

Linguistic Imperialism, Multilingualism, and Language Planning in Algeria

الإمبريالية اللغوية والتعددية اللغوية والتخطيط اللغوي في الجزائر

Leila BELLOUR

University Center of Mila (Algeria), leila_bellour@hotmail.com

Received: 22/08/2021

Accepted: 25/11/2021

Published: 28/12/2021

Abstract

Linguistic imperialism and globalization have become driving forces that compel the tergiversation of the Algerian language policy, which is very problematic. Indeed, linguisticism and the threat of linguistic genocide are the result of weak language management and planning, or a "do nothing policy". To facilitate language planning and its implementation, language planners must be convincing in regard to what language to use for which purpose. The paper vindicates that language conflicts, linguistic imperialism, and the struggle for linguistic rights, which multilingualism might spark, are interlinked with the ideological conflicts and the fervid desire for cultural hegemony. Henceforth, in the linguistic market, language planners must weigh the social and cultural consequences of the use of each language. We are in need of a thoughtful language planning, which must be in tune with the Algerian socio-cultural reality. To combat the inadequacy of language planning in multilingual countries, like Algeria, an important issue for language planners is which language to develop, and for what reason. The present paper borrows from a cluster of theories, especially Robert Philipson's idea of linguistic imperialism. Language planning, as the paper vindicates, might help prevent linguistic/cultural imperialism and save a language (Arabic), which might ooze away in the mist of time. At the same time, and especially that we are living in a globalized world, a Prospero-Caliban linguistic policy in regard to other languages has to be promoted.

Keywords: Linguistic Imperialism; Language Planning; Multilingualism; Linguicism; Linguistic Genocide.

ملخص:

لقد أصبحت الإمبريالية اللغوية والعولمة قوى دافعة تجبر سياسة اللغة الجزائرية على التحول، وهو أمر إشكالي للغاية. إن التمييز اللغوي وخطر الإبادة الجماعية اللغوية هما نتيجة لضعف إدارة اللغة والتخطيط، أو سياسة "عدم فعل أي شيء". لتسهيل تخطيط اللغة وتنفيذها يجب أن يكون مخططو اللغة مقتنعين فيما يتعلق باللغة التي يجب استخدامها ولأي غرض. يبين البحث أن الصراعات اللغوية والإمبريالية اللغوية والنضال من أجل الحقوق اللغوية التي قد تثيرها التعددية اللغوية مرتبطة بالصراعات الأيديولوجية والرغبة الشديدة في الهيمنة الثقافية. من الآن فصاعدًا في السوق اللغوي يجب على مخططي اللغة أن يوازنوا العواقب الاجتماعية والثقافية لاستخدام كل لغة. نحن بحاجة إلى تخطيط لغوي مدروس ويجب أن يكون منسجمًا مع الواقع الاجتماعي والثقافي الجزائري. لمكافحة سلبيات التخطيط اللغوي في البلدان متعددة اللغات، مثل الجزائر، فإن القضية المهمة لمخططي اللغة هي اللغة التي يجب تطويرها ولأي غرض. هذه الورقة تستعين بمجموعة من النظريات خاصة فكرة روبرت فيليبسون عن الإمبريالية اللغوية. قد يساعد التخطيط اللغوي، كما يوضح البحث، في منع الإمبريالية اللغوية/الثقافية وحفظ لغة (عربية) قد تتلاشى مع الزمن. في الوقت نفسه، ولا سيما أننا نعيش في ظل العولمة، فإننا بحاجة إلى تطبيق فكرة "بروسرو-كاليبان" في ما يتعلق بالسياسة اللغوية الخاصة باللغات الأخرى.

كلمات مفتاحية: الإمبريالية اللغوية، التخطيط اللغوي، التعدد اللغوي، التمييز اللغوي، الإبادة اللغوية.

Corresponding author: Leila BELLOUR, e-mail: leila_bellour@hotmail.com

1. Introduction

In many countries, like Algeria, the pecking order of languages is a reality. The belief that a language is superior to others is deeply ingrained in people's minds. This myth of language superiority can be "traced back to the Greek stigmatization of non-Greek speakers as 'barbarians', a word which etymologically mocks others as producing mumbo-jumbo, mere nonsense and not a language at all, i.e. linguistic racism (Phillipson, 1990, p. 90). Though, there is no plausible argument, which vindicates that there is a language, which is superior to another, and though, people seem to believe that all languages are equal, the reality is that some languages are considered as 'more equal than others'. When asked about the hierarchy of languages and whether there is a language, which is intrinsically superior to another, Noam Chomsky's answer was as follows:

The only intrinsic superiority of one language over another is that if one of them has more guns than the other. If Australian aboriginals were to conquer the world, [...] unclear would be the international language. I mean, essentially, there is no technical difference. Humans are basically identical-genetically quiet alike-and in their language capacities if there are any differences they are beyond their capacities to detect. So the idea of superior language just does not make any sense. In fact, take, say, English. I mean English is now the world's dominant language. Go back a couple of hundred years back. English was the language of a group of barbarians. (qtd in Hoodbhoy, 2001)

In fact, the hierarchy of languages is a reflection of a hidden social discrimination. Phillipson explains the interrelatedness between linguicism and social discrimination as follows: "A hierarchy of languages is integral to an imperial social order that discriminates by means of language – the acquisition and use of linguistic capital - marking off privileged classes and groups from others, linguicism being entrenched structurally and ideologically"(Phillipson, "English: From British Empire"). Linguicism, which refers to linguistic racism, or the inequality of languages, is meant to serve the aims and interests of the speakers of some languages, which are put at the top of the linguistic ladder.

The confrontation of different languages might lead to language conflicts in which the relationship between languages is always that of struggle for dominance. Survival is always for the fittest. Linguistic conflicts might even amount to physical conflicts and civil wars. In this regard, Skutnabb-Kangas writes:

The historical physical violence from the hundreds of years of colonization and imperialism continues today. In many countries, states are still trying to kill languages through direct physical violence towards the speakers, which is often sanctioned by laws in the country. Turkey is a prominent example. (2010)

Because the dominance of a language might lead to the withering away of another one, it is of utmost importance for language planners to resolve these language conflicts. Hence, language planning and policy should move towards linguistic peace.

2. Linguistic Imperialism

In fact, the use of a language performs some political roles, the reason why powerful countries try to consolidate linguistic hegemony. Chomsky writes: “One reason why we’re all speaking English is because of the power of the English-speaking world, England, and primarily now the United States. Their power is so overwhelming that people in these countries are extremely insular. The United States is one of the few countries where people see it no necessity to learn a second language”(qtd in Hoodbhoy, 2001, p. 9). The English language purveys colonial knowledge, power, and reinforces the West’s domination and hegemony.

In fact, linguistic imperialism vindicates that those who are under the dominance of a foreign language are not politically and mentally free, simply because they are not linguistically free. The Anglo-American world has tried to maintain its hegemony by dint of language. According to Phillipson, “the British Empire has given way to the empire of English” (1992, p. 1). The West realized the power of language to confirm, consolidate, and internalize Western ideologies and the imperial knowledge in others’ minds. They have used language to reinforce colonial views and stereotypes and to form a culture steeped in Western ideologies. When receiving an honorary degree at Harvard university in 6 september 1943, Western Churchill says: “The power to control language offers far better prizes than taking away people’s provinces or lands or grinding them down in exploitation. The empires of the future are the empires of the mind.” (qtd in Phillipson, 2017, p. 318).

To spread and impose their culture, and hence to expand their empire, linguistic imperialism becomes the best means. The countries of the Centre have tried to make those of the margin hypnotized, mesmerized, and attracted by their language and culture. According to Phillipson, linguistic imperialism is a “variant of linguicism, operating through structures and ideologies, and entailing unequal treatment for groups identified by language.” (1992, p. 1). In this view, linguistic imperialism also aims at disrupting the social harmony, creating social fragmentation and racial discrimination. The West reinforces the view that speakers of the ‘big languages’ are highly civilized, intelligent and pure, while speakers of the other languages are stigmatized as inferior, uncivilized and impure. Western countries fix stereotypes and relegate the other countries to a degree zero.

In his article “English From British Empire to corporate Empire”, Phillipson maintains that linguistic imperialism involves the following:

- it is a form of *linguicism*, a favouring of one language over others in ways that parallel societal structuring through racism, sexism and class: linguicism also serves to privilege users of the standard forms of the dominant language, those with convertible linguistic capital
- it is *structural*: more material resources and infrastructure are accorded to the dominant language than to others
- it is *ideological*: beliefs, attitudes, and imagery glorify the dominant language, stigmatize others, and rationalise the linguistic hierarchy

- the dominance is *hegemonic*; it is internalised and naturalised as being ‘normal’
- linguistic imperialism interlocks with *a structure of imperialism* in culture, education, the media, communication, the economy, politics, and military activities
- in essence, it is about *exploitation*, injustice, inequality, and hierarchy that privilege those able to use the dominant language
- this entails *unequal rights* for speakers of different languages
- language use is often *subtractive*, proficiency in the imperial language and in learning it in education involving its consolidation at the expense of other languages. (Phillipson, 2012)

The new form of colonialism, which is linguistic, aims at converting the whole world to the culture of the powerful countries. Linguistic imperialism aspires to destroy the national languages and to form intellectual people, who are likely to perpetuate the Western, economic, political, and social interests. Phillipson states that the Anglo-American civilizing mission of the 20th century is

to ensure that all citizens of the world ... are not confined to English for merely instrumental purposes. Its users will also adopt worldviews that will make them understand that the West, out of sheer benevolence, has taken upon itself the right to decide how world affairs should be run. (Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 2007)

According to Phillipson, one of the major goals of linguistic hegemony is to banish the language(s) of indigenous people. In his words, “Linguistic hegemony has been integral to this, ranging from outright linguicide, exterminating the languages of the Indigenous peoples, to more subtle pressures to abandon an ancestral language.” (Phillipson, 2009, pp. 2-3). Linguistic hegemony, or the extirpation of the indigenous or ancestral language, has been the fate of many languages worldwide, like Tamazight in the previous years, the Kurdish language in Turkey, and some minor languages in China, which underwent oppression by the authorities.

All the powerful countries, not only Britain and USA, try to spread their languages for economic and ideological purposes. In Phillipson’s view:

The active promotion of other major international languages such as Chinese, French, Japanese, and Spanish also aims to strengthen the market forces and cultures associated with each language, but the linguistic capital invested in these languages does not at present seriously threaten the current pre-eminence of English. A Chinese global empire may be on the way. (2012, p.11)

According to Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, the demise of some languages and the increasing disappearance of others owe to linguistic imperialism, which has both internal and external reasons. As she puts it:

Languages are today disappearing at a faster pace than ever before in human history. What happens is linguistic genocide on a massive scale, with formal education and media as the main concrete culprits but with the world’s

political, economic and military structures as the more basic causal factors. Big language turns into *killerlanguages*, monsters that gobble up others, when they are learned *at the cost* of the smaller ones. Instead, they should and could be learned *in addition* to the mother tongues. (1994)

There are many factors, which account for linguistic hegemony and hierarchy, which might, in turn, lead to linguistic genocide. First, Western countries are one of the main causes of the debility and loss of languages worldwide. In this respect, Skutnabb-Kangas writes: “In terms of the responsibility for killing languages everywhere in the world, Europe and the rest of Western countries bear a really heavy responsibility-and this will fairly soon start backfiring in serious ways, both economically and otherwise” (1994). Second, families when they teach their children, at home, a foreign language because they consider it as prestigious. Third, the school when it teaches pupils subject matters in a foreign language, hence severing them from their own. Even at the university level, as in Algeria, some fields of study are taught in French, the language of the colonizer. Felix Banda, vehemently, criticizes the use of a foreign language as a means of instruction. He states that “One major component of the notion of linguistic imperialism is cultural dominations of Africans through education in English.”(2009, p. 2).

Linguistic imperialism does not just result from the Western countries’ attempts to spread their language. It is also consolidated by the authorities and the elites. Phillipson’s book, *Linguistic Imperialism*, does not attribute “responsibility for what happens exclusively to the people in the Centre. Active engagement by politicians and academics in the Periphery is essential.” (Phillipson, 1996, p. 162). In the Algerian case, for instance, many politicians use French instead of the mother tongue in public.

Even language planners are not innocent; they might also be responsible for linguistic imperialism because the language policy and language practices depend, to a great extent, on their decisions. Language planners’ decisions might be destructive for the national languages if they are biased and very subjective. Phillipson opines that

There is always the risk of powerful ‘experts’ dispossessing people of their languages. If war is the continuation of politics by other means, then the conduct of linguistic policy is the civil form of the battle between languages, in which case the linguist needs to strive for the maximum amount of democratic control of all aspects of language policy. (1990, p. 86)

Language planners should learn from the other countries, especially those in which linguistic imperialism has resulted in linguistic homicide. Their glamorization of big languages and the prestige, which they might attribute to them is likely to result in downgrading the national languages. Among the detrimental effects of linguistic imperialism is the death of the mother tongue and the withering away of the native culture in the mist of time. It has already resulted, in the case of Algeria, in an utter lack of competence in the national languages (Arabic and Tamazight) and linguistic hybridity, which is the use of many languages and dialects in one conversation.

3. Linguistic Imperialism in Algeria

In Algeria, the importance of Arabic lies in the fact that it is the language of the Quran, the Hadith and so many religious books. It also preserves the Arabo-Islamic identity and maintains the unity of the nation. The famous Kenyan writer and theorist Ngugi Wa Thiong'o maintains that language is "the most important vehicle through which ... power fascinated and held the soul prisoner. The bullet was the means of the physical subjugation. Language was the means of spiritual subjugation" (1994, p. 9). Ngugi assumes that speaking a foreign language makes the non-native speakers prey to the danger of assimilation, losing their authentic culture. He believes that western language and culture are "taking us further and further from ourselves to other selves, from our world to other worlds" (Ngugi, 1994, p. 12). So, the West attempts to dominate and spread its culture by means of language because "An oppressor language inevitably carries racist and negative images of the conquered nation, particularly in its literature, and English is no exception." (Ngugi, 1993, p. 53). Ngugi, like many other post-colonial writers, is inspired by Michel Foucault's belief that discourse reinforces power relations because those who have power spread their knowledge in the way they wish. In his study of the nexus between power and knowledge, Foucault asserts that power "reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourse, learning processes and everyday lives" (2010). Believing that control over language is one of the main instruments of imperial oppression, Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin also ascertain that:

[colonial education] installs a 'standard' version of the metropolitan language as a norm, and marginalizes all 'variants' as impurities....Language becomes the medium through which a hierarchical structure of power is perpetuated, and the medium through which conceptions of 'truth', 'order', and 'reality' become established. (2002, p.7)

According to the "Sapir-Whorf hypothesis", every language expresses the specific worldview of its native speakers and constructs their reality. For the linguist Benjamin Lee Whorf, human beings "dissect nature along lines laid down by [their] native languages"(Lee Whorf, 1956, p.34). So, people, who speak the same language, are prone to have the same worldview. In line with this view, Ngugi asserts that "language as culture is the collective memory bank of a people's experience in history. Culture is almost indistinguishable from the language that makes possible its genesis, growth, banking, articulation and indeed its transmission from one generation to the next" (1994, p. 15). According to this view, no other borrowed language can replace the native one in expressing its worldview. Franz Fanon also finds cultural authenticity very difficult to preserve in a borrowed language. He considers that speaking the language of the oppressors implies the acceptance of their culture, because to speak "means above all to assume a culture, to support the weight of a civilization ... A man who has a language consequently possesses the world expressed and implied by that language" (1967, pp.17-18). In this view, speaking a foreign language makes non-native speakers prey to the danger of losing their own culture. In other words, identity

would consequently be at stake in the use of a foreign language. The colonizers have tried to depersonalize and alienate the colonized subjects by means of language. The latter does not only alienate one from his/her cultural roots, but also perpetuates Western culture and its myth of supremacy. Paul De Man, in turn, asserts that language is not devoid of the stains of ideology. According to him, literariness and ideology are by no means mutually exclusive: "What we call ideology is precisely the confusion of linguistic with natural reality ... it follows that, more than any other mode of inquiry, including economics, the linguistic literariness is a powerful and indispensable tool in the unmasking of ideological aberrations." (2000, p. 339).

After independence, herculean efforts for promoting Arabic have been made because the use of Arabic, in public and official affairs, indicates our national identity and independence. In 1998, in particular, standard Arabic became officially considered the language that should be used in institutions and in the administration. However, this standard Arabic is not used in the public life. Moreover, many Algerians suffer from an utter lack of competence in speaking and writing standard Arabic, even students of Arabic (Wahhabi, 2016). For many Algerians, Arabic is even stereotyped as sterile and inappropriate as a language of science and technology; this is the reason why some fields of study at the university level are taught in French and not in Arabic. Others call it the language of religious texts. It is considered inadequate for the labor market and modernization, and some Algerians feel ashamed of this language, which they think is inferior to other languages, like French and English (Abu Retima, 2001). Hence, it is accorded a minor importance in the linguistic market. This neglect of the mother tongue is likely to lead to the so-called linguistic genocide, because a language, which is not used and developed by its speakers, is likely to fade away with the passage of time.

Linguistic human rights were absent from the international law until recently. Since the early 1990s, linguistic human rights have been included and granted a cardinal importance. These linguistic human rights are likely to protect the world from a real linguistic genocide, especially that they recognize the importance of mother tongue and the rights of people, whose minority and indigenous languages have been banished for a long time. According to Article 25 of the Universal Declaration on Linguistic Rights:

All language communities are entitled to have at their disposal all the human and material resources necessary to ensure that their language is present to the extent they desire at all levels of education within their territory: properly trained teachers, appropriate teaching methods, textbooks, finance, buildings and equipment, traditional and innovative technology. (qtd in Hankoni Kamwendo, 2006, p. 66)

In fact, linguistic human rights give pivotal importance to mother tongue instruction. According to Phillipson, "UNESCO's Guidelines on Language and Education state (2003, pp. 30-33): UNESCO supports *mother tongue instruction* as a means of improving educational quality by building upon the knowledge and experience of the

learners and teachers”(Phillipson, “Disciplines by English”,2009,p.12). One way to resist linguistic imperialism and protect our national languages, in a world characterized by linguistic conflicts, is to use it as a medium of instruction in schools and in the universities. As Skutnabb-Kangas observes:

The world’s spoken languages are disappearing fast: pessimistic but realistic estimates fear that 90-95% of them may be extinct or very seriously endangered by the year 2100. Transmission of languages from the parent generation to children is *the* most vital factor for the maintenance of both oral and sign languages. When more children gain access to formal education, much of their more formal language learning, which earlier occurred in the community, takes place in schools. If an alien language is used in schools, i.e. if children do not have the right to learn and use their language in schools (and, of course, later in their working life), the language is not going to survive. (2008, p. 108)

So, parents’ transmission of the mother tongue to their children and teaching via the mother tongue ensure the survival of this language. According to Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, using a foreign language as a means of instruction is likely to create serious impediments, making the learning process impossible. In her words, “mainly dominant-language medium education for IM children

- prevents access to education, because of the linguistic, pedagogical and psychological barriers it creates;
- may lead to the extinction of Indigenous languages,
- thus contributing to the disappearance of the world’s linguistic diversity;
- often curtails the development of the children’s capabilities, perpetuates poverty, and causes serious mental harm. (qtd in Skutnabb-Kangas & Phillipson, 2010, p. 84)

In addition to Arabic, French is a very important language in the Algerian linguistic market. From a casual conversation with university teachers, the latter avow that it is considered the language of the elite for many Algerians, who have an inferiority complex in regard to their own language. It is the language of communication for many families and many official occasions, and it is widely used in the public life; eg., in menus of restaurants, shop signs and notices. French is also the language of science and technology in higher education.

Despite its herculean efforts to promote the use of Arabic, Algeria remains powerless in regard to French linguistic imperialism. French, very much like English, attempts to attain a global importance. Thus, it tries to relegate local/national languages and impose its linguistic hegemony, which might even result in “linguistic cannibalism”. This term is coined by Harish Trivedi, and it means the exclusion of a language by imposing another one. According to Phillipson, linguistic imperialism is not just confined to the English language. The French linguistic empire is also a real threat to our languages. He writes: “There is abundant evidence that virtually all the criteria for linguistic imperialism that I list initially in this article apply to both French

and English in the present world.”(Phillipson, “English: from British Empire to corporate empire”, 2012).

Using a foreign language as a medium of instruction results in various harms: mental, psychological, linguistic and cultural. As Skutnabb-Kangas points out:

This education may thus participate in linguistic and cultural genocide, according to two of the five definitions of genocide-II(e) and II(b)-in the United Nations 1948 *International Convention on the punishment and prevention of the crime of Genocide* (E793, 1948): Article 2: In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with *intent to destroy*, whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial or religious group, as such: Article II(e): “forcibly transferring children of the group to another group”; and Article II(b): “causing serious bodily or *mental* harm to members of the group”; (Emphasis added). (2009, p.40)

To sum up the quote, French linguistic imperialism is likely to result in the destruction of the mother tongue and cultural identity. The use of this foreign language, at the cost of the national languages, weakens children’s and students’ competence in these languages, especially that we are not a literary-based culture, whose people have a fervid desire for reading. In the course of time, the mother tongue might disappear.

Since the colonial period, France has tried to extirpate the national languages. In his article “How linguistic imperialism continues”, Phillipson stated: “Colonial governments implemented *linguicist* policies that discriminated in favour of European languages ...French ‘consumed’ other languages by processes of linguistic cannibalism” (2012, p. 5). The aim of the French linguistic imperialism is to form Algerian elites, who are French in intellect and culture.

In Algeria, many parents teach their children the French language at home instead of the mother tongue. Skutnabb-Kangas assumes that parents are responsible for the death of a language. According to her, the last speaker of Eyak, Marie, died in January 2008, while the last speaker of Andamanese, Boa, died in January 2010. In her article “Crimes Against Humanity in Education”, Skutnabb-Kangas asks:

Why are there no more any Eyak or Andamanese Bo speakers? Why did Marie and Boa not transmit their languages to their children? Why do most Canadian and Californian and Australian Indigenous parents not speak their languages to their children? Why are most third generation immigrant minorities to the USA and UK monolingual in English? Isn’t it up to parents to choose what language(s) to speak to their children and what language(s) their school should be in? Are parents not responsible, because they have chosen to kill their mother tongues or not to transfer them to their children? (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2010)

Parents participate in killing their language, which they think is not confluent with modernity and civilization. They want their children to be modern by learning and imitating foreign lifestyles, habits, culture, and language.

For a very long time, Tamazight, which conveys our origin and our cultural heritage, has been considered as a minority language. Language policies, in Algeria, so many years ago, eliminated Tamazight, which was deemed a mere dialect that might shatter the national unity and integrity. Despite its marginalization, Tamazight has survived and has started to gain its vitality thanks to the strong will of Algerians. Very much like Kurdish in Turkey, Tamazight was, for a long time, banished and relegated as a minor language. This language policy was against linguistic human rights. Indeed, Tamazight was the victim of a structural and ideological violence. In her paper “Crimes Against Humanity in Education”, Skutnabb-Kangas explains that structural violence happens when indigenous, tribal, or minority mother tongues are banished and banned. The Ideological violence refers to the stigmatization of indigenous, tribal, and minority languages and cultures. (2010)

Stigmatizing Tamazight as a mere dialect, or vernacular, is an attempt to murder this language. In his article “Disciplines by English”, Phillipson pointed out that “extinguishing minority languages has often been state policy, with the agents behind such policies identifiable.” (2009, p. 11). In the same article, Phillipson added that linguistic genocide is “when state policies fail to respect linguistic human rights, and can be seen as constituting crimes against humanity” (2009, p. 11). One example of the multifarious attempts to banish Tamazight is when Mouloud Mammeri wanted to give a lecture on Tamazight poetry in Mouloud Mammeri University in 1980. As a reaction, there were many riots, demonstrations, and strikes, which ended with the death of some students. The United Nation’s recognition of the rights of indigenous people is very promising for promoting Tamazight. In her article “Multilingual Education for Global Justice”, Skutnabb-Kangas stated: “*The United Nations declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, after 25 years of work, was adopted on 13 September 2007 in the General Assembly, with 144 states voting for it, 11 abstaining, 33 absent and 4 against.” (2009, p. 58)

Interestingly, many research works have shown that depriving people of their linguistic human rights leads inevitably to a disruption or a violation of the world’s ecosystems. In her article “Multilingual Education for Global Justice”, Skutnabb-Kangas wrote:

People who lose their linguistic and cultural identity may lose an essential element in a social process that commonly teaches respect for nature and understanding of the natural environment and its processes. Forcing this cultural and linguistic conversion on indigenous and other traditional peoples not only violates their human rights, but also undermines the health of the world’s ecosystems and the goals of nature conservation. (2009, p. 39)

Promoting Tamazight is likely to maintain and preserve biodiversity in our country, because some traditional ecological knowledge about biodiversity and the human life on earth is found in the indigenous languages. The interrelatedness between linguistic diversity and biodiversity is crystal clear in taboos and myths. The latter, for instance, preserve biodiversity by preventing the excessive use of some natural resources or by

considering some of them holy or harmful. So, linguistic diversity is essential for a long-term survival of many creatures, plants, and natural resources. In fact, if no efforts are made to promote Tamazight, this will unavoidably lead to the murder of this language in the course of time, and this, in turn, creates a disruption in the ecosystem and results in the loss of a very rich cultural heritage. Linguistic genocide is a real harm against humanity and against the whole planet.

In contrast with the Biblical myth of the Tower of Babel, which promotes the view that multilingualism results in God's punishment, Islam is not against linguistic diversity. God, who creates people with various mother tongues and races, says: "And one of His signs is the creation of the heavens and the earth and the diversity of your tongues and colors; most surely there are signs in this for the learned." (The Sura of The Romans, verse [30,22]) So, the idea that Islam privileges only one language, which is Arabic, is erroneous.

For the linguist, Noam Chomsky, multilingualism is very enriching for one's culture and civilization. He writes:

I just came back from India, and if you talk to the taxi driver, he may know up to five different languages. [...] people easily grow up knowing many languages. They're very cultured people as compared with Americans, who are very uncultured in this respect. They know one language and nothing else. But I don't think that's a healthy situation. I think it would be a much healthier situation if the English-speaking world was more civilized, and in tune to other languages and cultures. (qtd in Hoodbhoy, 2001)

According to Chomsky: "Exposure to various cultures and immersion in various cultures, languages and so on adds a certain richness to life and, yes, richness to life has a positive value" (Chomsky, 2000). Multilingualism becomes necessary to foster intercultural dialogue in a world marked by difference and Otherness.

Skutnabb-Kangas, who advocates the rights of all languages and calls for the promotion of multilingualism, maintains that linguistic diversity and biodiversity are interrelated. She writes: "Killing linguistic diversity also hastens the killing of knowledge about how to maintain biodiversity, because of the correlational and causal relationships between linguistic and cultural diversity and biodiversity" (Skutnabb-Kangas, "The stakes: Linguistic Diversity").

A monolingual attitude to language planning does not just make us alienated from the outside world. It is an utter denial of linguistic human rights. Hence, language planning should aim at multilingualism to make our country in tune with the socio-economic development and mobility, but it should also give a cardinal and primary importance to our cultural identity and national unity. Learning other languages is of great importance and benefit if it does not change our deep-seated identity. In other words, the other languages should not survive and thrive on the tomb of the mother tongue. In this respect, Skutnabb-Kangas, in her article "Linguistic Human Rights in Education", states:

Formal education which is *subtractive*, i.e. which teaches children something of a dominant language *at the cost* of their first language, is genocidal. By comparison, learning new languages, including the dominant languages which most children obviously see is in their best interest to learn, should happen additively, *in addition to* their own languages. (1994, p. 126)

Learning foreign languages is very enriching, but it should not be at the cost of the national ones. They should be learned additively to enrich one's linguistic repertoires. Skutnabb-Kangas's view collides head on with that of Phillipson. In his article "English: from British empire to corporate empire", Phillipson points out:

It is logical and comprehensible that English should be seen as desirable for the society and the individual, and involves agency. This approach avoids endorsing a spurious use of 'choice'. There is no problem here *provided that English is learned and used additively*, as an extension of one's linguistic repertoire, but this is not the case when mother tongues are neglected, which is the case in many countries worldwide. (2012)

Phillipson, profusely, praises Ngugi WaThiong'o, who writes in an English language, which is different from that of the British. This 'english' differs from standard English because it conveys the culture of the Africans, and it is immune from the taints of the foreign cultures. He writes:

Along with his earlier plays and novels in Giküyü and their translation into Swahili, Ngügĩ significantly demonstrates that .world literature. does not presuppose use of a European language or one of the Asian languages with a millennial literary tradition. In the Kenyan context, the importance of using a local language, rather than an elite language with intrinsically foreign cultural baggage, is that the reading habit can be fostered at the grassroots. In addition, the polemic thrust of the novel represents a potential for furthering political change, for consciousness-raising as a practical instrument for decolonising minds. ("Reviewing a Book", p.3)

Writing his novel, *Wizard of the Crow*, in English is an example of what Chinua Achebe called "New English". It is an 'english', a language of the Other, which carries the spirit and the culture of the Africans and bears the burden of their experience. Multilingualism would constitute great gains if the foreign languages are remolded, appropriated, and adapted to our socio-cultural reality. For instance, we have to depart from the conventional standard French and transform it into a medium that is able to convey our particular view of the world.

4. Suggestions for Language Planners

With the inclusion of Tamazight as a national language, and because of globalization and intercultural dialogue, the linguistic map in Algeria should change.

- Though people have to enjoy linguistic human rights, there should be a common language (Arabic) that ensures the national and cultural unity. According to Phillipson, "There is a need for explicit language policies based

on ethical human rights principles.”(2008, p.39). Some linguistic human rights seem to be too idealistic. So, language planning has to be more democratic, but it should take into account the national and cultural identity.

- If Arabic and Tamazight are not strengthened, they will be swallowed by the giant languages, which attempt to survive and thrive on the tombs of the small ones. To prevent linguistic imperialism, we suggest the following:
- Language policy should be concerned with “the production and publication of authoritative reference works (grammars, dictionaries, etc.) that stipulate which forms of a language are appropriate, correct, or ‘proper’” (Phillipson, 2004, p. 3).
- We have to write and publish in our national language(s) to impose our language in the world’s linguistic map.
- To strengthen our two national languages, we should encourage free reading.
- Teachers should use modern and recent methods to teach Arabic and accord a great importance to teacher training and curriculum innovation and development.
- In order for Tamazight to expand further, teachers should be trained to teach this language.
- Dictionaries are needed to make learning Tamazight easier.
- Language planners should encourage the opening of new departments for the study of Tamazight language and culture.
- Tamazight should be implemented and made a compulsory subject in the Algerian educational system at all levels. Teaching this language should not just be restricted to the places, where there is a high concentration of Tamazight speakers.
- Media might be an effective means of promoting standard Arabic and Tamazight.
- Multilingualism should be one of the pillars in language planning and policy. We have to encourage the use of one mother tongue, but at the same time, we have to encourage learning other foreign languages, which are likely to open doors to other worlds and to nourish our civilization and culture. We might save our cultural identity despite multilingualism if we use these foreign languages to express our viewpoints.
- In language planning, according to Phillipson, language planners should:
 - formulate policies for maintaining linguistic diversity;
 - help to create conditions for equality between speakers of different language;
 - counteract the linguistic dispossession currently threatening ‘minorized’ languages;
 - educate politicians, journalists, translators, and the general public; and
 - use all languages to decolonize minds, so as to facilitate equitable dialogue and to counteract occupation, physical or mental. (“Critical Inquiry in Language Studies”, p. 39)

- Language planners should make it clear that a foreign language is not a property; it can be denationalized. Learning a foreign language does not necessarily lead to the slavish imitation of the foreign culture. In fact, there should be a peaceful co-existence of languages, especially that there has been an increasing call for dialogue after 2001, which is nominated by the United Nations as the year of dialogue.
- Learning foreign languages will help us carry the weight of our cultural identity and express it to the whole world.
- We should encourage the teaching of English and other foreign languages to prevent the detrimental effects of the French linguistic imperialism.
- Language planners should respect linguistic human rights. For Phillipson, language policies have been to the benefits of elites and not to the massive population.
- Young Algerian intellectuals, linguists, and university professors, rather than the social and political elites must be the leading elites in language planning.
- Language planning is not the responsibility of the government and politicians only. It is also the responsibility of linguists and university professors.
- Language planners should raise people's awareness of the importance of each language. There should be a TV program that raises people's awareness of the linguistic map in Algeria, and mainly the importance of each language. This is important especially that there is a gap between what language planners theorize and people's linguistic practices. People's attitudes should be tergiversated.
- To safeguard Arabic, we have to foster the Algerians' positive attitudes towards their language.
- One of the reasons why language planning is difficult to implement is that language planners always follow a top-to-bottom strategy.
- Language planning may not be implemented because of the lack of will of politicians. Skutnabb-Kangas complains about the "Politicians' lack of knowledge about language-and-education issues everywhere in the world is appalling." ("The Stakes", p. 11)
- We should find ways that make it possible for Arabic and Tamazight to co-exist. The co-existence of these two languages should not promote the colonizers' divide-and-rule policy.
- Language policy lacks implementation because it is just theoretical, very far from people's emotional reactions and, probably, the government's real attitudes and convictions. The attitudinal factor is always ignored in language planning and policy. Adopting a bottom-up strategy, instead of a top-down strategy, will help understand the gap between language planning and its implementation. Attitudes are important among speakers of a language, and they influence their practices. A positive attitude is more likely to make a

person competent in the language he uses. Indeed, people's attitudes might be confirmed, modified, or completely changed by language planners.

- The will of people is very important in combating linguistic imperialism. In this regard, Hankoni Kamwendo writes:

While governments can formulate language policies that support the promotion and official recognition of minority languages in order to check language shift or death, the final determiners of the fate of any language are its native speakers. If speakers of a minority or marginalized language want to maintain it, it will be maintained. Governments can only complement the efforts of the speakers of the language. (2006, p. 61)

- For the promotion of Tamazight, we can learn from the Canadian experience. Oluwole S.Oyetade states:

As is evident in the Canadian situation, the will power of the speakers of a language is an important variable in the promotion of their language. It appears that so many people have accepted the linguistic status quo in the country and do not worry about the fate of their languages. Speakers themselves have a role to play in the development of their languages. For instance, such things as stories, proverbs, cultural issues and primers may be produced, if not in the form of real books, but at least in pamphlets by the native speakers themselves. So also, everyone should be taught to take pride in his language regardless of its status. This will guarantee the continuous existence of such language. (2003, p. 113)

- Since parents are responsible for the murder of languages, they have an important role in language practices. They should teach their children the mother tongue in the early years.

Conclusion

Arabic and Tamazight languages have to be accorded a pivotal importance because they express and convey authenticity and cultural identity. Their promotion is, likely, to prevent the detriments of the Big languages, which push the weak and the small ones aside. Unfortunately, the two national languages are not regnant due to linguistic imperialism. Linguistic Imperialism might be combatted if language planning and policy aim at supporting and promoting the languages of cultural identity, which save our territorial, political, and cultural unity. Multilingualism becomes a must in language planning and policy because it is important for the country's development, openness, and civilization. A country, which is locked in one language, will be left behind. However, language planners and people have to be cautious about the threats of these foreign languages. We have to domesticate these foreign languages and use them in ways that serve our aims and goals. To attain its objectives, language policy should also take into consideration people's attitudes; this affective variable might be more important than the other ones in language planning. Linguistic imperialism and controlling the mind are two sides of the same coin.

References:

- Abu retima, A. (2011). *The inferiority complex of some Arabs*. Retrieved from <https://elaph.com/Web/opinion/2011/3/642551.html>
- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (2002). *The empire writes back : Theory and practice in post-colonial literatures*. New York: Routledge.
- Banda, F. (2009). Critical perspectives on language planning and policy in africa: Accounting for the notion of multilingualism. *Stellenboasch Papers in Linguistics PLUS*, 38, 1-11.
- Chomsky, N. (2000). *The Chomskyan era: Excerpted from The architecture of language*. Retrieved September 05, 2012 from www.chomsky.info/books/architecture01.htm
- De Man, P. (2000). The resistance to theory. In D. Lodge (Ed.) *Modern criticism and theory: A Reader* (pp. 332-347). Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Fanon, F. (1967). *Black skin, white masks* (Ch. Lam Markmann, Trans.). New York: Grove Press.
- Foucault, M. Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and other writings 1972-1977. In M. Foucault, Retrieved July 15, 2010 from <http://www.mun.ca/phil/codgito/vo14/v4doc1.html>
- Hankoni Kamwendo, G. (2006). No easy walk to linguistic freedom: A critique of language planning during south africa's first decade of democracy. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 1(15), pp.53-70.
- Hoodbhoy, P. Noam Chomsky Interviewed. Retrieved November 27, 2001 from www.arvindguptatoys.com/.../hoodchomsky.pdf
- Lee Whorf, B. (1956). *Language, thought, and reality: Selected writings*. Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Ngugi Wa Thiongo' (1994). The Language of African Literature. In N. Wa Thiongo' (Ed.). *Decolonizing the mind: The politics of language in African literature* (pp.4-33). Zimbabwe: Publishing House.
- Wa Thiong'o N. (1993). *Moving the centre: Struggle for cultural freedoms*. London: James Currey Ltd.
- Oyetade, O. (2003). Language Planning in a Multi-Ethnic State: The majority/minority in Nigeria. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 1 (12), 105-117.
- Phillipson, R., & Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2007). Reviewing a book and how it relates to 'global' English, Ngugi wa Thiong'o, *Wizard of the crow*. *The European English Messenger*, 16(1), 50-54.
- Phillipson, R. (1990). Glottopolitics and linguistics warfare. *World Englishes*, 9(1), 85-94.

- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Phillipson, R. (1996). Linguistic imperialism: African perspective. *ELT Journal*, 30 (2), 160-167.
- Phillipson, R. (2004). *English-only europe: Challenging language policy*. New York: Taylor and Francis Group.
- Phillipson, R. (2008). Critical inquiry in language studies: the linguistic imperialism of neoliberal empire. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 5(1), 1-43.
- Phillipson, R. (2009). Disciplines by English and disciplining by English. *The Asia EFL Journal Quarterly*, 11(4), 8-30.
- Phillipson, R. (2009, January). *Some partner languages are more equal than others*. The Bamako International Forum on Multilingualism. January 19-21, 2009, Bamako, Mali.
- Phillipson, R. (2012). *How linguistic imperialism continues: diagnosis and resistance*. International conference on Protecting and Revitalizing Native Languages in an Era of Globalization. November 20-21, 2012, Seoul, Korea.
- Phillipson, R. (2017). Myth and realities of global English. *Language Policy*, 16(3), 313-331.
- Phillipson, R. (2012). *English: from British empire to corporate empire*. Retrieved July 15, 2021 from
<file:///C:/Users/TauriNet%20CYBERCAFE/Downloads/English_From_British_empire_to_corporate_empire%20(1).pdf>
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1994). Linguistic human rights in education. In *Valodas politika Baltijas Valstīs/Language Policy in the Baltic States*. Rīga: Krājumu sagatavojs, Latvijas Republikas Valsts valodas centrs, 173-191.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2008). Human rights and language policy in education. In S. May & N. Hornberger (Eds). *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (pp. 107-120). New York.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2009). *The stakes : Linguistic diversity, Linguistic human rights and mother-tongue-based multilingual education-or linguistic genocide, crimes against humanity and an even faster destruction of biodiversity and our planet*. Bannako International Forum on Multilingualism, Jan 19-21, 2009, Bannako, Mali.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2009). Multilingual education for global justice: Issues, approaches, opportunities. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas, R. Phillipson, A. K. Mohanty, & M. Panda (Eds), *Social Justice Through Multilingual Education* (pp.36-62). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & Phillipson R. (2010). The politics of language in globalisation: Maintenance, marginalization, or murder. In N. Coupland (Ed), *Handbook on Language and Globalization* (pp. 77-100). Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2010). Crimes against humanity in education, and applied linguistics-corporate globalization or geopolitical knowledge glocalisation?, Plenary at BAAL (British Association for Applied Linguistics). Aberdeen, September 9-11, 2010, Scotland. Retrieved from <www.lllf.uam.es/clg8/actas/pdf/paperCLG96.pdf>

Wahhabi, N. (2016). The low achievement in Arabic among university students: Causes and results. *Journal Geneartion, Humanities and Social Sciences*, (17-18),171-183.