hell does Vree mean?" (54). Yolland's insistence on the sanctity of the name seems to awake in Owen a similar sense of loyalty, and when Yolland next calls him 'Roland', he explodes: "George! For God's sake! *My name is not Roland!*" He repeats his name three times, and spells it, in response to each of Yolland's surprised and mortified half-sentences.

Although the stage directions indicate "the absurdity of the situation" (55), it is perhaps not so absurd as all that. Yolland, well meaning though he may be, was committing epistemic violence – and was furthermore *allowed to do so* initially because of the inherently unequal power relation that initially dictated their interactions and then out of Owen's complex negotiations and eagerness to avoid 'embarrassment'. Thus it seems that Owen comes to see the value in his community's shibboleths, and the epistemological reality of the renaming. He and Yolland both refer to their enterprise as "Eden," where they "name a thing and – bang! it leaps into existence!" "Each name a perfect equation with its roots." "A perfect congruence with its reality." (56) This nostalgia for the prelapsarian language of Eden is another important aspect of the linguistic hegemony of English, of the drive towards a lingua franca of any kind, and is addressed by Walter Benjamin in *The Task of the Translator*, Jacques Derrida in *Des Tours de Babel*[10] and Barbara Johnson in her book *Mother*

---

[10] In this essay, Derrida argues that the Babelian project is explicitly about establishing linguistic hegemony; but even more to the point, he discusses what we see happening in *Translations*: the

Tongues. We will explore this tension, and the pain felt in the process of translation, in detail through the work of these three and George Steiner.

Knowing what awaits us, I hesitate to return to the narrative of the play – the violence of final act may very well run roughshod over any attempts at balanced treatment of romantic nationalism and the real benefits of using English. Nevertheless, it is evocative of a more apparent sort of pain felt in the process of translation. I will try to keep it brief: and so Manus returns, interrupting the giggling, God-like name-givers, to announce that he is to become "a man of substance" (57) – having been offered a comfortable position as master of a hedge-school on the nearby island of Inis Meadhon. Now with the means to marry, he readdresses himself to Maire in earnest, hoping that she will give up her intentions of immigrating to America. Unfortunately, Maire and Yolland have been shyly interested in each other and Yolland, increasingly at home in Baile Beag, attends a community dance thrown by Maire's family. The two leave together and although they cannot understand each other (their exchanges are ironic and even comic in their unknowing repetitions), they eventually communicate through recitation (in Irish) of the place-names Yolland and Owen have been standardizing, and Yolland draws her a map of his own home in England, listing off the 'shires and 'fords of his own origin. They are interrupted by Sarah, who, shocked by the 'tribal disloyalty', runs to tell Manus.

The third and final act opens the next evening, and we learn that Yolland is missing, presumably dead. Manus is packing, agitated, and though he did not kill Yolland he refuses to speak to Lancey and clear his name before leaving town. Yolland's fate remains undisclosed, though it is implied that the never-present/often-discussed Donnelly twins may have had something to do with his disappearance. The land is swarming with British soldiers, "spread out in a big line from Sean Neal's over to Lag and they're moving straight across the fields towards Cnoc na nGabhar […] Prodding every inch of ground in front of them with their bayonets and […] tumbling everything before them – fences, ditches, haystacks, turf-stacks! […] straight through it be God as if it was heather, not a blade of it left standing" (73). Captain Lancey's final declaration to the community is a jarring removal of the proverbial kid gloves. No longer hesitant in his position of power, Lancey is commanding and unflinching:

> Lancey, to Owen: […] I will address them and it will be their responsibility to pass on what I have to say to every family in this section.

---

translation of the untranslatable, the shibboleth of the proper name.

Lancey indicates to Owen to translate. Owen hesitates, trying to assess the change in
Lancey's manner and attitude.
   I'm in a hurry, O'Donnell.

Owen: The captain has an announcement to make.
L: Lieutenant Yolland is missing. We are searching for him. If we don't find him,
         or if we receive no information about where he is to be found, I will pursue the
         following
         course of action. *(He indicates to Owen to translate)*
O: They are searching for George. If they don't find him -
L: Commencing twenty-four hours from now we will shoot all livestock in
         Ballybeg.
         Owen stares at Lancey.
         At once.
O: Beginning this time tomorrow they'll kill every animal in Baile Beag – unless
         they're told where George is.
L: If that doesn't bear results, commencing forty-eight hours from now we will
         embark on a series of evictions and levelling of every abode in the following
         selected areas -
O: You're not - !
L: Do your job. Translate.
O: If they still haven't found him in two days' time they'll begin evicting and
         levelling every house starting with these townlands.
L: Swinefort.
O: Lis na Muc.
L: Burnfoot.
O: Bun na hAbhann.
L: Dromduff.
O: Druim Dubh.
L: Whiteplains.
O: Machaire Ban.
L: Kings Head.
O: Cnoc na Ri.
L: If by then the lieutenant hasn't been found, we will proceed until a complete
         clearance is made of this entire section.
O: If Yolland hasn't been got by then, they will ravish the entire parish.[11]

Owen's final act of translation, his abrupt awareness of the duplicity inherent in the position he has

held throughout the play, is emphasized in his demeanor in the last few pages. He takes

responsibility for the situation in which the parish now finds itself: when his father, returning drunk

and irate over the news that he has been replaced as headmaster of the new national school by a

British "bacon-curer" from Cork, takes up the Name-Book and idly "leafs through it, pronouncing

---

[11] Pages 79 through 81.

the strange names as he does" (87), Owen hastily, embarrassed, takes it from him.

> O: I'll take that. (*In apology*) It's only the catalogue of names.
> H: I know what it is.
> O: A mistake – my mistake – nothing to do with us.

He is wrong, of course, but what he and the play neglect, caught up in the nationalistic fervor and the pain of translation, is the creative possibilities inherent in the mimetic relationship they've entered into – the possibilities for using the process of translation as a mode of resistance. While Owen may regret his initial inability to understand the shifting "landscape of … fact," the violence being committed is intimately connected to the work represented in the Name-Book. Hugh understands this and sees strength in the possibilities offered: "We must learn those new names. We must learn where we live. We must learn to make them our own. We must make them our new home." His son, still not comprehending, insists: "I know where I live." He is still the same Owen, isn't he? But Hugh draws an important distinction, again drawing heavily from Steiner: "James thinks he knows, too. I look at James[12] and three thoughts occur to me: A – that it is not the literal past, the 'facts' of history, that shape us, but images of the past embodied in language. James has ceased to make that distinction. […] B – we must never cease renewing those images; because once we do, we fossilize" (88). Like Rushdie, he seems to view the past as "a country from which we have all emigrated, that its loss is part of our common humanity."[13]

While *Translations* isn't exactly a deep philosophical work and lacks the nuance of Steiner's or Derrida's treatment of the subject, it provides ample opportunity to develop the necessary subtleties with regard specifically to the translation of men. We see Yolland's romantic insistence on and desire to remain faithful to local shibboleths in direct contradiction to both Saint Paul and to Hugh, though on different points. He denies translatability, though seemingly out of a naïve aesthetic distaste for the military nature of the translation. We will see more of this 'conqueror's guilt' in the writing on teaching English as a foreign language – a deep desire to protect and indeed, as Hugh notes, to fossilize the languages and cultures which are have adopted English as their lingua franca. This instinct of Yolland's is not entirely misguided, particularly in those areas where English has subsumed local vernacular and cut a deep chasm between older and younger generations, as it did in Ireland. However, the violence we see in *Translations* is not exactly

---

[12] At the moment passed out drunk on the floor, having just announced his engagement to the 'flashing-eyed' Athena.

[13] Rushdie, S. *Imaginary Homelands*. In <u>Imaginary Homelands: essays and other criticism 1981-91</u> (1991). p. 12.

analogous to today's globalization of English – although I suppose the citizens of Iraq may disagree. Nevertheless, the pressure to learn English felt by Maire is still present: to "get on in life" one may have to leave one's community, may have to speak English. Rushdie muses that while "it may be that when the Indian writer who writes from outside India tries to reflect that world, he is obliged to deal in broken mirrors, some of whose fragments have been irretrievably lost;" nevertheless this

> broken mirror may actually be as valuable as the one which is supposedly unflawed. […] It was precisely the partial nature of these memories, their fragmentation, that made them so evocative for me. The shards of memory acquired greater status, greater resonance, because they were *remains*; fragmentation made trivial things seem like symbols, and the mundane acquired numinous qualities. (11-12)

There is no doubt that the process of translation has its own particular pains – and multiplying the distance between generations is certainly one such pain. But the gains, both in terms of a Pauline 'edification of the community' and the more private pleasure of edifying oneself, are equally real. This translation, however, is not just a personal or community matter; what follows will situate the personal in the sociopolitical crossroads of our historical moment.

Chapter 1: A Portrait of the Dislocated Subjectivity (and his world)

Empire · multinational globalization · failures of neo-liberalism · privatization of governmentality · the knowledge economy · commodification of knowledge · production in indefinite non-space · the transnational cosmopolitan subjectivity ·

Polybius, in approaching the outbreak of the Second Punic War, draws distinctions between the beginning, the pretext and the cause. The cause is what shapes purposes and decisions, the beginning is what gives effect to them… In tracing causes, Polybius gives primacy, as one might expect him to, to the influence of laws and institutions, and above all, in the case of Rome, to its political constitution.

John Burrow, *A History of Histories* (2007)

In the globalised world the human need for stability becomes more acute, and narrative becomes more essential as a means to tune worldly discourse into a coherent resonance, to help make sense of the world. 'Narrative ultimately becomes a tuning into the world which rediscovers and re-establishes our place, our home in it.' ... Globalisation affects the reader's perception of 'home' – nation, family, affiliations – in complex ways.

Judie Newman, *Fictions of America: Narratives of Global Empire* (2007)

Our Historical Moment

The prevalent world-system in which we operate today is that of post-industrial capitalism. Also referred to as the knowledge economy, this system is characterized by the economic shift from the primacy of industrial/material production to that of knowledge production which occurred in the late 20th century. This system is supported and reinforced by the socio-political rhetorics of relativism and neo-liberalism: the current epidemic of epistemic relativism is dialectically intertwined with the economic and political neo-liberalism that has come into its own over the course of the late 20th and early 21st centuries, a relationship which will be further explored over the course of this chapter and which is symptomatic of the world in which the primary subject of this work, what I've termed 'the transnational cosmopolitan subjectivity', is formed and must act, further contextualized in a world characterized by the linguistic hegemony of English and global capitalism.

In order to better understand the development of and relationship between neo-liberalism and postmodern/relativist discourse, we will make use of the periodization developed by Immanuel

Wallerstein to talk about the socio-political organization of the world-system after the Cold War[14]. I chose this tripartite periodization because it is particularly effective in dealing with pluralities of meaning and understanding, based as it is in three "relevant pasts" which can be appealed to singly or in concert to examine the various roots of modern neo-liberalism and provide insight into the development of its various signs and symptoms. The first of these relevant pasts is "the past of the US hegemonic era, 1945-90" and has the most straight-forward narrative: in the aftermath of World War II, the United States was able to take advantage of its strong economic position, particularly vis-à-vis the devastation of the entire Eurasian land mass, and established a four-pillared "*pax americana*" (Wallerstein 1). The four pillars are

> 1.) the reconstruction of all major industrial powers in an effort to provide the basis for additional seats of production and for a significant pool of customers for American products – not to mention that the US "needed a network of associates to maintain the world order" and in which to "propagate the idea of a [prosperous] 'free world' … as a symbol of hope and therefore of moderation for the world's lower strata";
>
> 2.) an agreement with the USSR, as the only other serious military power, to respect fixed territorial boundaries within which each power would take responsibility for maintaining internal order, and in which the USSR would expect from America no assistance with post-war reconstruction;
>
> 3.) internal unity in the US, "built around the acceptance of US 'responsibility' in the world-system, anti-Communism at home and abroad, and the end of racial segregation"; and lastly
>
> 4.) "the slow political decolonization of the Third World and modest efforts for its so-called economic development" (ibid, 1-2).

This first "relevant past" and the four pillars of '*pax americana*' provide a foundational understanding of the precarious nature of today's socio-economical world, as we see each of the pillars increasingly undermined by the readily apparent excesses and injustices of global capitalism. The system thus made possible is the one in which global capitalism, coupled with and strengthened by political and economic neo-liberalist policies, has become the Round Table of the postmodern world. A table perhaps as mythically unifying as King Arthur's.

The second "relevant past" takes a broader view, spanning from 1789 to 1989. Beginning

---

[14] Wallerstein, Immanuel. "The World-System After the Cold War." *Journal of Peace Research* vol. 30. no. 1, 1993, pp. 1-6.

with the French revolution and the fundamental geopolitical shifts it inspired (namely the normalization of political change "legitimated by 'popular sovereignty'"), this narrative takes as its primary subject the creation and evolution of the ideological triumvirate of conservatism, liberalism and socialism. In each of these ideologies lies a fundamental belief in the inevitability of social change and an ostensible dislike and distrust of the traditional state (the latter sympathy, sufficiently widespread, could arguably be seen as a contributing factor to the rise of neo-liberalism in the 21st century). The primary differences between these ideologies lie rooted in their attitudes towards this inevitability: conservatives wishing to slow it down, liberals wishing to manage it rationally, and socialists wishing to speed it up. By the 1980s, both extremes – conservatism and socialism - had "united around the liberal program of orderly 'reform' enacted and administered by 'experts'" (ibid, 2), and although this initial act of ideological solidarity is by no means the primary reason for the political and social failure of liberalism as a promising source of change, it does foreshadow the seeming ideological stagnation and emphasizes the reciprocal relationship of the original triumvirate in the face of the neo-liberalism which rose from the economic collapse of the late 20th and early 21st century.

The two principal reforms dictated by the liberal agenda in the 19th century were the extension of suffrage and the formation and maintenance of the welfare state. As Wallerstein correctly states, "the object of the reforms was the integration of the working classes in a way that would tame their anger but not threaten the continuing functioning of the capitalist world-economy"; the wild success of these projects was due both to Western governments being able to "mobilize their working classes around a double nationalism: an intra-European nationalism and national superiority of the 'Europeans' to the 'backward' peoples of the world" and the fact that "the costs of the social welfare state could be borne without too much disruption because of the expanded exploitation of the periphery" (2). As the dust from the first World War settled, the world saw that Wilson had established liberalism as a global ideology - followed, twenty-five years later, by Roosevelt's global equivalent of the welfare state. Leninism, far from providing a foil to Wilsonianism as the official rhetoric claimed, merely provided emphasis: "anti-imperialism was self-determination clothed in more radical verbiage. The construction of socialism was economic development of the Third World clothed in more radical verbiage" (ibid). The major fault-line, which became clear as Africa and Asia were decolonialized and national liberation movements provided visions of a glorious geo-politics of progress, equality and state-sovereignty, was that there remained no periphery to support the development of the Third World, nor could one

20

"mobilize the 'patriotism' of the Third World against a 'Third World' [rendering the] taming of the working classes... a chimera at the world level" (3). Thus is enduring political and economic inequality shown to be an inevitability in a world dominated by narratives of progress and equality.

The final 'relevant past' is the narrative of capitalism as a historical system, spanning from 1450 to the present. This narrative covers the development of capitalism and its expansion, its ultimate triumph over (and elimination of) all other historical systems and establishment of "a political framework of 'sovereign' nation-states within an ever-more codified interstate system which has developed the right proportion of state power vis-à-vis the market so as to permit the maximal accumulation of capital" alongside a "complex system of the remuneration of labor, combining wage and non-wage forms, thereby keeping world labor costs down but offering incentives for efficiency" (3). The system of capitalism as we know it has also overseen the institutionalization of racism and sexism, thus "enabling the construction of a hierarchical labor force which is self-sustaining politically" (ibid). This long view of capitalism as a historical system allows us to see more clearly its dynamic nature, based "on a pattern of cyclical swings wherein the 'animal spirits' of the entrepreneurial classes, in pursuing their own interests, regularly and inevitably create mini-crises of overproduction which lead to downturns or stagnations in the world-economy" (ibid). We can see that the dynamic cycling is nevertheless proving unable to absorb all the structural stress of the system's unsustainable demands for growth, that capitalism as a world-system has been cycling closer to its basic contradictions: the system's need for constant spatial expansion and the constant externalization of costs. That these requirements are increasingly difficult to meet, despite the effectiveness of liberalism as an ideology in containing civil unrest, is the third source of precariousness in the world-system of the 21st century.

What is referred to here alternately as 'the transnational cosmopolitan subjectivity' or 'the dislocated subjectivity' is the individual in this precarious context of flux in each of Wallerstein's three relevant pasts. In another article, he identified two cyclical swings which characterized the capitalist system: "the so-called Kondratieff cycles that historically were 50-60 years in length" and the much longer "hegemonic cycles".[15] The most extravagant period of expansion in the history of capitalism ended (abruptly) in the 1970s, giving way to a double-whammy of coincident downturns in both the generational and the hegemonic cycles. Understood in concert with the coincident wavering in the first and second relevant pasts, this systemic catastrophe in the third has brought

---

[15] Wallerstein, I. Commentary No. 243, Oct. 15, 2008: "The Depression: A Long-Term View." Retrieved from http://fbc.binghamton.edu/243en.htm

about the return of a ferocious classical liberalism – neo-liberalism – and the growing invalidity of the triumvirate of state-centered ideologies. Faced with decreasing profits, capitalists (and therefore markets) shifted from production to what is essentially speculation, the same shift which has led to the development of what is widely considered post-capitalist 'knowledge society'.

As each bubble inevitably burst, organizations such as the IMF, the United States Treasury and Reserve stepped in to stave off economic (and social) disaster. The list is impressive: "1987 (stock market plunge), 1989 (savings-and-loan collapse), 1997 (East Asian financial fall), 1998 (Long Term Capital Management mismanagement), 2001-2002 (Enron)" (ibid) - and to this we can now add the U.S. real-estate bubble, the Wall Street fiasco, etc. which kicked off an impressive implosion from Iceland to Greece and Ireland which is still threatening the viability of the fledgling Eurozone. As the pillars of *pax Americana* falter and the promise of liberalism collapses, the welfarist agenda (which originated in the increased exploitation of the 'periphery') is exposed as untenable. Here, then, is the root of today's neo-liberalism: as we move into and past the twilight of American hegemony, the profit squeeze likewise causes the untenable liberal promise that pervaded the discourse of the welfare state to be left behind, and that which was to have expanded, time immemorial, now must be dismantled on a global scale.

To say, however, that American hegemony is over and the world-system has become multipolar is to misleadingly simplify the state of flux within which the transnational cosmopolitan subjectivity is now developing. As mentioned, the perspective that will be dealt with here is that of the lingering (and indeed expanding) linguistic hegemony of English as an indicator of the sociopolitical complexities of the 21st century. But Wallerstein's periodization draws attention to the uncertainty of the near future: without the traditional reinforcement of well-established and reasonably stable economic and political hegemony, what role might the increasing prevalence of English play in the reformulation of the world-system? On one level, the classrooms in which English is taught and learned, spider-webbed across the globe, are themselves saturated with the dying ideological narrative of liberalism (perhaps in many cases already replaced with its modern derivative neo-liberalism) as will be discussed in Chapter 2 through textual analysis of professional TESOL journals, promotional and recruitment material disseminated by major teacher training institutions (chosen due to their organizations' status as an international standard), semi-structured narrative interviews with English language teachers working at the university level and in language schools, and through insights gleaned from classroom observations.

Of deeper but less apparent importance is the matter of translation: English seems to be

engaged in the undeniably hubristic (and ambitious) project of rebuilding the tower of Babel. Such metaphorical use of the tower of Babel narrative is not particularly innovative: Derrida used it in 1985 as the basis of *Des Tours de Babel*, in which he argues that with the confusion of tongues, God condemned everyone to the labor of translation. It would seem, then, that what we're now trying to escape from is that very divinely imposed labor. However, rather than positing that the global proliferation of English indicates an end to the necessity of translation, I will argue that what is being projected is a large-scale translation of men. What are being translated are not just texts: it is as if we must all become 'translated men'. Nor is this necessarily a confined translation, as we will see in the tension between idealized visions of English held by 'native' and 'nonnative speakers' alike, and the extent to which one is able to fulfill the expectations and demands of this imagined English. In trying to find a model of transnational cosmopolitan subjectivity, I will interrogate the connection between translation and colonialism, neo-colonialism and the post-colonial situation, viewed in the light of post-colonialist theory. What sort of universalism is implied by a global English, for example as discussed by Alain Badiou?

In addressing these questions, I will explore what kind of 'Empire' is posited in the literary and academic works by incorporating criticisms of the concept found in Wallerstein's work and in the collaborative efforts of Hardt and Negri (2001; 2004). Having thus established the principal backdrop spanning the metanarratives dialectically shaping the professional field of English language teaching, the project will develop a portrait of the primary subject: the transnational cosmopolitan subjectivity created through the 'translation of men' occurring on a massive scale as English becomes "the world's second language".[16] This portrait will explore the sort of identity represented not in the context of a particular marginalized group, but rather identifying what is at the core of the implicit ideology of the (linguistically, geographically, culturally) dislocated individual.

What Empire?

Given the chimerical nature of the discursive miasma which forms our second atmosphere, in locating the implicit (and occasionally explicit) 'Empire' figured alternatively as backdrop or actor in many of the discursive narratives surrounding the English language, we will begin with a discussion of the equally adaptive notion of governmentality, as developed by Foucault in his 1978

---

[16] This is a phrase attributable to many, and used prominently in Jay Walker's talk on the world's English mania (available at ted.com).

lecture entitled 'Security, Territory and Population' (2007, p. 108). The concept is notable for its emphasis of the reciprocal relationship between techniques of power and discursive modes of knowledge, and the explicit acknowledgment that the political rationalities thus informing techniques of power are by no means neutral. This lack of neutrality is a point which also speaks directly to the deeper implications of the linguistic hegemony of the English language, which will be discussed in detail as we explore the roots of neo-liberalism, as well as the extent of neo-liberal governmentality at the level of the 'self-regulating' individual and on a broader systemic level in the relationships between individual, local, national and international governance.

Governance and governmentality were originally concepts tethered to the traditional nation-state; in the 21st century, however, it seems clear that this situation has shifted - in concert with (or as part of) postmodern socio-economic organization – from the centrality of the traditional nation-state towards the delocalized sphere of global private enterprise. In *Empire* (2001), authors and activists Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri theorize a system or network "of national or supranational organisms united under a single logic of rule" (xii) which has replaced the traditional imperialism known in the 18th and 19th centuries, thus presenting a qualitative break from previous experiences of hegemonic power. Through this network-based conceptualization they develop a theory of interlocking regulatory/disciplinary frameworks which comprise a transnational 'Empire', and in their subsequent work, *Multitude* (2004), they transform the heterogeneous citizenry into a cohesive and inexorable agency which "in its will to be against and its desire for liberation, must push through Empire to come out the other side" (218). Overlooking, for the moment, the inconsistencies and contradictions in their theories, I will however linger over their emphasis of delocalization and the shifting nexus of sovereignty and governmentality in the modern world-system, and specifically the effect that this may have on national (linguistic) identity.

Since Weber (writing in the late 1800s and early 1900s), the growing power of the nation-state and its ability to manage its citizenry through various means of governmentality has been recognized as one of the defining features of the 'modern world', understood here, in line with Wallerstein's periodization, to be the geo-political world which developed after the global revolutions of 1968.[17] The socio-political world of the 21st century is characterized at least in part by an increasing privatization of governmentality, and I will briefly show how in recent years governmentality has shifted from the purview of the nation-state. The following section will first

---

[17] Wallerstein, Immanuel. (1993). The World-System After the Cold War. *Journal of Peace Research, 30*(1), 1-6.

present a few specific cases of privatization in the American military forces, both domestic and in the wars being fought overseas, as well as in industries such as security, juvenile and adult correctional facilities,[18] hospitals and health insurance, emphasizing the breadth of the phenomenon with further examples from the international community. These examples will provide the groundwork for a discussion of the importance and implications of the decentralizing shift towards the privatization of governmentality on the level of the individual and the local, national and international communities.

To begin on reasonably solid ground, it is generally agreed that the most prominent aspect of state power has traditionally been the monopolization of the legitimate means of violence. However, the neo-liberal economic reforms of the 1980s[19] have since led to an increasing corporatization of the public functions of government in many countries. The manifestation of this phenomenon and the effects of neo-liberal economic policy in South America, Central America, Poland and the erstwhile Soviet block has been laid out in great detail by Naomi Klein in *The Shock Doctrine: the rise of Disaster Capitalism* (2007). However, while such a profusion of case studies clearly exists, I'd like to focus on America as a case particularly relevant to the primary concern of this thesis, as both a site of translation and as one of the primary sources of the socio-cultural and historical specificity perceived as belonging to the English language. And thus: taking America as a specific but by no means unique example, one can begin with the fierce public debates and widespread outcry over the abuses committed by Xe[20] while under government contracts and their increasing presence both internationally and on American soil (they were contracted to keep order during the Katrina disaster, and against the potential landfall of Hurricane Gustav in 2008[21]), which has been seen as a "demonstration of what everyone already feared: the utter breakdown of the

---

[18] Please see Eric Schlosser, "The Prison-Industrial Complex," Prison Privatization Report International, Prison Reform Trust; The Atlantic Monthly (December 1998); David Shichor, Punishment for Profit (1995); David Jackson, "Broken Teens Left in Wake of Private Gain," Chicago Tribune, (September 27, 1999); Coverage of PA Childcare in Michael Moore's *Capitalism, A Love Story* (http://www.midatlanticyouth.com/facilities/luzerne.shtml).

[19] These reforms were characterized by pursuit of a radical free market, through economic and social policies that are favorable for businesses but indifferent towards socio-economic inequality, which maximize competition and de-regulate the economy.

[20] Perhaps better known as Blackwater, a private security firm based in North Carolina and California. The company was renamed after several months of bad press surrounding the abuses for which they were being brought to trial.

[21] *Blackwater Preps for Hurricane Gustav,* retrieved from http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2008/08/officials-made/

government".[22] Similar concerns regarding the ability of the government to fulfill its half of the social contract, as well as polarizing fights over what that entails, arose over the fight for healthcare reform and Wall Street financial reform in 2010, both of which shared a crisis of privatization in their respective industries that led to gross inequalities and eventual market collapse, exposing a staggering amount of corruption and a near complete lack of oversight and accountability. The bills for reform and increased oversight eventually forced through the House and Senate met with such opposition from Republicans and corporate lobbyists, and emerged from the process so weakened, that they are seen as further evidence of the national government's ineffectiveness.

Public broadcasting programs like *Frontline* and political whistle-blowers such as Michael Moore have brought widespread, mainstream attention to the role of 'industry insiders' and lobbyists in shaping the legislation,[23] further emphasizing the power of corporations in a country which continues to tout itself as a paragon of democracy and civic justice. The degree to which politicians and the national government as a whole are compromised by the extraordinary sway exercised by industry has, in the last ten years, led to a distinct and often articulated sense of governmental ineffectiveness. But ineffectiveness in what? In providing "consumer protection" for its citizens. I offer one in-depth example which I hope will be found sufficient evidence to allow us to take privatization of governmentality as a real phenomenon, before returning to the more interesting question of its implications for our conceptual understanding of Empire and cultural-linguistic hegemony.

Privatizing 'Security': a case study

The memorandum released by the Congressional Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on October 1st, 2007 in order to organize the subsequently dismissed lawsuit brought against Xe[24] for documented abuses of power in Abu Ghraib and in Iraq, contains a few interesting passages which further illuminate the discussion. First, the Committee draws our attention to the political and economical evolution of the company:

Blackwater USA, based in Moyock, North Carolina, was established in 1997 and has

---

[22] *Blackwater Down*, retrieved from http://www.alternet.org/katrina/25858/

[23] See Frontline's "Obama's Deal," which aired on April 13th, 2010 (available online at http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline), and provides in-depth discussion of the political process behind the heathcare reform bill passed in November 2010. See also Michael Moore's award-winning documentaries "Capitalism: A Love Story" (2009) and "Sicko" (2007), etc.
Blackwater USA, it should be noted, is only one of three private companies contracted by the State Department in the Iraq war.

grown to become one of the world's largest providers of private military services, offering a diverse range of services including personal security details, military training services, aviation support, K-9 services, and its own line of armored vehicles. Prior to the war in Iraq, the company primarily offered training services for law enforcement and military personnel. But during the past six years, the business has expanded and diversified to include private military contracting. Blackwater's government contracts have grown exponentially during the Bush Administration, particularly since the start of the war in Iraq. Blackwater went from having government contracts worth less than a million dollars in 2001 to contracts worth more than half a billion dollars in 2006. (3)

While keeping an eye on the bottom line in terms of 'cold hard tax-cash', this particular narrative emphasizes both the modern-day mercenary feel of the company, and the accelerated involvement in 'state affairs', specifically the state department's reliance on the company through the development and escalation of the war. The latter implication comes close to an outright accusation of knowingly escalating the war for their own profit, harming the war effort "to win hearts and minds" through egregious misconduct. From here, the authors of the report lead into another portion of the report that highlights the degree to which politicians and businessmen are in bed with each other, explicitly undermining the perceived integrity of national politics. The report reads:

Blackwater has hired several former senior Bush Administration officials to work for the company. J. Cofer Black, who served as director of the CIA Counter-terrorist Center from 1999 to 2002 and as a top counter-terrorism official at the State Department until 2004, now serves as Blackwater's vice chairman. lT Joseph E. Schmiø, the Inspector General for the Defense Department from 2002 to 2005, is now general counsel and chief operating officer of the Prince Group, Blackwater's parent company.' (5)

Lastly, with regard to this report, I would like to draw attention to the third section of the Congressional report, entitled "Costs to the Taxpayer". This section, coming as it does at the conclusion of the report, the culmination of very calm, dignified and rational arguments impugning Blackwater's performance and ethical position, is clearly meant to be the decisive blow. Political arguments framed in terms of 'costs' or 'benefits' to the taxpayer have been a common sight in media coverage and in political discourse itself for decades, if not centuries, but the deeper implications of this pervasive capitalist metaphor remain undiscussed. What does it mean to equate the political sphere (in this and many other cases, an ostensibly democratic political sphere) with the market and its ruling capitalist ideology? I will argue that it changes the fundamental meaning of citizenship, thus potentially altering the nature of the relationship between a nation and its citizenry.

Hardt and Negri's work presents us with something of a contradiction, sometimes

conceptualizing 'Empire' as a coherent socio-political and economic structure based in a constitution and, at other times, as a permanent state of exception. The capitalist metaphor used here speaks to both - in this case, by appealing to the 'rational capitalist' mind which could judge the situation through the impartial bifocals of the accountant who sees a distinct imbalance between service and payment, and exposing clearly the inconsistencies in the application of the theoretical 'rules' of balanced budgets and contractual obligations. If, in this metaphor, taxpayers are regarded as consumers and customers, then the government itself is a corporation, with primary responsibility for profit margins and shareholders rather than customer service. The deeper implications of this will become clear as I introduce Wendy Brown's discussion of neo-liberalism as it's presented in her article 'Neo-liberalism and the End of Liberal Democracy' (2003), but I wish to bring this to your attention as I establish the broader scope of privatization.

It is clear that the privatization of so-called 'security' (and by extension, the undermining of national governments' claims to a monopoly of legitimate violence) is not just an American problem. European borders are often monitored by private companies, as are immigration containment centers, a state of affairs that has led to egregious human rights violations and the establishment of activist group MigrEurop[25] which is fighting to raise awareness of the "migrant detention centres" subcontracted by heavily corporatized Frontex. Nor is this just a phenomenon in the neo-liberal capitalist countries of Weber's 'western modernity'. In a New York Times article published on June 6th of 2010, Matiullah Khan was described as the most powerful man in southern Afghanistan. The article described Matiullah Khan as "the head of a private army that earns millions of dollars guarding NATO supply convoys and fights Taliban insurgents alongside American Special Forces."[26] Nor is this an isolated phenomenon either: the article explains that Mr. Matiullah's organization is one of "at least 23 private security companies working in the area without any government license or oversight." Not too surprisingly, the people are said to love Matiullah, citing by way of explanation that "the government people are not honest."

What is of concern in each of the previously mentioned examples and the phenomenon they represent is the increasingly indistinguishable line between business interests and the roles and obligations of the government which further impact the citizen's perception of her obligations towards the nation-state and her role in relation to it. How will this shift affect national identity, and by extension the connection between a nation, its citizenry and their linguistic identity? The latter,

---

[25] Information on the group and their activisim can be found at http://www.migreurop.org.
[26] Filkins, Dexter. *Rule of the Gun: With US Aid, Warlord builds an Afghan Empire.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/06/world/asia/06warlords.html?th&emc=th

further tied up in socioeconomic questions of habitus and spheres of influence, represents a significant aspect of the shifting position of the traditional nation-state in the modern world-system and the available methods by which individuals may attempt to position themselves. The current linguistic structuring of the world-system seems to provide the opportunity for (well-educated) individuals to strengthen a sense of national community outside the traditional nation-state while simultaneously participating in a conversation facilitated by a global lingua franca. But this is an ideal – the vision of English expounded by Jay Walker[27] which presents English as emancipatory, readily available and lacking the shibboleths that make 'Eurenglish' a term of derision. The discussion of education to follow will explore a few of the social and political realities unacknowledged in Mr. Walker's idealized vision.

Already in some cases the distinction between corporate interests and state actions has completely disappeared, leaving in its wake a deep suspicion of and lack of trust in the national government on the part of its citizens, further undermining the legitimacy of the current governmental system and creating a vacuum that in many cases speeds the process of privatization. To examine some of the national and international implications of this increasingly porous distinction between private business and government, I will begin with a discussion of Michel Foucault's conceptualization of governmentality, incorporating John Morison's discussion of the changing role of government and the relationship between the government and the civil sector,[28] and Wendy Brown's discussion of neo-liberalism,[29] with an eye to what is lost when we lose sight of the state in a world characterized by increasingly privatized modes of governmentality.

I should caution now, to avoid undue pessimism, that while privatization is rightly demonized to the extent that it undermines the civil society and exacerbates economic inequalities and class divisions, it is worth underlining that Hardt and Negri see in *Empire* openings for creation and liberation, and these potentials, I will show in the course of this work, carry over to the realm of linguistic identity.

---

[27] Walker, Jay. (2009). *Jay Walker on the World's English mania*. Retrieved from http://www.ted.com/talks/lang/eng/jay_walker_on_the_world_s_english_mania.html

[28] Morison, John. *The Government-Voluntary Sector Compacts: Governance, Governmentality, and Civil Society*. Journal of Law and Society, Vol. 27, No. 1, Voices, Spaces, and Processes in Constitutionalism (Mar., 2000), pp. 98-132.

[29] Brown, Wendy. "*Neo-liberalism and the End of Liberal Democracy*" in Theory & Event; Volume 7, Issue 1, 2003.

Governmentality and Biopower

Let us turn first to Foucault for a clearer understanding of the concept governmentality, which he outlines in terms of the *role* of the government:

> The art of government ... is essentially concerned with answering the questions of how to introduce economy- that is to say, the correct way of managing individuals, goods, and wealth within the family...and of making the family fortunes prosper...This, I believe, is the essential issue in the establishment of the art of government-introduction of economy into political practice. […] To govern a state will mean, therefore, to apply economy, to set up an economy at the level of the entire state, which means exercising toward its inhabitants, and the wealth and behavior of each and all, a form of surveillance and control as attentive as that of the head of a family over his household and his goods.[30]

Governmentality, then, is a power to be exercised - a power of forming populations and forming knowledge about those populations – which though traditionally firmly within the purview of the state, is nevertheless potentially available to any other entity of sufficient means. As Foucault sees it, the problem of modernity is not so much in the statization[31] of society as in the *governmentality of the state*, the process(es) through which the state regulates the population as an economic resource and encourages self-regulation on the part of the individuals who make up the population. Intimately related is the concept of biopolitics, which Foucault defines as "the attempt, starting from the 18th century, to rationalize the problems posed to governmental practice by phenomena characteristic of a set of living beings forming a population: health, hygiene, birthrate, life expectancy, race."[32]

It should be noted, however, that Foucault was writing at the tail end of a classical period during which the state's power was well established and thus some, notably Nancy Fraser (2003), have seen fit to adapt his conceptualization to fit the modern world-system. In this thesis, it is taken that a shift in the socio*political* reality of the citizen/nation dynamic will inevitably impact the

---

[30] Faubion, James D. (ed). Hurley, Robert and others (trans). (2000). *Power: essential works of foucault 1954-1984 vol 3*. From 'Governmentality', p. 217.

[31] The process through which the state becomes dominant, presumably at the cost of heads of household, and which ultimately realigns the power available to local community organizations, families etc. to magnify or act in concert with power of the newly dominant state. The distinction I see here is in the nature of the power exerted by the state: the statization of society leaves neutral the power thus accumulated, while the economic/regulatory nature of governmentality, and its dependence on discursive dominance to the extent that self-regulation is rendered possible and efficient is power of a more distinctly menacing hue.

[32] Foucault, M. Senellart, M (ed). (2010). *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the College de France 1978-1979*. p.317.

socio*linguistic* reality of the citizen. The question now is: as governmentality has become a familiar aspect of (and form of power in) our world, and this power has been increasingly developed by non-state actors (private companies monitoring our shopping habits, our internet usage, the growth of 'surveillance medicine',[33] as well as the examples already discussed), how does the privatization of these governmentality functions affect the governmentalization of society? Or is the privatization of governmentality an inevitable stage, since in Foucault's conceptualization it was always about economics (political economy) and policing the population? In other words, we are here concerned with the effect that a shifting locus of governmentality might have on the nature of citizenship.

Hardt and Negri seem to see the shift as an inevitability and in line with the nature of Empire, though it is a shift in which they see much (eventual) emancipatory promise. The globalization of capitalism, strengthened through the establishment of international organizations and a vast network of often overlapping debt and debtors, has forced the inevitability of supranational organization – and more to the point, "[t]he tendential realization of the world market should destroy any notion that today a country or region could isolate or de-link itself from the global networks of power in order to re-create the conditions of the past and develop as the dominant capitalist countries once did" (2001, p.284). The political economy is solidly the economic economy, and the inequalities of today's world-system are, within the current confines, permanent – despite the wavering of American hegemony and faltering faith in the state.[34]

What the cases of privatization discussed previously show to be happening in the United States and around the world can be considered, crudely, a stifling of the democratic process and broad shift from citizen to consumer as the unit of rule (i.e. a population is composed not of citizens but of consumers and potential consumers). It is as *consumers* that individuals participate in the processes of the modern political economy: the individual's or group's political power is derived directly from the power of demand, and particularly in the fierce fighting around health care and

---

[33] Armstrong (1995) in *The Rise of Surveillance Medicine* writes: The new 'social' diseases of the early Twentieth century...were the initial targets for novel forms of health care, but the main expansion in the techniques of monitoring occurred after World War II when an emphasis on comprehensive health care, and primary and community care, underpinned the deployment of explicit surveillance services such as screening and health promotion...[demonstrating] the practicality of monitoring precarious normality in a whole population. […] The solution...had already begun to emerge earlier in the twentieth century with the development of a strategy that involved giving responsibility for surveillance to patients themselves (398-99).

[34] The revolutions burning throughout the Middle East are further proof of this, and perhaps also of Hardt and Negri's hopeful prognosis, though we won't know for years, probably, how it will all shake out. Their faith in the 'multitude' is rooted in its heterogenaity and dynamism, characteristics which they see as products of modern social life and economic production.

Wall Street reform in the US, one sees corporations and industries adopt changes based on consumer pressure channeled through -*but not harnessed by*- the national government.

The power of the consumer is more effective than that of the citizen, which in any case can only be exercised once or twice every four years. One should keep this in mind when looking, for example, at statistics from Indonesia that describe a population in which upper and middle-class children are taught English to the exclusion of their country's native language, ostensibly in order to prepare them to be professionally competitive in the global job market/economy although, practically speaking,[35] isolating them from their country's history and culture, not to mention their neighborhood's local eatery.[36] This choice could be seen to signal first the perceived primacy of the English language in the world economy, and by extension the perceived inadequacy of the Indonesian language on the part of its (potential) speakers as well as an emphasis on language as a tool which can supply globally-acknowledged socioeconomic leverage, the development of which is the responsibility of the individual (and thus can be seen as an aspect of self-regulatory "postfordist" neo-liberalism) and which effects, to varying degrees, the sanctity of the national community. Here, the individual seems less a national citizen taking part in (or at least with access to) a civil society – and more like someone trying to develop competitive skills in preparation for a life as consumer/product in a neo-liberal, global, knowledge economy. This perception is portrayed with dark humor by Lyotard in his collection of short stories *postmodern fables* (2003): in 'Marie goes to Japan', the narrator continuously refers to herself as a "stream of cultural capital." Life as a professional in the knowledge economy is described as a constant struggle to remain current, 'cutting edge', packaging and selling:

> Marie remembers that their prof was explaining to them that capital is not *time is money*,[37] but also *money is time*. The good stream is the one that gets there the quickest. An excellent one gets there almost right after it's left. On radio and TV they call it real or *live* time. But the best thing is to anticipate its arrival, its "realization" before it gets there. That's money on credit. It's time stocked up, ready to spend, before real time. You gain time, you borrow it. You have to buy a *word processor*.

---

[35] No pun intended.

[36] Onishi, Norimitsu. "As English Spreads, Indonesians Fear for Their Language". Published in the New York Times, July 25 2010. Available online at
http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/26/world/asia/26indo.html?pagewanted=1&_r=1&th&emc=th

[37] Lyotard's translator, Georges van den Abbeele, notes that the italicized words were English in Lyotard's French text. That the words thus set apart are phases and objects intimately connected to the rhetorics of neo-liberalism (e.g. capitalism, efficiency, tolerance) comes as no particular surprise, and serves to underline the depth of the connection drawn between the language and the discourse.

Unbelievable, the time you can gain with it. – But what about the act of writing? – You can write faster, page layouts, footnotes, corrections, you see? – Poor Marie, you won't get rich, you like scribbling on your piece of paper, too bad for you. You are a slow little stream. You will be passed by fast little streams. Of expeditious culture. It suffices to die before you become ridiculous. She tells herself that thought takes time and there's nothing you can do about it. Or what in general they stupidly call creation. That doesn't much resemble streams. Ponds, rather. You flounder in them. It goes nowhere, it's not happy, not communicative. […] My prof, he reminded us of Kant: think for yourself, and according to yourself. Today, they say, that's logocentric, not *politically correct*. The streams must all go in the right direction. They must converge. Why all this cultural busyness, colloquia, interviews, seminars? Just so we can be sure we're all saying the same thing. About what, then? About alterity. Unanimity on the principle that unanimity is suspect. If you are a woman, and Irish, and still presentable, and some kind of professor in Brazil, and a lesbian, and writing non-academic books, then you are a real good little stream. Cultural capital is interested in you. You are a little walking cultural market. (5-6)

For Marie, as is also evident in the excerpt from the same story which kicked off this work, nationality is merely another method of differentiation – a marker having the powers of differentiation similar to those of gender, sexual orientation, profession, area of expertise. I don't believe this is truly the case in our knowledge society as we know it today, but it is nevertheless a very succinct expression of the possibilities inherent in the shift from citizen to consumer which we have now connected to the rise of neo-liberal economics and the privatization of governmentality.

A consumer democracy is characterized by overwhelming inequality, based almost exclusively on individual and private choice, which is of course only limited by one's ability to command market resources. Such an arrangement quickly undermines and ultimately paves over the abstract idea of citizenship and leads inevitably to mass disenfranchisement. The democratic ideal with which we're familiar is a democracy in which decisions are based on votes and voice, the combined power of debate leading to public outcomes - when compromises are necessary, the final vote is binding but public debate escalates in importance. Public choices, in the ideal democracy, provide the framework for public and private decisions. However, if left to private decisions, such as the consumer's freedom to choose, the political economy is suddenly in danger of becoming the 'economic economy', leading to things like private security companies, private correctional facilities and private healthcare providers with a keen eye on the profit margin (and, as we are now witnessing, catastrophic environmental damage).

The freedom to choose is both a freedom of the consumer and a freedom of the corporation, and is thought to be at the core of liberalism. By way of introducing the latter, as practice and as ideology, I will quote Foucault at length:

[Liberalism is] a principle and method of the rationalization of the exercise of government [here not an institution but a verb], a rationalization which obeys – and this is what is specific about it – the internal rule of maximum economy. [… It is] imbued with the principle 'one always governs too much' – or at least, one should always suspect that one governs too much…The question behind the suspicion that there is always the risk of governing too much is: Why, after all, is it necessary to govern? (2010, 318-19)

[Liberalism furthermore] constitutes […] a tool for the criticism of reality: criticism of a previous governmentality from which one is trying to get free; of a present governmentality that one is trying to reform and rationalize by scaling it down; or of a governmentality to which one is opposed and whose abuses one wants to limit. So, in different forms it will be possible to find liberalism both as a regulative schema of governmental practice and as a sometimes radical oppositional theme. (320)

The paradox if liberalism, and the origin of the crisis of governmentality that Foucault identifies is the "procedures of control and forms of state intervention" necessitated by the "double exigency" between liberty and security (ibid, 329). Wendy Brown speaks specifically to the political rationality of neo-liberalism integrated into major institutions and ideologies since the Reagan-Bush administration, through the Clinton administration, and increasingly emerging as a new face of governmentality: "a mode of governance *encompassing but not limited to the state*, and one which produces subjects, forms of citizenship and behavior, and a new organization of the social" (2, emphasis added). Brown writes of the current understandings of neo-liberalism that they:

eschew the *political rationality* that both organizes these policies and reaches beyond the market. Moreover, these referents do not capture the *neo* in neo-liberalism, tending instead to treat the contemporary phenomenon as little more than a revival of classical liberal political economy. Finally, they obscure the specifically political register of neo-liberalism in the First World, that is, its powerful erosion of liberal democratic institutions and practices in places like the United States. (4, emphasis in the original)

This criticism highlights the problematic at work here, emphasizing the short-sightedness of any discussion of the contemporary sphere of global politics that doesn't take seriously the implications of the privatization and spread (or shift) of governmentality beyond the traditional realm of the state. In emphasizing the need to distinguish between neo-liberalism and classical liberalism, Brown is channeling our attention towards the 'political register' of a term and ideology that has often been relegated to either the social or economic sphere. "Neo-liberalism," Brown continues,

carries a social analysis which, when deployed as a form of governmentality, reaches from the soul of the citizen-subject to education policy to practices of empire. Neo-liberal rationality, while foregrounding the market, is not only or even primarily focused on the economy; rather it involves *extending and disseminating market values to all institutions and social action*, even as the market itself remains a distinctive

player. (7, emphasis in the original)

Brown's implicit vision of 'Empire' is very much in line with Hardt and Negri's in that she emphasizes the unifying "rule of logic" which she identifies as 'neo-liberal rationality', the global dissemination of which is at the heart of a hegemony that is distinct from any nation-state's power. In his discussion of governmentality, Foucault also talks about a shift from 'law' to 'tactic,' in which the law is seen and used as a tactic for disposing of one's resources, and of the undesirable aspects therein. As governmentality is increasingly privatized, one should be wary of the conceptualization and formation of a population as a resource undifferentiated from those that early capitalism was built upon. This shift is not insignificant: "Whereas the end of sovereignty is internal to itself and possesses its own intrinsic instruments in the shape of its laws, the finality of government resides in the things it manages and in the pursuit of the perfection and intensification of the processes it directs, and the instruments of the government, instead of being laws, now come to be a range of multiform tactics" (Foucault 211). If the idea of 'tactic' in the context of neo-liberalism seems ominous, it is a reaction which Brown explains:

> The political sphere, along with every other dimension of contemporary existence, is submitted to an economic rationality, or put the other way around, not only is the human being configured exhaustively as *homo economicus*, all dimensions of human life are cast in terms of a market rationality. While this entails submitting every action and policy to considerations of profitability, equally important is the production of all human and institutional action as rational entrepreneurial action, conducted according to a calculus of utility, benefit, or satisfaction against a micro-economic grid of scarcity, supply and demand, and moral value-neutrality. […] Neo-liberalism is a constructivist project: it does not presume the ontological givenness of a thoroughgoing economic rationality for all domains of society but rather takes as its task the development, dissemination, and institutionalization of such a rationality. (9)

As such, the vestigial nation-state posited in *Empire* is not in control, acting (if at all) as a sort of guarantor and passive monitor in the global market: it is the neo-liberal economic policies which act as the normative force in organizing both the state and society. This relationship is not entirely fantastic, despite the criticism leveled on Hardt and Negri for building their model of political economy on "shaky foundations".[38] In the fight for healthcare reform and the Wall Street financial reforms in the United States, for example, we see the state *openly responding to market needs* through a combination of intense lobbying pressure, playing on law-makers' previously established

---

[38] Moore, David. (2003). "Hardt and Negri's *Empire* and Real Empire: the Terrors of 9-11 and After" in *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies, 2*(2).

neo-liberal credentials, extensive propaganda-like advertising campaigns, and a reliance on a pre-established ideological framework at work in the population. Brown writes, "neo-liberal rationality extended to the state itself indexes state success according to its ability to sustain and foster the market and ties state legitimacy to such success" (12). We can perhaps better understand this if we consider that American hegemony was initially established on the state's market success: America's efforts to stabilize the economies of Europe after WWII, and the subsequent energy expended in developing and maintaining a controlling hand in the economies of South America through the Chicago School. As America's economy struggles, so too do those who are heavily invested in the country's continuing hegemony feel increasingly threatened while currency speculators predict the next big power.

As has been shown in the examples of privatization discussed earlier, neo-liberal rationality extends far beyond the market, imposed through normative and regulative practices of governmentality that are largely internalized by each individual. Brown characterizes this internalized corrective of neo-liberal governmentality as:

> reliev[ing] the discrepancy between economic and moral behavior by configuring morality entirely as a matter of rational deliberation about costs, benefits, and consequences. In so doing, it also carries responsibility for the self to new heights: the rationally calculating individual bears full responsibility for the consequences of his or her action no matter how severe the constraints on this action, e.g., lack of skills, education, and childcare in a period of high unemployment and limited welfare benefits. Correspondingly, a "mismanaged life" becomes a new mode of depoliticizing social and economic powers and at the same time reduces political citizenship to an unprecedented degree of passivity and political complacency. (15)

This atomization of the individual contrasts jarringly with Hardt and Negri's utopian vision in which 'the poor' are designated as the "common denominator of life, the foundation of the multitude...the very possibility of the world...the field of immanence presented, confirmed, consolidated and opened...the center of the political and productive terrain [and the only force with the potential for] World Possibility" (Hardt and Negri 2000, 156-7; quoted in Moore, 121) and all tiers of society that once were considered the proletariat, the peasants, the petty-bourgeoisie are ultimately rendered equivalent under the vast umbrella of the 'multitude' stretching across chasm between the first and third worlds. Moore writes with pointed but not misplaced sarcasm,

> Labour – once divided into a clearly defined and largely industrial proletariat under the power of the bourgeoisie (but according to Hardt and Negri, forcing its innovations upon the bourgeoisie and thus propelling expansion, even to Empire) – is now a universal and equivalent force. Slaves and professors along with sugar-cane cutters and computer nerds are part of this radical multitude: they only have to further realise

their power, and communicate a bit better, to continue their role of making history and to take it to unparalleled heights. […] One wonders if the coltan diggers in the eastern Congo shovelling the essential mineral for cell-phones, Sony play-stations and NASA space-stations under the guns of Rwandan-backed warlords, are 'conscious' of their new power, and whether their subjectivity was the force behind this constellation of extraction, production and consumption. More traditional analytical techniques than *Empire's* would inscribe their 'objective' position in the global division of labour with less certainty. Or in Zimbabwe, one might ask: who constitutes this segment of universal labour, the horticultural workers spraying flowers to be exported to Holland, or the so-called 'war veterans' (in alliance with a very visible state) doing a little *primitive* primitive accumulation on their own? Is this the emergence of a hybrid of feudalism, primitive accumulation, and its postmodern, *informatisation*, relation? Hardt and Negri try to have their cake and eat it too: they alert us to the complicated mix of peripheral production relations but then get caught up in the homogenising space of the internet, wherein we are all cyborgs. (121, 123)

While the supposition of a unified 'multitude' is clearly ahead of its time, the roots of Hardt and Negri's position can perhaps be seen in the potential of the precarious sociopolitical position outlined previously in Wallerstein's three relevant pasts. Moore notes that they have overstated their case by "ignoring the role of 'hard' commodities such as oil in the economy of the United States, for example [… thus making] the global economy appear to be held together more by ideology than by real goods – and [making] the problem of unilateral imperialism more easily surmountable than it is," by ignoring the very real inequalities in consumption of resources among populations (both economically and nationally defined), and by ignoring or invalidating tensions or outright resistance couched in religious or national essentialism (124). And so, in considering the reality of globalization – politically and economically, but also on the human level – it will prove necessary to temper the telescopic tendencies of Hardt and Negri's vision of globalization with the reality of the continuing (though fluid) role of the nation-state, and the atomization of the neoliberal 'internalized corrective'. The 'telescopic' view hitherto devoted to Hardt and Negri's conceptualization of Empire can be used instead to magnify the larger impact of this internalized corrective at the individual level of society, most specifically the challenges faced by what remains of civil society. John Morison's (2000) case study, *The Government-Voluntary Sector Compacts*, of the relationship developing in 1998 between the British government and British civil society is useful to this end, as it describes a "particular exercise of power taking place outside the formal constitution and how it is structured by wider processes."

Morison advocates a "wider project of renewing and invigorating democracy in those new structures and relationships that make up a wider process of governance," processes which mark "a move from the modern state to an idea of 'cosmopolitan governance' and, as such, [involve]

complex relationships at regional, national and global levels and across political institutions, agencies, networks and associations in the economy and in civil society at each level" (99). Here we have a more appropriate, nuanced vision of what Hardt and Negri termed 'multitude', one that acknowledges the possible disintegration of the civil sphere threatened by the changing nature and sites of governmentality we've discussed but nevertheless insists on maintaining the civil sphere specifically in its role in relation to governance rather than merely in protest or as a site of insurrection against a delocalized Empire. Through Morison's work it is argued that "although the scope of what is meant by *governance* is now widening to different levels and across various relationships, the whole project of *government* is becoming now reduced as there is a *loss of decision-making power and accountability to bodies beyond the traditional state*" (100, emphasis added), a state of affairs which has been shown to reach far beyond the borders of the United Kingdom. As such, the following passage from Morison's article offers an insightful point of entry to discussing the potential effects of the privatization of governmentality, and identifying the site of struggle:

> The point remains that such [extragovernmental] structures and mechanisms continue to make up the reality of government under a Labour regime and it is on this ground that battles over legitimacy, democratic sufficiency or reflexivity should be fought, rather than in the high constitutionalism of Westminster, Whitehall, and the local council chamber. [...] A fuller story can only be obtained by looking at wider processes of governmentality and the changes in the nature of the state whereby stark differences between public and private become more fluid and uncertain as power is dispersed through networks of action that traverse the legal-constitutional boundaries that supposedly separate state and civil society. This is a complex and developing process, involving, on the one hand, a paradigmatic shift from welfarism to economic rationality and, on the other, an idea of non-state actors developing autonomy or resistance to control in a complex engagement between actors from the formal state and those from within informal networks of power beyond the state. (102)

Remaining undistracted by the specificity of his case study, Morison's primary point, that "battles over legitimacy, democratic sufficiency or reflexivity" should be waged in those bodies beyond the (weakening) traditional state which are increasingly the sites where the decision-making power lies (and therefore where public accountability should also lie) seems a rational one, and deceptively straight-forward given the significant shift in political and legal precedent required to extend to private corporations the public accountability traditionally accorded the democratic state. One of the major dangers Morison points out earlier in his argument is that, like advancements in deep-water oil drilling, "acceptance of the main thrust of changing patterns of governance has not been accompanied by the development of any new mechanisms for constraining and democratizing the

new forms of public power" (101). This challenge to Hardt and Negri's optimistic vision in *Empire* is a cause of serious and increasingly precarious imbalance on both a global scale and in the sphere of the individual.

Of course, biopower and governmentality are core concepts in Empire. Particularly given that, in line with Foucault's conceptualization of governance, Hardt and Negri portray a power that is essentially biopolitical, "a form of power that regulates social life from the interior" while constructing its order as "permanent, eternal, and necessary" (2000; 23, 11), thus portraying a paradox in which neo-liberal modes of self-regulation unify all elements of social life while leading inevitably to the mainstreaming of resistance through usurpation into the constantly forming networks. Hardt and Negri explain the paradox as follows: "the refusal of exploitation – or really resistance, sabotage, insubordination, rebellion, and revolution – constitutes the motor-force of the reality we live, and at the same time is its living opposition… In effect, the object of exploitation and domination tend not to be specific productive activities but the universal capacity to produce, that is, abstract social activity and its comprehensive power" (209-210). Because exploitation can no longer be localized (i.e. confined to the 'third world' periphery or to disenfranchised or unorganized lower socioeconomic classes), Hardt and Negri see an opportunity for real, productive resistance only in their conceptualization of a mass agency, to which is devoted their subsequent publication, *Multitude* (2004). In *Empire*, however, they originally present this agency as rooted in the "abstract labor" which characterizes the knowledge economy (Lyotard's Marie is a perfect example of dissociated, i.e. competitive rather than cooperative, abstract labor):

> this abstract labor is an activity without place, and yet it is very powerful. It is the cooperating set of brains and hands, minds and bodies; it is both the non-belonging and creative social diffusion of living labor; it is the desire and striving of the multitude of mobile and flexible workers; and at the same time it is intellectual energy and linguistic and communicative construction of the multitude of intellectual and affective laborers (209).

While this vision is no doubt meant to inspire, the necessary cooperation is not in evidence – particularly in the various fields of knowledge production. Hardt and Negri argue that "the force that must…drive forward theoretical practice to actualize these terrains of potential metamorphosis is still (and ever more intensely) the common experience of the new productive practices and the concentration of productive labor on the plastic and fluid terrain of the new communicative, biological and mechanical technologies" (218), but neglect to acknowledge that meaningful recognition of 'common experience' is hindered by neo-liberal rhetorics such as mediated 'différence' multiculturalism which, in a consumerist-dominated society is used to atomize

increasingly specialized, self-defined groups (think of Badiou's disabled Serbs, Catholic pedophiles, moderate Muslims, ecologist yuppies and prematurely aged youth, quoted in the preface). It is perhaps worth considering, in this context, the role of English as a global lingua franca in fostering the communicative sphere, the new global civil society which seems necessary in the development of individual and collective agency within Empire.

As we have seen during the course of the twentieth century, in order to pursue political ends, the state has been forced to get involved in the market economy. Since then, it became a major player in the economy, and in so doing, compromised its own independence from society[39] and left principles of governance vulnerable to co-optation by the private sphere. This section has offered as example a number of private spheres into which previously state-controlled instances of governmentality have been absorbed, and this discussion I am hoping will lead to a general questioning of the Foucauldian paradigm, his program of understanding governmentality through distinguishing between state power and the public political economy. Morison's emphasis of civil society is powerful, and offers what seems to be a promising revision:

> a major attraction of the concept of civil society seems now to lie with its possibilities as an alternative to the tired old state-market dichotomy. Market solutions may have not entirely run out of steam but there is undoubtedly a search for something to moderate them and a renewed interest in ways to accommodate the existence of power beyond the formal state. [...] Some of this would seem to relate to the connections that can be made between civil society and ideas of citizenship and social inclusion as well as wider notions of civility. Other aspects perhaps connect with the idea of civil society acting as a tonic for democracy. Certainly there has long been a view that [...] everywhere 'democratic government is strengthened not weakened, when it faces vigorous civil society'. Often this means that civil society is given the job of both generating solidarity and protecting freedom beyond the reach of the state, as well as articulating choice. Advocacy of the value of civil society may be combined with a belief in participatory democracy to suggest ways of transcending the limits of traditional, liberal, aggregative democracy. (103-104)

Civil society, as a term, does of course have an element of plasticity to it, but this certainly does not make it analytically insubstantial. In fact, as Morison argues, it seems to point (and very usefully) towards an alternative to the 'tired' and increasingly misleading state/market dichotomy that has hitherto characterized liberalism. Brown, however, makes it explicitly clear that a civil society is not something that can be counted on to develop naturally in our current neo-liberal, increasingly privatized world - a serious turn from Hardt and Negri's 'multitude'. "The model neo-liberal citizen,"

---

[39] See Gianfranco Poggi's *The Development of the Modern State* (Stanford University Press 1978), chapter 6; especially 125-132.

she writes,

> is one who strategizes for herself among various social, political and economic options, not one who strives with others to alter or organize these options. A fully realized neo-liberal citizenry would be the opposite of public-minded, indeed it would barely exist as a public. The body politic ceases to be a body but is, rather, a group of individual entrepreneurs and consumers . . . which is, of course, exactly the way voters are addressed in most American campaign discourse. (15)

Brown offers two examples, both close to home and distressingly recognizable, as further indications that this atomized, neo-liberal 'rational' citizenry is well on its way to becoming the foundational reality for the globalized majority: first, the market rationality of universities, "from admissions and recruiting to the relentless consumer mentality of students in relationship to university brand names, courses, and services, from faculty raiding and pay scales to promotion criteria" - this will be discussed in detail shortly; secondly, and this observation is lately as relevant in Turkey as it is in America, "the way in which consequential moral lapses (of a sexual or criminal nature) by politicians, business executives, or church and university administrators are so often apologized for as "mistakes in judgment," implying that it was the calculation that was wrong, not the act, actor, or rationale" (ibid). This societal shift has direct implications for how English as a 'global language' is used and appropriated by individuals, allowing for acquisition and use of the language to be seen as a factor in a calculation of personal or professional worth and (at least temporarily) white-washed of ties to hegemonic/neo-colonialist realities that will inevitably re-emerge as individuals or institutions question their relationship to and expectations of the language, and English's relationship to the other languages which color their world.

Perhaps it is time to reconsider the assumption that the state is a serious player in the political economy to the extent to which it broadens into the private spheres of 'economy economy', fatally undermining the distinction between public and private and leading, eventually, to the crisis we see developing before us. Although the market economy will always require some form of sovereignty to provide the ideological space a certain degree of legitimacy to the constructed boundaries which provide the tension necessary for the accumulation of capital, what kind of underpinning or unifying role can the state play, linguistically, culturally or otherwise, if the global economy can threaten to render it nearly obsolete - convenient if anachronistic? Hardt and Negri's Empire may be falsely free of national power play and maneuvering – Moore is correct as ever in his concern that their book "may be invoked to see a new empire in the making, but it is very much

planned to give priority to *American* business,[40] and it will be firmly guarded (for a number of months, in any case) by the monopoly of force that all states need, be they imperial or not" (120): the nation-state is certainly not gone, though drastically compromised. Nevertheless, Moore concludes his criticism with an important question, admitting that:

> in spite of its language of nationalism and old-style imperialism, the United States of America is taking on the shape of a new global co-ordinator. Furthermore, if it destroys itself in the process there will be all the more need for a new global regulator. This will be a big government indeed and will raise the question: is it 'big government' *per se* that Hardt and Negri should condemn, or is it, much more prosaically, 'what kind' of big government? (126)

What Foucault can be seen doing in his discussions of governmentality is precisely trying to write *against* that Weberian and Durkheimian tradition, carried on so faithfully in France and Germany, of the deification of the state. Foucault, we must remember, was writing at the tail end of state power, when Keynesian state politics was on its way out (though in France, of course, full-fledged neo-liberalism wouldn't come until Sarközy); the oft-made criticism of Foucault is that he took great pleasure in undermining our established institutions, practices etc., without ever proffering anything in their place. This is the question these authors are addressing: are we losing something when we lose sight of the state? The answer they all imply is a resounding 'yes': we lose the principle of *abstract citizenship*, and with this, the potential loss for some segments of the population of an important aspect of national unity – that aspect which is tied to a sense of investment in and unconditional love of or loyalty to one's country. To combat this sobering possibility, we should perhaps ask how can we (re)create a public realm that is truly public, in which one's ability to participate is not dependent on one's ability to control and wield market resources? How can an abstract conceptualization of citizenship be preserved? And if it were preserved or even strengthened, would this shift the linguistic balance of power?

While it is beyond the purview of this thesis to venture too far into political prognostication, I submit that the nature of global government and the uses made of English, through the maintenance or dissolution of discursive rhetorics shaping its linguistic community, will be intimately and mutually constitutive. The question then becomes, what are the most prevalent rhetorics in the English language teaching community and how do they shape and influence

---

[40] Although this is legitimate criticism, there are a number of other social scientists (etc.) whose work indicates that such a United States-centered approach or narrative is justified given that those purple mountains majesty produced the neo-liberal economics that now form the ideological basis of Empire. See, for example, Naomi Klein's *The Shock Doctrine* (also available in documentary form, for those of us who have been looking forward to a quiet movie night).

classroom realities and presumably those beyond the classroom? This and related questions will be addressed in the second chapter, after a short discussion about higher education in the 21st century in the coming pages. With that in mind, I'd like to redirect our attention to the idea that of course state power has been greatly eroded by globalization and the new conceptualizations of society inherent in the knowledge society discourse, all focused on networks which transcend and in many cases disregard national boundaries. The state cannot *really* affect all the things that would make a difference for its population, regardless of its will or politicians' campaign promises. Given the transnationality of privatized governmentality, it is worth asking whether there is a way to create a public space to foster a civil society that operates on a principle other than the current dominating discourse of neo-liberalism. And, given current sociolinguistic trends, any such global civil society would likely communicate in English. We will focus on the implications of the continuing linguistic hegemony for much of the remainder of this work.

Education in Knowledge Society Discourse

The shift from industrial to post-industrial capitalism that led to the rise of today's 'knowledge economies' has, not unexpectedly, overseen some dramatic changes in the realm of higher education, and the extensive literature produced by the small army of non-partisan international and national organizations formed to monitor and explore the extent of this change is a strong statement of the consideration given to the matter. However, rather than itemizing the undeniably repetitive myriad contributions, we will focus on the issues raised in the representative and commendably thorough efforts of the European Science Foundation (ESF). The thematic reports released in 2008 by the ESF's Higher Education Looking Forward (HELF) emphasize the economic importance of higher education in 'knowledge economies' as well as "its importance for social equity and mobility and for social cohesion and integration" (ESF 2008a, 259), citing the unprecedented expansion of higher education in recent decades and, of particular interest here, acknowledging the "pervasiveness […] of grand narratives – of globalisation, of knowledge society, of academic capitalism etc." (ibid, 262). The following excerpt lays out the dichotomies and paradoxes in the narratives surrounding higher education on the global level, providing a succinct appraisal of the precarious position of this pivotal aspect of the postmodern world:

> While much research addressed higher education's responsiveness to external pressures and requirements, one could also identify a clear strand that addressed its capacity for resistance, if not downright subversion—*escaping governance* as one contribution put it. High hopes and aspirations were to be found in many national and

international policy documents but research tended to point to complex and conflicted realities. Higher education was generally cast as a real or potential *hero* in contemporary society but examples were not difficult to find where higher education emerged more as the *villain,* variously legitimising social inequality, blocking off opportunities, failing to equip the workforce, failing to innovate or failing to take *truth to power.*

Public and private dichotomies were also much in evidence, not just in terms of the ownership and funding of higher education but in terms of its contribution to a larger and wider *public good* beyond the various private and positional advantages accruing to individuals, enterprises and nations. From such perspectives, intellectual property could be seen as the *hoarding of knowledge* and educational goals replaced by *credentialism.* Tensions of these and other sorts could sometimes appear to be creating a *legitimation crisis*. (HELF 2008a, 263; italics in the original)

In the context of globalization, we will focus first on the term 'knowledge society' as a crucial concept in understanding the complexities of the changing roles of educational institutions, not to mention the expectations of students. The HELF reports, citing a personal communication, define knowledge society "as an imaginary space, a discourse which is based on certain intellectual starting points in the analyses of social realities of modern societies, while as a concept it tends to create its own images, expectations and narratives"; they continue, citing Latour's (1988) conclusion that "knowledge society is both the objective of policies and debates and an agent promoting policies and debates concerning its potentials" (HELF 2008b, 11). This conclusion is supported in the literature/discourse, where 'knowledge society' is treated both as the environment in which the discourse is taking place and as an active agent in the shaping of discourse and institutions. I will again quote at some length:

> The discourse of knowledge society is supported by two main perspectives concerning the recent debate on the transformation of science and the university. The first asserts that a radical metamorphosis is taking place in the relationship between knowledge production and university institution. Authors such as Gibbons et al. (1994), Nowotny et al. (2001) and Etzkowitz et al. (2001) argue that governments have promoted national prosperity by supporting new lucrative technologies together with the universities which become 'engines' of their regions. Gibbons et al. (1994) argue that a new form of knowledge production 'Mode 2' is replacing the traditional 'Mode 1'. Mode 2 is transdisciplinary research, characterised by heterogeneity and is more socially accountable and reflexive than Mode 1 knowledge. They argue that universities are losing the monopoly of knowledge production. The other variant of the metamorphosis thesis is the Triple Helix thesis which states that the university can play an enhanced role in innovation in increasingly knowledge-based societies. A second, more moderate view of the transformation of knowledge production and universities holds that academic capitalism is challenging the traditional values found in higher education institutions, where a subsequent attempt is made to substitute neo-liberal values and management practices. Universities become fertile ground for entrepreneurial universities and academics (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997; Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004;

44

Marginson and Considine, 2000). (2008b, 11)

This network-dominated conceptualization of society in the knowledge society discourse adds another dimension to our understanding of the shifts in the idea of nation-state discussed in the previous section, emphasizing the extent to which universities and other sites of knowledge production are very much a part of the atomization and corporatization engendered in the rhetorics of neo-liberal economic policy. Nevertheless, education is seen as a possible avenue towards and advocate for social justice and equality – it may be worth our while to explore this widely held expectation and try to ascertain more specifically the precise avenues available in and through education.

The ESF study's findings with regard to higher education and "the achievement or prevention of equity and social justice" focus on two different, though complimentary, notions of access: "whether certain groups are excluded or under-represented in higher education" and an understanding "concerning higher education's contributions to society in other respects, about who benefits and who pays" (2008b, 12; paraphrase of Calhoun, 2006). These two notions of access are further situated in two different ideological approaches, which can be found to be reflected in the discourse analysis discussed in the following chapter. The first ideological approach has been characterized as the "'liberal' or 're-allocative' approach" in which "attention is given to meeting the human capital requirements of a high-skill economy both efficiently and fairly, to developing a meritocratic selection/allocation system, to promoting civic values and behaviour, in short – to facilitating a society characterised by high levels of social mobility." The second, in contrast, "has been termed an 'elite reproduction' approach where the emphasis is upon the reproduction and legitimisation of existing social relations and the inequalities they represent" (ibid). Inextricably tangled as it is with the notion of progress, both on the individual and societal levels, higher education in the network-based knowledge society is irrevocably enmeshed in a "remarkably diverse set of challenges, competing claims and communities" and thus, "how a university (or indeed its many constituent parts) proceeds to identify, prioritise and engage with its communities reflects a process that helps to determine its evolution and chances for survival" (2008b, 14). The increasing prevalence of institutions the world over advertized as 'English language medium universities' is in part a direct result of the attempt to address these diverse expectations, claims and communities.

To illustrate with a concrete example, let's take a broad look at the educational system in

Turkey. Parents in Istanbul have the opportunity to send their children to public schools where classes are conducted in Turkish and English is offered as either a core or secondary subject, or to any number of public and private French, German, Italian or English medium institutions. Schools in the later category, especially at the secondary levels, are more often than not the lingering remains of the occupation of Istanbul (from November 13, 1918 to September 23, 1923 by the French and British armies) and subsequent Treaty of Sèvres, signed in 1920 by France, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom and the Ottoman Empire, in which Istanbul and her hinterlands were designated a demilitarized zone under international control. In Istanbul alone, there are 18 private English language medium high schools and several public schools whose primary language of instruction is listed as both English and Turkish. These high schools are expected to prepare students for higher education at the top universities, the vast majority of which are Turkish and English language medium universities. Parents who send their children to English language medium primary schools expect them to test into English language medium secondary schools, and from there to attend one of the prestigious English language medium universities in Turkey (most often cited is Boğaziçi University, once Robert's College) or abroad.

There is a noticeably strong native-speaker bias at all levels in all English language medium institutions I'm familiar with in Istanbul, a bias which is supported by the Ministry of Education's proposed plan to hire 40,000 foreign (i.e. 'native-English-speaking') teachers who would be assigned to classrooms from the kindergarten and preschool level all the way through university programs, despite the fact that an estimated 400,000 Turkish teachers are "waiting for assignments".[41] The article cites Ünal Akyüz, the head coordinator of the projects department in the Ministry of Education, saying that as of 2011 there are some 48,000 English teachers in Turkey. Representatives from Eğitim-Sen, the Educators' Union, claim that foreign teachers are paid approximately twice the annual salary of Turkish educators in similar positions, although Akyüz claims "an average English teacher from Turkey is currently paid 2,200 Turkish Liras a month, and foreign teachers would be paid $1,500 a month, which is about 2,000 Liras" (ibid). Other aspects of the program include "establish[ing] English cafes where fun and educational courses such as English through music and English through drama could be both given" to address the concern that English language instruction has hitherto focused on grammar to the detriment of students' speaking abilities, and importantly, only offering one-year contracts to the incoming teachers – a

---

[41] Some 40,000 foreign teachers to be assigned in Turkey. (2011, March 27). *Hürriyet Daily News*, Retrieved from http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/n.php?n=some-40000-foreign-teachers-to-be-assigned-2011-03-27

stipulation which many worry will lead to a double exploitation (of inexperienced teachers by the state, and by inexperienced teachers of their status as a native speaker) without any benefit accrued for the programs in question. This situation is mirrored in the multitude of English preparatory programs, intended to prepare incoming university students for the rigor of courses in (ostensibly) English language medium universities, not to mention English language medium primary and secondary schools. The discourse surrounding native and nonnative English-speaking teachers is tenacious and universal; we will explore it in depth in the following chapter.

Another discursive thread touched upon in the article is brought up by Mahfuz Yalçınkaya, the press consultant for Eğitim Bir-Sen (another Turkish education union), when he expressed concern over "whether the foreign teachers would bring a secret agenda along with their language skills to the elementary schools and kindergartens of Turkey. 'There could be missionaries among the teachers, or they may have other goals like promoting their own culture'." Fear of covert cultural imperialism has led to a strong xenophobia specifically targeting foreign English language teachers in a number of countries, most notoriously South Korea.[42] Understandably enough, this phenomenon is one with which the profession has been preoccupied in recent decades, and is increasingly well represented in critical approaches to ESL/EFL as professionals debate the moral responsibilities of English language teachers, in which one can see a distinct liberal bias against teachers who practice a traditionally conservtive religion (Evangelical Christians get a lot of flack, but no one seems to mind a practicing Buddhist in the classroom) and an increasing tendency towards self-doubt and wide-scale recriminiation as pedagogical tools and approaches come to be seen as culturally biased. These narratives, we will see in the following chapter, are robust in the professional literature and may offer additional insight into the profession's perception of its role, both ideal and actual, in the translation of men.

As previously discussed, part and parcel of the growth of knowledge society (/economy) and knowledge society discourse, and intimately connected with the globalization of English, is what is called the corporatization or privatization of higher education – the increasing involvement of private businesses and the development of a for-profit mentality in education. Just as the worrisome trend complicates the relationship between national government and citizen, so too does it

---

[42]   See for example http://ihateteachinginkorea.blogspot.com/, or the following article (http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jan/31/world/la-fg-korea-english31-2010jan31) which describes Korean activists targeting foreign English teachers.

complicate the relationship between universities and the public they are expected to serve. The ESF researchers have found that:

> These days, the corporate social responsibility of higher education extends beyond producing graduates and research outputs. It requires them to engage in public debates, to enter into close working relationships with private actors and to be part of multiple networks and alliances with multiple actors on various levels including government agencies, students, business, research sponsors, local communities and regional authorities. This linking up with external stakeholders and communities is strengthened further by state policies aimed at deregulation and marketisation. (2008b, 14)

The emphasis of "corporate social responsibility" and "deregulation and marketization" allows the economic narrative to overshadow the sociopolitical, in effect eclipsing both the individual and the intricate discursive negotiations inherent in the steering and governance of higher education. Here, the effect of neo-liberal market policies is complicated by what is seen to be the state's increasing efforts "to govern and 'steer' higher education systems, [efforts which are] linked to underlying 'narratives' of public management reform; and [which] vary from one European nation state to another, reflecting attachment to alternative narratives, conditions of path dependency and localised reform trajectories" (ibid). The resulting emphasis on policy networks and the policy regimes which produce them led the HELF researchers to propose three possibilities in the redefinition of the state: the transformation of the public sphere into a "more restricted and managed sector"; the "*'hollowing out' of the nation state* which is losing functions, legitimacy and authority to an increasing range of alternative actors," the phenomenon discussed in the previous section; and finally "attempts to ensure the *democratic revitalisation* of pathological and over-bureaucratised traditional forms of public administration," an approach which leads to the critique of public servants' monopoly on expertise, and a general questioning of their position in defining public interest (2008b, 15-16). Of these, the very poetically expressed 'hollowing out of the nation state' seems to be the most likely when we consider the increasing privatization of governmentality discussed in some detail here, and the entrenched neo-liberal discourse threaded through the socioeconomic sphere.

As we continue, I'd like us to have in mind this delocalized, deterritorialized 'Empire' as the context in which we are increasingly finding ourselves, and the one which will characterize the geopolitics of English as a global lingua franca. When the schoolmaster Hugh, back in Baile Beag, spoke of the community's ties to Greco-Roman culture, he was referencing the last cycle of what was, effectively, a global linguistic hegemony. More than referencing it, he (and the community at

large, to varying degrees) derived pride and some part of his (their) identity from its persistent, and fully assimilated traces in their Gaelic landscape and culture. The Empire which will contextualize this new cycle of linguistic hegemony, given its delocalized, deterritorialized nature, is not necessarily the 'original' producer/source of English, as the Greco-Roman Empire was for the language and culture of the previous hegemony, and thus perhaps the link between linguistic idiom and the culture(s) with which it is traditionally associated will prove to be all the weaker. We will explore this possibility through discourse and narrative analysis of scholarly literature produced within and for the ESL/EFL profession, particularly focusing on the native/nonnative speaker dichotomy and various conceptualizations of agency and ownership on the part of professionals and language learners of all backgrounds.

Chapter 2: Metanarratives and Discourses

* fluency and accuracy * the promise of accessibility * agency in defamiliarizing the familiar * dead linguistic metaphors * the moral authority of the educator * fluidity of linguistic affiliations and cultural identity *

> What all of us have in common is concern for the English language and for the people to whom we would teach it.
>
> <div align="right">H. B. Allen, TESOL and the Journal (1967)</div>

> Moral authority resides in the role of the teacher; to be a Christian teacher is not the same as being a Christian flight attendant or a Christian businessperson, because teachers act as moral agents on learners, a role that in most contexts is compounded by hegemonic relations of power, race, and language. [...] A more significant point is that nonevangelical TESOL is of course not so pure in this regard either. All teachers aim to change their students (Johnston, 2003), and all have an implicit or explicit agenda. Any teacher who introduces notions of gender equality, for example, may also be accused of imposing her or his values on students.
>
> <div align="right">Varghese and Johnston, Evangelical Christians and English language teaching (2007)</div>

> On the one hand, one might argue that politics should stay out of TESOL; on the other hand, the political stance taken here may be seen as demonstrating an unacceptable normativity: one who espouses leftist politics is being critical; one who doesn't, isn't. The first objection is fairly easy to deal with: the vast majority of work in TESOL remains locked within conservative or liberal frameworks, so a healthy dose of leftism is justifiable as a counterbalance. ...Critical approaches to TESOL are fundamentally political, but the critical approaches discussed here do not adhere in any simple sense to a normative leftist politics. Indeed, we as TESOL professionals need to move away from the modernist-emanicpatory assuredness of traditional leftist approaches to critical work and instead engage with a more problemzatizing stance that always forces us to question the ethics and politics of what we do.
>
> <div align="right">Pennycook, Critical Approaches to TESOL (1999)</div>

Introduction

Having now established the relevance of discourse in education and introduced some of the overarching metanarratives and discourses shaping the field, in this chapter we will shift focus slightly from the realm of theory to the (marginally) more concrete realm of the archives in order to look specifically at their manifestations in the professional field of teaching English as a second/foreign language. For our purposes, we will confine ourselves primarily to the professional organization *TESOL* (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages) and its eponymous academic journal, which was established in the mid-1960s. The organization provides a particularly appropriate focus for a number of reasons: it is the original, legitimatizing organization of the profession, has a significant global following, and remains central to EFL teachers around the world

as a way to become or remain involved in ongoing research, access professional development and lesson planning resources, connect with peers and colleagues, and find employment – schools and universities the world over post job openings on the TESOL forums. Of course, we'll also allow secondary recourse to other TESOL-sponsored publications, and to a few of the more popular public-minded books by scholars and educators, to the extent that they provide more explicit insight into popular/public narrative discourse. In addition to the archival sources, arguments and assertions will be further strengthened (or complicated, as the case may be) through a handful of in-depth interviews conducted with English language instructors in Istanbul working at the university level in programs built around 'English for academic purposes' with a specific 'native English speaker' hiring requirement. While several of the individuals who participated are no longer in the same positions, each participant's identity (and privacy) will nevertheless be protected through the use of pseudonyms and by obscuring the occasional personal detail.

TESOL's mission statement, written in 1967 by its president and founder, Harold B. Allen (quoted above) speaks primarily to U.S.-based educators, and emphasizes both the high demand and marked need for the establishment of just such an umbrella organization. The excerpt introducing the chapter refers to a common, unifying "concern for the English language and for the people to whom we would teach it" (4) -as Allen says- presumably shared by all EFL professionals. Although this 'concern' is not explicitly named, it is nevertheless quickly elaborated upon through multiple narrative-rooted implications, intentional or otherwise. Concern for a language is often interpreted as concern at once for the so-called purity of the language and for its continuation, and likely the continuation of its position in the implicit linguistic hierarchy. Concern for the people to whom the language might be taught elicits idealized visions of Peace Corps volunteers and dusty savannahs, bewildered and impoverished immigrants in urban ghettos: a light evangelical, self-righteous tint which is as present today as it was in the '60s, when programs like AmeriCorps, Teach for America and the Peace Corps were just underway. However, these twinned concerns need not necessarily be read negatively: one of the arguments for many of these broadly humanitarian organizations was to 'level the playing field', and this was also the period of bilingual education, writing centers and open universities. The atmosphere of optimism, naïveté aside, also encourages the acknowledgment of a desire for universal transparency, a desire to render accessible one culture's shibboleth.

And nor, one might argue, was this accessibility meant to overpower or replace other local shibboleths. Alongside 'concern for the English language', Allen's missive also incorporates the

51

following explicit acknowledgement that English is/will come to be used predominantly in very specific arenas: "particularly important are those commitments in the developing countries where the need for English as the language of commerce and education constitutes an immediate emergency" (ibid). Leaving aside for a moment the question of what might constitute an 'immediate emergency' in this arena, English as the language of commerce has long been a familiar notion, and one that has found biting expression in the widely celebrated poetry of Michael Hartnett (1941-1999), who writes, in a poem titled *A Farewell to English*,

> …I will not see
> great men go down
> who walked in rags
> from town to town
> finding English a necessary sin
> the perfect language to sell pigs in.[43]

While the negative connotations of such an association have been with us since biblical times, it nevertheless remains, as noted, 'a *necessary* sin' – one which could even be said to release the local idiom from such unsavory employment. And so perhaps using English as the language of commerce can be excused, but what of English as the language of education? Seeing as we ended the previous chapter with a reasonably extensive discussion of the complex competing demands facing education on the local, national and global levels, it should be abundantly clear that the idiom of education is far from innocuous, and English language education in non-English-speaking countries takes place in a heavily politicized sphere. 'Offering' access to the English idiom as a medium through which to educate the global youth is a gift that many find deeply problematic – interpreted either as an overt move of colonial oppression, or merely as a misguided and ultimately harmful means of undermining the unity of non-English-speaking national communities.[44]

However, as mentioned, Allen was speaking - in 1967 - to teachers and administrators in the United States, and the goals laid out for the organization and its members certainly reflect that. He

---

[43] From *Collected Poems* (2001, p147). As a note which will be of interest to us shortly, Michael Hartnett is one of a number of authors who, for some portion of their career, stopped writing in English. This denial can be understood in a number of different ways – as simultaneously a political denunciation of colonialism/imperialism, a strong act of national patriotism, and an attempt to recapture a lost or fading past. The poem excerpted here was originally published in the collection that was meant to be, as titularly indicated, a farewell to English. The ban lasted exactly three volumes and ten years, although he continued to write in Irish as the mood struck him.

[44] When defending the departmental name-change from English to African Literature and Languages, writer and activist Ngugi wa Thiong'o's argument famously centered on the contention that "education is a means of knowledge about yourself."

urges the establishment of national guidelines to standardize the field, and the appointment of a TESOL specialist to a high position in the United States Office of Education; he calls for increased research and general "recognition of the problem[45] by each relevant school administrator" (6). But for all these humble, if vague, entreaties, Allen ends on a generically rousing note: "The future of TESOL and our profession demands much of its leaders and of its members. But it is a future with rich rewards" (ibid.).

From his other contributions to the journal, the unspecified rewards he promises here seem to be, first, the rewards inherent in the education profession, those associated with the sense of accomplishment surveying a group of students deeply enthusiastic about Thoreau - or, from a more specifically 1960s TESOL perspective, better prepared to navigate the wilds of American public life, who feel the sense of ownership or belonging that comes with linguistic mastery. Students who will walk tall, knowing that any discriminatory profiling will be done purely on the basis of their skin color or dress, and not on their verbal self-expression. The second possible interpretation of the promised rewards is for the teachers more than the community: the opportunity for exotic mobility, and sense of purpose (its degree of delusion largely beside the point), addressing "those commitments in the developing countries where the need for English as the language of commerce and education constitutes an immediate emergency." In Turkey (and any number of other countries) a quick survey at any dershane staff meeting or hazırlık office will turn up a significant number of TESOL-types who entered the profession primarily to take advantage of the short to mid-length job opportunities available in far-flung lands.

Unfortunately, while the global nature of the profession is certainly a legitimate draw, it has had the negative effect of creating a class of "back-packer English teachers," the members of which are perceived as broadly "deprofessionalizing" and undermining the efforts of more 'serious' English language teachers. Clapson and Hyatt, who interviewed native and nonnative English language teachers in France in an effort to establish policy, cultural and ideological influences on the career paths of English teachers in French higher education, quote a native English speaker who "felt more disadvantaged by her colleagues' tendency to view all foreigners as being transient and somehow not part of a team despite years of service" (630) than by the mere fact of being a native English speaker.[46] This is somewhat significant, given the stringent examinations required of

---

[45] Presumably this refers to the number of immigrant students with little or no English enrolled in U.S. schools: very much a local/national program with no clear Imperial undertones.

[46] Clapson, M. and Hyatt, D. (2007). Policy, Cultural and Ideological Influences on the career paths of teachers of English in French higher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*(3), 626-633.

everyone who teaches in French higher education – exams which require fluency in academic, bourgeois French. Any educational institution risks serious damage to its reputation if it is found to be hiring English language teachers without the certification granted through this exam system, and any native English speaker[47] who has successfully passed would, one might assume, have 'proven their mettle' and be exempted from the distrust and overt equation with the English-speaking world. That this was not found to be the case only proves the durability of the perceived transience of those in the English language teaching profession: as Clapson and Hyatt make abundantly clear, "France will never be a back-packer English teacher destination" (633). From the vehement reaction from Turkish educators and educators' unions to the Ministry of Education's plan to dramatically increase the number of native English-speaking teachers in the coming years, I believe it is safe to say that the sentiment is widely shared among those personally and professionally affected – if not always as well supported by the national government in question.

The discrepancy no doubt is due in large part to the fact that, despite the difficult professional conditions and the legislative offensive to protect the symbolic and political importance of French mounted carefully and consistently since 1510[48], even France is home to a significant and growing demand for English. Notably,

> English is not a compulsory subject. All *langues vivante* (LVs or modern languages) are accorded theoretically equal status, something seen as of importance in facing *l'hégémonie écrasante de l'anglais* (the crushing hegemony of English; Legendre, 2003). In practice, pupils and students increasingly choose English from among twelve languages theoretically on offer as their LV1 (90.38% for the 2002–2003 academic year for secondary schools and 63.9% at university). The government has had to respond to market forces and create the required English teaching posts.[49]

---

[47] This article doesn't address bilingualism – being a native English speaker precludes the possibility of being a native French speaker.

[48] Please see Clapson and Hyatt (2007, p.627): "The *Loi Bas-Lauriol* (Bas & Lauriol, 1975) introduced legislation making the use of French obligatory in commercial, industrial, and technological domains. Wright (2004, p. 123) notes that, despite support for this legislation among an intellectual elite, the growth of English lexis use in France and the numbers of those wishing to study English grew relentlessly. To counter this interest in English, the *Loi relative à l'emploi de la langue Française* (Law 94–665 of 4 August 1994) relating to usage of the French language, also known as the Toubon Law (Toubon, 1994) extended the provisions of the *Loi Bas-Lauriol*. Wright (2004) further notes that the wider public failed to consent to the Toubon Law, judging it to be against their interests or desires. Both Wright (2004) and Spolsky (2004) conclude that language policy as a language management tool will ultimately fail if individuals see it as counter to their interests."

[49] Ibid., 626.

That aside from the elite, whose status is tied in part to the status of French (specifically, the 'high' French required to pass the teacher certification exams), a large portion of the French population sees the government's language policy as counter to their interests presents another important consideration with regard to the position of English as a global lingua franca.

But as for his blithe offer of access to the shibboleth of English, it would seem that Mr. Allen neglected (through no fault of his own) to anticipate a number of complications – the two most prominent being the fact that even in the 1960s there were several varieties of English, each with its own stereotypes and associations, and secondly, the enduring stigma allocated to nonnative English speakers, teachers and other professionals alike. In establishing (and complicating) the dichotomy of the native/nonnative English speaker, we will reference the substantial subspecies of critical TESOL writing that deals, largely through ethnographic analysis, with the subjectivity of accent/dialect and the negotiation of identity (primarily through strategic participation) in the ESL classroom and beyond.

Alastair Pennycook and Richard Bailey, two prominent and prolific scholars in the TESOL literature whose work explores the imperialistic side of the global English language teaching conglomeration, both hedge around the ways in which nonnative speakers of English in (neo)colonial contexts assert themselves and attempt to undermine the authority of English and its native speakers. Although Bailey seems to be primarily interested in fostering a benevolent, blindly legitimizing attitude towards the disadvantaged nonnative speaker's linguistic distortions rather than exploring the effects or sources of their agency,[50] Pennycook's work includes a smattering of books and articles devoted to the intricacies of linguistic ownership, locality and the agency of the nonnative speaker. The trend seen in his books is mirrored in his articles (which for brevity's sake I won't enumerate), and reflects the general direction, it seems, of critical TESOL research: studies on the use of English in colonialism (*The Cultural Politics of English as in International Language*, 1994; *English and the Discourses of Colonialism*, 1998) give way by 2007 to a more explicit emphasis of its use by the colonized (*Global Englishes and Transcultural Flows*, 2007; and his most recent book, *Language as a local practice*, 2010). In this chapter, we will look closely at the native/nonnative speaker dichotomy, problematizing the notion of 'ownership' and exploring the varieties of agency available to all members of a linguistic community.

---

[50] Excellent examples abound in the short monthly column Bailey wrote between September 2003 and October 2006 for University of Michigan. Available online at http://www-personal.umich.edu/~rwbailey/links.html.

In beginning this line of thought, a discussion of the metaphorical construction in TESOL literature of language in general and English in particular will allow us to shift gears slightly towards close reading analysis, and begin to think about the sociopolitical possibilities made possible – or obscured – by their presence in the discourse. It will be of use, I have found, to keep in mind the broader discourses of neo-liberal globalization and knowledge society discussed in the previous chapter.

Linguistic Metaphors in Political Context: the colonial metaphor?

> Each controversy hinges on a choice between metaphors, such as the competing force-dynamic models that underlie an invasion and a liberation.

<div align="right">Steven Pinker, Stuff of Thought (243)</div>

In his book *Images of English: a cultural history of the language* (1991), Richard Bailey uses standard metaphors to establish language (as *langue*) as a liquid container, something in which a person or idea might be immersed, as well as a medium in which something – such as education or business - may be conducted. The English language in particular is treated as a more or less neutral 'tool' which may be "used," "employed," or "sharpened." But more strikingly, the English language is given a personality corresponding in part to the subject presented in the first paragraph of Bailey's preface: English as competitive, spoiled - requiring of praise and celebration while ignoring questions of whether it might be "deserving of such celebration" (vii). Implicit in the author's descriptions used to establish a 'characteristic' native English speaker is the further constitution of English[51] as a language about which people can and do feel strongly, can be in love with, something inherent within it (or the individual's relationship with it) which arouses passion tinged with religious fervor (e.g. English is described as having "adherents" (viii)). Bailey's personifications of the English language described here seem both to be implicitly tied to characterizations of the more negatively stereotypical native English speaker, the naïve traveler who assumes that everyone on this green and verdant Earth can reasonably be expected to know how to communicate in English, and interestingly, in the latter conceptualization as something which arouses passion, establishes the language as having a unifying, uplifting or emancipatory power independently of its speakers.

---

[51] It can be argued that Bailey could be read here to be speaking perhaps of one's native tongue in general, but at this point all instances have been framed around English in particular, and thus it seems reasonable to continue with this assumption - particularly if considered in light of the highly politicized context of its use outside of Anglophone countries.

From an initial emphasis of encompassing fluidity as a primary trope through which to understand languages, Bailey introduces harder (but no less organic) metaphorical connotations: English is "deteriorating", "splitting into separate communities" (viii). From the latter snippet, we can identify another standard metaphor used in understanding the global conceptualization of languages on a broad spatio-temporal stage is that of a Darwinian model of evolution, which emphasizes ever increasing allopatric speciation (making use of theories both of gradualism and punctuated equilibrium) and the discourse of 'survival of the fittest'. English, for example, is believed by many to be "at the pinnacle of linguistic evolution" (viii), to have been 'discerned' (chapter one), 'transplanted' (chapter five) and 'improved' (chapter seven).

In addition to this, we ought also to consider two extended metaphoric structures that bridge both the Language-as-Object and Language-as-Subject conceptualizations: language-as-social/constructed and language-as-natural/organic. Both of which, as metaphoric constructions, are dead as doornails (metaphorically speaking).

> Language is the thing about ourselves and our communities we know best. It is our distinctly human characteristic, and in the Anglophone speech fellowship we acquire a body of lore, closely connected with other social values, about language in general and our own in particular. Children […] learn adult strategies of communication before they refine the techniques of form and content through which communication is accomplished. Differences in usage accompany various occasions, and every individual commands many possibilities that can be deployed to suit those occasions. (Bailey 1).

Again, from the very first sentence- though this time of the introduction- this excerpt is a veritable mess of a shallow mass grave, assorted bleached metaphor gleaming through patchy grass. Grisly imagery not withstanding, it is a little difficult to tease apart the conceptual frameworks at use here: we have language as an essential, inherent (and therefore natural/organic) aspect of what makes us 'distinctly human': an 'Anglophone speech fellowship' which holds language to be social/constructed, the basis of a community and of communication. A language is both given (by the communities it makes possible and fosters, one assumes) and accumulates (both of which have different implications when read as language-as-social/constructed and as language-as-natural/organic) a 'body of lore' and accompanying (appropriately specific) 'social values'.

Continuing within the natural/organic schema, we find Bailey discussing "language [as] the means by which we display our origins and express our aspirations...the foundation of our social selves...closely tied to our sense of self," something about which we have a certain amount of "received wisdom" (1). These statements are quite clearly made consciously, employed to show

language as a 'foundation', as both originary, inherent, some part of a 'core of truth' shaping who we are as individuals *and* as social beings, simultaneously influential in our personal goals and ambitions (our participation in a socio-temporal modernity) and itself subject to 'received wisdom', a product of a collective socio-linguistic (cultural? national?) past, a throwback from pre-modernity. Although this linguistic metaphor-landscape is largely made up of 'dead' metaphors, the fact remains that they can be resuscitated, consciously or unconsciously, and have significance in the context of a discourse on a particular language and in a particular political framework.

In examining the ideological implications of these metaphorical constructions, I would like to speak for a moment about the interviews and fieldwork conducted for this project. Recorded interviewees[52] spoke about English as tool for critical thinking, or a specialized, highly culturally-marked medium in which this phenomenon is *most likely to be developed*. The English language, as a conceptual environment, they held, is the ideal site for the development and fostering of the culturally-constituted concept called 'critical thinking'. Implied in both cases is that this phenomenon (critical thinking as pedagogical tool or desired educational outcome) developed organically in the West, specifically in Anglophone academic traditions. This popularly held view is one clear example of the enduring cultural specificity of the English language and English language classrooms, despite assertions that English is an egalitarian, global language.

Another example I draw from a short TEDtalk lecture given by Jay Walker, to which I referred in the introduction, on "the world's mania for learning English." Mr. Walker presents the language as an "opportunity for a better life, job, to be able to pay for school or to put better food on the table," showing stadiums full of Chinese people shouting "I Want To Speak! Perfect! English! I Want To Change! My Life!" Walker ends his talk with the following: "is English a tsunami, washing away other languages? Not likely. English is the world's *second* language. Your native language is your life, but with English, you can become part of a larger conversation, a *global* conversation about *global* problems." He likewise neglects to acknowledge the enduring historical and rhetorical/discursive ownership claims both made by and, more often than not, given to citizens of traditionally English-speaking countries.

Ultimately, in the both the allopatric 'world Englishes' camp and in the more standardizing 'global English' camp, the English language is primarily presented as a tool for problem-solving, set apart from one's native language, which is the site for life - perhaps the medium in which you

---

[52] Other respondents did not agree to be taped, and discussions concerning these other participants are derived from notes taken during conversation.

live it, perhaps specifying socio-linguistic concepts which would shape that life. English here is *misunderstood* as an aggressor, a destructive force of nature which cannot be sidestepped or avoided.

Among the many proponents of world Englishes, such as Jennifer Jenkins (who will be discussed in detail in the context of 'nativeness and ownership') or our good friend Alastair Pennycook, great pains are taken to emphasize the imperialistic implications of a standardized English, to distinguish between English as a national language even *having* 'native speakers' and between an idealized depoliticized English with unharnessed emancipatory powers. On the other hand, proponents of the globalization of English, through the implicit desired adherence to a 'global' standard which follows from the use of a singular English, draw on narratives of English as a superior language - due either to its fluidity/flexibility and the richness thus associated, or to an uncomplicated view of English as somehow 'classless', a tool (singular) the use of which provides access to social mobility.

Although both positions have a certain element of naïveté, they are nevertheless used to great effect in the discourses of the knowledge economy/society and global neoliberalism. One can see, in both positions, a distinctive shift away from English as a nationally-defined, and therefore exclusive or exclusionary, language. As we look specifically at the ongoing and heavily nuanced discussion of how to define a 'native speaker', we will also have to contend with the implicit contradiction between the as-yet unshakable designation/distinction between native and nonnative speakers on the one hand and the ongoing efforts to shake English free of its 'original' geographical and cultural markers. And so, on we go.

<u>What makes a Native Speaker?</u>

> I once read in a newspaper that western people do not consider Singaporean as a native English speaker. However, many Singaporean can only speak one fluent language which is English, if they are not considered a native English speaker, then what is their native language? Chinese or Tamil? If they can't even command Chinese or Tamil, how can they be considered a native speaker of these languages.
>
> > 'seasurfer'[53]

I have to make that decision here @ englishforums.com - it's a tough one! The truth is
that it comes down to (in my humble opinion) a feeling in the text they write. When
there are no clear rules, as in this case, gut feeling tends to win out!

---

[53] Excerpted from a forum discussion at englishforums.com ("the world's largest EFL/TEFL social network"), originally posted Feb 1, 2005. Full discussion available at: http://www.englishforums.com/English/HowWouldDefineNativeSpeakerEnglish/xwmc/post.htm

I like clear, well written and pragmatic text - they may not punctuate perfectly and the wording may include slang. Most 'native speakers' tend to be quite liberal in their application of poetic license. Rich people don't always drive expensive cars - native speakers tend to play with their language!

Response by 'hitchhiker'

This question (as I hope we have all come to understand) is not as straightforward as it may seem, and a significant sub-category of articles in *TESOL Quarterly* address it exclusively and directly – though a definitive answer has yet to be presented in any of the many contributions to the discussion. Diving right in: Jun Liu's article entitled *Nonnative-English-speaking Professionals in TESOL,* published in the Spring 1999 issue, addresses some of these difficulties. She interviews a handful of TESOL professionals who are fluent in another language (there is no graceful way to categorize them – incidentally the problem her article is meant to address), some of whom consider themselves native speakers of English, while others do not despite a long history with the language *and* British or American culture. Liu's participants' "sense of being an NS [native speaker] of a language was deeply connected with cultural affiliation and identity" (93), a connection which has the effect of de-emphasizing actual fluency in the language, or the 'correctness' of the individual's accent. Of one of her participants, Liu writes: "to her, a native language was naturally acquired as the L1 [first language], but an NS of a language is someone who binds the languages with social identity, cultural affiliation, language competence and confidence" (94). Ultimately, what Liu offers is a model of multiple social identities which "change with new experiences and new social interactions, according to people's needs and their readiness to accept how they are perceived by others" (95), laying the emphasis on the importance (in students' minds, as they judge their ESL teacher and consider the nature of their relationship) of professionalism rather than the teacher's status as a native or nonnative speaker, as both have their own advantages and disadvantages, rendering the labels "simplistic and reductionist" (100-101).

While this may seem a pat conclusion, Liu does note an intriguing tendency among her participants: many of them "did not seem to have any trouble defining either the term nonnative speaking professions in TESOL or themselves [...] They appeared to be comfortable perceiving themselves the way others did" (96). She finds this presumed passivity problematic, which it may well be as long as we're merely urging the denigrated and downtrodden towards self-liberation, but what is more interesting in the context of this particular investigation is the relative fluidity of the outmoded labels and the specific rejection of a 'native speaker' label by those who had every right

to claim it – professionals who had emigrated to the U.S. at a very young age, or grew up in a bilingual household – in all cases, people who spoke fluent English and presumably could, if they chose, assume a place in the 'privileged' camp and answer any of the advertisements for a highly-paid position requiring native speaker status.

So why didn't they? A similar tension is played out in one of the interviews done for this thesis: the respondent took great pains to distance herself from America in the postmodern context of 'clearing a space' for herself professionally and personally, repeatedly saying things like "[it's] hilarious, because I'm *technically* not a native speaker… but I have an American passport," followed by laughter. Off tape and among friends will she happily call herself a 'southern girl' and lament the loss of her (southern) accent, and is deeply and personally involved in American politics and culture. On tape or around acquaintances, that she was born overseas into a non-Anglophone family and went to international schools for her early education factors prominently in conversation. It is my belief, and a central hypothesis to this thesis, that individuals whose 'credentials' allow them flexibility in and control over perceived linguistic and cultural affiliation will manipulate their fluidity (some might call it cultural hybridity) to their professional and personal advantage, making that very hybridity a central aspect of their identity, *above* any of the (national) affiliations available to them.

Cecilia Tang, in *On the power and identity of nonnative speakers* (1997), like Liu, also subscribes to a fluid conception of identity – specifically citing Hogg and Abrams' (1990), who hold that "the social identity perspective holds that all knowledge is socially derived through social comparisons" (22). Tang makes this explicit: "the identity of an individual is not fixed but is developed and accentuated by being compared with others" (577). The quantitative survey data that comprises the bulk of the research shows that "a very high percentage of respondents believed that NESLTs [Native English Speaker Language Teachers][54] were superior to NNESLTs [Nonnative English Speaker Language Teachers] in speaking (100%), pronunciation (92%), listening (87%), vocabulary (79%), and reading (72%). In contrast, NNESLTs were felt to be associated with accuracy rather than fluency" (577-8). Such an association elicits questions about the trend towards 'world Englishes' described above. Prominent and charmingly named examples include 'Singlish' in Singapore, 'Turklish' in Turkey, and varieties of 'Eurenglish' used throughout the European Union.

---

[54] Talk about your awkward acronyms.

The implicit distinction made between accuracy and fluency in a language, and their division between nonnative and native speakers respectively, introduces another complicating facet of the native speaker distinction tied directly to competing conceptualizations of language as simultaneously fixed and fluid. The implication is that nonnative speakers have consciously acquired the language, paying close attention to grammatical rules, their exceptions and nuances. Coexistent with this awareness, this aura of *deliberateness* associated with conscious acquisition, is a distinct sense of the language as a fixed, knowable – masterable- entity. All this exists synchronically with the 'unlearnerable mystic' of the native speaker, who is perceived as being more 'fluent' – more able to communicate effortlessly and without special regard for learned rules of grammar and syntax (although in the native speaker these rules are not learned but somehow intrinsically, intuitively known).

Limiting our linguistic terrain to English and the paradoxical metaphors which have established the concurrency of the language as fixed-and-fluid, English is in the distinctive position of having been praised for its 'elasticity', for its sponge-like properties – for being uniquely ready, able and willing to incorporate words from other linguistic idioms[55] and for being so vital, so full of life as to be constantly evolving new and exciting (or distressing) modes of communication – all of which, to the dismay of the more sensitive language users, are immediately welcomed into the legitimating arms of the scrabble dictionary. (Let me be the first to inform you that 'grrl' and 'thang' have been deemed *technically* acceptable and can now be found in accredited scrabble dictionaries, though house rules may have a special provision stating otherwise.)

So can we come to our own reasonable conclusion, based on all this talk of fluid and negotiable identity? Arguably the most stable indicator of whether a person is a native or nonnative speaker seems to be student perception and associated stereotypes – both positive and negative. My students accept my ruling on grammar, punctuation, and word-usage unhesitatingly, even when I am unable to produce an actual 'rule' to render these pronouncements anything other than arbitrary. Ergo: I am a native speaker, the ultimate creative authority, bound only by those standardizing rules I choose to accept, based on my desired effect and audience. The bilingual teacher from a non-Anglophone country who grew up in America? While she may claim hybrid cultural identities in her personal life, her students accord her the same privilege of being both a source and arbitrator of rules regarding the use of English: whatever addendums she may try to add, it would seem that she

---

[55] This has been called the 'salad' effect, in reference to the updated version of the American 'melting pot' metaphor.

too is a 'native speaker'. Ultimately, however, as English inevitably democratizes, becoming Englishes and losing its original geographical and cultural specificity, this distinction will truly cease to have any meaning – even the lingering, shakily constructed distinction that clings tenaciously to academic discourse through the in-roads made by those aspects of the English language teaching profession dominated by global capitalism cannot preserve that which has ceased to effectively exist. Rather, as the following discussion will I hope show, vestigial 'nativeness' will most likely be replaced by the fluid concepts of 'ownership' and 'fluency'.

'Nativeness' and Ownership

> To speak means above all to assume a culture, to support the weight of a civilization. Every colonized people, in other words, every people in whose soul an inferiority complex has been created by the death and burial of its local cultural originality, finds itself face to face with the language of the civilizing nation. That is, with the culture of the mother country. To speak a language is to take on a world, a culture.
>
> <div align="right">F. Fanon, Black Skin, White Masks (1952, 17-18)</div>

> English is now ours, we have colonized it.
>
> <div align="right">Germino Abad, Philippine poet (Manila 1996)[56]</div>

In the preface to *Images of English: a cultural history of the language*, Bailey opens with a narrative of the problematic of English, anecdotally establishing a discrepancy between perceptions of the language's linguistic hegemony held not only by people from Anglophone countries but also people from non-Anglophone countries (collectively represented by "a Pakistani observer") and proffered empirical data about the actual extent of the language's use, thus establishing a narrative of delusional hubris on the part of "ardent" English speakers. Bailey starts out strong, distancing himself immediately from the arrogant and self-congratulatory "English-speaking peoples, [who], riding what they believe to be the rising crest of their influence on world affairs, regularly praise the unparalleled excellence of their language, often tracing it to their economic, political, and military power" (vii), further characterizing his subjects as romantic linguistic patriots ("ardent English speaker[s], gazing with satisfaction at the huge display of dictionaries and grammars at the Singapore Book Fair in 1986"), an ignorant but privileged population unaware of the world outside their protected spheres (they "offered estimates [of world-wide English-speakers] that were absurdly high" and "many asked what competing language could possibly challenge English...draw[ing] on geopolitical mythology...Surely, these friends said, French, German and

---

[56] Philippine Daily Inquirer, 12 August 1996; quoted from Schneider, 2003.

Russian are not serious competitors to English"). English is "their language"; the economic, political and military power is also theirs, as is any misapprehension of the English language's position in the global linguistic balance of power.

But: this narrative of secure ownership (English as "their language"), however appropriate it may have been to cite in 1991 when Bailey's book was published, does not find much company among more recent contributions to the discussion of nativeness and ownership in TESOL literature. Rather, the conceptualization of English as a sponge, a fluid entity, easily adapting and incorporating words from other idioms – as nonexclusive, negotiable and 'ownable' in variance – has come to dominate the discourse of English(es) as a global presence. Here we will look specifically at the negotiation of linguistic ownership as it is studied in the TESOL context, with an eye to how ownership of English might affect the individual's (read, ESL student's) relationship with/identity in relationship to his or her first language and culture.[57]

Jennifer Jenkins, in her book *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and Identity* (2007), explores the concerns voiced by 'native' and 'nonnative' English speakers alike about English as a lingua franca (ELF) in an effort to create a legitimate space for this incarnation of a globalized English alongside the world Englishes fostered in the 'outer circle' as the logical pedagogical advancement from EFL (teaching English as a foreign language). ELF, she argues, is rendered mute by two parallel but conflicting systems of norms - its sociolinguistics and pedagogy – which are further in conflict with existing 'native-speaker norms'. Her defensive critique of ELF-naysayers (primarily applied linguists) rests predominantly on the contention that they have misinterpreted or misunderstood the reality of ELF and its potential as simultaneously globally unifying, and broadly empowering (as long as the native and nonnative distinction goes the way of all things) on the basis of their "belief in the norms of standard language" (33).[58]

---

[57] Like the overwhelming majority of the authors discussed here, I allow for the assumption that language and culture are inextricably linked. This assumption, however, will have serious and interesting implications for the discussion which will take place in the subsequent chapter: given this discussion, what might be the significance of the increasing globalization of English(es)- of a global translation of men?

[58] Interestingly (and perhaps this ought not be relegated to a footnote, but I trust it will nevertheless be read and given its fair consideration), the global hierarchy of nations shifts in the literature from the standard socioeconomic conceptualization of 'developed/developing/undeveloped' and first-, second- and third-world to the slightly less value-ridden attempt at a sociolinguistic map of global English use: 'inner circle/expanding circle/outer circle'. The implied emancipatory nature of the shift is that English ownership (the center of any circle) can multiply, creating a 'multipolar' linguistic world to match the presumed multipolar geopolitical world that is currently on the rise.

With regard to nonnative English speaking teachers' ambiguous attitude towards accepting or acknowledging their membership in an EFL community, Jenkins suggests that these 'NNS' individuals do not 'own' their identities but have rather had them "imposed" (198) by their own and their colleagues' inability to transcend the deeply-rooted linguistic hierarchy between native and nonnative. The wistful refrain of 'Oh, if only we could let them go' is developed a little more encouragingly, as she concludes with findings that this very prejudice seems to be beginning to dissolve and that one day, ELF will be "codified and its status as a legitimate means of communication acknowledged [and] we shall be able to talk about Teaching English of Speakers of Other Languages: teaching the ELF of proficient L2 [second or acquired language] users themselves" (252). While the pragmatic requirements needed to make such a shift remain less than clearly examined, Jenkins's argument is convincing to the extent that ELF promises an English as fluid and playful as its discursively-constructed ideal. But as long as the pragmatics remain out of our grasp, it seems worthwhile to look at how some authors from the postcolonial diaspora are *actually* wrestling with the still-legitimate contentions of English as a manifestation of the colonial oppressor.

Their work with this problem, the discomfort of using the language of the oppressor, incorporates a few different approaches to agency: writing against colonialism (undermining the colonial gaze through the colonial's own language), undermining the 'purity' of the colonial's English through incorporation of the colonized's language(s), and finally, a complete disavowal of and turn from English to the author's 'native' language. These methods of asserting or acquiring agency will be compared to those described in the TESOL literature, during which I ask you to consider the variation in method and effect as an indication of the complexities inherent in the metaphor of translation that will be dealt with on a theoretical level in the next chapter. The first examples, literary in nature, may seem more deliberate, more measured – outright protests or subtle erosions amplified, powerfully, across the English-speaking world *and* the diasporas from which they originate. How will similar issues of ownership and identity negotiated over by individuals (teachers and students alike) in TESOL classrooms be resolved, and what methods will be proven effective on their level? Additionally, will there be any methods available to either that the other does not or cannot access? The literary efforts will be subjected to deeper analysis during this subsequent discussion: here a description of the methods used and their overall effect on the work in question is provided as a means of introduction and initial comparison.

As an example of the second path towards agency in/ownership of English, Ngugi wa Thiong'o, in all of his English writing and perhaps especially in his novel *A Grain of Wheat*, liberally incorporates words from a number of African languages, and self-consciously neglects to provide any of the authorial tools readily available to provide easy access to this unfamiliar 'intrusion' and leaves his reader to struggle towards meaning through contextual clues. In so doing, wa Thiong'o effectively renders foreign the English of the colonial master – he molds the language into something unfamiliar, something calculated to create an uneasy relationship between this imagined colonial reader and his language. One of his critics elaborates: "challenging and overhauling the Eurocentric notion of language was an essential part of decolonialization, and that is precisely what Ngugi does by defamiliarizing the English language for the non-African English readers" (Loomba 2001).

Amitav Ghosh uses a similar device to very different effect, emphasizing in *Sea of Poppies* (2008) the fluid, unselfconscious mixture of English and the other local dialects, slangs, pidgins, creoles[59] – and most clearly in juxtaposition to wa Thiong'o, the seeming 'naturalness' and comprehensibility of such a viscous linguistic experience. The reader, although still denied the easy access of a glossary or footnotes, can nevertheless learn quickly first to decipher and then to readily comprehend the sailors' chimerical language – can perhaps identify source languages or common roots, and pick up the rhythm of the familiar/unfamiliar speech. This comprehensibility of the unfamiliar lends a sense of surprise and wonder at the fluidity of language as a whole, and the feeling that it absolutely *cannot* – by its very nature – be owned by anyone.

Both Michael Hartnett and Ngugi wa Thiong'o, for some portion of their literary careers, turned their backs completely on English, refusing to write in it and instead adopting as their primary medium of communication Irish (in Hartnett's case) and Gikuyu (in wa Thiong'o's). For wa Thiong'o, the decision to abandon English was made during a traumatic imprisonment in December 1977 following the upheaval that accompanied the release of his novel *Petals of Blood*, a harsh critique of neo-colonial Kenya: "The Kenya Weekly Review described as "this bomb shell" and the Sunday Times of London as capturing every form and shape that power can take."[60] This negative attention from the Kenyan government, coupled with a similarly critical and controversial

---

[59] For those interested, Ghosh's primary source when recreating this rich 18th-century linguistic ecosystem was Sir Henry Yule's Hobson-Jobson: A Glossary of Colloquial Anglo-Indian Words and Phrases (1886) – also used by Salman Rushdie.

[60] From Ngugi wa Thiong'o's biography, available online at www.ngugiwathiongo.com/bio/bio-home.htm

play of his, *Ngaahika Ndeenda* (I Will Marry When I Want), co-authored with Ngugi wa Mirii, led to his arrest. He was held without charge, and it was only through the efforts of Amnesty International that he was eventually released in December 1978, although the Moi Dictatorship did not allow him to hold a position at any of the country's universities. He went into exile in Britain (1982-89) and the United States (1989-2002) on learning the dictatorship intended to assassinate him. Needless to say, the Moi Dictatorship put significant effort into censoring wa Thiong'o:

> Thinking that [his 1986 novel *Matigari*'s] main character was a real living person, Dictator Moi issued an arrest warrant for his arrest but on learning that the character was fictional, he had the novel "arrested;" instead. Undercover police went to all the bookshops in the country and the Publishers warehouse and took the novel away. So, between 1986 and 1996, *Matigari* could not be sold in Kenyan bookshops. The dictatorship also had all Ngugi's books removed from all educational institutions. (ibid)

Even two years after the fall of the Moi Dictatorship in 2002, when wa Thiong'o and his wife attempted to return to Kenya, he was met by an assassination attempt and the couple "narrowly escaped with their lives." Thus it would seem that wa Thiong'o's refusal of English was as much a refusal of and attempt to undermine the neocolonial government established in the wake of Kenya's 'liberation' as it was a refusal of the erstwhile colonial oppressors. He understood the Gikuyu language to be pivotal in the movement towards true liberation of Kenya, a 'true liberation' of the spirit and the mind. To that effect, the simultaneous 'defamiliarization' of the colonials' English and the adoption and edification/legitimization of Gikuyu served as the foundation for the ongoing decolonization of the Kenyan mind.

Michael Hartnett's rejection of English in favor of Irish shares some of the 'decolonizing' intentions present in wa Thiong'o's renunciation, although his relationship with the Irish language does not seem to have been that of native speaker or mother tongue. Rather, he remembers listening to his grandmother, whom he claimed was one of the last native speakers of Irish, conversing with other elderly members of the community. His grandmother, however, conversed with young Michael primarily in English. It was at school that he discovered the sociopolitical imbalances and tension between English and Irish, the latter of which was taught to him as an 'endangered language' in the national schools.

On graduating from secondary school, Hartnett emigrated to London and but by the end of 1968 he had returned permanently to Ireland, heralded by the critical acclaim that accompanied his first book, *The Anatomy of a Cliché*. In 1974 he left Dublin, retreating to rural Templeglantine where he worked as a professor of creative writing, and by 1975, with the publication of *A Farewell*

to English, Hartnett devoted himself to heavy drinking and producing Irish literature. In 1984 he returned to Dublin, his marriage of fourteen years over (attributed to his alcoholism), and in 1985 returned to English. The book which heralded this return, *Inchicore Haiku*, is a work of personal memoire that explores the previous few tumultuous years. Following *Inchicore Haiku*, he published a handful of novels in English as well as several translations of classic Irish literature into English before dying in October 1999 of alcoholic liver syndrome.

From Hartnett's biography, it would seem that the Irish language he was drawn to was idealized and romanticized through childhood memories of his grandmother and the community and past she represented. Based on the poetry in *A Farewell to English*, one might see his repudiation of English as an effort to address an enduring sense of isolation from one's community or roots, and as the expression of a feeling that there is within him (and all others who have been cut off from their past by Anglophone sociopolitical colonialism) a 'core' which he cannot communicate or from which the conscious part of him has been severed. Hartnett's return to English, unlike wa Thiong'o's, seems to indicate less an emergence from a reconstitutive linguistic or cultural experience than a growing awareness that the source of the deep psychic isolation he felt was not located in his perceived isolation from an idealized 'originary' linguistic community.

Wa Thiong'o's experience, on the other hand, seems to be emblematic of a very different kind of political and personal experience. Due to his prominence as a political and cultural icon in a deeply unsettled country (and continent), and the variations in the linguistic situations of Gikuyu and Irish, Ngugi's refusal of English is itself both reconstitutive of the political movement of decolonization in Kenya and a powerful legitimating statement of the real possibility of 'true freedom' for Kenyans and by extension serves as an example for other countries in similarly unstable sociopolitical positions. In *Decolonizing the Mind* (1986) he formally renounces English (using the same words that Hartnett did: farewell to English), writing that

> A specific culture is not transmitted through language in its universality, but in its particularity as the language of a specific community with a specific history. Written literature and orature are the main means by which a particular language transmits the images of the world contained in the culture it carries. … Language carries culture, and culture carries, particularly through orature and literature, the entire body of values by which we perceive ourselves and our place in the world.... Language is thus inseparable from ourselves as a community of human beings with a specific form and character, a specific history, a specific relationship to the world. (15-16)

However, his return to English does not undermine the original gesture. On the contrary, I believe it enlarges the original gesture, allowing English to become a tool in the broader mission of

decolonizing the hearts and minds of all cultures affected by (neo)colonialism. The emphasis in his later political activism is on decolonizing the 'languages of sound and image' and encouraging individuals to make use of all available means and methods of cultural production to foster communication between all marginalized languages, and between marginalized languages and English. In refusing English for a period, and producing a number of novels and short stories in the language of a culture 'wounded' by colonialism and ongoing neocolonialism, marginalized within its own people, Ngugi legitimated the language and the culture, stabilizing both within their people. In returning to English, he was giving it back to the same marginalized but newly legitimated population as another – one of many - 'means of cultural production.' An important first step in *moving the center* from the West and creating a multiple centrality.

Armed with the examples provided by these literary figures, a transition is now necessary to the casestudies and research present in the TESOL literature. To begin with, I'd like to introduce two concepts presented by Hall (1992).[61] Hall describes his conceptualizations of *transition* and *translation* as follows:

> Everywhere, cultural identities are emerging which are not fixed, but poised, in *transition* between different positions; which draw on different cultural traditions at the same time; and which are the product of those complicated cross-overs and cultural mixes which are increasingly common in a globalised world. […]
>
> [*Translation*, on the other hand] describes those identity formations which cut across and intersect natural frontiers, and which are composed of people who have been dispersed forever from their homelands. Such people retain strong links with their places of origin and their traditions, but they are without the illusion of a return to the past. They are obliged to come to terms with the new cultures they inhabit, without simply assimilating to them and losing their identities completely. They bear upon them[selves] the traces of the particular cultures, traditions, languages and histories by which they were shaped. The difference is that they are not and will never be unified in the old sense, because they are irrevocably the product of several interlocking histories and cultures, belong at one and the same time to several "homes" (and to no one particular "home"). People belonging to such cultures of hybridity have had to renounce the dream or ambition of rediscovering any kind of "lost" cultural purity, or ethnic absolutism. They are irrevocably translated....They are the products of the new diasporas created by the post-colonial migrations. They must learn to inhabit at least two identities, to speak two cultural languages, to translate and negotiate between them. Cultures of hybridity are one of the distinctly novel types of identity produced in the era of late-modernity, and there are more and more examples of them to be discovered. (Hall 2002, 310)

---

[61] As quoted by Constant Leung, Roxy Harris, and Ben Rampton in *The Idealised Native Speaker, Reified Ethnicities, and Classroom Realities* (*TESOL Quarterly*, vol 31(3)).

These conceptualizations, considered with respect to native and nonnative speakers and the power dynamics in which English is enmeshed, will prove quite useful in formulating and theorizing linguistic (and sociocultural) agency. First, a look at negotiation of identity in the TESOL classroom.

Amy Tsui, in her 2007 article entitled *Complexities of Identity Formation: A Narrative Inquiry of an EFL Teacher*,[62] focuses on the transition from English learner to teacher through the experience of Minfang, a TESOL professional from the People's Republic of China. She begins with the following point of departure: "Although researchers seem to agree that professional identities are multi- dimensional or multifaceted, they hold opposing views with regard to whether the 'sub-identities' (Mishler, 1999, p. 8) should or could be 'harmonized' and 'well balanced' (Beijaard, Meijer, & Verloop, 2004, p. 122) or whether the construction of identity is a 'continuing site of struggle' between conflicting identities (MacLure, 1993, p. 313; see also Lampert, 1985; Samuel & Stephens, 2000)" (657). Tsui further emphasizes the social aspect of identity formation, arguing for recognition of the role played by professional context, as an aspect of the agency/structure dichotomy, in identity formation and negotiation, quoting Wenger's (1998) proposal that identity formation takes place amid "the tension between our investment in the various forms of belonging and our ability to negotiate the meanings that matter in those contexts" (188; quoted on Tsui, 660). What, after all, *is* our investment in forms of belonging and the ability to negotiate meaning in those contexts? For Tsui's subject, Minfang, negotiation and belonging are conceptualized through "engagement, imagination, and alignment" (ibid). Engagement refers to one's participation and investment in any given community, while imagination refers to one's self-placement in the broader world (through the primary community/ies in which we are engaged) and includes the risk of stereotyping and related misconceptions/misjudgments. Alignment refers to expression of power inherent in the process of assimilation (full or partial) of one's "actions and practices" into agreement with the group or community and involves either a positive negotiation of "compliance and allegiance" or a negative experience of "coercion and oppression …[leading to the individual's] dissociation and alienation" (661). Taking place within this triumvirate is the specific aspect of 'the negotiation of meanings':

> The negotiability of meanings, according to Wenger (1998), determines the extent to which one is able to contribute to and shape the meanings in which one is invested. […] Meanings are produced in the process of participation and they compete for the definition of events, actions, and so forth. Some meanings have more currency than

---

[62] Printed in TESOL Quarterly, 41(4).

others because of the different relations of power between those who produced them (see also Freeman & Johnson, 1998). Their relative values, however, are subject to negotiation. People claim ownership over the meanings produced in the sense of being able to use, modify, and appropriate them as their own. Ownership of meanings is increased if many people participate in the negotiation process. […] Wenger points out that the in- ability to negotiate and claim ownership of meanings, often because of asymmetrical power relations, can create an identity of nonparticipation and marginality. The appropriation of meanings can alienate those who produced the original meanings when they find themselves unable to reclaim the meanings they produced. (ibid)

In the current linguistic geopolitical organization, all ESL/nonnative English speakers, be they students, proficient or fluent English users, or accredited TESOL professionals, all struggle to establish their own presence and ownership within this 'economy of meanings'. Likewise, native English speaking TESOL professionals are increasingly aware of this ingoing negotiation and the difficulties inherent in establishing within it their own unclear position.[63] It is hoped that perhaps a

---

[63] The ongoing deliberations about the place of English and its role in non-Anglophone countries explicitly speak to and increasingly require direct confrontations and answers from native English speaking professionals. See for example, the following plea:
"One question I have wrestled with as a graduate student in the field is whether we are unwittingly serving exploitative multinational corporate interests as missionaries once served conquistadors, weakening the cultural and linguistic resources of people in a manner that makes the carnage of local cultures and economies possible." (MacPherson, quoted in Norton 1997), or Ruth Spack (2006), who writes "I imagine most of us remember the moment when we realized that teaching English to speakers of other languages is not an innocent endeavor" and incorporates Vandrick's (2002) request that all ESL teachers ask themselves "whether the colonial shadow may have enveloped our unconscious behavior as well. Are we unintentionally infantilizing students by viewing ourselves as nurturers or saviors (as I once did) or by speaking loudly, making large gestures, or extending excessive or exaggerated praise? Are we unwittingly ignoring diversity if we set a particular Western standard of achievement or language (standard English) and measure students against that standard (as I once did)? Are we unconsciously positioning ourselves as superior if we predetermine the curricula based on our perceptions of what students need –without consulting the students themselves- and then expect students to be grateful for all that we have done for them (as I once did)?" (595). As Spack's tone suggests, emphasized by her refrain of 'as I once did', the native English speaker who finds herself teaching the language is expected to have perpetuated the age-old crimes of the oppressor. But a closer look at the last few questions she poses reveals the strong potential for paralysis in the face of such criticism. Is the teacher to allow students to set the class curriculum, a responsibility which I daresay many language learners, particularly beginners or intermediate students, would balk at and consider impractical, unproductive or unprofessional. They are, one assumes, paying to be taught a language. And speaking as a language learning myself, I often find myself appreciating clear enunciation – far from infantilized, I feel recognized and included. While the question of whether TESOL educators are perpetuating Western imperialism in different parts of the world is one with which each individual teacher must grapple, the strength of the guilt and self-policing must also be tempered.

clearer understanding of the means of agency and sites of negotiation available to both native and nonnative English speakers alike will help in overcoming this hurdle.

The Chinese professional described in Tsui's article began his university-level relationship with the English language in the wake of government-led efforts to overcome a problem described as 'deaf-and-dumb English', in which students who had had 900 hours of language instruction[64] were found to be skilled in writing and grammar but unable to converse in even simple English. The State Education Commission saw fit to recruit a small army of native English speakers (termed *foreign experts*) who developed a new pedagogy called Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) which was accompanied by the release of a specially designed textbook, *Communicative English for Chinese Learners*. Minfang came from an educated family, relocated to an impoverished rural area during the Cultural Revolution "for re-education by peasants" (663). His father ensured that he excelled at school, with the expectation that he would escape poverty by going to university. In this context, "Learning English was highly valued because it offered the possibility of going overseas, which was generally referred to as getting *gold-plated*" (ibid). Minfang was accepted to a prestigious university with a first-rate English program, and familial expectations were high. However, at university he was ostracized for his rural dialect.

> He felt that not only was his English poor, but his communication style was also different. He wrote in his narrative, "Most of the students from Guangzhou were very talkative and communicative, using 'sandwiched English' in their daily conversation, that is, code-switching between Cantonese and English in class. Compared with them, I was an inert and quiet country bumpkin who was ignorant of this cosmopolitan fad." He was scared of going to class because he could not follow the teacher's instructions. For the first 3 months, the teachers constantly reminded him that he was on the wrong page. He was sent to evening classes in the language laboratory tailored for students with poor listening and speaking skills. Despite his good knowledge of English grammar and good written English, he was stigmatized as the "deaf-and-dumb English learner" with "special needs." (663-64)

I would like to draw attention here to Minfang's description of the other students' use of English as 'sandwiched English' or code-switching: this style of usage is typical of the regionalized 'world Englishes' and is a strong indicator of perceived ownership. After a year spent 'standardizing' his Cantonese and code-mixing proficiency, he writes that he "felt affiliated and assured" in his peer group, and able to "completely concentrate on [his] studies" (664). As he progressed in his

---

[64] The methodologies used "consisted of a combination of Chinese traditions of learning, such as intensive study and recitation of texts, and western influences, including grammar-translation, extensive and intensive reading, linguistic analysis, and the study of literary texts (Burnaby & Sun, 1989)" (Tsui, 662).

language studies, although he did very well, he did not feel that he got much out the CLT classes, which he felt were "soft and unrealistic":

> 'soft' because the linguistic points were not made entirely explicit in the communicative activities. Students could finish a host of activities without knowing how these activities were related to the language system and what was learned [and] 'unrealistic' because it required the teacher to have pragmatic competence. Minfang pointed out that most of his teachers had never inter- acted with native speakers of English, had never gone overseas, and had never found themselves in a situation where they had to use English for daily interaction. It was therefore unrealistic to expect them to evaluate the appropriateness of utterances and communication strategies. Moreover, he felt that these activities carried underlying cultural assumptions which required students to assume different personae if they were to participate fully. (664-5)

The expected native-speaker bias expressed here is typical, but although it undermines the authority of the Chinese teachers, whose ranks he ultimately joins, Minfang is nevertheless able to develop significant comfort with the English language, adopting the code-switching habits of his peers and improvising lessons as a new teacher. His negative experiences in the CLT classroom (which he describes as 'a battlefield') and sense of connection with his students allow him to feel confident.

After graduation, Minfang s hired as a CLT "success story" – the 'deaf-and-dumb English student' who rose to the top of the class, presumably through the lesson imparted in the government-sponsored CLT program. The program was considered the 'core' of the university's English language offering, and only the best teachers were recruited to teach it. The English program was further split into a hierarchy of CLT, grammar, vocabulary, reading and listening, with salaries which reflected the pedagogical hierarchy. Minfang was hired at the bottom rung as a listening instructor, with the explicit warning that if his spoken English failed to improve, he could be fired – although if it did, there were opportunities for advancement. In an effort to conform to the explicit values of the department and perhaps become better respected within that community, he at first tried (unsuccessfully, due to poor student response) to incorporate CLT-type activities. After a warning from his superiors, he reverted to the kind of pedagogy he was familiar with from his own early education, (TM, or 'traditional methods', as described earlier): "He said, "My behavior matched my beliefs for the first time since I began teaching." At the end of the year, two of the three classes he taught ranked first and second respectively in the examination among all the first-year classes" (668). He became known as the popular listening teacher. In Minfang's third year he was promoted to CLT and, after a bad review from a surprise inspection, he "follows the textbook doggedly" but was ultimately "caught between his allegiance to his institution and his

73

moral responsibility to his students," who he knew from recent personal experience, were far from well-served by the CLT approach to language learning (670). Over the course of the year he felt his allegiances pulling him: emphasizing CLT through the inspection period and afterward trying harder to meet the "needs and wishes" of his students. High student evaluation scores led to Minfang being recognized as a "model CLT teacher" in his fourth year teaching, and his colleagues were encouraged to sit in on his classes, further emphasizing the conflicting allegiances and feelings of moral obligation. By his sixth year at the university, he "saw himself and was seen [by his colleagues] as the custodian of CLT pedagogy" (671), a state of affairs which caused him to further distinguish between his personal position as unsatisfied with the CLT approach, and his professional persona as its champion.

Once settled into the teaching position, Minfang enrolled in a master's program in EFL: "The exposure to theories and models of English language teaching provided a different perspective on the conflicts that he had experienced during his 4 years of teaching. In particular, he found discussions of the misconceptions of CLT very useful. He realized that accuracy and fluency should not be seen as dichotomous, and that one was not supposed to be achieved at the expense of the other. Similarly, student-centeredness was not to be understood as the absence of teacher guidance." Asked to give a demonstration CLT lesson, a newly 'empowered' Minfang found himself "disgusted by his "dual identity as a faked CLT practitioner and a real self [that] believed in eclecticism." He felt that CLT had been elevated as "a religion"" (673). Leaving soon after to pursue a doctorate in the United Kingdom, Minfang writes: "The conflicts were not resolved until after I left the institution. Now that I am pursuing my doctoral degree in the U.K., and with two years of research study [behind me], I feel that I am more solid and I know what I am doing. […]My under- standing now is that no matter what methodology you use, you have to be humanistic. The essence of CLT is humanism. I do believe teaching is an integrated skill developed through experience, inspiration and passion." (673) Minfang's experience shows how true membership in a community is 'inseparable from competence' and that "Participation is contingent on legitimacy of access to practice. Negotiation of meanings involves being able to shape and hence claim ownership of meanings that matter in the community…[P]articipation as well as nonparticipation in the negotiation of meanings is central to identity formation."

In considering the possibilities of appropriation and reclamation of meanings' ownership, it seems clear that Minfang derived a huge portion of his personal approach to teaching from his lived experiences as a learner – the strategies he found useful as a student are those around which he

built his *positive* identity as a language teacher. His learning strategies and experiences were rendered irrelevant by the university authorities through his reification as a product of CLT; all of his personal 'meanings' developed over the course of career as a student were appropriated and nullified, creating a serious dissociation between his core beliefs and his membership in the university community. That he was *successful* in this community further postponed the successful integration of core pedagogical beliefs and his institutionally-dependent position as a teacher. As Tsui acknowledges, "The sources of Minfang's empowerment were the possession of knowledge and a master's degree, both of which were valued by the EFL community. However, such empowerment, as we have seen, was not sufficient for Minfang to negotiate the meanings of EFL teaching and learning with the powers that be. In an institution with a clearly delineated hierarchy of power, the asymmetrical power relationship, which led to the nonnegotiability of the meanings of CLT, was a major reason why Minfang's identity as a CLT teacher never took root" (677). She ultimately uses the phrase 'legitimacy of access to practice' as the decisive factor in the development and stabilization of the nonnative English-speaking teacher's identity within the ESL community.

Having devoted the better part of the previous five pages to factors in the identity negotiation of nonnative English speaking TESOL professional, let's quickly turn to the other side of the desk and look at the process from the students' perspective. We will start with a case-study of a young ESL student in the United States: Khadar Bashir-ali (2006) provides an in-depth case study of a 15-year-old Mexican immigrant ('Maria') attending secondary school in the Midwestern United States who refuses to learn or use the standard academic English (SAE) because of the social stigma it carries and the affiliations her use of it would suggest to her peers. Maria is the eldest child in her family and had begun attending school in the United States two years prior; as neither parent spoke English, she also acts as the family's 'linguistic care-taker', a responsibility which causes her to miss a noticeable amount of school. Bashir-ali is particularly interested in what pressures cause Maria to deny her linguistic and cultural roots: she claims to be half African American and half Puerto-Rican, distances herself from other Mexican students, whom she denigrates. She refuses to speak Spanish and instead adopts African American vernacular English (AAVE), the dominant dialect among her peers. "AAVE," Bashir-ali notes, "is also the linguistic and cultural identity marker for African American students who use language as a way to define their common histories and establish a social, cultural, and linguistic allegiance to their group in and outside the school context" (628). Given Maria's age, the low social status of students in the ESL program, the

familial isolation inherent in her position as 'linguistic caretaker' and the majority African American working-class community in which she lives, the author's investigation seems to be an exercise in stating the obvious.

However, reiteration of rocky teen years aside, the article also emphasizes the lack of empathy and necessary pedagogical skills on the part of teachers who deal with immigrant students in ESL programs and the negative stereotypes and affiliations associated with "proper English" – and the social stigma associated with participation in the school's ESL program, despite the number and diversity of students served under its auspices. Bashir-ali admits that "an outward animosity between the majority African-American students and the minority Mexican and other ESL students existed in the school, often leading to violent clashes" (632), and that language was used by the students as a marker of linguistic superiority and a symbol of denigration and discrimination. Standard academic English,

> is the linguistic medium used in her classrooms, usually teacher-directed and monitored. This leads to a perception of SAE as being "uncool" and a threat to her ability to access the dominant social hierarchy of the school. "Nobody laks dem, dey a geeks ya know, lak teachas pet," said Maria of those students in the class who follow the teacher's instructions and who do their work. […] Furthermore, Maria did not see any value in learning SAE. Her immediate need as a ninth grade ESL student in a predominantly African-American urban high school was to be accepted and to belong. (634)

The lack of empathy seems to have three manifestations. First, Bashir-ali reprimands her colleagues for their lack of awareness of or interest in the particular pressures and responsibilities many of the ESL students face – some of which may cause an uptick in absence. She also calls for more "understanding of the social, racial, cultural, and linguistic aspects that shape students' identities within the school" and chides: "In Maria's school, many teachers are also not aware of their students' background, and most of them do not make the effort to find out the personal histories of ESL students in mainstream classes. In addition, they seem to lack knowledge of the diversity of linguistic minorities that exist within their school" (635-636). This article, simplistic and self-righteous though it may be, does drive home the socio-economically fractured reality of distinct English dialects sharing the same 'territory', so to speak, and their respective affiliations and statuses. Bashir-ali, herself an "African American of immigrant origins" (629), makes only brief reference to the primary pedagogical problem:

> Teachers need to understand the social motivations that affect the racial and linguistic identities of ESL students like Maria, students who want to learn and interact solely using the dominant social language, while resisting acquisition of SAE… Teachers

must also consider the consequences of using their position of authority when they attempt to impose SAE and its social norms on students. Further research is needed in this area to *investigate ways that would make SAE more acceptable and relevant to students (not only ESL learners) in these urban schools*" (637, emphasis added).

The phrasing used here points to a distinct preference for conformity to the current academic standard dialect over fostering acceptance of the many existing – and largely easily comprehensible – dialects, the approach championed by those who prefer to describe the global spread of English as the rise of 'world Englishes', the proliferation and subtle but increasing differentiation of a large and growing number of local English varieties around the world.

To return to the People's Republic of China, Gao Yihong, Zhao Yuan, Cheng Ying and Zhou Yan's article *Relationship Between English Learning Motivation Types and Self-Identity Changes Among Chinese Students*[65] presents clearly delineated empirical data (a nice change, I'm sure). The motivation types (for learning English) identified are intrinsic interest, immediate achievement, individual development, information medium, going abroad, social responsibility, and learning situation, while the data suggests correlations between intrinsic interest and productive and additive changes, between individual development and self-confidence change, and between social responsibility and productive and split changes. In other words, students who entered English language lessons with a pre-existing interest in Anglophone language and culture were the most likely to experience significant linguistic improvement *and* a reinforced interest in Anglophone language and culture based in a sense of having learned more about themselves and perhaps who they wanted to be.

The correlation between individual development (motivation) and self-confidence (change) was shown to be "largely independent of cultural motivations and self-identity changes" (148), indicating perhaps that students who see English primarily as a tool for success in life derive self-confidence from their linguistic development but their increased ability to participate in Anglophone culture is neither a defining factor of their intended *use* for English nor any factor in their own cultural identity. The study's minor findings, specifically the "polarity … revealed when identity changes were correlated with social responsibility motivation—productive [harmonious] change on the one hand, and split [disruptive/unharmonious] on the other" (ibid). The authors explain the polarity as follows: "This result might point to the role of native culture identity in EFL learning and the ambivalent functions of native-culture-oriented learning motivation in such a context. Some motivations of immediate nature, such as test scores, learning situation, and going

---

[65] TESOL Quarterly 41(1), March 2007.

abroad seemed to have negative effects on cultural self-identity, that is, subtractive and split changes" (ibid). The conclusions of the study indicate that changes in learners' self-conceptualization are directly related to changes in national or regional identity – transformations likely related to the experience of modernization or globalization in these countries. A further conclusion is that "productive bilingualism can serve as an educational objective [such that] Teachers may simultaneously cultivate learners' intrinsic interest, and positive attitudes and beliefs associated with the target language and culture on the one hand, and the native language and culture on the other. A proper integration of the two will lead to productive changes" (149).

These insights, coupled with Edgar Schneider's attempt at a description of the process whereby a 'new' English develops into a recognized dialect, should provide a reasonably coherent and thorough sketch of the various routes and methods of legitimation and agency available to and used by nonnative English language speakers. In his article *The Dynamics of New Englishes: from identity construction to dialect birth* (2003),[66] Schneider argues that "despite all obvious dissimilarities, a fundamentally uniform developmental process, shaped by consistent sociolinguistic and language-contact conditions, has operated in the individual instances of rerooting the English language in another territory" (233), a process consisting of the following consecutive stages: foundation, exonormative stabilization, nativization, endonormative stabilization, and differentiation. Referencing Kachru's distinction between 'genetic nativeness' and 'functional nativeness' (1997, 4-5; quoted on 238), Schneider perceives of and describes English as an organic entity "which is currently growing roots in a great many countries and communities around the world, being appropriated by local speakers, and in that process it is diversifying and developing new dialects" (ibid). The background common to the developing/developed dialects of English is, unsurprisingly, that of colonialism and specifically the kind of contact situation caused by colonialist circumstances, making the development of new dialects a primarily neocolonialist project of decolonialization. Gupta's (1997) distinctions provide non-determinant subcategories for his framework, based on "'monolingual ancestral English' (e.g. US, Australia), 'monolingual contact variety' (e.g. Jamaica), 'monolingual scholastic English' (e.g. India), 'multilingual contact variety' (e.g. Singapore), and 'multilingual ancestral English' (e.g. South Africa)" (235).

In establishing the theoretical groundwork for his proposed process of dialect development, Schneider makes a point to clarify his conceptualization of 'identity' as sociolinguistically constructed (and reconstructed) through "symbolic linguistic means." He cites J. Jenkins (identity

---

[66] Published in *Language,* vol. 79(2). June 2003. pp. 233-281.

"as 'the systematic establishment and signification, between individuals, between collectives, and between individuals and collectives, of relationships of similarity and difference' (Jenkins1996: 4)) and Eckert ('one's "meaning in the world" (Eckert 2000 :41)), further emphasizing that one's identity is comprised both of developing knowledge about who one is *and perhaps more importantly*, knowledge of who one *wants* to be (239). The framework he provides for the shifting/reconstitution of identity thus understood is thus generalized:

> The individual parties who came into cultural and linguistic contact with each other needed to define and redefine themselves and their social roles in the light of the presence of the other groups, of their own historical roots and cultural traditions, and in their relationship to territories and distant centers of political and military power. As these relationships changed over time, so did their identities, their images of themselves in relation to others and the world, and, in turn, their language usage as an expression of these changing identities. (240)

Schneider sees the reconstitution of group identities as following a cyclical pattern along the lines of 'us' versus 'other' as the 'other' becomes familiar and forms a new 'us'-based relationship with the 'original us' and allowing for a new 'other', against which appropriate linguistic shibboleths much be erected, thus reconstituting the linguistic ecology of the region. Having established this, the second primary factor is "the ecology and ethnography of the socio-political and, consequently, communicative relationship between the parties involved in a colonization process, a factor which [he calls] the STRANDS OF COMMUNICATIVE PERSPECTIVE" (242, and yes, he is a fan of fully-capitalized 'terms of interest'). Naturally enough, the two primary perspectives are those of the colonizers and the colonized, both of which he incorporates by providing space for both in each of the developmental stages. These competing but complementary perspectives are understood to be inextricably interwoven and to some extent mutually constitutive and their simultaneous presence is offered as an improvement on the English as a Native Language (ENL) and English as a Second Language (ESL)/Inner and Outer Circle designations, which categorizes regions without consideration for the diversity of speech communities it may hold. Thus, "the stages and strands of this process are ultimately caused by and signify reconstructions of group identities of all participating communities, with respect to the erstwhile source society of the colonizing group, to one another, and to the land which they jointly inhabit" (244). In the initial 'foundation' stage, Schneider makes an important distinction generally overlooked: that

> Typically, settlers come from different regional backgrounds, and, thus, do not behave linguistically in a homogeneous way, being native speakers of different regional and/ or social dialects. Accommodation theory predicts that to secure communication in such a situation, forms that are widely used and shared by many will be communicatively successful and will therefore be used increasingly, while forms that are not likely to be

widely understood, that is, strong regionalisms or group markers, will frequently result in communication failure and will thus tend to be avoided. Thus, within the STL [settler] strand and predominantly in large-scale colonization settlement and in informal and oral contexts, over time speakers will mutually adjust their pronunciation and lexical usage to facilitate understanding. (ibid)

Local language influences the development of the budding dialect at first passively, as resident English speakers become familiar with indigenous customs and objects, flora and fauna. And thus develops "an English vocabulary segment of local significance, largely consisting of loans" (246). The indigenous strand has irreparably marked the local English community: "It can be assumed that at this stage the identity of the local English community expands to encompass something like 'English plus': genuinely British no doubt, but seasoned with the additional flavor of the extraterritorial experience which those who stayed 'home' do not share, an experience which finds expression in the adoption of indigenous words. And it may be assumed that this emerging 'English-cum-local' identity carries a positive attitude and is construed as an enriching experience in the service of the less challenging, distant home country" (ibid). On the other side of the tracks, English becomes a social marker of the indigenous elite, and their "identity is enriched in a fashion not unsimilar to that of the English immigrants they associate with: certainly their self-perception at this stage remains that of members of the local community, but at the same time their ability to communicate with the Europeans opens their eyes to aspects of another worldview and gives them an extra edge of experience and competitiveness within their own group."

From this stage develops 'structural nativization', in which the following means of contact-driven change emerge: "code switching, code alternation, passive familiarity, second-language acquisition strategies, and … negotiation, the case 'when speakers change their language (A) to approximate what they believe to be the patterns of another language or dialect (B)'" (246). As the linguistic situation develops into phase three, nativization, it enters "the central phase of both cultural and linguistic transformation in which both parties involved realize that something fundamental has been changing for good: traditional realities, identities, and sociopolitical alignments are discerned as no longer conforming to a changed reality, and the potentially painful process of gradually replacing them with something different, a new identity reflecting a changed reality, combining the old and the new, is in full swing" (247). The 'settlers' at this point are expected to be transitioning from "the acceptance of a distant mother country as the source of both political power and linguistic and cultural guidance to gradual independence" (247), while for the first time, the two strands have become inextricably intertwined. Although,

they are unlikely to be equal partners in this process: While the STL-strand group also

incorporates some elements of local culture in its identity construction and symbolization (including select linguistic elements), the labor of mutual approximation tends to be assumed primarily by members of the IDG strand group, who undergo a process of linguistic and cultural assimilation and large-scale second language acquisition (Schumann 1978). This process is likely to lead to language shift-even if power relationships interfere and the process becomes not only one of peaceful and voluntary assimilation but also 'a site of struggle' (Norton2000:128; cf. Gumperz& Gumperz 1982). A case in point would be the far-reaching adoption of English by the Maoris. (247-8)

To continue, the fourth phase (endonormative stabilization) "is marked by the gradual adoption and acceptance of an indigenous linguistic norm, supported by a new, locally rooted linguistic self-confidence" (249-50). In this stage, a *new* indigenous identity has developed and stabilized, complete with "psychological independence" and "the acceptance of local forms of English as a means of expression of that new identity" understood to be "distinct from the norms of the original colonizers" (250-251). In the last phase, differentiation, the new nation emerges as a politically and culturally independent entity with a distinct language variety. "However, this is not the end point of linguistic evolution; rather, it is a turning point from which something new springs: the stage of dialect birth. Once a solid national basis has stabilized, one's global, external position is safe and stable, as it were, and this allows for more internal diversification" (253). What Schneider ultimately tries to argue is that the colonized countries have *already* had significant effect on the English language, enough so that they would be justified in asserting part-ownership in the inevitably occurring creative partnership between the 'settlers' and the 'indigenous' population.

So here we have seen several means of asserting ownership: participating in the negotiation of meanings, incorporating other speech communities' linguistic idioms (code switching or 'sandwiching'), consciously adopting dialects outside the accepted standard that better suit one's current or desired self-identity, or simply by coming to English from a variety of 'learner motivations' and taking from the language exactly what one needs and no more. Each has the effect of undermining the conceptualization of English as truly *belonging* to a colonizing or imperialistic 'West' as something that must be taken whole with all of its lingering 2D cultural stereotypes, instead revealing the extent to which the evolving cultural meanings have been 'joint ventures' throughout the colonial period of expansion and well into our century. While the '2D stereotypes' *are* pernicious, they are on a shaky foundation. Just because the first and largest professional association devoted to teaching English as a second language developed in America does not seem to provide sufficient reason for a continued monopoly on its cultural production. And particularly given the global expansion of groups like TESOL to include vast scores of 'nonnative English

speaking professionals' and developing distinctions between 'genetic native speakers' and 'functional native speakers', it would seem that its members have made it clear that the monopoly is only a memory - and one which should begin fading any minute now.

The following section will provide some initial insights into how university level English teachers and students in Istanbul are negotiating the struggle between institutionally-perceived definitions of 'nativeness,' their own perceptions of English-medium education, and an increasingly explicit awareness that such definitions are not necessarily valid or particularly meaningful. But the fact remains that the global economy is unsteady, unemployment is high, and institutions all over the world are offering comparatively well-paid positions to traditionally defined native English speakers who are willing to experience the uncertainty of life abroad.

The Expatriate Discourse: TESOL on the ground in Istanbul

> It feels like a consulate in [the English teachers'] office. If the office were full of Turkish people, someone would have asked me what I needed or what I was doing there. Instead, I was ignored for almost half an hour.
>
> -Turkish university student (my translation)

> And so they go [abroad], and they're used to teaching in a certain way with a certain type of student, that ...isn't ...all memorization-based and they get there and they try to develop a context and have the students talk about the context before they go into the teaching, and the students are waiting to be told what to memorize. And so there's this disconnect between the teacher and the student. There's this *huge* disconnect, which you can always tell who's somebody new who's just arrived to Japan because they have- their mind is blown and they don't know how to reach these students. 'Cause it's a language. How do you teach a language if they're not...voicing ideas with you? Because they have to speak. So you get a lot of [TESOL] forum comments like that. […] The further East you go, the worse it gets. And- it's true. It's true because I say it's true! I don't need evidence to prove it! (laughs, coughs). [...] And so yes, I have had some of that [in Istanbul]. Some. Not as extreme as it was in Korea.
>
> - Instructor A (2010 interview)

> The joke I always tell is that I've been all around Turkey- to Urfa, to Diyarbakır, and the hardest place I've ever been in Boğaziçi campus, 'cause I completely- the educational culture is so different. …I think primarily, at least in -and I'm sure this is your experience too- in the American educational system a certain degree of combativeness, or competitiveness is rewarded.
>
> - Instructor B (2010 interview)

The ethnographic portion of this work serves to provide a 'real world' context within which to explore the themes and theories hitherto discussed in the archival and literary analyses. To that end,

the following explanation may be useful: all quotations discussed here are derived from two recorded and ten unrecorded narrative interviews with 'native' English speaking instructors teaching at the university level in Istanbul, as well as from field notes accumulated over the past academic year (2010-2011). Participants hail from all corners of the English-speaking world, although predominantly from America, Canada, Britian and Ireland; most of the participating individuals have some formal training as an ESL teacher, and all but one participant have a master's degree or higher. All but three or four of the participants are functionally monolingual, while the remaining are bilingual or multilingual. To protect the anonymity of the participants, identifying details concerning their place of employment or their own backgrounds have been modified.

Quite apart from the obvious convenience, that this ethnographic research was carried out in Turkey is of some significance. We have been talking about neo-colonial and post-colonial situations, but Turkey is not exactly a former colony - though in the evening of its incarnation as the Ottoman Empire it had been host to European and American military forces, and it has since maintained reasonably close ties with America (allowing the US to attack Iraq from bases in Anatolia, for example, and during the Cold War harbored a U.S. nuclear bomb pointed at Russia – the root of the Cuban Missile Crisis). The country's relationship with the EU is complex, as it remains the largest market for Turkey's exports (which have, incidentally, grown exponentially in the last decade) and many countries, though most famously Germany, have significant Turkish populations whose second and third generations are now struggling to create spaces for hybrid cultural identification.

Kevin Robins begins his essay *Interrupting Identities: Turkey/Europe*[67] with a reference to Adonis who, "in the context of the Arab world, refers to 'an illusory, specious modernity', [argues] that 'the intellectual principles which gave birth to modernity are lost to us, their substance wiped out'" - from which Robins concludes that "exposure to modern culture (that is to say, western culture) resulted not in cultural creativity and emancipation, but in conformism and dependency ... Westernization seemed to threaten everything, especially [historically-derived] meaning" (Hall and du Gay, 62-3). Against this is posed a "protective retreat into the closure of tradition [which] in fact represents 'a dependency on the past, to compensate for the lack of creative activity by remembering and reviving'" (ibid). Thus is imposed a false, polarized 'choice' between assimilating an "alien modernity" and retreating into 'the closure of tradition' – both promising unsustainable dependencies and "an obliteration of personality... a borrowed mind, a borrowed life' (Adonis,

---

[67] Chapter 5 in Hall and du Gay's edited volume *Questions of Cultural Identity* (1996, pages 61-86).

quoted by Robins, 63). In seeking ways to transcend this false polarity, Robins presents Turkey as a grounds for:

Turkey, Robins writes, has been the poster child for the European center's insensitive relationship to what it perceives to be its peripheries: Europe demands a sacrifice, that Turkey "assimilate western values and standards" as markers of a universal culture, but refuses to acknowledge any sacrifices made, clinging instead to a Platonic understanding of intrinsically, necessarily inferior mimesis. "The Turkish case simply shows how far it is possible to pursue this elusive universal culture, yet still be derided and rejected" (66). He continues:

> Turkey made its sacrifice; it made the westward turn. From the period of the *Tanzimat* reforms, through to the movements of the Young Ottomans and Young Turks, the Ottoman Empire struggled to find some accommodation to Europe. The social 'revolution' undertaken by Mustafa Kemal (Atatürk) in the 1920s was the culmination of this long process. Turkey opened itself unconditionally to the forces of western modernization. 'We cannot close our eyes and imagine that we live apart from everything and far from the world,' Mustafa Kemal declared. 'We cannot shut ourselves in within our boundaries and ignore the outside world. We shall live as an advanced and civilized nation in the midst of contemporary civilization'. […] It was resolved to adopt the western institutions of nationalism and the nation state. Westernization was the road to salvation for the Turkish people, and its adoption was to be absolute.
> What has been achieved? What kind of modernization and national culture has been instituted in the Turkish Republic? Turkey's modernization has been an arid and empty affair…Modern Turkish culture has been imitative and derivative in its emulation of the European model…Cultural meaning is created only through affiliation and comparison to the western ideal: the Turkish elites have constantly measured their achievement according to their resemblance to the European model (or, rather, their image of what it is). (67)

While this is the standard narrative of Turkey's relationship with Europe, Robins prefers to look at it in terms of what modern Turkey, in its project of modernization, has closed itself off from – namely the "disavowal and suppression of historical memory in the collectivity" and the "denial and repression of the actuality of Turkish culture and society" (68). The Turkish state that emerged from this disavowal was one fundamentally opposed to its cosmopolitanist Ottoman past, adopting with regard to its minority populations policies of exclusion, followed by assimilation and integration. However, this national project of homogenization (incidentally one of the principal concerns ranged against globalization) has, since the 1980s, faced a "proliferation of Islamic publications, the growing recognition of ethnic heterogeneity [and] increasing references to the Ottoman past" – in short, what Robins sees, in line with Nilüfer Göle, as "the real Turkey reasserting itself against official and state culture" (72). The increasing globalization of the world, which has brought

transnationalism to a new level in all spheres - from economics to art – and the shifting geopolitics since the end of the Cold War outlined by Wallerstein, has also shifted perception of the world's growth. The Middle East is increasingly the center of attention, an area of cultural and political revolutions, and moreover, an area in which Turkey's strategic importance is not to be sniffed at; no longer does it seem as though everyone were trailing after Europe and America.

Turkey's system of higher education certainly reflects this new sense of opening and expansion. From the 21 state universities operating in 1981, the Turkish higher education sphere has by 2010 exploded to include 94 state universities and 45 *vakf* (foundation) universities, with an estimated 30% of students attending the new private universities by 2008.[68] Unsursprisingly (states are notoriously slow to fund higher education), while the number of students at the university level tripled between 1982 and 1996, funding increased by only 15-20 percent (ibid). Sargın's (2007) discussion of the public sector's inability to provide for the growing student population impresses upon us the comparative prevalence of private sector *vakf*-run institutions. Full disclosure: Sabancı University, I suppose it should be noted, is one of these private universities- most of which are run by a board of directors, a system modeled after that of the US and established in the 1981 university reforms. International for-profit companies, such as Laureate,[69] have controling interest in several universities, negatively impacting some instructors' idealized understanding of their role in higher education and shifting students' understanding of their relationship to their education and the university – broadly mechanizing at each level.

When asked about the challenges of teaching English to Turkish university students, the first thing mentioned is the lack of "critical thinking skills" which, it is assumed, have been sacrificed to the multiple-choice exam-centered nature of the Turkish education system from which the students have emerged (which is referred to as "test-minded," "memorization-based" and "dulling"). Students, their English teachers complain, don't know how to write or how to develop and support an argument rather than simply assert their opinion or regurgitate their textbook. Instructor W expresses a different view of the matter:

> I actually think the testing is only part of the problem, I think that the primary problem
> is actually the hegemonic nature of hierarchical and authoritarian structures. Until and
> unless schools treat students as social equals and teachers as consultants who are

---

[68] Soysekerci, S. and Erturgut, R. (May 2010). Anatomy of a period: Structural transformation in the Turkish higher education system between 1981 and 2009. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 2*(2); 3477-3482.

[69] http://www.laureate.net.

providing the service of education, students cannot develop the skills with which to use their education as an expressive device. I am articulate not simply because I've had a great material education, but also because my educational system since middle school respected me as the author of my thoughts.

And strangely, in Turkey, when I was around uneducated people, they were often more open to expressing ideas -- no matter how uninformed they were -- than educated people and I think it has everything to do with being in a position outside of the hierarchical hegemonic systems imposed through education. […] It's idealistic, sure. But I just don't see the point of education otherwise. (personal communication)

Regardless of the instructor's level of idealism, though, the general attitude towards their students was characterized and colored by their perceived deficiencies, broadly centered around the previously mentioned lack of 'critical thinking skills'.

The 'disconnect' between teacher and student described by Instructor A is readily apparent, as students complain that the classes have little to no bearing on the rest of their academic studies, and like Minfang see the vaguely 'skills-based' activities as largely irrelevant and often demeaning. Some students expressed the sentiment that many of the 'imported' teachers are perhaps not competent to teach at the university level, or that the classes themselves are not appropriate. Most first-year students' curriculum included a Turkish class in which much of the "generic critical thinking thing" (my translation) was duplicated, without the language barrier, thus further rendering irrelevant the classes taught by the English language teachers. Students' insecurities or recalcitrance about the language barrier surfaced once again in the feeling many shared that the English language teachers judge them on their performance in the classes without taking into account the difficulty of performing well in a language with which they are only partly familiar. They were all aware of, and remarked on, the predominantly monolingual nature of the English language departments.

While the more monolingual teachers showed a tendency to generalize from their own students to the Turkish population at large (without any seeming awareness of the relative quality of the universities at which they were employed, and thus the relative quality of the students within the spectrum of all Turkish university-level students), more acculturated teachers with linguistic access to and varying levels of interest in the local culture occasionally do make similar points (about the testing-centered nature of Turkish education and its perceived effects), but don't seem to have this general theory that they, as a people, lack 'critical thinking' skills or the ability to engage in abstract thought. That these values seem to be embedded in the Anglophone culture of most of the teachers

is in line with Dwight Atkinson[70], who calls for teachers to be "cautious" about trying to incorporate critical thinking pedagogies for the following reasons:

> (a) Critical thinking maybe more on the order of a non-overt social practice than a well-defined and teachable pedagogical set of behaviors; (b) critical thinking can be and has been criticized for its exclusive and reductive character; (c) teaching thinking to nonnative speakers may be fraught with cultural problems; and, (d) once having been taught, thinking skills do not appear to transfer effectively beyond their narrow contexts of instruction. (71)

Further discussions on the matter reveal some very funny misconceptions, for example that the complex mathematics required in the entrance exams for Turkey (surely advanced abstract thinking) are not seen by the teachers as anything other than rote learning. In contrast, classroom activities in the English language classrooms are student-centered, based on groupwork, attempts on the part of the department to foster student agency. Many of the instructors expressed the opinion that their Turkish colleagues teaching 'core' content-based courses do their students a disservice, that they ignore the needs of the students and perform their job as if they were "sifting" for the best students. The English language instructors, on the other hand, think of themselves as "democratically" catering to all of the students, making sure "that no student is left behind"[71]

When asked how they understand the place of the English language, in education or more broadly, instructors tended to talk about English as the "defacto" language of the global economy, necessary for success – it is seen as feature of the landscape that everyone has to reckon with. These views were supported with anecdotal evidence of students who couldn't "manage" to learn English at their university now seeking private lessons. Teachers from backgrounds who are familiar with English as a colonial or imperial aggressor (i.e. India or Ireland) can see the language (and their lessons) as an imposition, which has the effect of making them more sensitive to the way that students might feel – these instructors can speak to student resentment and have more empathy with language learning process. Unfortunately, I do not have any data regarding student perception of these instructors, but I hypothesize that they are more respected in the classroom than their monolingual colleagues.

With regard to the matter of cultural 'translation', I spoke with a small minority of the

---

[70] *A Critical Approach to Critical Thinking in TESOL*. Published in TESOL Quarterly, vol 31(1), Spring 1997, pages 71-94.

[71] This is a particularly interesting turn of phrase, as it refers to the educational 'reforms' implemented under George W. Bush which required all schools to pass a slew of tests in order to receive federal funding. The reforms are popularly, if ironically, known by the moniker "No Child Left Behind".

participating English language teachers who had devoted a reasonably significant amount of effort to gaining access to the Turkish shibboleth, and were more or less integrated into Turkish society. They were married to Turkish spouses and took great (but quiet) pride in their mastery of the language. Both (I did say 'small minority') communicated with their spouses primarily in Turkish, though both spouses were very comfortable in English as well. Instructor K is raising his three children to be bilingual, and sending them to public schools in Istanbul.[72] He emphasizes 'not wanting them to feel like outsiders' and while he participates fully in all aspects of their lives, he nevertheless remains loyal and consistent to his own beliefs and sense of self-identity. For example, he tells a story of taking his eldest daughter to school on a Friday, and remaining seated through the national anthem. The example he sets for his children will, he hopes, encourage them to discover for themselves 'who they are' and that this identity need not conform to perceived social or cultural boundaries. Incidentally, his eldest daughter is very protective of her father and when, for example, school friends suggest that he 'sounds weird,' she is quick to defend him. All this to say that instructor K is fully immersed in Turkish language and culture but has become so while remaining fully recognizable to himself, and without compromising any aspect of his 'original' cultural identity. And how is it that these individuals don't feel that they've lost their identity at all? How have they become integrated without 'Becoming Turkish'? It would seem that the largest parts of their identity are derived from aspects of themselves unrelated to their national origins, such as coming from a working class background, or membership in the socialist workers' party.

On the other hand is the majority of the participants whose Turkish is functionally nonexistent, despite having been in the country between two and eight years. These individuals can be roughly divided into two groups: 'career expats' who, while living in Istanbul and not particularly transient, have made little to no effort to get to know their host culture and instead live in what they occasionally, laughingly, refer to as 'an English-speaking bubble'[73]; and the second group, which is more transient, only expecting to stay in Istanbul for a year or two after which they will seek a similar job in another country – the "back-pack English teachers" referred to by Clapson and Hyatt approximately thirty-five pages ago. Neither of these groups have any interest in 'putting

---

[72] This is significant, as two or three other instructors who have children with a Turkish spouse are sending their children to private international schools (English language medium), and in one case, the instructor is not claiming Turkish citizenship for the child.

[73] By which is meant that they frequent restaurants with English-speaking wait-staff, they are employed in English-language institutions, their friends are primarily other expats – they bank in English, go to the English-speaking gyms.

down roots' in Turkey, and in fact put not insignificant stock in their perceived freedom and enjoyment of a 'jet-setting' lifestyle.

It is worth noting that *all* of the participants are (or were) employed at private institutions of higher education, and the time spent untangling the mass of conflicting responsibilities of educational institutions operating within a corporatized 'knowledge-based society' will finally be of explicit use. First, we will explore the disjuncture between the perceived purpose or validation of the English language programs and its failure to live up to there ideals from the respondents' point of view. Informant A spoke quite frankly about this, responding passionately when asked whether there was anything she thought the program was supposed to do for the university.

> Oh! My god! It's academic skills! Yes! This program is trying to bridge the gap between high school ...in Turkey...and international university standards. Not Turkish university standards- I don't know other universities in Turkey in terms of their standards. But in terms of internationally, what we expect university students to be like- and they're trying to bridge that gap.

From this abstract discussion, she focused on part of what had caused the program to fail:

> under [new Administration] it [the atmosphere of the program/department] relaxed, in terms of 'okay, we don't need all these meetings' whatever, but then he's hiring people who come in with any old masters. Who *don't* necessarily have the educational background. And so, whereas I think one end would have been okay, or the other end been okay, in terms of okay fine, we'll relax the master's degree but we'll continue having these meetings, so that those *with* the experience can mentor those without. OR we keep the strict requirements and we loosen up how much we force each other to work with each other, but it doesn't matter because we all have this background, we're all here *because* we know, and we can sort of go willy-nilly and explore on our own. But I think it was the two coming in together that a bunch of people just flailing (makes *poof* gesture with hands).

It is clear that these programs and the individuals participating in them face a mosaic of administrative difficulties, different educational expectations, and a sense of both being qualified on the basis of fluency/training in education but uneasy navigation of the social and professional tensions inherent in a field where qualification is often perceived to be connected more to nationality than merit or talent.

On the part of other (Turkish) faculty (speaking from observations in the field) there seems to be a strong discourse of and distinction between themselves and their colleagues as proper academic faculty on the one hand, and on the other, individuals hired as native English speaker instructors as 'support staff'. This is very much the sort of tension that Instructor B finds himself faced with when interacting with the core course professors of his departments. He explained his perception of the situation:

> They [Turkish faculty members] look at us [English language teachers] mostly like

parasites...like we've latched on and we're sucking their blood. And if they try to remove us it would probably be too painful, so they're not going to. But for the time being it's like a very unpleasant sort of... they allow us to stay and we keep on sucking.

His understanding of the program was cynical, if realistic:

It's marketing, for the most part. […] it's a marketing tool. It's a cash-cow. Because they can throw people in this English teaching cycle and English teachers, well, up to this year, were relatively cheap to maintain. We don't- they don't ask for much. They're not long-term hires and they generate a significant amount of income by teaching classes of twenty, thirty kids at time.

Instructor A, at the time of the interview, however, was in a very different and much more fruitful and integrated situation a department itself run by a well-respected foreign national.

The institutions with which the respondents are or were associated all have reputations as 'for-profit' institutions and to make them competitive in the market emphasize the presence of 'native English speakers' on their faculty and the comprehensiveness of their English language program, all offering on-going support from a preliminary 'prep' year and as the students advance through their chosen major. It is an unfortunate coincidence that the university board members' sense of responsibility to the student-customer seems to drop off considerably once he is paying tuition, and while the programs are retained and touted as educational assets, little constructive effort is put into making them effective avenues through which students might be able to develop their sense of ownership of English as a mode of communication available to them and legitimate users of English.

In the concluding chapter, we will explore the agency attributed to translation through philosophical considerations and attempt to piece together a reasonably coherent understanding of the possible avenues through which the 'disjuncture' and the 'displayed in the archival and ethnographic analyses gaps' between English as it is taught and English as it is experienced by its users might be addressed and mended.

3: Translated Men in the Twenty-First Century

> At the very moment when pronouncing 'Babel' we sense the impossibility of deciding whether this name belongs, properly and simply, to *one* tongue. And it matters that this undecidability is at work in a struggle for the proper name within a scene of genealogical indebtedness. In seeking to 'make a name for themselves,' to found at the same time a universal tongue and a unique genealogy, the Semites want to bring the world to reason, and this reason can signify simultaneously a colonial violence (since they would thus universalize their idiom) and a peaceful transparency of the human community.

Derrida *Des Tours de Babel* (111)

> While a poet's words endure in his own language, even the greatest translation is destined to become part of the growth of its own language and eventually to be absorbed by its renewal. Translation is so far removed from being the sterile equation of two dead languages that of all literary forms it is the one charged with the special mission of watching over the maturing process of the original language and the birth pangs of its own.

Benjamin *The Task of the Translator* (74)

Language is the house of Being. In its home man dwells.

Heidegger *Letter on Humanism* (217)

> [...]It is because we live
> By trading another's sorrow for our own; another's
> Impossibilities, still unbelieved in, for our own ...
> "I am myself still?" For a little while, forget:
> The world's selves cure that short disease, myself,
> And we see bending to us, dewy-eyed, the great
> Change, dear to all things not to themselves endeared.

Randall Jerrall *Children Selecting Books in a Library*

Introduction

I should perhaps be a little more hesitant (or at least more apologetic) about admitting that the previous two chapters have been an exceedingly long introduction to and framework for the discussion we're about to have here, in the last third of this paper, to which you have bravely given what was no doubt once a lovely Sunday afternoon. But your patience urges me to make good on my promises, and in any case it will be put to good use: now we should be able to discuss the broader implications of what I've termed a 'large-scale translation of men' through a reasonably well-informed understanding of the geopolitical atmosphere of the 21st century, specifically the changing nature of governmentality, the shifting role, shape and nature of the traditional nation-

state (and the associated effects on the socio-political role of national languages), and related changes in the sphere of higher education – not to mention armed with a reasonably thorough understanding of the discursive and pedagogical modes of imperialistic restraint (internal and external neo-colonialist fetters) and mediums or opportunities for the development of (likewise internal and external) agency expressed in the TESOLy literature. My primary interest, I can now confess freely, is to re-examine the *possibilities* inherent in the process of translation as discussed in the most frequently quoted philosophical consideration of texts (namely Benjamin and Derrida) in the specific, explicit context of the translation of *'men'*.[74]

First, a few points on our chosen conversants and their connection to my stated interest: first, Saint Paul, Benjamin and Derrida are, perhaps incidentally, all Jewish men speaking as members of an extraterritorial nation, and hyperconscious of writing in a tongue which is not necessarily theirs by any genetic filiations. St. Paul gives us the connection between the translation of texts and the idea of becoming a translated man, complete with a sense of urgency which is unmatched in later writing on the subject (he thinks, after all, that the world is coming to an end in a year's time), insisting that as a species we must get rid of this veil, be transformed from one degree of glory to another. And secondly, all three thinkers equate translation with redemption, some kind of afterlife, so that it's a process/relationship which gives life both to the copy and the original. Finally, they are all thinkers of mimesis, although it is Benjamin who has given us the most evocative reflections on mimesis and translation in the last century. I evoke Benjamin in part because I also want to emphasize the hope which animates this project: We owe to Benjamin his reflection that "there is no document of civilization which is not at the same time a document of barbarism" (*Illuminations*, 248). He is acutely conscious of this, but what he hopes for in translation is perhaps to bring about a redemption of this barbarism, to have it translated into salvation. Much pain has gone into building this temple of globalized English, and this must be remembered. But it's not a matter of tearing down the temple out of disgust, because it has been built with very literal blood, sweat and tears. Rather, it's a matter of applying ourselves to the task of translation, such that the oppression bears fruit, and perhaps redemption. Such is the possibility inherent in the task of translation, and in the extended use of the metaphor.

---

[74] I trust I'll not be dismissed as a prisoner of the patriarchy if I continue to use 'men' in the old-fashioned inclusive sense. It's an aesthetic choice, really.

To this admittedly ambitious end, I'd like to return to a text briefly mentioned in the opening pages of the first chapter: Macaulay's 19th century *Minute on Indian Education*.[75] This colonial text provides an early conceptualization of 'translated men' within two competing frameworks (for which we will use the simplified shorthand 'Aristotelian' and 'Platonic'[76]). Macaulay lauds "the great revival of letters" that was the Renaissance, to wit the Europe-wide exercise in the translation/imitation of ancient Greek and Roman writing and (idealized) culture. Macaulay is not too humble to admit, however, that this exercise in translation and imitation produced an English literature "now more valuable than that of classical antiquity" (724). In this distressingly Freudian turn of events, Platonic contentions of the inherent and insurmountable inferiority incurred through *mimesis* have been firmly (if 'context-specifically') brushed aside: the imitation surpassed the original; the son destroyed the father.

But Plato's framework of mimetic inferiority is in many ways still with us - most notably, for our purposes, in the Oriental/Occidental dichotomy and the sense of 'belatedness' that characterizes many people's (individual and collective) anxiety when faced with the unremitting demands of modernity and modernization. As noted by Toker in an unpublished paper, the Aristotelian and Platonic frameworks, though mutually exclusive, are nevertheless coexistent in the discourses of colonialism (and postcolonialism): "While implicitly reserving the European colonizer's right and ability to imitate, translate, take over, and improve upon fields of knowledge […] these discourses have often explicitly taken a Platonic stance towards non-European and/or colonized peoples' attempts at imitating and interpreting the scientific and cultural forms of the Western colonizer," a paradoxical approach which has at its core "a deeper tension that can be traced back to what Derrida would call the metaphysical desire for an origin or identity that lies beyond the play of *différance* and representation." In creating, through (neo)colonialism and the (neo)colonial gaze, a distinct 'other' against which to define and unite Western cultures, the industrious 'colonial troopers' of Edge's article[77] were able, simultaneously, to firmly establish the

---

[75] Macaulay, Thomas Babington. (1952). 'Minute on Indian Education', in *Prose and Poetry*, selected by G.M. Young. London: Rupert Hart-Davis: 719-730.

[76] I say 'simplified', not (merely) to excuse myself from the mental cartwheels necessary to properly express the complications of Aristotelian and Platonic thought, but to allow us to make use of the most widely-known readings of the two thinkers. As is proper and necessary, more complicated interpretations may be introduced. In the event that your curiosity remains unsated, please see Toker (forthcoming). For our immediate purposes, however, the Aristotelian framework is the position that the 'copy' can improve upon the 'original' and the Platonic framework holds that the 'copy' is inherently inferior to the 'original'.

[77] Quoted as an epigraph in the first chapter.

West as *center* – as *origin* – around which the periphery might cluster and from which its various factions might draw their own identity. Macaulay's *Minute* is quite clear on the matter: he sees education as the principle method by which to create "a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern; a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect"[78] – in other words, a class of translated men, of translators constituted by that very function. These 'translated men' are to be rendered thoroughly Other – neither fully Indian, nor properly English – and thus denied the agency inherent in the position of translator. Such is the metaphor lived in the colonial setting. And nor is this setting defunct, but while the position exemplified in Ngugi wa Thiong'o's statement in defense of the shift to African language and literature in Kenyan universities (the contention that "education is a means of knowledge about yourself") is meant to justify a very political 180-degree about-face for the education system in neocolonial Kenya, what we are going to try to do here is adopt a perhaps equally dogmatic rejection of such polarity altogether. Not exactly 'a pox on both your houses', but close.

Macaulay's statement (and its socio-cultural political foil, the complete repudiation of English by wa Thiong'o and other postcolonial writers and activists) should now be reconsidered, carefully, in terms of the complexities present in the global sphere of increasingly profit-driven higher education pervaded by a neoliberal knowledge-economy discourse, and in the more specific terms of what we looked at in the second chapter: the real-world experiences of English language teachers and students in Istanbul, understood in conjunction with the narratives and discourses threaded throughout the scholarly research being published under the auspices of TESOL and similar organizations. Above, Derrida provides us with another figuration of this dichotomy: between a shared idiom perceived as 'colonial violence' or a 'peaceful transparency'.

From one perspective, Macaulay's talk of translated men (as a class constituted by its very function as translator between the colonial oppressor and those whom they oppress) is very familiar. Owen's situation in *Translations* is emblematic of the diverse complications inherent in such a position – the precariousness can be seen in the discrepancies simultaneously between what he conveys to the locals of Baile Beag and what he in turn conveys to the British officers on their behalf; in the abrupt shift from a position of which he was proud, from which he derived authority, to a position of helplessness, an inability to soften the sentence (neither the utterance nor the linguistic structure) through disloyal translation or through personal appeal to a commander whose

---

[78] Ibid. p. 729.

respect he felt he had. Such tales of naïveté and betrayal are familiar now, and serve largely to reinforce neoliberal, multicultural fantasies of mutual exclusion and continued marginalization and oppression for those traditionally exposed to it.

And in Friel's play, the end result of such an arrangement is not peace: as the stage lights dim, we leave Owen readying himself to amend "his mistake." He is going, the implication seems clear, to join the renegade Donnelly twins - illusive representatives of fierce Irish nationalism and the IRA. What happened to our translated man, the trusted go-between and message-relayer? Owen's character is originally understood as the compliment of Maire's: "forward-thinking," moderate and progressive, accepting the ascendency of the English language. Although, in contrast to Maire's occasionally confrontational or antagonistic stance towards the rural townspeople, Owen's relationship with the more traditional side of Ireland shifts subtly over the course of the play from a reifying one of light condescension and hubristic self-distance to one of deep understanding and protection – though arguably still reifying, and thus still somehow distant. Owen, it seems, distinguishes the culture/civilization of his native community from its (his) language, and we may remember that the play itself emphasizes the community's strong cultural ties to the Latin and Greek literatures: Hugh composes poetry not in Gaelic but in Latin, the place-names have distinct Latin roots – they speak of the Gods as though they were members of their community.

In Owen's final implied act, then, we see a turning-in, what I would argue is a false patriotism. The "infidelity" to a "pure" linguistic identity implied in the community's relationship with Greco-Latin language and culture points to an understanding of Gaelic as a more or less transitory phase in the increasingly-enriched linguistic procession through which the community has experienced its past and present - making of Hugh's closing reference to the Roman conquest of Greece less an allusion to the British conquest of Ireland than an acknowledgement of/reference to the replacement of Latin by English as the language of international culture. Gaelic, in this context, is a cultural tool – a shibboleth which can be used to demarcate a community, to set it apart, to conceal it and to mediate access – an antithesis to the global language of English, and to Latin before it, but the two, it seems clear, are far from mutually exclusive.

The disappearance of Yolland and Owen's implied entrance into the militant nationalists' group signifies in Friel's treatment of the British occupation of Ireland the strategic extraction of the moderate influence, the "committed Hibernophile," coincident with the neutralization of Owen, emblematic of the pragmatic approach to encroaching imperialist powers. Friel takes pains to emphasize the naïveté of such an approach – through Owen's subservient acceptance of the unlikely

name imposed on him by the uncomprehending and indeed unconcerned British, and through his occasionally tense relationship with Manus over their differing understandings of familial or community responsibility and the condescension with which he treats his father. It is Lancey himself who first explicitly acknowledges Owen's double treachery; as the British military camp burns after the pronouncement of the community's sentence, he lays the confluence of disasters at Owen's feet: "You carry a big responsibility in all this." The 'translated men' (or man, I suppose) of *Translations* are dupes, people whose exploited ambitions or restlessness serve to render them (willfully?) blind to their role –and to the means of agency that remain available to them- as translators in the colonial process.

What we are not privy to in Owen's transformative sequence, however, is the manifestation of George Steiner's third stage of translation: that of integration and mutual growth, of the continuation – the 'afterlife' – of the source language within and as a *now-constitutive* aspect of the target language. In the following sections we will try to push the metaphor of translation to help us problematize the dichotomized poles of 'free' and 'slavish' translation (the first such dichotomy, inherited from Horace and Cicero), of sense-for-sense and word-for-word, and ultimately exploring the largely denied or overlooked middle ground between the poles of 'invisible translator' producing a "fluent," "intrinsically imperialistic," "assimilative" or "appropriative" translation[79] and the 'visible translator' who emphasizes the "foreignness" of the work, actively alienating the target audience with which he is meant to be communicating. Drawing some momentum in part from the discussion of the metaphorical construction of language in the second chapter, we will deal with language-as-(translated)-object, a situation in which the individual is simultaneously given primary agency *and* occupies the relatively stable position of 'medium' while the language is 'translated' to suit the translator's needs and intended audience, and then with language-as-medium through which the individual-as-text is translated/rendered (for what purpose and intended audience?).

But first, to return to one of our original points of entry into the 'translated men' metaphor, it will be interesting (I promise), and perhaps even useful, to reconsider the multiple positions held by our friend St. Paul. He is a translator in two or three ways: in the traditional sense of translating a

---

[79] Douglas Robinson establishes this dogmatized treatment of translation in his essay *Translation as Phantom Limb*, which will be discussed at appropriate length, as appropriate. (Originally published in Marilyn Gaddis Rose, ed., *Translation Horizons: Beyond the Boundaries of Translation Spectrum*, 25-44. Translation Perspectives IX. Binghamton, NY: Center for Research in Translation, 1996. Collected in Douglas Robinson, *What Is Translation? Centrifugal Theories, Critical Interventions* (Kent, OH: Kent State UP, 1997), 113-31.)

text (or, you know, the Word of God) into the Greco-roman idiom and as a 'translator of men' through the act of conversion, of rendering gentiles 'translated' by pulling them into contexts that are not originally theirs. Through Paul's work as interpreter/translator, the Jewish scriptures become a new matrix for cultural contextualization – he opens up, renders accessible, the (highly exclusive) Jewish tradition to outsiders, to gentiles. As a man, he is on an apostolic mission of translation through which he 'edifies' the growing Christian community.

Paul himself writes, in the first epistle to the Corinthians, that he has been "made all things to all men" – the translator himself translated through and into the contextual matrix of his interlocutors. He is forced, to the extent that he truly wants to render the Holy Writ accessible, to adapt to or adopt the customs of his would-be converts, becoming himself a mimic man. In a sense, the desire and accompanying attempt to render accessible the heretofore exclusive shibboleth/idiom could be called the desire and attempt to *domesticate,* although in this instance there is no particular home for which Paul is domesticating the Judaic tradition. Naturally, there is a great deal of variation between the contexts in which he hopes to foster Christianity, and between the 'original' tradition and those 'accessible' versions rendered through literal linguistic translation and simultaneous contextual domestication. In order to be a good translator and fulfill the Lord's demand of him, St. Paul realizes that he cannot *force* 'the good news'. Rather, he must make himself/the word of God understood through active translation. If the communication fails, so too does the conversion and ultimate edification. He writes (again in the first epistle to the Corinthians) "except I know the power of the voice [Therefore if I know not the meaning of the voice], I shall be to him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian to me" (Smith, 2001: 363; quoted in Toker, 2005: 33). To render successful his project of gentile conversion, then, it is clear that St. Paul did indeed have to become 'all things to all men', had to imitate *them* to a certain extent. And thus the translator is translated.

As Toker argues, the 'house of Being' of Christianity *requires* translation. When dealing with gentile converts, or potential converts, St. Paul (and those following in his path) forces them to accept (to a large extent) the Jewish context of the Torah, its rules and teachings. But to do this requires also an 'opening up' of the family of Abraham beyond the god-given son Isaac to include Ishmael, the illegitimate son ('man-given', I suppose). With this perceptual shift in the Jewish tradition, the move which renders it accessible, *everyone* is now a child of Abraham and everyone has to accept the relevance of the Jewish scriptures to their lives – they are rendered somehow Jewish. This act of hospitality on the part of Paul might be (and certainly was, among his

contemporaries) seen as presumptuous: that he may have been 'opening it up' in an illegitimate way, now excluding rabbinical Judaism from 'the house [of Being]' because they fail to understand the *spirit* of the word.

In fact, one of St. Paul's contributions to translation theory is the distinction he draws between the 'letter' and the 'spirit', resembling Horace and Plato's distinction between 'slavish' and 'free' made some hundred years earlier. In opening up a tradition to newcomers, is he trying to impose it on them? Yes, of course – to some extent, but the point to be driven home here is that St. Paul is actually trying to *make something more accessible out of it*. A double translation of mutual recognition. In writing in the lingua franca of the recently AD world (had this all happened today, he almost certainly would have been writing in English), at the end of the day Paul is giving people a new set of cultural references, imposing a new culture on them, but incompletely. He makes distinctions between gentiles and Jews, giving the former more freedom from all of the restrictions of Mosaic law. He entreats his converts to obey the spirit rather than the letter.

This ethic of translation in Paul's gospel applies also to the translation/conversion of men. Translated men, in following the spirit of the teachings, become in some ways *more* Jewish than the Jews (or at least those that cling tenaciously to the letter of the law) – in direct contradiction to a Macaulian translation. What is striking when we move onto Macaulay is that although he is also trying to impose translation – to get a group of people to accept a new set of texts as their own - the spirit (as it were) of the translation is very different. This translation is governed by a very specifically Platonic frame ('Indian in color, English in sentiment') of the inevitability of failure. The whole situation and process is drenched in the understanding that it will fail. Macaulay's desire to share the riches of British literature is decidedly *not* an act of hospitality; the colonial subjects slated for positions as middlemen are not being welcomed into the same house, as Paul's converts are. This is a real colonial situation in which Macaulay is looking for people to use as tools of exploitation, whereas St. Paul is trying to establish a situation of radical equality between Jew and gentile converts – between the 'original' and the 'mimetic copy'. The Pauline context takes as its conceptual framework the Aristotelian belief that translation/mimesis might be successful (and even produce a superior version) that governed the spirit of the Renaissance and allowed Macaulay to proclaim the European translations superior to their Greco-roman 'originals'. As Toker quotes in closing, "the Pauline prophet-translator unveils the spirit of the Scriptures and presents 'the glory of the Lord as though reflected in a mirror' so that all Christians may be 'transformed into the same image from one degree of glory to another' (II Corinthians)" (40). The mimesis taking place here

clearly doesn't take place within the Platonic framework of inferiority. Converts are not half a Christian. Rather, Paul seems to recognize degrees of difference – there is the understanding that one is asked to imitate Christ but without the heretical expectation of equaling him. In place of the ambition to equal Christ, to become a perfect copy, is the ambition to share in his glory. And on the mortal plane, in taking on some aspects of the Jewish tradition, converts are not becoming inferior copies of Jews but are rather given the opportunity within the Pauline framework to in fact understand the scriptures better than 'real' Jews, through a more complete understanding of the spirit/letter distinction.

But what of Macaulay? How does translation function in an imperialist context? Of course, all cultures learn from each other, and Macaulay's reference of the Renaissance indicates a general acknowledgement of the possibility of appropriation, although the colonial framework within which he speaks categorically denies that possibility to others (*the* Others). As we may recall from Wallerstein's second 'relevant past', the liberal reforms of the 19th century (the extension of suffrage and establishment of the welfare state) were made possible by a double nationalism - an intra-European nationalism and national superiority of the 'Europeans' to the 'backward' peoples of the world – and the economic cushion provided by the largely invisible or fully rationalized exploitation of the periphery. The sense of European superiority and its accompanying condescension and moral authority/responsibility contributes deeply to the similar but more confined and static translation of men called for by Macaulay as he sought to remold men's minds through the frame of a British education in the classics. From this perspective, the translating medium of the British classics defines the individual's frame of reference, provides a new set of models to imitate and a new set of negative examples to avoid (part of the process of becoming a translated person), but without the promise of acceptance into the 'house' for which you have been prepared. Now this is interesting, because if one were to shift the historical context by perhaps 50 years, you might find yourself in a familiar situation of neoliberal multiculturalism and in the middle of arguments that this process of translation is so harmful that everything possible must be done to preserve in the children of the still-marginalized periphery a strong sense of cultural identity through the repudiation of the hegemonic English language and literature. While this reaction is perhaps understandable, it seems –if considered within the Pauline framework of translation- that it denies, just as Macaulay does, the very possibility of appropriation, assimilation and the promise of growth and innovation that accompanies it.

These ambiguities are discussed by Bhabha in *The Location of Culture*, in which he shows how it creates 'mimic men' who are 'white but not quite,' where to be Anglicised is decidedly not to be *English* – where you have the 'poor' copy, the inferior simulacrum. Economic liberalism still exists, well entrenched, as a global ideology, albeit stripped of much of its promises now that the 'periphery' has been pretty well exploited and with it the cushion which provided the stability for the welfare state – leaving us with the self-regulated limitations of neoliberalism spread throughout our socio-economic spheres, and notably in the globalized sphere of higher education developed and increasingly market-bound within the knowledge economy of the late 20th and 21st centuries. Thus the denial of translation, the attempt to remove oneself and one's community from the fray of iterability, seems tantamount to accepting (and therefore the added danger of eventually assuming as one's own) the Platonic framework in Macaulay's static, stagnating vision. Because it's true that the realizations that accompanied the decolonization of Africa and Asia - that there was no periphery to support their development, no new 'Third World' against which to mobilize their patriotism – made it clear that enduring political and economical inequality would remain an inevitability in a world dominated by neoliberal narratives of progress and equality, it is no wonder that in a context so like Macaulay's – and so unlike St. Paul's - there is such a strong visceral reaction against the rise of English as the world's lingua franca, despite the danger of stagnation. But on the other hand, the hope provided by Butler reading Bhabha and by Bhabha himself is that the process exposes – can put into question - the model/copy relationship and ultimately destabilize the Platonic insistence on the primacy of the original. Butler writes of the "counter-colonialist possibility" of translation that it

> also exposes the limits of what the dominant language can handle. It is not always the case that the dominant term as it is translated into the language (the idioms, the discursive and institutional norms) of a subordinated culture remains the same upon the occasion of translation. Indeed, the very figure of the dominant term can also alter as it is mimed and redeployed in that context of subordination. Thus, Homi Bhabha's emphasis on the splitting of the signifier in the colonial context seeks to show that the master – to use Hegelian parlance- loses some of his claim to priority and originality precisely by being taken up by a mimetic double. Mimesis can effect a displacement of the first term or, indeed, reveal that the term is nothing other than a series of displacements that diminish any claim to primary and authentic meaning. There is, of course, no such translation without contamination, but there is no mimetic displacement of the original without an appropriation of the term that separates it from its putative authority. (*Contingency, Hegemony, Universality*; pp37)

It is also worth noting that the process described by Bhabha and Macaulay is *also* the process, more or less, whereby the 'English' *become 'English'*. A special consideration of exactly *how* (or perhaps

more appropriately *whether*) these two processes are different may also provide useful insight into how different our situation is from Macaulay's, and from St. Paul's.

Wallerstein's final periodization, the narrative of capitalism as a historical system, provides an opening through which we might posit an alternate conceptualization of the future of neoliberal capitalism. You will remember he notes that the expansion of capitalism required the establishment of "a political framework of 'sovereign' nation-states within an ever-more codified interstate system which has developed the right proportion of state power vis-à-vis the market so as to permit the maximal accumulation of capital" alongside a "complex system of the remuneration of labor, combining wage and non-wage forms, thereby keeping world labor costs down but offering incentives for efficiency", complete with institutionalized racism and sexism through which was reified a self-sustaining hierarchical labor force (3). He also presented a condensed picture of the "cyclical swings" that govern the now-global markets' booms and busts, and which are cycling ever closer to capitalism's basic contradictions - its need for constant spatial expansion and the constant externalization of costs. I noted then that these requirements have been increasingly difficult to meet, despite the effectiveness of liberalism as an ideology in containing civil unrest, and given the deeply precarious position of the Anglophone countries, particularly the United States (given its prominence as a world power in the recent past and the well-documented hypocrisy and arguable misanthropy of its governments and financiers) reflected also in the archival analysis of the last chapter, what I believe we are dealing with – or will be dealing with in the coming decades - is an English which has become more neutral. The inevitable political and economic decline of its 'native-speaking' countries, while no doubt contributing significantly to the neutralization of English as a translator or medium for the translation of men, should not be its primary cause. Rather, as I hope the previous chapter has shown, its speakers and users (to adopt the most neutral denominations) have been increasingly taking active roles in assimilating the language to their own contexts and uses, and I hope that as the native/nonnative speaker dichotomy is increasingly shown to be defunct, these speakers and users of English will cease to hesitate to claim proper ownership – to consider themselves 'half an English-speaker' or an inferior copy of an already idealized 'native speaker'.

As I wrote in an earlier unpublished paper discussing the creative power inherent in the fray of iterability,

Valoration of the original has been a social and philosophical constant since Plato's notion of mimesis and iterability, and the irredeemable chasm between the authenticity of the Ideal and the imperfect copy of the material thus established. The mimetic object (or subject) is always debased by its assumed infidelity to the original, the 'pure presence' that escapes in every iteration. In the question of identification and identity the necessity of mimesis is acknowledged sometimes with resignation, sometimes with grief, through a glass darkly; but all acknowledgment has thus far served to shore up the phantasm of a pure presence outside, maintained by and through mimesis which is itself simultaneously employed and disavowed.

I argued that Judith Butler's interventions in the classical interpretations of Antigone serve to thrust kinship structures once more into the semiotic fray of iterability. Rather than claiming a merely timeless authenticity, the position Butler sought to establish through Antigone is both timeless and contingent, although the contingency is effaced as it becomes an effect of her timelessness. With regard to the mythical constitution of the nation-state, it would seem that the sort of nation that could be mythically established/constituted through this reading and repositioning of Antigone is *necessarily* extraterritorial – a nation suited to the deterritorialized Empire characterized by neoliberal capitalism. Such a nation thus constituted would openly flaunt its mimetic nature and thus further call into question all other nations still mired in the process of employment and disavowal, those nations which hold fast the self as ontological ground and which are slowly becoming almost obsolete as the sources of governmentality shift into the purview of the plastic, hierarchical institutions which constitute Empire. The sense of nation-hood Butler seem to be trying to establish (or which could be established through her) *must* be extraterritorial, it cannot conform to bounded identity and become merely another Germany standing over another France. As an extraterritorial nation, what this would do would be to establish a diaspora without a holy land, a nation which joyfully renounces the phantasmic presence of a reified origin. Such a 'nation' would flaunt its mimeticism, its impurity, and in so doing could perhaps help us imagine what a 'translated' community can be.

While with regard to Butler I was concerned primarily with the forms of kinship (extrapolated to the level of the state, a time-honored tradition dating from the Acts of Paul and Thecla), I'd like to now consider the same complications of the mimetic relationship as inherent in any discussion of translation. Without repudiating this precarious placement, I would like to re-examine the role of translation and claim agency for the sociolinguistic 'origin' in the constitution of that which has hitherto been seen merely as an instrument and victim/casualty in the never-ending iteration of a people's unity. In claiming such agency for a linguistic population, I hope to

claim the possibility, and indeed the necessary contingency, of a living, speakable identity in (re)iteration.

In *The Shock Doctrine*, Naomi Klein emphasizes the importance of retaining ownership of one's history, and thereby retaining ownership of one's identity. Shock, she says, is not merely the state we enter when something horrible happens to us. Rather, it is the state of having *lost our history*. Thus one could conclude that our history, and specifically our uninterrupted ownership of it, is the stabilizing force that allows us to maintain our identity through any number (or severity) of personal or communal catastrophes. Does the translation of men qualify as a 'shock', or share any characteristics of shock? Perhaps, given that it requires making room for another's historical framework and culture within one's own. Perhaps too, just as understanding and being able to 'name' the economic and political machinations that Klein shows are often put into play in the immediate aftermath of the shock of a natural or man-made disaster can (hopefully) provide populations with the wherewithal to stand up for their own perceived needs, rights, and interests, so too might a similar awareness of the vulnerabilities, strengths and ambiguities of translation prove enabling or rejuvenating for the translated individuals or communities. Through perhaps an overly-methodological breakdown of the metaphor with which we are now very familiar, I propose we now explore some of the avenues by which the individual might exercise control over the process of translation.[80]

---

[80] I trust you'll forgive me - as pedantic as it may seem, it remains a good way to ensure a certain degree of thoroughness as energy levels lag.

The Translator in the Metaphor of Translation

> When translators say that their job is to 'step aside and let the original author speak through them', that is close enough to what is traditionally thought of as spirit-channeling or psychic communication with the dead to make the analogy potentially worth exploring. The translator is a 'medium' or mediator who channels the 'spirit' or voice or meaning or intention of the source author across linguistic and cultural and temporal barriers to a new audience that could not have understood that source author without such mediation. The translator does not speak in his own voice; he speaks in the voice of the original author. The translator does not convey to the target audience her own ideas, meanings, arguments, images; she is a neutral and noncommittal conduit to the target audience of the ideas and meanings of the original author. 'How then,' Alexander Frazer Tytler asked in 1797, 'shall a translator accomplish this difficult union of ease with fidelity? To use a bold expression, he must adopt the very soul of his author, which must speak through his own organs'. The translator, to use Patrick Mahoney's spiritualist term, must become the source author's 'borrowed body'.

> Douglas Robinson (2001)[81]

> The basic error of the translator is that he preserves the state in which his own language happens to be instead of allowing his language to be powerfully affected by the foreign tongue.

> Benjamin, *The Task of the Translator*

As we think about the role of the translator, it becomes necessary to ask who is, or could be, the translator. Some immediate possibilities are the language instructor (himself a 'native' or 'nonnative' speaker with a widely varying relationship with the English language), the language user (with variables similar to those available in the instructor), and the linguistic idiom itself – in our case, English. Given these three different variations on the theme, how do we understand the agency of the translator in relation to the 'text', as mediator between idioms? What opportunities are there for redefinition (appropriation or assimilation?) of the position or role of the translator, and of the agency to which she is ascribed? And of course, what about the Benjaminian question of the 'task of the translator' – and what does the translator owe to her target audience, or to the object of translation?

I opened with Robinson's quote because I feel that it is an excellent expression of the dual (potentially paralyzing) expectations traditionally attached to the translator. The first, the demand to produce a 'faithful' translation, is in itself an opportunity for the translator to assert agency, because

---

[81] Robinson, Douglas. 2001. *Who Translates? Translator subjectivities beyond reason*. State University of New York Press: Albany; pp21-22.

it requires a subjective balance of 'spirit' and 'letter'. Is the translator of the Pauline bent, and likely to favor spirit over slavishly, word-for-word, reconstructing what many would agree to be an inferior copy? As Robinson notes, the analogy of translator as spirit-medium (problematically, from the perspective of the 'rationalist regime of Western thought')

> suggests both a.) that the source author has the power to initiate communication with the target audience *through* the translator (though again this does not mean that the translator is passive: the translator actively creates the channel through which the author actively contacts the target audience), and b.) that the translator possesses some means of gaining access to the author's voice and meaning, of reliably 'opening up' to the intentional speaking of a person who is almost invariably other (sometimes translators translate source texts they wrote themselves, but usually the source is another person), more often distant in time and place, and not infrequently dead (23).

The agency he ascribes the translator here, in the creation of "the channel through which the [English language] actively contacts the target audience," applies as well when the object translated is not a text. And of course, the 'channel' is the translator's own mind, own personal idiom and is colored by his own relationship with his target audience. Rather than considering this in terms of different kinds of texts (yes, I'm sure an electronics manual ought to be translated word-for-word, and I'm equally sure that it's only graciousness which keeps me from suggesting that perhaps in such a case there is no discernable difference between the letter and the spirit), I'd prefer to consider it in terms of our first classroom-based subjects: the language instructor and learner.

Language instructors, before putting together a single lesson plan (if they're the lesson-plan-making sort), have to have a clear idea about what mix of grammar and vocabulary acquisition (we'll call this the 'letter') and what kind of content or underlying sense of the language ('spirit') they believe would be the most beneficial for their students. Do they believe that their students are learning English to improve their employment or education prospects (instrumental approach), or perhaps because they would like to participate in a global culture (invested approach), or, heaven forbid, because they love Shakespeare or Dorothy Dunnett and want to read it in the original or produce works thus inspired? And how does the instructor in question approach the language, and her job teaching it? Is it 'just a job', or did a heavenly voice stop her dead in her tracks on the road to Damascus?

While the instructor has a certain amount of control over his own perception of the job (though of course this is impacted (negatively, by and large) by the institutional environment), the instructor's approach to the job is also colored by his self-perception as an English language user, a complex negotiation for both 'native' and 'nonnative' speakers. However, both 'native' and

'nonnative' speakers' self-confidence in the classroom is derived directly from a combination of education and experience. This seems excessively clear in the case of the 'nonnative' English language teachers (as seen in Minfang's narrative), and is equally the case for 'native' speakers, despite the lackadaisical hiring practice in many educational institutions in non-Anglophone countries. Native-English-speaking teachers lacking formal training who interviewed for this project expressed a much greater degree of dissociation, and viewed the job as something of a joke – which, considering the lack of direction or useful support provided institutionally, is understandable if not exactly inspiring.

As the classroom becomes less dominated by the native/nonnative speaker dichotomy, it is my hope that the teacher will be able to maintain focus on the 'letter' to the degree necessary for her students to achieve a sense of mastery, and with that, a sense of ownership with which they, as a community, can assimilate/appropriate/create an appropriate accompanying 'spirit'. Which brings up to the second balance which must be struck by the translator: that between 'assimilation,' 'appropriation' and maintaining the 'alterity' of the original in her translation. Like the Babelian paradox of necessary/divinely mandated translation and forbidden/impossible translation, the debate "as it has been traditionally binarized has at one pole the insistence that the translator should 'submit' to the source author and/or text, and at the other the belief that such submission is impossible: that translators are the active interpretive agents in the act of translation and control the entire event" (Robinson, 24). It seems easy enough, when shifting the metaphor from texts to individuals and cultures, to see this as a false binary. The individual cannot be called a product of or submissive conduit for the English language, and while some postcolonial authors may have felt as though their alterity was disrespected by the linguistic presence of the language of their colonial oppressor, it seems abundantly clear that complete repudiation is not particularly an option – and thankfully, not desired. The two authors we looked at who turned their backs on English in seeking to address postcolonial injustices or to edify their own local community returned, eventually, to bring their voices to a larger audience, to make their grievances known to a larger audience, to speak *directly* to their erstwhile masters in a tongue which was no longer theirs alone.

And what of the language itself as translator? Consider, for instance, the self-taught individual – or the individual moved on a visceral level by the poetry of Ted Hughes, who emerges from the reading changed. This would also be where we can explore the world-shaping powers occasionally attributed to language. Let's say, for the sake of argument, that the powers of expression most readily available in one's language does impact the way in which we conceptualize

the world. The power of metaphors, for instance, to shape the way that illnesses are treated and which patients are stigmatized, and how.[82] Here, it seems, we can attribute the 'enriching' byproduct of translation usually attributed to the linguistic idioms involved directly to the 'translated' individual. Just as for texts "translation ultimately serves the purpose of expressing reciprocal relationships between languages" (Benjamin, 73), so too can it serve a similar purpose in the translation of men. "In translation," Benjamin writes, "the original rises into a higher and purer linguistic air, as it were. It cannot live there permanently, to be sure, and it does not reach it in its entirety. Yet, in a singularly impressive manner, at least it points the way to this region: the predestined, hitherto inaccessible realm of reconciliation and fulfilment of languages" (75-76).

In the following section we will shift our perspective within the metaphor once more, this time to consider the ways in which we understand English as a medium in which something is to be or has been translated. If we typically understand works thus translated to be in a position of 'imitation', how then does this render English - as the counterfeiting mint? What is the possibility for agency in assertion of mimetic authority over English on the part of the subject/object translated into English, and does this authority change between the 'original' and 'translation'?

‘Source and Target’ in the Metaphor of Translation

> The excluded middle between static strangeness and familiarity that I am working toward, here, is a dynamic *sliding* between strangeness and familiarity, a becoming-familiar that yet retains an air of alterity – an appropriation that I want to compare to a physiological sense called proprioception, that sense that makes us feel our body as our own.
>
> <div align="right">Doug Robinson, Translation as Phantom Limb (4)</div>
>
> Translation keeps putting the hallowed growth of languages to the test: How far removed is their hidden meaning from revelation, how close can it be brought by the knowledge of this remoteness?
>
> <div align="right">Benjamin The Task of the Translator (75)</div>

My brother having turned me onto the famed neurologist-cum-anthropologist, Oliver Sacks, I was much gratified to see him employed in the illustration of a most appropriate and helpful metaphor introduced by Doug Robinson in the excerpt above. Proprioception, 'the sense that makes us feel our body as our own', is useful in this discussion of 'source' and 'target' to the extent that it allows for the very dynamic sliding between strangeness and familiarity that Robinson advocates as the most appropriate conceptualization of this relationship, and perhaps also the best way to break out

---

[82] I refer, of course, to Susan Sontag's seminal study, *Illness as Metaphor*, published in 1977.

of the paralyzing demands with which the translator must wrestle. It also allows me to provide a nice parable to demonstrate the productive way in which we might surmount the negative associations with mimesis: suppose you have a leg. This leg, for whatever reason, must be amputated, and after several grueling months of rehab you are fitted with a prosthetic leg. This prosthesis can be useful to you – perhaps you will have one specially made with springs and whatnot such that you can now outrun most Olympic medalists – or it can be a hindrance of which you are ashamed, and you find yourself housebound and miserable. Now, of course the prosthesis will never *be* your old leg: your body simply cannot assimilate it so thoroughly. Rather like the newly minted Christians bathed in the glory of the word made flesh, emulating the ideal but avoiding heretical equivalence, your prosthesis will perhaps have good days and bad days – it may chafe one week, and you'll grumble, but the next you may catch your breath at the summit of a mountain that your uncomplaining prosthetic helped you climb. Just so might the translated man find English burdensome in some contexts, and liberating or edifying in others. The challenge will be, I suppose, to maintain the propriotic sense of self as whole throughout – to maintain the occasionally painful phantom limb over which the prosthesis is superimposed.

But this parable isn't sufficiently nuanced (or perhaps I am not) to allow us to consider the path suggested by Benjamin, above. Or perhaps it is: without the prosthesis, perhaps the amputee cannot fully experience a propriotic sense of self. Despite acting as a constant reminder of the individual's 'incompleteness', translation-as-prosthesis allows the phantom limb produced by the proprioception to mimic completion. You find you are walking simultaneously on the phantom limb and the mimetic prosthesis. Make no mistake, the prosthetic analysis might suggest that other people might do this naturally, which is not the case. There is an important sense in which language is always a prosthesis – Derrida makes this connection as well in *Monolingualism of the Other, of the Prosthesis of Origin* (1998) – language is a very technical skill or entity, a fact emphasized in the metaphor of fluency and in the varying degrees of successful communication between even 'native' speakers of a language.

Now that I've plagued you with a vision of a world peopled entirely by amputees, trotting around on their prosthetic limbs which are to varying degrees integrated and other to their idealized propriotic selves, I suppose what I would like to have made clear is the following: the prosthesis is not inferior.

The Prelapsarian Fantasy: considering the implications of 'pure language'

> Exultation is the going
> Of an inland soul to sea –
> Past the Houses –
> Past the Headlands –
> Into deep Eternity –
>
> Bred as we, among the mountains,
> Can the sailor understand
> The divine intoxication
> Of the first league out from Land?
>
> -Emily Dickenson

We are always, constantly and unavoidably, being translated into new situations, new contexts – linguistic or otherwise. This poem (pretentious though it may be to drag Ms. Dickenson into this) is for me the most beautiful expression of the 'divine intoxication', the sublimated joy that renders necessary and worthwhile the uncertainties of this kind of translation. *Exultation* – the word itself only more beautiful in repetition – and its semantic sisters, exhortation and exhilaration, make a strong argument for leaping through contextual frameworks.

So why is the prelapsarian fantasy of a pure language so tenacious? Owen and Yolland chortled in their 'Eden',[83] calling things into being through the act of (re)naming; translators seek a temporary proximity to the universal meaning behind and between idioms; we all wish to be able to communicate more fluently and with more people – in our idiom or theirs, or (if worst comes to worst) some chimerical assimilation of the two. It certainly can't be that as a species we are uniformly or predominantly timid or lazy, although I'm sure those of us of a certain age felt a small surge of mild bitterness watching *The Matrix* and its science-fictional taunt of having access to any skill, instant linguistic mastery of any idiom for which one had the necessary programming. In keeping with the biblical implications of 'prelapsarian', and incidentally *The Matrix*, perhaps we could call on the high Christology of St. John's gospel to look at the relationship between a prelapsarian idiom and the plethora of postlapsarian idioms with which we contend today. For our secular purposes, God is the figuration of a pure language.

The gospel of John is the source from which theories of the holy trinity were developed, and thus it is here that we see the first conceptualization of Jesus as the manifestation of the *logos* of

---

[83] They "name a thing and – bang! it leaps into existence!" "Each name a perfect equation with its roots." "A perfect congruence with its reality." (*Translations* 56)

109

God – the 'Word', the utterance of God. "In the beginning was the *logos*. And the *Logos* was with God, and the *Logos* was God – he was in the beginning with God. All things came into being through him." (John 1) *Logos*, as discussed, means roughly 'reason' or 'language', and thus Jesus (as 'the word') is figured by John as the utterance of God, of pure language. And on earth, he becomes 'the word made flesh', the self-expression and emissary or representative of God, the pure language. In his position as emissary, Jesus is thus *fully representative* of the Father: 'To see the son is to see the father. To hear the son is to hear the father. To recognize the son is to recognize the father.' (John 12) So here we have an *active utterance* – both in the sense of having been present and instrumental in genesis and in the sense of having then been separated/distinguished from the pure language, 'made flesh'. In verse 14, John writes "and the word became flesh and pitched his tent among us, and we have seen his glory, the glory as of a father's only son, full of grace and truth. from his fullness we have all received grace upon grace. The law indeed was given through Moses, grace and truth came through Jesus Christ." He is distinguishing here, as we have been and as translators as a rule seem to do, between the 'spirit' and the 'letter': the word, as representative emissary of pure language, reveals or expresses the true content of the pure language, the father. And thus it is that through seeing the 'word/utterance made flesh' John holds that you are receiving the message of God himself – you are experiencing a communicable, translated form of the pure language.

The subtlety John introduces is the limitations of the 'word made flesh': he reports Jesus saying that he cannot act without the father, and that it is only by virtue of the fact that the word is *sent* by God that he can do anything at all – Jesus 'does the work of God'. This reinforces the sense of active utterance, but complicates the relation between the idioms as we experience them and the 'pure language' from which they are derived and as whose emissaries they act. As I'm not a biblical scholar, I don't feel any particular need to take this any further – but the point for our purposes seems to be close to that of Benjamin's, that the translation (Jesus, for continuity's sake) "intends language as a whole" but that ultimately, "No translation would be possible if in its ultimate essence it strove for likeness to the original. For in its afterlife – which could not be called that if it were not a transformation and a renewal of something living – the original undergoes a change" (77, 73). It's this change, I have come to believe, that Emily Dickenson is referring to above.

Of course, with all this talk of divinely inspired and inspiring change, what I hope has been made reasonably clear here is that the fear of homogenization through English as a shared lingua franca is

unfounded. While the global ubiquity of Starbucks and McDonalds remains as distressing as ever, and the contentious people of the world should never stop publishing the atrocities committed by Big Business, Big Pharma, and Big Uni (to perhaps coin a phrase), we should nevertheless be careful not to confuse (or conflate) the crime with the linguistic idiom in which it is perpetrated. Doing so would, I believe, rob all English language users, regardless of its debunked status, of the ability to claim any kind of ownership over or agency in the idiom, however they use it. And that would be a tragedy indeed.

In the introduction to this chapter, I cited Naomi Klein on the importance of maintaining ownership of one's history if communities wished to avoid exploitation in our neo-liberal capitalist world. For Benjamin, the importance of history is somewhat more beautifully and delicately stated:

> Just as the manifestations of life are intimately connected with the phenomenon of life without being of importance to it, a translation issues from the original – not so much from its life as from its afterlife. […] The concept of life is given its due only if everything that has a history of its own, and is not merely the setting for history, is credited with life. In the final analysis, the range of life must be determined by history rather than by nature, least of all by such tenuous factors as sensation and soul.
>
> <div align="right">(Task of the Translator, 72)</div>

It seems clear that we achieve a deeper, richer language through the confusion and multiplicity of meanings/idioms, and that if the creativity in the role of the 'target' audience – the listener or reader - lies in her ability to synthesize and interpret, such a confusion or multiplicity would compound the possibilities for innovation. Nor does English, despite the word's existence as a seemingly homogenizing force, particularly seem to threaten that multiplicity. I mean this in a few ways. English exists as a label for a broad and ever-diversifying family of idioms – you can call them dialects, world Englishes, what have you, but the fact remains that as ownership becomes inevitably and increasingly available each distinguishable idiom will serve as a new community-fortifying, but no longer isolating, shibboleth.

Furthermore, even within a standardized English, carefully policed by the lingering remains of native-speaker privilege and class-based warfare, the creative agency in the position of those who produce the utterance, and in the position of those who receive and interpret/translate it for themselves or for a larger audience renders communication necessarily inexact. What we should marvel at is the possibility of communication - the extent to which it succeeds to our liking, and the extent to which our act of communication made possible a continued innovation. The nonterritorial nature of the neoliberal economic hegemony that can be roughly understood as our 'Empire' in fact requires this dynamic, the simultaneous necessity and impossibility of translation. But, because I

would hate to end this on a less-than-inspiring note, it is also worth noting, finally, that if English is able to fulfil the promise seen here – to be divested of its neo-colonial residue through the agency available to the disenfranchised through appropriation, assimilation and eventual ownership – it seems to me that its use as a global lingua franca could be the key to creating something resembling a truly egalitarian, nonterritorial civil society in which or through which a global community might be able to exercise increasing agency to combat, for example, the privatization of education. Or whatever they saw fit.

And to those who recoil from the thought of an un-policed, egalitarian, umbrella-term English: our efforts to police commas and semi-colons are misplaced. As columnist David Mitchell writes, "It's no fun prissily adhering to grammatical rules if it's mandatory. This academy [of the Queen's English] wishes to turn something I have chosen to do – an attitude by which I define myself – into something I'm forced to do, along with everyone else... It's the blandly didactic product of priggish, literal, two-dimensional thinking."[84] So to those of us who, like Mr. Mitchell, "derive a lamentably high percentage" of our self-esteem from knowing and following grammatical dictates,[85] I suggest we all carry on taking pride in our adherence to those traditional grammatical rules (and in shirking those we've deemed dated) *without* slipping into teutonic fits over the 'purity' of that which never was pure, and in any case evades singular ownership and thereby stagnation and general uselessness. What we are destroying in the geopolitical linguistic landscape of globalized English usage, or what in any case *needs* destroying, is the paradoxical dialectic in Macaulay's colonial version of translated men. In its place, the opportunity for appropriation from a non-origin, the possibility for our translations to surpass the 'original' must be acknowledged as universally available. And just think of the worlds of innovation that would thus be rendered possible.

---

[84] http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2010/jun/13/david-mitchell-comment-is-free

[85] I am not ashamed to admit both experiential and spiritual familiarity with a scene from *Sex and the City* in which all the self-doubt and general angst with which Carrie Bradshaw had been struggling since her ex announced his engagement to a young socialite evaporates with a common misuse of there/their/they're.

Bibliography

Alatis, James E. (1987). The Growth of Professionalism in TESOL: Challenges and Prospects for the Future. *TESOL Quarterly, 21*(1), 9-19.

Allen, Harold B. (1967). TESOL and the Journal. *TESOL Quarterly, 1*(1), 3-6.

Amin, Nuzhat. (1997). Race and the Identity of the Nonnative ESL Teacher. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(3), 580-583.

Appiah, A. (1994). Identity, authenticity, survival: Multicultural societies and social reproduction. in A. Gutmann (Ed.), *Multiculturalism* (pp. 149–163). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.

Apter, Emily. (2005). *The Translation Zone: A New Comparative Literature.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Armstrong and MacKanzie. (2003). Private Versus Public Juvenile Correctional Facilities. *Crime & Delinquency, 49*(4), 542-563.

Armstrong, David. (1995). The Rise of Surveillance Medicine. *Sociology of Health and Illness 17*(3), 393-404.

Atkinson, Dwight. (1997). A Critical Approach to Critical Thinking in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(1), 71-94.

Atkinson, Dwight. (1999). TESOL and Culture. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(4), 625-654.

Badiou, Alain; Brassier, Ray (trans). (2003). *Saint Paul: the foundation of universalism.* Stanford CA; Standford University Press.

Bailey, Richard. (1991). *Images of English: A Cultural History of the Language.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Bailey, Richard. (2003-2006). Talking about Words. *Michigan Today.* Retrieved from http://www-personal.umich.edu/~rwbailey/links.html.

Bhabha, Homi K. (1994). *The Location of Culture.* London: Routledge.

Biguenet, John and Schulte, Rainer (eds). (1992). *Theories of Translation: an Anthology of Essays*

Block, D. and Cameron, D. (2002). *Globalization and Language Teaching.* London: Routledge.

Brennan, J. et. al. (2008). *Higher Education Looking Forward: An Agenda for Future Research.* Retrieved from www.esf.org/helf.

Brennan, J. et. al. (2008a). *Higher Education Looking Forward: Themes on the Changing Relationship between Higher Education and Society.* Retrieved from www.esf.org/helf.

Brown, Wendy. (2003). Neo-liberalism and the End of Liberal Democracy. *Theory & Event, 7*(1).

Brutt-Griffler, J. (2002). *World English: a Study of its Development.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Brutt-Griffler, Janina and Samimy, Keiko K. (1999). Revisiting the Colonial in the Postcolonial: Critical Praxis for Nonnative-English-Speaking Teachers in a TESOL Program. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(3), 413-431.

Canagarajah, S. (1999). *Resisting Linguistic Imperialism in English Teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cheshire, J. (ed). (1991). *English Round the World: sociolinguistic perspectives.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cribb, Michael. (2000). Machine Translation: The Alternative for the 21st Century? *TESOL Quarterly, 34*(3), 560-596.

Crystal, David. (2000). *English as a Global Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, David. (2008). *By Hook or by Crook: a journey in search of English.* Woodstock, NY: The Overlook Press.

Cummins, J. (1994). Knowledge, power, and identity in teaching English as a second language. In

F. Genesee (Ed.), *Educating second language children: The whole child, the whole curriculum, the whole community* (pp. 33–58). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, C. (1996). *What is English Teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Day, Richard R. (1984). Career Aspects of Graduate Training in ESL. *TESOL Quarterly, 18*(1), 109-127.

Derrida, J. (2002). *Acts of Religion*. New York and London: Routledge.
Duff, Patricia A. And Uchida, Yuko. (1997). The Negotiation of Teachers' Sociocultural Identities and Practices in Postsecondary EFL Classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(3), 451-486.

Edge, Julian. (2003). Imperial Troopers and Servants of the Lord: A vision of TESOL for the 21st Century. *TESOL Quarterly, 37*(4), 701-709.

Ernst, Gisela. (1994). Beyond Language: the Many Dimensions of an ESL Program. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 25*(3), 317-335.

Faubion, James (ed). (1994). *Michel Foucault: Power*. New York, London: Penguin Books.

Filkins, Dexter. (2010, June 5). *Rule of the gun: with US aid, warlord builds an Afghan empire*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/06/world/asia/06warlords.html?th&emc=th

Foucault, M. (2010*). The Birth of Biopolitics: lectures at the College de France 1978-1979*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Friel, Brian. (1981). *Translations*. London: Faber and Faber Limited.

Galli, Barbara Ellen and Mendes-Flohr, Paul. (1995). Franz Rosenzweig and Jehuda Halevi: Translating, Translations, and Translators. *There is only one language* (pp. 337-415).McGill, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press. *from Dryden to Derrida*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gebauer, George and Wulf, Christoph. (1992). *Mimesis: culture, art, society*. Berkeley, CA & London, UK: University of California Press.

Hansen, Jette G. and Liu, Jun. (1997). Social Identity and Language: Theoretical and Methodological Issues. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(3), 567-576.

Hardt, Michael and Negri, Antonio. (2000) *Empire*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hardt, Michael and Negri, Antonio. (2004). *Multitude.* New York, NY: Penguin Press HC.

Howatt, A. P. R. and Widdowson, H. G. (2004). *A History of English Language Teaching* (second ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ibrahim, Awad El Karim M. (1999). Becoming Black: Rap and Hip-Hop, Race, Gender, Identity, and the Politics of ESL Learning. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(3), 349-369.

Jackson, Kenneth L. (1970). TESOL Journals in Japan. *TESOL Quarterly, 4*(2), 169-179.

Jacobs, Jane. (1995). *A Schoolteacher in Old Alaska: the story of Hannah Breece*. New York: Vintage Books.

Jenkins, Jennifer. (2006). Current Perspectives on Teaching World Englishes and English as a Lingua Franca. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(1), 157-181.

Joyce, James. (1992). *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man.* Ware, Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Limited.

Keiser, Hans-Lukas (ed). (2006). *Turkey Beyond Nationalism*. New York and London: I. B. Tauris.

Klein, Naomi. (2007). *The Shock Doctrine: the rise of disaster capitalism*. New York: Metropolitan Books, Henry Holt and Company.

Klein, Perry, D. (1997). "Multiplying the problems of intelligence by eight: A critique of Gardner's theory". *Canadian Journal of Education, 22*(4), 377-394.

Krell, David Farrell (ed). (1978). *Martin Heidegger: Basic Writings, revised and expanded edition.*

London: Routledge.

Kristal, Efrain. (2002). *Invisible Work: Borges and Translation.* Vanderbilt: Vanderbilt University Press.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1999). Critical Classroom Discourse Analysis. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(3), 453-484.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). TESOL Methods: Changing Tracks, Challenging Trends. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(1), 59-81.

Leung, Constant; Harris, Roxy; Rampton, Ben. (1997). The Idealised Native Speaker, Reified Ethnicities, and Classroom Realities. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(3), 543-560.

Lin, Angel M. Y. (1999). Doing-English-Lessons in the Reproduction or Transformation of Social Worlds? *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(3), 393-412.

Liu, Jun. (1999). Nonnative-English-Speaking Professionals in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(1), 85-102.

Loomba, Ania. (2001). Colonialism/Postcolonialism. London and New York: Routledge.

Lyotard, Jean-François. (1999). *Postmodern Fables*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

McNamara, Tim. (1999) Theorizing Social Identity: What Do We Mean by Social Identity? Competing Frameworks, Competing Discourses. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(3), 561-567.

Morison, John. (2000). The Government-Voluntary Sector Compacts: Governance, Governmentality, and Civil Society. *Journal of Law and Society, 27*(1) Voices, Spaces, and Processes in Constitutionalism, 98-132.

Nero, Shondel J. (1997). English Is My Native Language... or So I Believe. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(3), 585-593.

Nero, Shondel J. (2000). The Changing Faces of English: A Caribbean Perspective. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*(3), 483-510.

Nieto, Sonia (ed). (2010). *Language, Culture, and Teaching: critical perspectives.* London and New York: Routledge.

Nisbett, Richard E. (2003). *The Geography of Thought: how Asians and Westerners Think Differently...and Why.* New York: Free Press.

Norton, Bonny. (1997). Language, Identity, and the Ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly 31*(3), 409-429.

Ochsner, Robert. (1980). Job-Related Aspects of the M.A. İn TESOL Degree. *TESOL Quarterly, 14*(2), 199-207.

Onishi, Norimitsu. "As English Spreads, Indonesians Fear for Their Language". Published in the New York Times, July 25 2010. Available online at http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/26/world/asia/26indo.html?pagewanted=1&_r=1&th&emc=th

Pennycook, Alaistair. (1994). *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language.* London: Pearson Education.

Pennycook, Alastair. (1998). *English and the Discourses of Colonialism*. London and New York: Routledge.

Pennycook, Alastair. (1998). *English and the Discourses of Colonialism*. London and New York: Routledge.

Pennycook, Alastair. (1999). Introduction: Critical Approaches to TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(3), 329-348.

Pennycook, Alastair. (2007). *Global Englishes and transcultural flows.* London and New York: Routledge.

Phillipson, Robert. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Phillipson, Robert. (2009). English in Globalisation, a Lingua Franca or a Lingua Frankensteinia?.

TESOL Quarterly, 43(2), 335-339.

Poggi, Gianfranco. (1978). *The development of the modern state*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Richards, Jack C. and Rodgers, Theodore S. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching.* Cambridge, New York, Port Melbourne, Madrid and Cape Town: Cambridge University Press.

Robins, Kevin. (1996). 'Interrupting Identities: Turkey/Europe', in *Questions of Cultural Identity*, ed. by Stuart Hall and Paul du Gay. London: Sage, pp. 61-86.

Robinson, Douglas. (1997). *What is translation? : centrifugal theories, critical interventions*. Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press.

Ronowicz, Eddie and Yallop, Colin (eds). (2007). *English: One Language, Different Cultures*. New York: Continuum.

Sampson, Gloria Paulik. (1977). A Real Challenge to ESL Methodology. *TESOL Quarterly, 11*(3), 241-255.

Saxena, Mukul and Omoniyi, Tope (eds). (2010). *Contending with Globalization in World Englishes (Critical Language and Literacy Studies)*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Scahill, Jeremy. (2005, September 22). Blackwater down. *The Nation,* Retrieved from http://www.alternet.org/katrina/25858/

Scales, Julie, Wennerstrom, Ann, Richard, Dara, & Wu, Su Hui. (2006). Language Learners' Perceptions of Accent. *TESOL Quarterly*, *40*(4), 715-738.

Schachtman, Noah. (2008, August 31). Blackwater preps for hurricane gustav. *Wired*, Retrieved from http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2008/08/officials-made/

Schnieder, Edgar. (2007). *Postcolonial English: Varieties Around the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Soysekerci, S. and Erturgut, R. (May 2010). Anatomy of a period: Structural transformation in the Turkish higher education system between 1981 and 2009. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 2*(2); 3477-3482.

Spack, Ruth. (2006). English Lessons. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*(3), 595-604.

Steiner, George. (1975). *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Steiner, George. (1998). *Language and Silence: Essays on language, literature, and the inhuman*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Tang, Cecilia. (1997). On the Power and Status of Nonnative ESL Teachers. *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(3), 577-580.

Thiong'o, Ngugi wa. (1994). *A Grain of Wheat*. Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinemann.

Toker, K. Onur. (2005). "Prophesy and Tongues: Saint Paul, Interpreting, and Building the House" in *Translation and Religion: Holy Untranslatable?* ed. Lynne Long. Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

Tsui, Amy B. (2007). Complexities of Identity Formation: A Narrative Inquiry of an EFL Teacher. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*(4), 657-680.

Varghese, Manka M., & Johnston, Bill. (2007). Evangelical Christians and English language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, *41*(1), 5-31.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. (1993). The World-System After the Cold War. *Journal of Peace Research, 30*(1), 1-6.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. (2003). *The Decline of American Power: The U.S. in a Chaotic World.* New York: The New Press.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. (2006). *European Universalism: The Rhetoric of Power*. New York: The New Press.

Warschauer, Mark. (2000). The Changing Global Economy and the Future of English Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*(3), 511-535.

Wennerstrom, Ann K., & Heiser, Patty. (1992). ESL student bias in instructional evaluation. *TESOL Quarterly*, *26*(2), 271-288.

Films:

Bragg, Melvyn. (2003) *The Adventure of English: the Biography of a Language, parts 1-8*. Originally aired November 2003 in the UK.

Walker, Jay. (2009). *Jay Walker on the World's English mania*. Retrieved from http://www.ted.com/talks/lang/eng/jay_walker_on_the_world_s_english_mania.html