The Northern Development Discourse and its Use of English: Implications for a Post-2015 Future

M.S. Williams

Mark S. Williams – Development Anthropologist, Professor of English, School of Foreign Languages, Jianghan University; 8 Sanjiaohu Road, Hanyang–WEDZ, Wuhan, 430056, China; E-mail: markswilliams59@hotmail.com

As World War II came to an end in the mid 1940s with the result that the Allies would prevail, America and Britain began plans for the post-war reconstruction of Europe and for what would become the basis of the Northern development discourse. The planning, deliberation and implementation of such a post-war development network was steeped in English language and thought. Major institutions of the architecture for reconstruction and development formulated at that time – e.g., the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (now the World Bank) – communicated their programmes and goals almost exclusively in English, and continue to do so. Indeed, as the concept of "development" has formed and progressed in the North over the last 70 years, a specialized variant of English has propagated the literature, the practice and the discourse. Certain development practitioners have scrutinized this, especially in formal discussions and forums held over the last several years. This study continues that scrutiny on the effect that this specialized use of language could have on the shaping of the post-2015 global sustainable development agenda.

Key words: North, English language, discourse, development, sustainable development

Introduction

With World War II coming to end, certain plans for the reconstruction and development of Europe in a new post-war global environment were ready to activate. These plans had been carefully coordinated years earlier by the United States and Britain,[1] leaving the other Allied power of the Soviet Union out of the discourse. It seemed that, with the end of this war, President Wilson's promise from the first world war would finally come to fruition: to make the world safe for democracy. As polarization materialized with the U.S., Britain, and other European nations (the first-world) on one side, and the Soviet Union and future Warsaw Pact nations (the second-world) on the other, former colonial possessions gaining independence at the end of the war (the third-world) realized they had to align their position with either the first-world or the second-world. Choosing first-world alignment (now called the 'North' in the literature)

---

[1] "[I]n 1941 Prime Minister Churchill secretly met President Franklin Roosevelt to coordinate war strategy and plan for the ensuing peace. He declared in the House of Commons on 24 August 1941: '...the British Empire and the United States..., fortunately for the progress of mankind, happen to speak the same language and very largely think the same thoughts ...' (Morton 1943, p. 152)" [quoted in Phillipson, 2008, p. 2]. Later, "the Bretton Woods institutions, founded in 1944, began with missions quite distinct from their latter-day involvement with North-South relations. The IMF was conceived by John Maynard Keynes [of Britain] and Harry Dexter White [of the U.S.], the two pillars of the Bretton Woods meeting, as the guardian of global liquidity, a function that it was supposed to fulfil [*sic*] by monitoring member countries' maintenance of stable exchange rates.... [T]he IBRD [or World Bank] was, as its name implied, set up to assist in the reconstruction of the war-torn economies, particularly those of Western Europe..." [Bello, 2006, p. 36; cf. Cohn, 2008, p. 17].

meant being adopted into a strong view of capitalist economics and (eventually) neo-liberalism. Should a third-world nation (now termed the 'South') align itself with the North in order to take advantage of the Bretton Woods donor institutions, this recipient nation would soon become aware of all the strings attached to such an alignment [Willis, 2011, p. 16] — not the least being communication in the *lingua franca* of the North: English. Even in the last 20-25 years, as the Soviet Union dissolved after the dismantling of the Berlin Wall, former second-world countries have wrestled with taking on certain accoutrements of neo-liberalism and 'globalization' in the consideration of receiving aid and development assistance from the North.

Select Literature with an Emergent Theme

From the outset, let it be known that the primary limitation of this study is that it is more probative than prescriptive. For that reason, this is a select literature review with a surfacing theme that has ramifications for the post-2015 discourse. It is true that "thematic reviews of literature are organized around a topic or issue, rather than the progression of time. However, progression of time may still be an important factor in a thematic review" [UNC, 2012, p. 5]. 'Progression of time' is significant because the original Northern discourse emanated some 70 years ago in that timeframe of post-war reconstruction [cf. Arce and Long, 2000, p. 3]. Furthermore, the primary postulation, administration, program execution, and communication of that main discourse was, and continues to be, of the English language and thought-processes. This is the main theme that surfaces in this select literature again and again. Some might ask: Is there really a problem with a *lingua franca* for widespread communication — in this case, English? Such a pervasive language is said to serve a necessary instrumental and utilitarian function [Bieberly, 2008, p. 28; Modiano, 2001, p. 344], minimizing misunderstanding across cultures and disavowing the need for mediating interpreters. But this begs a paramount question: Does human language operate in such a cultural vacuum? Whether one answers 'yes' or 'no' to this question, a corollary question emerges in the context of this study: How will the use of English in planning and implementation affect the global sustainable development agenda for the future beyond the year 2015? The elucidation of this last question as the emergent theme in this select literature becomes the primary focus of this short examination.

Emergence of the Northern Development Discourse

The realization of clandestine meetings between Britain and the U.S. has all the intrigue of a Hollywood blockbuster. Notice again in footnote #1 the dates regarding the U.S.-British agreement on post-World War II development plans. Not only is there the mention that the U.S. and Britain met 'secretly' during the early phases of the war, but also this date is more than three months before America officially entered World War II. A few years after this, the Bretton Woods meeting to design and implement the financial institutions that would direct the reconstruction and development of the post-war world (especially in war-ravaged Europe) convened in 1944 — more than a year before World War II officially ended. Instead of fueling conspiracy theories, however, these details are mentioned here to highlight the significance of the ubiquitous presence of Britain and the United States in the prescription, design, and application of this Northern blueprint ('Western,' in the old East-West dichotomy) for a post-war world — with the English language as the primary medium of communication.

Interesting, but perhaps not surprising, is that this blueprint found advocacy after World War II from none other than U.S. President Harry Truman, indicated in his resounding state-

ment that "...the American system [should] become a world system."[2] Building on that strong foundation, U. S. Secretary of State George C. Marshall addressed the 1947 graduating class of Harvard University with the following plea for the reconstruction of war-torn Europe:

> The truth of the matter is that Europe's requirements for the next three or four years of foreign food and other essential products — principally from America — are so much greater than her present ability to pay that she must have substantial additional help or face economic, social, and political deterioration of a very grave character... The remedy lies in restoring the confidence of the European people in the economic future of their own countries and of Europe as a whole... It is logical that the United States should assist in the return of normal economic health in the world, without which there can be no political stability and no assured peace (Marshall, 1947). [Magid, 2012, p. 2]

This, then, accentuates the rationale for the current Northern discourse of development — even seventy years later. From this viewpoint, if there was no reconstruction of Europe, then there would be the hindering of "normal economic health in the world." With America and Britain grateful for northwestern Europe's fight against Nazi Germany, it was not difficult at that time in history for the U.S. Congress to approve the Marshall Plan concomitant with the other Bretton Woods interventions.

The Marshall Plan, Neo-liberalism, and Globalization

While the Marshall Plan was grandiose in its design to reconstruct European economies, it was short-sighted in its ability to carry out its mandate without creating undue risk to the stretched post-war American economy [Magid, 2012, pp. 3-4]. Under the Marshall Plan statute that formed the European Cooperation Agency (ECA), however, invitations to U.S. businesses to contribute directly to the reconstruction effort could be made. During the war, American businesses might have been conscripted into war-time service — research, development, and manufacture; under this statute, however,

> [U]S businessmen would market their goods directly to foreign firms, utilizing the ECA office in Washington.... Businesses, however, were still reluctant to engage in foreign direct investment in Europe as they feared that they would be unable to realize their returns in dollar denominations. The ECA, therefore, also functioned as a guarantor of convertibility from European currencies to dollars as long as these investments were considered essential for European recovery.... [Magid, 2012, p. 4]

Thus began a relationship, if not a marriage, between American businesses (many of them, future multinational corporations) and the U.S. government in helping President Truman realize his dream for the 'American system' to become a world system. This, along with other mitigating factors, helped to give birth to the concept of "neo-liberalism" [Cohn, 2008, p. 77] and its vehicle for expansion: "globalization."[3]

---

[2] "The whole world should adopt the American system. The American system can survive in America only if it becomes a world system." (President Harry Truman, 1947, cited in Pieterse 2004, 131.) [quoted in Phillipson, 2008, p. 1]. An interesting commentary on this proclamation of President Truman states that "development also originated in this moment of stillness and hope and not in the hegemonic agenda of US President Truman though one was not totally separated from the other" [Kiri and Van Ufford, 2004, p. 11]. Despite Kiri and Van Ufford's downplay of Truman's agenda, their commentary lacks the verve of Truman's original emphatic statement.

[3] "Globalisation is not an inclusive or progressive form of internationalism. Rather, it is the successful expansion on a world scale of particular localisms of social, economic, and political organisation, which are neo-liberal and capitalist in character. The mix of material and ideological elements that make this expan-

How, then, did the emergence of neo-liberalism, and the corollary push to a world, globalized system, affect the manner in which the North would offer aid and assistance to the less-developed countries (LDC) of the South? The Bretton Woods institutions were used to offer loans and other assistance for LDCs to strive in developing economies-of-scale. The caveat was that the LDC in question would also work to allow for more liberal economic policies in which other business interests (namely, those of corporate America) could come and offer their goods and services along with LDC local businesses. Under the guise of coming in as friendly-competition to stimulate market growth, the larger corporate businesses would begin to undermine these smaller, local businesses, effectively driving them out. As the IMF and the World Bank would demand repayment of the loans, the businesses would be forced to sell off, creating the conundrum that neoliberal globalization fosters on LDCs in this situation [Korten, Perlas, & Shiva, 2002, p. 5]. As this system expanded through the decade of the 1980s under the Thatcher government and the Reagan administration,

> the globalization of markets is [now] connected with a new social formation, namely, the emergence of a transnational stratum of business executives of multinational companies, international consultants, and development experts, [etc.].... People in this stratum speak a jargonized international English, spend a lot of time in planes or behind computers, live in international hotels, and share a similar lifestyle. In fact,...the efficiency of development experts [found in this stratum] is lowered as they increasingly lose contact with local culture. [Evers, 2004, pp. 211-212]

How did development experts find themselves in this new social stratum, communicating in 'jargonized international English'? For this, more historical background is required.

The English Language and Development Discourse

Two World War II Allies, the United States and Britain, used English as their primary medium of communication. When the third Ally, the Soviet Union, started its own discourse (i.e., the Soviet bloc and Warsaw Pact), leading to the formation of the Western first-world / Eastern second-world dialectic, the *lingua franca* of English for the Western (Northern) paradigm was firmly established. For this reason alone, from 1945 to the present, most of the significant Northern development literature has appeared in the English language; albeit, one with a specialized vocabulary.

> Development discourse refers to the process of articulating knowledge and power through which particular concepts, theories, and practices for social change are created and reproduced.... Attention to development discourse emerged in the 1990s, building upon critical approaches to development communication studies. Development discourse studies tend to view dominant models of development as a highly contested domain in which dominant groups attempt to assert control over marginalized groups of people.... Studies of development discourse tend to examine strategic communicative intervention of development institutions for social change in terms of the constructed problems and solutions... [Young-Gil, 2008]

In this manner, then, English was the 'strategic communicative intervention;' not only for communication between developers and those wanting development, but also in the conceptualization and planning of such development projects. Due to this specialization and observa-

---

sion possible makes globalisation a hegemonic process. Nor does globalisation create or encourage economic freedom, opportunities, and choice at all levels; rather it is more akin to a monoculture of ideas, politics, and economic models" [Guttal, 2010, pp. 76-77].

tions of government and business forces regarding neo-liberalism and globalization, certain development practitioners began to show concern that representatives of LDC recipients would not be fluent enough in what was termed as "Developmentspeak, a peculiar dialect of English" [Eade, 2010, p. viii].[4]

Why such concern? Scholars who represent "English as an International Language (EIL)" [Modiano, 2001, p. 339] emphasize its utilitarian, universal benefits: "English is currently regarded as the world's principal international language. As a result there are now more exchanges between non-native speakers of English than between non-native speakers and native speakers. Thus, it could be fair to say that English no longer belongs to any particular group of people" [Rajasekhar, 2012, p. 114]. The English language is becoming so ubiquitous that it is "...the potential speaker of English...who will decide about the kind of culture to be expressed not the language or its native speakers. In fact, it looks illogical or unreasonable to expect the learners [to] give up their own culture and adopt the culture of the acquired language or its speakers" [Aliakbari, 2002, p. 6]. This view, found time and time again in the EIL literature [Aliakbari, 2002; Crystal, 2003; Modiano, 2001; Nunn, 2005; Rajasekhar, 2012; Yano, 2006] sounds benign and optimistic.[5]

Despite the optimism, this EIL view fails to take into account that "...language and culture each contribute to our understanding of the other" [Shaw, 1988, p. 25]; in other words, language does not operate in a cultural vacuum. While it might be easier for a LDC representative to think and communicate in simple conversational English (akin to sending emails or joining English-language chat-rooms on the Internet), the intense thought-processes and mastery of the jargonized 'Developmentspeak' has its affect on cherished traditional views and customs. Recently, Anderson [2014] shed light on this in his monograph analysis of "...the discursive cues that prompt people to decide who they are" [p. 8]. Expositing this premise in his last chapter on "the global South" [pp. 167f], Anderson ponders if the European colonial discourse accounts for the "sporadic and tenuous record" of democracy [cf. p. 6], with its corollary concept on development. While some like Anderson betray an optimism that development (in the context of democracy) is "possible" anywhere and everywhere [2007, pp. 33-34], the expressions of these concepts in the English medium load them with multiple layers of meaning. Indeed, the interpretation of what the LDC representative believes the development discourse to be in his or her country could vary considerably from other stakeholders sitting at that same discussion table: "Whereas one assumes development to denote a higher income for the rural population, a second links it with a better investment climate for multinational companies leading to employment and economic growth, a third with sustainable resource use, a fourth with better health care for mothers and infants, a fifth with economic and cultural imperialism, and a sixth with an opportunity to make a living in the aid business. Development means different things to different people" [Ziai, 2013, pp. 132-133].

---

[4] "[T]he concepts and language of international development are defined by the cultural mindsets of donor agencies, be they bilateral or multilateral.... The intellectual contribution and cultures of aid-receiving countries, even those where English is the medium of higher education, are...consigned at best to the textboxes of influential reports published by the World Bank and other UN specialised agencies..." [Eade in Cornwall & Eade, 2010, p. vii].

[5] "Languages and the cultures that the local communities express and contain are becoming homogenized according to Redman (2002) who argues, 'English spans the divide between people and cultures. It isn't owned by Britain and America: now it belongs to everyone' (p. 45). This may inevitably mean that everyone belongs to English and other languages and cultural practices disappear and are lost forever" (Burnett, 2004) [Arnold, 2006, p. 3]. The admission of 'other languages and cultural practices...lost forever' makes this statement less than benign.

Therefore, in the wake of this confusion and consternation came the consultation that produced the Cornwall and Eade volume. This conference met to address the ubiquitous use of English "buzzwords and fuzzwords" [Cornwall, 2010, p. 1] in the Northern development discourse. Indeed, one of the apparent prerequisites to receiving aid from the North entails subscribing to this particular English lexicon.

> [Such specialized English terms] close to the mainstream of much development discourse during the past two decades include: accountability, capabilities, civil society, consumer, decentralisation, democracy, deprivation. diversity, empowerment, entitlement, environment, gender, globalisation, governance, human rights, livelihood, market, ownership, participation, partnership, pluralism, process, stakeholder, sustainability, transparency, vulnerability, well-being. [Chambers, 2004, p. 3]

Other English words and phrases identified include: "needs," "population," and "planning" [Escobar, 1997, p. 503]; "small farmers" [Edelman and Haugerud, 2005, p. 43]; "capacity building," and "results based" [Leal, 2007, p. 539]. While some of these words and phrases might appear innocently on any daily newspaper crossword puzzle, the fact that they are used conspicuously in the Northern discourse on development means that there is more to their definitions than mere dictionary renderings. And, as noted by Ziai [2013] above, the interpretations for such specialized terminology assume different meanings to different stakeholders.

Development Discourse vis-à-vis the Anglo-dominated Paradigm

While appearing neutral and utilitarian, English words used in certain contextual situations can produce ideas and concepts charged with cultural and political meaning. Rajasekhar [2012, p. 116] actually concedes this when he quotes Crystal [2003, p. xii] stating that: "'[I]t has all happened so quickly. In 1950, any notion of English as a true world language was but a dim, shadowy, theoretical possibility.... [F]ifty years on and world English exists as a political and cultural reality....'" Others in the EIL circle have made similar concessions to the nature of this 'cultural reality' of English [Aliakbari, 2002, p. 2; Yano, 2006, p. 2]. With this acknowledgment, a jargonized trait emerges: "[F]ew of the words used in Anglo-dominated development discourse admit of translation into other languages: many come to be used in other languages as loan-words, their meanings ever more closely associated with the external agencies that make their use in proposals, policies, strategies, and reports compulsory" [Cornwall, 2010, p. 4].

The Northern discourse of development, then, is directed not only by the anglophone language of the United Nations and the Bretton Woods institutions, but also it is steeped in the philosophies and practices of Western (Northern) modernism. Therefore, "the standards — the criteria — for development are those of Western economics, of Western politics, of Western technology, of Western styles of life. This is generally true whether the planners and policy makers are Western people or not.... [They] are nearly always those who have been trained according to Western standards, often in Western institutions, and have been assimilated to Western values...." (Berreman, 1994, p. 8).

The legacy of the British and American Industrial Revolutions, and the notion that science and technological advances contributed to the modernization of the world, are paramount in this anglo-dominated paradigm. The seemingly absurd question, "Does modernization require Westernization?" [Lal, 1999], is debated in the literature, and that debate is beyond the scope of this study. For our purposes instead, it is realized that the Northern development discourse is

fraught with the concept that LDCs are somehow backward, and need the kind of development assistance to "catch up" that the "modernisation project" can offer:

> It implied the establishment of a new optic on the value and practical use of local traditions: thus aid policies and planning models of the industrialised countries, promoted by international organisations and underpinned by academic research, sought to identify and eradicate the various 'traditional' cultural and institutional obstacles that were assumed to block 'progress'. In this way, a 'developmentalist' relationship with Third World traditions was established and legitimised. [Arce and Long, 2000, p. 5]

Not only, then, do LDC representatives have to speak and think in English while sitting in these stakeholder conference meetings, but they also have to adjust their 'traditional' thinking which "...is often conceived of as being linked to a psychological or cultural disposition that is in some sense backward and prevents people from embracing modernity" [Crewe & Harrison, 1998, p. 43]. Therefore, this jargonized English becomes a double handicap: first, as the medium of development discourse communication (foreign, though it is); and, second, as a foreign cultural thought-process. This echoes Schulzke's [2014] concern that, despite many apparent benefits, there is much regarding the unanswered question "...whether it will unfairly disadvantage those who learn English as a second language, and whether English's dominance will be considered legitimate by nonnative speakers" [p. 225]. Part of that legitimacy consideration is the embracing of 'democracy' as it is understood in the Northern discourse.[6] This leads into the next section.

'A World Safe for Democracy' – Whose Democracy?

Under the Northern development paradigm, democracy was placed in contrast to the communism of the Soviet bloc and Warsaw Pact countries before the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989. LDCs, choosing the economic and political freedom of Northern 'democracy,' would then opt for assistance from and subscription to Bretton Woods institutional principles and policies. What these recipient countries received was "import substitution industrialization policies" in the 1950s and 1960s, the "export-led growth model" of the 1970s, and then, the "structural adjustment programs (SAPs)" of the 1980s and 1990s [Cohn, 2008, pp. 214, 346, 347].

Meanwhile, LDC nationals were eager to experiment with participatory approaches in local development projects, giving them a voice and a greater sense of democracy in their midst. "Arising from the emancipatory pedagogy of Paulo Freire..., the principal objective of the participatory paradigm was not development — or 'poverty alleviation' — but the transformation of the cultural, political, and economic structures which reproduce poverty and marginalisation" [Leal, 2007, p. 540]. These recipients liked the qualities of American and British democracy, but did not necessarily want it replicated by Northern anglophones.

An example of this comes from White [1996, p. 6]:

> The Bangladeshi NGO leaders are in a dilemma. They are unhappy with the official agencies' new plan. Neither social nor environmental questions have been given the consideration they deserve. As happens more and more often, they have been invited to attend a meeting to discuss the plan. Flattered at first by official recognition, they are now uneasy. If they do not go, they have no grounds

---

[6] "These days, the language of democracy dominates development circles. At national level it is seen in the rhetoric of 'civil society' and 'good governance'. At the programme and project level, it appears as a commitment to 'participation'. This is trumpeted by agencies right across the spectrum, from the huge multilaterals to the smallest people's organizations" [White, 1996, p. 6].

to complain that the interests of the poor have been ignored. But if they go, what guarantee do they have that their concerns will really be heard? Too many times they have seen their discussions drain away into the sand. The plans are left untouched; but their names remain, like a residue, in the list of 'experts' whose opinions the scheme reflects.

This, then, is exactly where the interpretation of 'democracy' breaks down in its understanding between Northern and Southern stakeholders. Being a word subject to many meanings and interpretations, it is prudent to realize that this word has nuanced differences in meaning for those giving the aid in development and those on the receiving end. Whereas local, grass-roots interpretation of experiencing democracy will include hands-on, direct contact by the population involved and affected, the disconnect comes because the Northern discourse does not easily "...liberate the imagination of democracy from the constraints that 'big science,' the nation-state, and [Northern] development have imposed" [Visvanathan, 2003, p. 239]. Indeed, many other phrases, words, and terminology appearing in the Developmentspeak lexicon also seem to get lost in translation.

A telling illustration of this is the International Monetary Fund's initiative in implementing Structural Adjustment Programs (SAP) to LDC recipients especially in the 1980s and 1990s.[7] The implementation of these SAP initiatives (from Venezuela in Latin America to Nigeria in Africa) led to riots, general strikes, and other acts of violence [Leal, 2007, p. 540]. With the LDC local authorities attempting to counter these top-down moves of the World Bank with participatory approaches in development implementation,

> the Bank assumed a populist appearance.... The new rhetoric assumed a pseudo-political stance in its suggestion that the 'crisis of governance' in many countries is due to the 'appropriation of the machinery of government by the elite to serve their own interests', and went so far as to state that a 'deep political malaise stymies action in most countries'.... At a first glance, one might naively infer that the logical implication is to call for people to be empowered to overturn the current and oppressive state of affairs through increased political participation. However, the actual intent is somewhat different. By having identified the nasty state as the culprit, the World Bank was not advocating a popular government, but rather creating a populist justification for the removal of the state from the economy and its substitution by the market. [Leal, 2007, p. 542]

This comment, therefore, assumes the tone of 'the end justifying the means.' But, this is not uncommon regarding the workings of the neoliberal Bretton Woods machinery within the strictures of its mandate, as well as the lexicon of its jargonized English. Neoliberal advocates of globalization are no less generous in their dissemination of the principles of democracy and freedom [Galeota, 2004, p. 22], but do they truly resonate with LDC recipients who rather desire these principles on their terms?

This last question echoes the query of Crewe and Harrison in their seminal work: "Whose Development?" [1998]. Their query stimulates further questions related to this study: Whose democracy? And, in whose interpretation? What truly will be accepted on both sides (recipient and donor) as legitimate in the development process? Regardless of EIL arguments, the fact that English is the primary medium of communication effectively handicaps those whose first (or even, second) language is not English. "Where English is not the prime language of scholarship, let alone the language in which most people communicate, the exclusion is greater still. For instance, Mike Powell reports finding 'bilingual, regionally oriented development practitioners in West Africa struggling to interpret and reconcile the very different development discours-

---

[7] The mention of such specifics of the Northern Development paradigm assumes a knowledge of the literature. For those requiring a short overview, it is suggested to consult either Cohn, 2008, pp. 324-357, or Willis, 2011, pp. 1-35.

es coming out of Anglo-Nordic and Francophone intellectual traditions' (Powell 2006:523)" [Eade, 2010, p. vii]. The major reason for this is the composition of the Developmentspeak lexicon itself: "The language of development is, as Fiona Wilson suggests, a hybrid, not quite the language of social science nor of 'living' English; its 'vocabulary is restricted, banal and depersonalised'. Its 'underlying purpose', she notes, 'is not to lay bare or be unequivocal but to mediate in the interests of political consensus while at the same time allowing for the existence of several internal agendas' (1992:10)" [Cornwall, 2010, p. 5].

Where, then, is 'democracy' when the medium of the language being used is not fully understood by both parties concerned? Whose definition of democracy is normative? In drawing the line between Northern and Southern interpretations, there is substantial evidence to indicate that the Bretton Woods institutions are less interested in participatory democracy and more interested in participatory compliance.[8] The following admission by Rajasekhar [2012, p. 117], therefore, should come as no surprise:

> [T]hose who promote English — organizations such as the British Council, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank, and individuals such as operators of English language schools — use three types of argument: Intrinsic arguments describe the English language as providential, rich, noble and interesting. Such arguments tend to assert what English is and what other languages are not. Extrinsic arguments point out that English is well established and it has many speakers, there are trained teachers and a wealth of teaching material. Functional arguments emphasize the usefulness of English as a gateway to the world.

Another EIL promoter [Yano, 2006] states that such 'functional arguments' for 'the usefulness of English' indicate a fluid movement — indeed, the democracy — of English as the common medium.

The U.S.-led economic, technological, and cultural globalization has made English the most widely used language in the world, but at the same time its worldwide spread has brought de-Anglo-Americanization of the language. Today 80 percent of English use is among nonnative speakers who use it as a lingua franca and this tendency will continue because the number of English speakers in the Expanding Circle far exceeds that of the Inner and Outer Circles. It means that English is required to keep its international intelligibility despite its localization and resulting diversification.... [p. 4]

This, however, begs a necessary question: If the 'international intelligibility' of English were to render it locally unintelligible (as witnessed in misinterpretations of Developmentspeak), how can it truly advance the cause of LDC localized initiatives in development? This in fact becomes Schulzke's [2014] point and major contribution to this discussion: it is not ultimately the use of English (especially, in an LDC context); rather, it is how English, in a jargonized form, is used. How does such use propel or impede this discourse and its mutual understanding on both sides?

Whither 'Sustainable Development' in the Northern Discourse?

This then leads finally to the focus on sustainability in the development discourse. Indeed, intelligibility of development planning and implementation on both sides is a prerequisite to teamwork and success of stated initiatives. Recall above (in the Chambers quote) that the English word, 'sustainability' (and its cousin, 'sustainable development'), are found in the Developmentspeak lexicon in the discourse. Given the arguments set forth thus far in this study, what

---

[8] Such a listing of this literature could fill a large tome of its own. Rather, the interested reader could start with any and all References at the end of each Chapter in the Cornwall & Eade volume [2010].

is to be said of these terms − sustainability, and sustainable-development − as they are interpreted and re-interpreted from one side of the development discourse to the other? Whither 'sustainable development' beyond 2015?

In the more common two-word variety of 'sustainable development,' it is interesting to note that the term exposes an oxymoron (i.e., 'Is the current development paradigm truly sustainable?') in which LDC recipients wonder if the Northern donors and Bretton Woods institutions are basically schizophrenic:

> [The d]eveloping countries' original agenda of trade liberalization, debt relief, poverty reduction, and an increase in development assistance was developmentally focused. This was lined up against the developed countries' environmentally-focused agenda of climate change, biodiversity loss, deforestation, and declines of the world marine fisheries. Of course, the economy has always been an overriding concern....
>
> [T]he institutions governing the global economy—the Bretton Woods Institutions, World Trade Organization (WTO), Group of 8 and increasingly the Group of 20—are stronger than those promoting social equity, poverty alleviation, and environment cooperation (Halle, 2002). The notion of sustainable development has lost traction since the Brundtland report and Rio Summit because of the dominance of the economic growth agenda. [Drexhage & Murphy, 2010, pp. 16-17, 18]

While the last statement does little to inspire, some hold out hope for the promise of sustainable-development, especially as it a champion for the climate change agenda.

> So what of the future? Will sustainability become the unifying concept of the twenty-first century, as many so boldly proclaimed just a few years ago?... [W]ith climate change in particular − and wider risks associated with environmental change, whether epidemic disease or biodiversity change − now being seen as central to economic strategy and planning, there are clear opportunities for the insertion of sustainability agendas in new ways into policy discourse and practice.
>
> [C]an...[sustainable development] be reinvigorated and reinvented for new challenges, or does it need discarding, with something else put in its place?... [I]n my view at least, sustainability − and the wider agenda that it inspires − is here to stay. [Scoones, 2010, p. 160]

Despite the voiced optimism above, it remains to be seen how Northern developers and Southern recipients will understand each other and continue to work together productively in the current development discourse. The purpose of this select literature review, therefore, has been to alert the reader to the omnipresence of jargonized English, with its Developmentspeak lexicon, that has pervaded Northern development planning and implementation over the last seventy years. Being more probative than prescriptive, then, it is hoped that others can take this information and use it to shape the global sustainable-development agenda beyond 2015 for better understanding between all future stakeholders.

References

Aliakbari M. (2002) *Linguistic Imperialism, Linguistic Democracy and English Language Teaching*. Brisbane: Griffith University, Center for Applied Linguistics and Languages (unpublished).

Anderson R.D., Jr. (2007) Discourse and the Export of Democracy. Stair, no 2(2), pp. 19-35.

Anderson R.D., Jr. (2014) *Discourse, Dictators and Democrats: Russia's Place in a Global Process*. London: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

Arce A., Long N. (eds.) (2000) *Anthropology, Development and Modernities: Exploring Discourses, Counter-tendencies and Violence*. London: Routledge.

Arnold J. (2006) Some Social and Cultural Issues of English as the Global Language: Everything is Changing, Everything is Going, Going, Gone Now. *Electronic Magazine of Multicultural Education*, no 8(1), pp. 1-11. Available at: http://www.eastern.edu/publications/emme/2006spring/arnold.pdf (accessed 09 February 2015).

Bello W. (2006) *Deglobalization: Ideas for a New World Economy* (Philippine edition). Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press.

Berreman G. (1994) Anthropology, Development and Public Policy. *Occasional Papers in Sociology and Anthropology*, no 4, pp. 3-32.

Bieberly C.J. (2008) *Television Commercials as a Window on American Culture for Teaching Adult English as a Second Language Students*. Kansas State University.

Burnett R. (2004) *Critical Approaches to Culture, Communications + Hypermedia: Postmodern Media Communities*. Vancouver: Emily Carr University of Art & Design. Available at: http://www.eciad.bc.ca/~rburnett/Bas.htm (accessed 09 February 2015).

Chambers R. (2004) *Ideas for Development: Reflecting Forwards* (IDS working paper 238). Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.

Cohn T.H. (2008) *Global Political Economy: Theory and Practice* (Fourth edition). New York: Pearson / Longman.

Cornwall A., Eade D. (eds.) (2010) *Deconstructing Development Discourse: Buzzwords and Fuzzwords*. Warwickshire: Practical Action Publishing Ltd. P.1-18.

Cornwall A. (2010) Introductory Overview – Buzzwords and Fuzzwords: Deconstructing Development Discourse. *Deconstructing Development Discourse: Buzzwords and Fuzzwords* (eds. A. Cornwall and D. Eade). Warwickshire: Practical Action Publishing Ltd.

Crewe E., Harrison E. (1998) *Whose Development? An Ethnography of Aid*. London: Zed Books.

Crystal D. (2003) *English as a Global Language* (Second edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Drexhage J., Murphy D. (2010) *Sustainable Development: From Brundtland to Rio 2012*. New York: United Nations. Available at: http://www.un.org/.../docs/GSP1-6_Background on Sustainable Devt.pdf (accessed 13 April 2015).

Eade D. (2010) Preface. *Deconstructing Development Discourse: Buzzwords and Fuzzwords* (eds. A. Cornwall and D. Eade). Warwickshire: Practical Action Publishing Ltd.

Edelman M., Haugerud A. (2005) Introduction: the Anthropology of Development and Globalization. *The Anthropology of Development and Globalization: from Classical Political Economy to Contemporary Neoliberalism* (eds. Edelman M. and Haugerud A.). Victoria: Blackwell Publishing Ltd. P. 1-74.

Evers H.D. (2004) The Global Context of Development Anthropology: Social and Cultural Dimensions of Market Expansion. *Development Anthropology: beyond Economics* (ed. Y. Kikuchi). Quezon City: New Day Publishers. P. 204-218.

Escobar A. (1997) Anthropology and Development. *International Social Science Journal*, no 54, pp. 497-515.

Galeota J. (2004) Cultural Imperialism: an American Tradition. *The Humanist*, May/June, pp. 22-24, 46.

Guttal S. (2010) Globalisation. *Deconstructing Development Discourse: Buzzwords and Fuzzwords* (eds. A. Cornwall and D. Eade). Warwickshire: Practical Action Publishing Ltd. P.69-79.

Halle M. (2002) *Sustainable Development Cools off: Globalization Demands Summit Take New Approach to Meeting Ecological, Social Goals*. Available at: http://www.iisd.org/pdf/2002/commentary_trade_1.pdf (accessed 13 April 2015).

Kiri A., Van Ufford P.Q. (2004) *A Moral Critique of Development: Ethics, Aesthetics and Responsibility*. Working paper, no 128. Aalborg: Aalborg University – Institute for History, International and Social Studies.

Korten D.C., Perlas N., Shiva V. (2002) *Global Civil Society: the Path Ahead*. Available at: http://www.cadi.ph/Features/Global_CS_Path_Ahead_Main.htm (accessed 8 October 2008).

Lal D. (2000) Does Modernization Require Westernization? *The Independent Review*, no 5(1).

Leal P. (2007) Participation: the Ascendancy of a Buzzword in the Neo-liberal Era. *Development in Practice*, no 17(4-5), pp.539-548. doi: 10.1080/09614520701469518.

Marshall G. (1947) *Commencement Speech*. Cambridge: Harvard University.

Magid J. (2012) The Marshall Plan. *Advances in Historical Studies*, no 1(1), pp. 1-7. doi: 10.4236/ahs.2012.11001.

Modiano M. (2001) Linguistic Imperialism, Cultural Integrity, and EIL. *ELT Journal*, no 55(4), pp. 339-346.

Morton H.V. (1943) *Atlantic Meeting*. London: Methuen.

Nunn R. (2005) Competence and Teaching English as an International Language. *Asian EFL Journal*, no 7(3), pp. 61-74.

Phillipson R. (2008) The Linguistic Imperialism of Neoliberal Empire. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, no 5(1), pp. 1-43.

Powell M. (2006) Which Knowledge? Whose Reality? An Overview of Knowledge Used in the Development Sector. *Development in Practice*, no 16(6), pp. 518-532.

Rajasekhar G. (2012) Colonialism and Imperialism and its Impact on English Language. *Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research*, no 1(4), pp. 111-120.

Redman C. (2002) Wanna Speak English? *Time*, 24 June, p. 45.

Schulzke M. (2014) The Prospects of Global English as an Inclusive Language. *Globalizations*, no 11(2), pp. 225-238. doi: 10.1080/14747731.2014.904173.

Scoones I. (2010) Sustainability. *Deconstructing Development Discourse: Buzzwords and Fuzzwords* (eds. A. Cornwall and D. Eade). Warwickshire: Practical Action Publishing Ltd. P. 153-162.

Shaw R.D. (1988) *Transculturation: the Cultural Factor in Translation and Other Communication Tasks*. Pasadena: William Carey Library.

University of North Carolina (UNC) (2012) *How to Write a Literature Review. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina College of Arts & Sciences-The Writing Center*. Available at: https://writingcenter.unc.edu/files/2012/09/Literature-Reviews-The-Writing-Center.pdf (accessed 20 June 2015).

Visvanathan S. (2003) Mrs. Brundtland's Disenchanted Cosmos. *The Geopolitics Reader* (eds. G.O. Tuathail, S. Dalby, and P. Routledge). London: Routledge. P. 237-241.

White S. (1996) Depoliticising Development: the Uses and Abuses of Participation. *Development in Practice*, no 6(1), pp. 6-15. doi: 10.1080/0961452961000157564.

Willis K. (2011) *Theories and Practices of Development* (Second edition). New York: Routledge.

Wilson F. (1992) Faust: the Developer. *CDR Working Paper*, no 92.5.

Yano Y. (2006) Cross-cultural Communication and English as an International Language. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, XV(3), pp. 1-8.

Young-Gil C. (2008) Development Discourse. *The International Encyclopedia of Communication* (ed. W. Donsbach). Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell. doi: 10.1111/b.9781405131995.2008.x.

Ziai A. (2013) The Discourse of "Development"and why the Concept Should be Abandoned. *Development in Practice*, no 23(1), pp. 123-136.