World Englishes As A Site for Pedagogies of The Public Sphere

Amarjit Singh
Faculty of Education at Memorial
University of Newfoundland

This paper offers a number of suggestions to cultural workers whose interest lies in understanding the role of world Englishes in expanding "the public sphere." It discusses the context in which English has been transformed into "Englishes" or world Englishes. This transformation has raised issues related to the "hegemony of English" in certain circles. Whether the custom of using world Englishes in various international situations creates conditions for establishing "the hegemony of English" or for enhancing the multiple public spheres, would depend upon a number of factors. It is argued that world Englishes should be articulated in terms of a site and cultural practice, where cultural workers can practice different forms of pedagogies. There is not much to be gained by thinking of world Englishes in terms of a logic of either camp, because in the space between the two positions - "the hegemony of English" and the "liberating" potential inherent in the world Englishes - there are possibilities to expand "the public sphere" and democratic living.

This paper suggests that those interested in the world Englishes need to see themselves in the roles of critical educator and cultural worker and develop self-images appropriate to these roles. To be involved in pedagogical practices in the roles of critical educator and cultural worker requires seeing the world not only in terms of what is, but also what ought to be or what is possible. Second, educators as cultural workers need to articulate world Englishes in terms of a cultural and political site, and as a practice for the production of new forms of knowledge, representation, and identity. This step is another way to fully understand the role of world Englishes in expanding the public sphere. Third, educators and other cultural workers - that is, those who are committed to cultural production (e.g., artists, social workers, media people, lawyers, and others) - should be critically conscious of the shift from English to world Englishes and the space this shift has created for them to be imaginative and innovative in their specific domain of everyday life. Fourth, cultural workers need also to realize that at stake here is the narrowing of the public spheres, unless they choose to function as active participants at those various specific sites that might have opened to them due to this shift. Finally, the paper suggests that cultural workers can function as active educators, admittedly in varying degrees of engagement, by developing pedagogies of transformation suitable to their own specific locations, goals, interests, and social realities. Getting actively involved means being able to open new spaces for bringing about at least some desired reforms or changes in the given situation. Looking at world

Englishes as a site in this way can play a significant role in expanding the multiple public spheres within and across societies and cultures.

The paper expands on the issues mentioned above by first discussing the context in which English has become a dominant international language and thus has been transformed into world Englishes. This transformation of English into world Englishes has raised issues related to the "hegemony of English" in certain circles. Since this is perceived by some to be problematic, the paper next briefly focuses on this issue and then discusses several on-going but related conversations, provides illustrations, and makes further suggestions as to how world Englishes as a site and cultural practice can play a significant role in expanding the public sphere and thus democracy and democratic living.

1. The context

The internationalization of life in all its major spheres - economic, social, political, and cultural - is recognized in many quarters as a significant event of our time. We believe ourselves to be living in an age of globalization. This is affecting us all in one way or another. We are asked to "think globally, act locally." The suggestion is that we are witnessing a new phase in the development of capitalism that has been described variously as late capitalism, flexible production or accumulation, disorganized capitalism, global capitalism, and post-Fordism (Harvey, 1992; Smart, 1993). We are told that processes of globalization are affecting national traditions, cultures, and economics. It is argued that each "major aspect of social reality...is simultaneously undergoing globalization, as witnessed by the emergence of a world economy, a cosmopolitan culture and international social movements" (Archer, 1990:1).

Accompanying economic fragmentation is cultural fragmentation, implying that most societies are becoming multicultural, and that the conditions created by global capitalism help explain the global movement of peoples and cultures, the weakening of boundaries among societies, and certain other phenomena that have become apparent over the last two or three decades. Hall (1991:57-58) describes some of the most salient characteristics of post-Fordism:

> "Post-Fordism" is a [broad] term, suggesting a whole new epoch distinct
> from the era of mass production ... it covers at least some of the following
> characteristics: a shift to the new information "technology"; more flexible,
> decentralized forms of labor process and work organization; decline of the
> old manufacturing base and the growth of the "sunrise", computer-based
> industries; the living off or contracting out of functions and services; a great
> emphasis on choice and product differentiation, on marketing, packaging,
> and design, on the "targeting" of consumers by lifestyles, taste, and culture
> rather than by the categories of social class; a decline in the proportion of
> the skilled, male manual working class, the rise of the service and white-collar
> classes and the "feminization" of the work force; an economy dominated
> by the multinationals, with their new international division of labor and
> their greater autonomy from nation-state control; and the "globalization" of
> the new financial markets, linked by the communications revolution

Concomitant with the globalization of capitalism, the culture of the
market has acquired a renewed importance in the daily affairs of citizens
in all cultures and nations. Historically, the market and the activities
associated with it, in fact, have had a large array of cultural
consequences for the people who have participated in the market
economy. Its consequences for and effects on society, culture, and
identity are both praised and condemned.[1]

In this broad historical context, there is a growing awareness in the general
public that the dominance of the international market culture has transformed
the conditions under which people communicate with each other in various
international situations, such as in education, in business, in tourism, in
personal interaction, and in literary creativity. It has done so by forcing the
use of English as international custom.[2] This custom has been dubbed in

---

1 Thomas L. Haskell and Richard F. Teichgraeber III (1993, pp. 2-3) explain that "to speak of 'the culture
of the market,' ... is not to assume that culture is merely a reflection of autonomous economic
factors, or to suppose that the market is always associated with the same cultural forms, independent
of time, place, tradition, or human volition. There is no single 'culture of the market.' But, on the
other hand, not all cultures are equally compatible with the needs of a market economy. To speak of
the cultural implications of the market is to assume that markets, precisely because they are aspects
of culture, have cultural concomitants, and that we are capable of identifying at least some of them.
Just what those concomitants are, whether they are best understood as preconditions of market
behavior or as results of it, and just how necessary or contingent their connection to market activity
may be, are open questions ..."

some circles as "the hegemony of English." Accordingly, some scholars assert that this custom has caused problems of linguistic discrimination, cultural imperialism, and colonialization of consciousness (Tsuda, 1993, 1994, 1994a). To me, this reading of the issue suggests that a main objection to the hegemony of English could be that it somehow restricts the development of the public sphere, as recently suggested by Fraser (1994). Following Fraser, it appears to me that the hegemonic aspect of English could restrict the development of the public sphere in the sense that it narrows the space in which citizens debate their common concerns, other than economic ones, in the context of globalization and the expansion of the market culture. This may be the one negative consequence for citizens arising out of the increasing importance of the market culture.

On the other hand, the market culture also has brought about situations in which English itself has been transformed into "Englishes" or "world Englishes."[3] This change has taken place both in form and function (Kachru, 1994). Moreover, Kachru (1994:3) states that:

---

2 Kachru (1994:2) points out that the cross-cultural function of English has greatly expanded in many spheres of life and "... that has given English an unprecedented status as a global and cross-cultural code ofcommunication ... It is for this power that English is presented as an Aladdin's lamp for opening the doors to cultural and religious 'enlightenment' as the 'language for all seasons,' a 'universal language,' a language with no national or regional frontiers and the language on which the sun never sets." The evidence that English has acquired such a status in the world has been documented by Bailey and Görlach (ed.) (1982); Kachru (ed.) (1982) [1992], and 1986 [1990]; and McArthur (ed.) (1992).

3 Kachru (1994:1-2) states "the concept 'world Englishes' demands that we begin with a distinctionbetween English as a medium and English as a repertoire of cultural pluralism; one refers to the form oflanguage, and the other to its function, its content. It is the medium that is designed and organized formultiple cultural - or cross-cultural conventions. It is in this sense that one understands the concepts'global,' 'pluralistic,' and 'multi-canons' with reference to the forms and functions of world Englishes.What we share as members of the international English-using speech community is the medium, that is,the vehicle for the transmission of the English language. The medium per se, however, has no constraints on what message - cultural or social - we transmit through it. And English is a paradigm example of medium in this sense.

When we call English a global medium, it means that those who use English across cultures have a shared code of communication. And the result of this shared competence is that, in spite of various types of cultural differences, we believe that we communicate with each other - one user of English with another, a Nigerian with an Indian, a Japanese with a German, and a Singaporean with an American. It is in this broad sense of interlocutors that we have one language and many voices."

> And now, at least in some circles, the use of the term 'English literature' is considered rather restricted and monocultural. Instead, the term 'English literatures' is steadily gaining acceptance ... and the term 'Englishes' or world Englishes' does not raise eyebrows in every circle. This terminological feud is not innocent; it is loaded with ideologies, economic interests, and strategies for power.

Despite the fact that this shift in terminology is not innocent, I believe that it has been instrumental in expanding "the public sphere" at both national and international levels through various discourses.[4]

The concept of "the public sphere" was originally developed by Habermas in his 1962 book, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. As mentioned earlier, Fraser (1994:74-75) has critically reviewed this concept recently and has expanded it with respect to theorizing the limits of democracy in late capitalist societies. According to her, in part, the public sphere is the space in which citizens debate their common affairs. It is an arena of institutionalized, discursive interaction. This concept allows citizens to make distinctions between markets and democratic associations. It is a theatre

---

4 There are many other discourses on the language issues which make conflicting demands on cultural workers. For example, Grossberg (1994, p. 10) points out that education as a field in the United States and elsewhere has been caught "between the conflicting demands and critiques of two opposed discourses. On the one side, there is a discourse of multiculturalism and liberation which calls for a democratic culture based on an acceptance of social difference and which is usually predicated on a theory of identity and representation. On the other side, there is a discourse of conservatism based on canonical notions of general education and a desire to impose what it cannot justify - the existence of an illusory common culture." For another related discourse, see Samuel P. Huntington (1993). Yet there is another discourse which links the problems of a multicultural workforce and multicultural consumers with the interest of global/transnational/multinational corporations in global popular culture. Global corporations are interested in global programming to sell their products to multicultural consumers through advertising. A multicultural population is seen as presenting a dilemma for both the transnational corporations and the nationalists. The question is, which culture should be reproduced - the global culture or the national culture? Here, there are many conflicting discourses. In the United States, Allan Bloom (1987) argues for maintaining western cultural tradition and Hirsch (1988) argues for cultural literacy based on western tradition to maintain national unity. In contrast, groups dominated by European-American white cultures argue for multiculturalism, multicultural education, and Afrocentricity. For these discourses, see Giroux (1993), Giroux and McLaren (1994), Giroux (1991), Giroux (1994), and Spring (1994). Then there is the postcolonial discourse. For this, see Arif Dirlik (1994), Giroux (1993), and Ashcroft, Griffiths, & Tiffin (1987). Kachru (1994) presents discourse surrounding English as a pluralistic language and discusses the three themes - cross-cultural communication, global interdependence and educational linguistic - the themes that are closely related to the world Englishes. In all these discourses, world Englishes play an important role, directly and indirectly.

for debating rather than for buying and selling goods and services.[5] I believe that world Englishes as a site could open up various spaces for cultural workers where they could attempt to develop democratic associations whose main emphasis would not be on merely buying and selling of commodities, but on building relationships based on the principles of justice, freedom, fairness, and equal opportunities for all citizens, regardless of their gender, race, class, age, life styles, and nationalities.

One way to see world Englishes as a site and cultural practice is to be able to participate in the on-going conversations[6] about these two notions (site and *cultural practice) in certain circles (e.g., cultural studies and the critical theory* of pedagogy) and in other related conversations about such notions as cultural public sphere. Also important is an understanding of how these conversations relate to each other, and what consequences such participation has on one's daily life as an individual and citizen. It is hoped that being able to participate in these conversations should give one some sense of meaning(s) which, in

5 Fraser (1994:75) states that "the idea of 'the public sphere' in Habermas' sense is a conceptual resource ... It designates a theatre in modern societies in which political participation is enacted through the medium of talk. It is the space in which citizens deliberate about their common affairs, hence, an institutionalized arena of discursive interaction. This arena is conceptually distinct from the state; it is a site for the production and circulation of discourses that can in principle be critical of the state. The public sphere in Habermas' sense is also conceptually distinct from the official economy; it is not an arena of market relations but rather one of discursive relations, a theatre for debating and deliberating rather than for buying and selling. Thus, this concept of the public sphere permits us to keep in view the distinctions between the state apparatuses, economic markets, and democratic associations, distinctions that are essential to democratic theory."

6 Richard Rorty (1982) maintains that in the pragmatist view human kind is living out an extended conversation over the generations, and the aim of every scientist, philosopher, artist, critic, psychologist, and citizen should be to participate in and contribute to their culture's conversation. Conversations are socially constructed. According to the pragmatist, there is no fixed, permanent "truth" at all. Michel Foucault (1980) goes beyond these philosophers in pointing out the socially constructed nature of truth. According to him, truth is inscribed in the knowledge/power relationship. McLaren (1989:180) explains that knowledge is always an "ideological construction linked to particular interests..." and that "power relations are inscribed in what Foucault refers to as discourses or a family of concepts. Discourses are made up of discursive practices." Foucault (1972:117) defines discursive practices as "a body of anonymous, historical rules, always determined in the time and space that have defined a given period, and for a given social, economic, geographical, or linguistic area, the conditions of operation of the enunciative function." And discursive practices, according to Foucault (1980:200), "...are not purely and simply ways of producing discourse. They are embodied in technical processes, in institutions, in patterns for general behavior, in forms of transmission and diffusion, and pedagogical forms which, at once, impose and maintain them." McLaren (1989:180) explains that "discursive practices, then refer to the rules by which discourses are formed, rules that govern what can be said and what must remain unsaid, who can speak with authority and who must listen. Social and political institutions, such as schools and several institutions, are governed by discursive practices."

turn, will deepen one's understanding about the possible function of world Englishes in expanding the multiple public spheres within and across societies.

2. Conversation about site and practice

In the realm of certain forms of cultural studies and the critical theory, the notions of cultural site and practice are talked about in a specific way. For example, Simon (1994) explains that a cultural-political site is not an ordinary situation. It is a complex and conflictual location where intricate representational forms are worked out and produced. It is a place where a multiplicity of forces (determinations and effects) are at work to produce a particular practice. Different things can and do happen at a specific site at a particular time. A site is a place where different possibilities of uses and effects interact. According to Simon (1994:40):

> The notion of 'site' refers...to a specific material form with a particular relationship to time and space within which modes of production and distribution of representations are accomplished.

A site is a contested terrain where, according to Simon, "the past is traversed by competing and contradictory constructions." Further, he suggests that "cultural workers intending to initiate pedagogies of historical reformation need an understanding of topography on which these struggles are taking place" (Simon, 1993:128). To struggle at a site means taking into account the specificity of the particular context in which one is located in relationship to others.

There could be many sites of production for a particular struggle. Simon (1994:128-129) provides a simple list of the sites of popular memory production, and it is reproduced below to illustrate what is meant when one talks about the notion of site in a concrete way. Following Simon, one can see how world Englishes as a site could be taken up (e.g., integrated) in various other sites where people engage themselves in various forms of struggles. World Englishes could be taken as a site at myriad places - in households and public venues, such as sports arenas, schools, business forums, embassies, airline counters,

hotel lobbies, government offices, shopping centers, bus and train terminals, international trade centers, the interformation highway, and the like. At these spaces, due to globalization of daily life and expansion of market culture, more and more people are using world Englishes as a means of communication. Market culture also produces other sites for various forms of struggles where world Englishes play, or could play, important critical pedagogical role. These sites are prints, posters, postcards, t-shirts, ads of various kinds in media, and so on. Simon's list of popular memory production includes:

- state-sponsored commemorations either declared or enacted in law, e.g., holidays or national days of remembrance

- national and local archives which not only select what is considered important to preserve but define the retrieval codes which will provide access to stored documents and artifacts

- public and private schools which mediate the relation between communities and state sanctioned historical representations

- academic journals and books

- museums and galleries, both state sponsored and private

- fiction and non-fiction, adult and children's books produced for the 'general public'
- newspapers, magazines and television news programs and documentaries

- fictional narratives produced for either television or cinema

- prints, posters, postcards and t-shirts

- story quilts and arpelleras

- public art ranging from state-commissioned monuments to community murals

- photo albums and diaries
- collections of memorabilia

- orally produced and reproduced family or community narratives

- ritualized, expressive speech forms

It is in the above sense that I suggest that one could see the world Englishes as a site for various forms of cultural and political struggles and practices. World Englishes as sites are arenas where cultural workers can contest what is said to be natural, real, and given in a culture at any particular time in history and attempt to transform, or at least reform, that cultural reality in terms of what it should be or could be.

3. World Englishes as a site for critical pedagogy and cultural workers

World Englishes also could be seen as a site which brings cultural workers into the circle of pedagogy. Pedagogy is practiced by cultural workers in the classroom, the gallery, on the street, or on many other sites, some of which have been identified above. In a sense, everyone is a cultural worker, an educator, and an intellectual, but not everyone functions in society according to these roles (Giroux, 1988b; Aronowitz and Giroux, 1985). The point is that every human activity and relationship involves pedagogical practices. Learning and teaching activities are everywhere in culture. Therefore, there are many forms of pedagogies suitable for different sites and forms of struggle.[7] I see world Englishes as a site where one, as a cultural worker, can understand the role of pedagogy and world Englishes in issues involving learning by raising the following general questions:

- how do world Englishes at different sites help people to learn to become self-conscious persons?

- how do world Englishes at different sites enable people to engage in self formation and in the formation of society?

---

7 Grossberg (1994:12) states that "in the new space of educational discourse, the very concept of pedagogy has been exploded and multiplied." For example, we now not only have a pedagogy of the oppressed (Freire, 1989) but many other pedagogies: a pedagogy of voice; a pedagogy of place; a pedagogy of desire, style, and presence; a pedagogy of desiring machines; the pedagogies of border intellectuals; and the postmodern pedagogies. For references to these pedagogies, see Giroux's books cited in this paper. Also, see Grossberg (1994:12) and McLaren (1994:192-222).

- how do world Englishes enable people to learn about other cultures and their own and to come to self-understanding?

- how do world Englishes facilitate people's learning in order for them to situate themselves in the historical context of a global society and the market culture?

- how do world Englishes create desires in people in different countries to learn to relate questions of knowledge and power?

- how do world Englishes motivate people in different countries to learn to understand the limitations and possibilities inherent in institutions in their own countries as well as the limitations and possibilities of a global society?

I believe that those who engage in discourses in respect to the rise of the status of world Englishes in the context of globalization have the option to function as cultural workers in their role as educators and thus be in a position to initiate various pedagogical practices and struggles. This they should do in order to enhance the function of world Englishes in expanding the multiple public spheres at global and local levels.

Let us now examine the notions of critical pedagogy, cultural workers, and their roles in expanding democratic struggles and practices. In the context of globalization, relationships between its centers and margins are rapidly being questioned and re-defined. Many people have been involved in developing the notion of critical pedagogy and other related notions. Henry Giroux is generally regarded as the leading figure in this field. Grossberg's (1994) and many other people's work is also important because, as Giroux explains, critical pedagogy "has borrowed significantly from post-modernism, feminism, literary theory, cultural studies, and psychoanalysis" (Giroux, 1993:149).

The relationship between pedagogy and various forms of struggles has been defined and articulated in many different ways. Grossberg (1994:9) talks about struggles and pedagogy and states that:

> The question of cultural studies is not so much whom we are speaking to (audience) or even for (representation), but whom we are speaking against. And consequently, the resources we need, the strategies we adopt, and the politics we attempt to define must always take into account the particular context in which we are struggling.

Simon (1992:55-71) defines pedagogy as "a term which signals the practical synthesis of the question 'what should be taught and why?' with considerations as to how that teaching should take place." Some view Simon's definition as quite a narrow view of pedagogy in contrast to Willis's definition of pedagogy, which they believe is quite broad. Willis (1990:137) claims that:

> Making (not receiving) messages and meaning in your own context and from material you have appropriated is, in essence, a form of education in the broadest sense. It is the specifically developmental part of symbolic work, an education about 'the self' and its relation to the world and to others in it. Where everyday symbolic work differs from what is normally thought of as 'education' is that it `culturally produces' from its own chosen symbolic resources.

The concept of educators as intellectuals has been developed by Aronowitz and Giroux (1985) and Giroux (1988b). Recently, Giroux (1993) has extended his notion of teachers as intellectuals and, in doing so, he talks about educators as cultural workers. He asserts that critical and reflective educators should function as public intellectuals at sites which provide them openings and safe spaces for trying out new pedagogical practices. Educators, like other cultural workers (such as lawyers, social workers, architects, medical professionals, theologians, and writers), should rethink and discuss the purpose and meaning of education in the context of globalization. Traditionally, the artists, writers, and media producers have been seen as cultural workers. Giroux (1993:5) extends the concept and practice of cultural work by including educators and other professionals and by emphasizing the primacy of the political and the pedagogical. In his words:

The pedagogical dimension of cultural work refers to the process of creating symbolic representations and the practices within which they are engaged. This includes a particular concern with the analysis of textual, aural, and visual representation and how such representations are organized and regulated within particular institutional arrangements. It also addresses how various people engage such representations in the practice of analysis and comprehension.

Further, Giroux says:

The political dimension of cultural work informs this process through a project whose intent is to mobilize knowledge and desires that may lead to minimizing the degree of oppression in people's lives. What is at stake is a political imagery that extends the possibilities for creating new public spheres in which the principles of equality, liberty, and justice become the primary organizing principles for structuring relationships between self and others.

Giroux explains that problems pertaining to the relationship between social theory and educational practice have been discussed by several scholars within and outside the educational field. Many new pedagogical spaces and new paradigms are being opened by the wider movements in feminist theory, post-structuralism, post-modernism, cultural studies, literacy theory, and the arts. All have promising possibilities for bringing about changes in the school and the wider social order. These wider movements address the issues of pedagogy within the politics of cultural differences and are part of the wider discourse on rethinking in education (Cherryholmes, 1988). The major focus is on redefining the meaning of both critical pedagogy and cultural politics. Politics of cultural differences implies that pedagogy involves not only the practice of knowledge and transmission of skills, but so much more. Pedagogy is a form of cultural and political production - deeply concerned with the construction and organization of knowledge, subjectivities, and social relations. Seeing pedagogy as cultural politics means to emphasize its historical and

theoretical aspects and to get away from seeing it as a-historical and an a-theoretical practice. Cultural politics is concerned with the production and representation of meanings and with the analyses of practices that are involved in their production. The relationships between schooling, education, pedagogy, and cultural practices are related to the dynamics of social power. Because power is unequally distributed in different spheres of society, power relations are often contested. People contest asymmetrical power relations through engaging in various textual, verbal, and visual practices which result in a form of cultural production. Pedagogy understood this way is deeply involved in the construction and organization of knowledge, desires, values, and social practices.

As a form of cultural practice, pedagogy helps people to understand themselves, their relationship with others, and their environment. This is because, to paraphrase Giroux (1992:3-4), pedagogy is a cultural practice, and the use of pedagogy enables cultural workers, educators, teacher interns, and students to produce meaning. This meaning, in turn, informs them regarding their individual and collective futures. The important point is to make distinctions between pedagogy and the particular practices of an individual teacher in his or her classroom. What an individual teacher does in the classroom is based on practical, day-to-day considerations and concrete knowledge. That activity is not pedagogy. Those actions are practical management and instructional strategies, tactics, and orientations which help the teachers to conduct their daily, routine work in the classroom and school contexts. To Giroux (1993:4), pedagogy means rewriting the relationship between theory and practice as a form of cultural practices. Giroux explains:

> Pedagogical theory is not a substitute for the particular practices taken up by historically specific subjects who work in concrete, social, political, and cultural contexts. On the contrary, it is a discursive practice, an unfinished language, replete with possibilities, that grows out of particular engagements and dialogues. It offers up new categories, examples, and insights for teachers and others to engage and rethink everything from the purpose and meaning of schooling to the role that educators might play as cultural workers.

Following Gramsci, Giroux points out that all men and women are intellectuals, but not all of them function in society as intellectuals. Aronowitz and Giroux (1985) analyze the social function of educators as intellectuals by using four categories: (1) transformative intellectuals, (2) critical intellectuals, (3) accommodating intellectuals, and (4) hegemonic intellectuals. These, they claim, are ideal-typical categories.

According to them, transformative intellectuals take seriously the relationship between power and knowledge. They believe that society consists of the dominant group and the dominated groups. The dominant group uses knowledge as power for controlling purposes. This domination creates an atmosphere of despair for citizens who lack the knowledge and civic courage to challenge the values and beliefs of the dominating group. The function of transformative intellectuals is to create conditions in society whereby new values and beliefs can be produced. This, in turn, will provide opportunities for students in schools and citizens in the larger society to become agents of civic courage who will not give up hope of changing the school and society. By making despair unconvincing, they will engage in activities which will make society more open, equal, and just, and will thereby produce a democratic society which celebrates human dignity.

The second group, critical intellectuals, differ from the transformative intellectuals in the sense that they prefer not to get involved or are unable to get involved in any collective solidarity and struggle. These intellectuals do not like inequality and injustice but politically do not want to be actively involved in any organized activities which are directed to reducing disparities in society.

The third group is composed of the accommodating intellectuals who firmly hold values and beliefs of the dominant society and openly act to support it and its ruling groups. In other words, they uncritically mediate ideas and practices that serve to reproduce the status quo. Some of these intellectuals disdain politics by proclaiming professionalism as a value system. In other words, they like to uphold the concept of scientific objectivity, which they believe is politically neutral.

While the critical and accommodating intellectuals self-consciously function as free-floating in their relationship to the rest of society, the last category of intellectuals, the hegemonic intellectuals, are tied up in the preservation of the institutional structures in which they are located. They go beyond upholding the concept of scientific objectivity and prefer to function as moral crusaders. Their desire is to provide moral and intellectual leadership to various factions of dominant groups and classes, making these factions aware of their common economic, political, and ethical functions.

Aronowitz and Giroux (1985:35) explain that "Gramsci attempts to locate the political and social function of intellectuals through his analysis of the role of conservative and radical organic intellectuals". Whereas the conservative organic intellectuals prefer to be agents of the status quo, the radical organic intellectuals choose to provide their moral and intellectual leadership to a specific class - in their case, the working class. But they could also perform similar functions for any other dominated group. These categories of intellectuals are not supposed to be too rigid. Wright (1978) points out that many intellectuals, including educators, occupy contradictory class locations. The experience of various types of intellectuals must be analyzed in terms of the objective antagonisms they face at various sites where they are engaged in using world Englishes.[8]

Giroux (1993:73-80) extensively reviewed relevant material in the areas of modernism, post-modernism, and feminism. On the basis of his review, he has developed nine principles which "touch on these issues and recast the relationship between the pedagogical and the political as central to any social movement that attempts to effect emancipatory struggles and social transformations."

---

8 Grossberg (1994, pp. 8-9) states that "cultural studies ... offer a different model of intellectual politics: neither the organic intellectual, who has an already existing relation to an already existing constituency,nor the specific intellectual, who can only construct local and temporary constituencies based entirely on his or her expertise. Cultural studies attempts at least to construct a more flexible, more pragmatic, more modest and more contextual model of the political functions of the intellectual, connecting to, constructing, and reconstructing its conjunctural constituency. Cultural studies thinks constituencies are made, not given in advance, as if the relationship of social identity and politics were already inscribed on the walls of our social experiences."

More recently, Giroux has focused on the relationship between cultural studies, postcolonial critics, and education. In doing so, he has developed a form of pedagogy for cultural workers which he calls border pedagogy (Giroux, 1993:28-36) - a model based upon notions of border, border crossing, and borderlands. These borders are both physical and cultural. What he suggests is that, as persons, we have created circles, or "borders," around us based on our own experiences, values, ethics, identity, and biographies. We think of these borders as safe spaces, where we feel at home and rooted. He suggests that in the postmodern world, we need to cross these borders and enter into borderlands created by others in which others feel equally safe and at home. We should also feel secure enough to let other people enter our own borderlands. This he calls "border crossing" which involves building bridges between and among different borders. Border crossing results in creating new borderlands which, in turn, create conditions under which new possibilities arise - among other things, for the representation of practice, for the politics of identity and community, for the discourse of cultural workers and their location, for reclaiming the discourse of democracy, for the discourse on cultural workers as public intellectuals, for critical literacy as the discourse of possibility, and for articulating a discourse of postmodern citizenship. In Giroux's (1993:28-29) words:

> First, the category of border signals a recognition of those epistemological, political, cultural, and social margins that structure the language of history, power, and difference. The category of border also prefigures cultural criticism and pedagogical processes as a form of border crossing. That is, it signals forms of transgression in which existing borders forged in domination can be challenged and re-defined. Second, it also speaks to the need to create pedagogical conditions in which students [cultural workers] become border crossers in order to understand otherness in its own terms, and to further create borderlands in which diverse cultural resources allow for the fashioning of new identities within existing configurations of power.
>
> Third, border pedagogy makes visible the historical and socially constructed strengths and limitations of those places and borders we inherit and that frame our discourses and social relations. Moreover, as part of a

broader politics of difference, border pedagogy makes primary the language of the political and ethical. It stresses the political by examining how institutions, knowledge, and social relations are inscribed in power differently; it highlights the ethical by examining how the shifting relations of knowing, acting, and subjectivity are constructed in spaces and social relationships ... As part of a radical pedagogical practice, border pedagogy points to the need for conditions that allow students [cultural workers] to write, speak, and listen in a language in which meaning becomes multiaccentual and dispersed and resists permanent closure. This is a language in which one speaks <u>with</u> rather than exclusively <u>for</u> others ... border pedagogy can reconstitute itself in terms that are both transformative and emancipatory.

Grossberg's (1993:2) comments on education and the emergence of cultural studies are also helpful here. He states that education has recently emerged as:

One of the most pressing, promising, and paradoxical sites of cultural studies ... I described it as paradoxical because, despite a strong connection between cultural studies and education at the former's beginnings, the concern for education has apparently had only a limited impact until recently.

The notion of pedagogy always had an important place in cultural studies. In Raymond Williams's (1989:162) words, the pedagogical responsibilities of cultural studies is:

Taking the best we can in intellectual work and going with it in this very open way to confront people for whom it is not a way of life, for whom it is not in all probability a job, but for whom it is a matter of their own intellectual interest, their own understanding of the pressures on them, pressures of every kind, from the most personal to the most broadly political.

And in Stuart Hall's (1992:17-18) words:

The work that cultural studies has to do is to mobilize everything that it can find in terms of intellectual resources in order to understand what keeps making the lives we live, and the societies we live in, profoundly and deeply anti-humane ... Cultural studies' message is a message for

academics and intellectuals but fortunately, for many other people as well. In that sense, I have tried to hold together in my own intellectual life, on the one hand, the conviction and passion and the devotion to... rigorous analysis and understanding, to the passion to find out, and to the production of knowledge that we did not know before. But, on the other hand, I am convinced that no intellectual is worth his or her salt, and no university that wants to hold up its head in the face of the twenty-first century, can afford to turn dispassionate eyes away from the problems ... that beset our world.

4. World Englishes and pedagogical openings

This paper has suggested that one way to look at world Englishes is to articulate it in terms of a complex site, where cultural workers can practice different forms of pedagogies. They can do this by taking into account their own locations, the particular contexts in which they are struggling, and the specific struggles in which they are engaged. In this way, it might be possible for cultural workers to promote the democratic principles of liberty, equality, and justice by enlarging the multiple public spheres and thus expanding the horizon of democracy. World Englishes is a site where cultural workers can engage in various forms of pedagogies, depending upon their affective practices, investments, possibility of social mobility, and placement at a particular time in socially determined structures. Giroux (1993:160) states that:

> Pedagogy is both exhilarating and dangerous. It's one of the few forms of cultural politics that cannot simply be consigned to academia. Its central questions of ideology and politics ask how people take up what they take up; that is, how they participate in, produce, and challenge particular ways of life. The issue is not simply how people are inserted into particular subject positions but also how they create them. To raise that question is automatically to engage the language of specificity, community, diversity, difference, and the struggle for public life.

Whether the custom of using world Englishes in various international and national situations creates conditions for establishing "the hegemony of English"

or for enhancing the multiple public spheres would depend upon a number of factors. It would, in part, depend on how one, as citizen, understands the transformation which has taken place in relationships among nations and the people in them due to changes brought about within the global capitalist economy and the culture of the market. It would also depend upon the meanings which multilingual and monolingual cultural workers attach to the rise in status of world Englishes in the context of this new world system. At least two viewpoints have been expressed in this respect. First, it is clear that with the diasporic motion of population across national and regional boundaries, cross-national, cultural, class, gender, and ethnic boundaries have become blurred. This has created a real and genuine cosmopolitalism in certain circles, and its consequences are appealing to many people in their own right. In this context, many people find themselves aspiring to learn many foreign languages and cultural skills to enhance their storage of cultural capital, and these people also seem to have resources which they are willing to spend for this purpose. For example, many foreign exchange programs provide parents and their children the opportunity to learn some form of world Englishes abroad, in their own communities and even in their own households, by assuming the role of host families. Second, it has been asserted by some that there is some degree of self interest involved on the part of those who describe the rise in the status of English as a dominant international language in terms of "the hegemony of English." It might be taken as an expression of the new found power of certain types of intellectuals who have acquired some form of world Englishes as another cultural resource to be used in their own interest and for the interest of circles in which they function as intellectuals. They might want to use that power in order to constitute the world in their own self-images.[9]

---

9 Arif Dirlik's (1994:339) comments in respect to postcolonial intellectuals and postcolonial criticism are helpful here. He states that "*postcolonial, rather than a description of anything, is a discourse that seeks* to constitute the world in the self-image of intellectuals who view themselves (or have come to view themselves) as postcolonial intellectuals. That is, to recall my initial statement concerning Third World intellectuals who have arrived in First World academic, postcolonial discourse is an expression not so much of agony over identity, as it often appears, but of new found power."

The point is this: that there is not much to be gained by thinking of world Englishes in terms of a logic of either camp, because in the space between the two positions - "the hegemony of English" and the "liberating" potential inherent in the world Englishes - there are possibilities to expand the public sphere and democracy through the creation of various forms of enabling communities based on democratic associations - creatively and imaginatively.

Let me share with you an observation I made at one of the forums on internationalization I participated in last year. The forum was attended mostly by Japanese participants, who had various professional backgrounds. The main focus of the forum was to have a safe space where participants could freely express their opinion, mainly in "English," but also in Japanese and in any other language if they felt it necessary to do so. There was a genuine feeling of respect for each other in this regard among the participants. In one of the sessions, the topic was host families and foreign student exchange programs in Japan. The participants discussed the situation in which an "English" - speaking student or person comes and stays with a Japanese family in Japan for a certain duration of time. The conversation started with the realization of how globalization, internationalization, and the culture of the market have made such programs widespread and economically viable in Japan; but the discussion quickly shifted from economic concerns to affective concerns. Participants were interested in how the Japanese feel and define themselves - in other words, what is unique about being Japanese in the sense that people talk about being an American, an Englishman, or an Indian. Is there such a thing as "Japaneseness" and, if so, how could the uniqueness of being Japanese be made understandable to non-Japanese? There was a sense in the group that the Japanese try hard to understand what constitutes Americans and Englishmen, but somehow, others do not try as hard to understand the Japanese - perhaps because others do not try as hard to learn the Japanese language as Japanese try to learn "English," and so on. To make the story short, many participants realized that when faced with a choice to select a student or a person who spoke "English," the general tendency on the part of Japanese families is to select a person from the United States or Europe, preferably from England, and not an Asian or an African person who speaks "English." The realization

of this fact led the participants to ask: why is this the case? Are Japanese prejudiced against Asians and Africans? Do they want to constitute themselves in the self-images of an American, a European, or an Englishman? In the course of this type of reflective discussion, a question was posed: would a Japanese family readily accept a Korean who was well versed in "English"? There was a pause; the participants looked puzzled and, for a moment, got involved in conversation with persons sitting next to them or across from them. The group was energized by this question. When the micro conversations subsided, the conclusion reached was this: that in general, a Korean person speaking "English" would not be readily chosen to be placed in a Japanese family, but in some cases, such a person would be more than welcome there. This led to a brief discussion of Japanese-Korean relationships in Japan in the past, the present, and the future, and to the general discussion of Japanese relationships to other Asians in Japan. The consequence of all this was that the Japanese participants in the forum voiced their resolve to be cognizant of these matters and to take them up more openly when next involved in planning exchange programs in Japan. The participants were - albeit not consciously - functioning as cultural workers and practicing critical pedagogy in order to enhance the public sphere. The pedagogical significance of this episode should be obvious to us. It made me realize how world Englishes as a site can be consciously taken up (integrated) with other sites (in this case the forum and the Exchange Programs) to pursue tasks of enhancing the public sphere.

I believe by articulating world Englishes as a cultural site and practice, and by functioning as cultural workers, it is possible to integrate world Englishes with many other sites where issues involving immigration, multiculturalism, curriculum, racism, gender discrimination, I.Q. testing, social mobility, equal opportunity, and issues related to the information and conflict among civilizations are being contested. In all these spaces, citizens can decide to choose to function as cultural workers and thus practice some form of critical pedagogy in order to enhance the public sphere. I am not suggesting this as a panacea to all problems. The form of conversation presented in this paper has many critics (see Zavarzadeh and Morton, 1994;

Harris, 1992). However, I must agree with Giroux, who, in his many writings (1993, 1994, 1994a and 1991, especially see his interviews), links critical pedagogy to critical democracy. He makes some significant comments in regards to the purpose of public education which I believe are equally significant to any form of informal learning and teaching situations. He states that "we need to reclaim the progressive notion of the public in public schooling so that education can become a real public service, just as one might say maybe the arts need to be taken up pedagogically in the same ways" (Giroux 1993, p. 15). Giroux builds on John Dewey's thinking on democracy and points out that "Dewey talked about democracy as a way of life that has to be made and remade by each generation" (1993, p. 12).

WORKS CITED

Archer, R.M. 1990. "Foreword" in M. Albrow and E. King eds. *Globalization, Knowledge and Society*. London: Sage.

Aronowitz, S. and **Giroux, H.A.** 1985. *Education Under Seize: The Conservative Liberal and Radical Debate Over Schooling*. Massachusetts: Bergin and Garvey.

Aschcroft, B.; Griffiths, G. and **Tiffin, H.** 1989. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. New York: Routledge.

Bloom, A. 1987. *The Closing of the American Mind*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Cherryholmes, C.H. 1988. *Power and Criticism: Poststructural Investigations in Education*. New York: Teacher College, Columbia University.

Dirlik, A. 1994. "The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism." *Critical Inquiry*, Winter, pp. 328-356.

Foucault, M. 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. New York: Harper Colophon Books.

Foucault, M. 1980. In C. Gordon ed. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings*. New York: Pantheon.

Fraser, N. 1994. "Rethinking The Public Sphere: A Contribution to The Critique of Actually Existing Democracy." in H.A. Giroux and P. McLaren eds. pp. 74-98.

Freire, P. 1989 [1971]. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Giroux, H.A. 1988a. *Schooling and The Struggle For Public Life: Critical Pedagogy in the Modern Age*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Giroux, H.A. 1988b. *Teacher as Intellectuals: Toward A Critical Pedagogy of Learning*. Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey.

Giroux, H.A. 1993. *Border Crossing: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education*. New York: Routledge.

Giroux, H.A. 1994b. *Disturbing Pleasures: Learning Popular Culture*. New York: Routledge.

Giroux, H.A. ed. 1991. *Postmodernism, Feminism, and Cultural Politics*. New York: Albany State University of New York Press.

Giroux, H.A. and **McLaren, P.** 1994. *Between Borders: Pedagogy and the Politics of Cultural Studies*. New York: Routledge.

Grossberg, L. 1994. " Introduction: Bringin' it All Back Home - Pedagogy and Cultural Studies" in H.A. Giroux and P. McLaren eds. pp. 1-25.

Hall, S. 1991. "Brave New World." *Socialist Review*, 91, No. 1, pp. 57-58.

Harvey, D. 1992. *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Inquiry into the Origin of Cultural Change*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Haskell, T.L. and **R.F. Teichgraeber III.** 1993. *The Culture of the Market*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Held, D. 1987. *Models of Democracy*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Hirsch, E.D. Jr. 1988. *Cultural Literacy: Why Every American Needs to Know*. New York: Vintage Books.

Huntington, S.P. 1993. *The Clash of Civilization? The Debate*. New York: Foreign Affairs.

Kachru, B.B. 1986. "The Power and Politics of English." *World Englishes*, 5.2-3: pp. 121-140.

Kachru, B.B. 1990. "World Englishes and Applied Linguistics" in *Learning, Keeping and Using Language* (Vol. 11). Edited by M.A.K. Halliday, J. Gibbons, and H. Nicholas. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamin. Also in *World Englishes*, 9.1: pp. 3-20.

Kachru, B.B. 1992. "Meaning in Deviation" in B.B. Kachru ed. *The Other Tongue*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Kachru, B.B. 1994. "The Speaking Tree: A Medium of Plural Canons" in *Georgetown Round Table in Languages and Linguistics* (GURT). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

McArthur, Tom. 1994. "Organized Babel: English as a Global Lingua Franca" in James E. Alatis ed. *Georgetown University Round Table on Language and Linguistics 1994*. Wahington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

McLaren, P. 1989. *Life in Schools: An Introduction to Critical Pedagogy in the Foundations of Education*. Toronto: Irwin Publishing.

Mouffe, C. 1988. "Radical Democracy: Modern or Postmodern" in Andrew Ross ed. *Universal Abandon: The Politics of Postmodern*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Rorty, R. 1982. *Consequences of Pragmatism: Essays 1972-198?* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Simon, I.R. 1992. *Teaching Against the Grain: Text for a Pedagogy of Possibility*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Simon, I.R. 1994. "Forms of Insurgency in the Production of Popular Memories: The Columbus Quincentenary and the Pedagogy of Counter Commemoration" in H.A. Giroux & P. McLaren eds. pp. 127-142.

Smart, B. 1993. *Postmodernity: Key Ideas.* New York: Routledge.

Spring, J. 1994. *Wheels in the Head.* New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Tsuda, Y. ed. 1993. *Eigo Shihai-eno Iron* [The Objection to the Hegemony of English] Tokyo: Disan Shokan.

Tsuda, Y. 1994. "The Diffusion of English: Its Impact on Culture and Communication." *Keio Communication Review*, No. 16, pp. 49-61.

Tsuda, Y. 1994a. "The hegemony of English in international communication." A paper presented for the 1994 Annual Convention of International Communication Association, July, 1994, Sydney, Australia.

Williams, R. 1989. "The Future of Cultural Studies." *The Politics of Modernism: Against the New Conformists.* London: Verso.

Willis, P. 1990. *Common Culture.* Boulder: Westview.

Wright, E.O. 1978. "Intellectuals and The Working Class." *The Insurgent Sociologists*, 8(11), pp 8-15.

Zavarzadeh, M. and **D. Morton.** 1994. *Theory as Resistance: Politics and Culture after (Post) Structuralism.* New York: The Guliford Press.