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Taking language as a tool of power, manipulation and dominance, we can easily determine how a form of language can influence and alter thoughts and perceptions. Within one's social paradigm exists dialect and language, whereby we communicate our personal philosophies, principles, politics, cultures and traditions. Language can mean more than just words. Language is the backbone to life's most fluid verbal art form and freedom of expression.

Language in media, especially the English language in international media, has influenced a global audience to an extent where their perceptions towards an event or situation may be altered. It is the international media's job to inform the world about current events. However, within each news channels appears to be a bias that directs their respective audience to believe the facts the way they are presented.

Therefore, this essay will examine the English language media's influence over international opinion towards the Gezi Park Demonstrations and the Syrian Uprising. Both events will be examined in a manner where every aspect of language is scrutinized within its context and content.
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Introduction

Media language belongs to a category unto itself. This is why there are separate university majors in journalism and English. The manner in which a newsworthy event is related is quite different from the way a poem, play, or fictional story is told. To be sure, fiction can often be a vehicle for communicating a political agenda and/or a cry for help, protest, or call to arms. However it is not the intent of this paper to examine those forms of phrasing. We will stay focused on the manner in which the use of language in international media is designed to shape thought and opinion.

English has established itself as an "international language", universally accepted in the global market place as the single most important means for communication. Due largely to the economic culture and military dominance of Britain and the United States, English has become the "world's language when it comes to conducting international business and diplomacy"[1]. There are an estimated "328 million native English speakers"[2] and as many as "1.5 billion people around the world learning it as a second language."[3]

Of particular relevance here is the fact that over the past few decades, English has also emerged as the preeminent language used in international media; print media, social media, and television news. A significant percentage of the world's population is able to converse in more than one tongue, with English being the most common second language. Perception of thoughts and feelings differ amongst languages, yet everyone perceives images in a relatively similar way. This is why the international media has become so sophisticated in combining dramatic videos with English text and presentation.

Why English is the predominant language in news media?

1) The American news channels and institutions have more money that any other countries news media. Money talks. And in this case, the talk is English.

2) America has the largest education population with access to high quality news media in the world even though China and India have larger populations, the penetrations of the quality news media into the population are much lower per capita.

3) Technology: American and British news institutions such as CNN, FOX, Bloomberg, Reuters, UPI, BBC, International Herald Tribune, Wall Street Journal, and the NY Times are all English language sources. They employ the most technologically advanced means of instantaneous communication and data processing, as well as having veritable armies of experts of every conceivable subject on every immediate comment on breaking news.

Language is the strongest form of communication in every single aspect. Therefore, language has dominated a power to influence opinions and perceptions towards any specific event/situation/object. According to American linguist Benjamin Lee Worf (1897 – 1941), language does shape the way you think. In one of his cases, he discusses how the mother tongue limits how and what we are able to think. Worf examined how languages' tenses, grammatical genders, and specific rules, shaped feelings – therefore concluding to how language plays a vital role within the development of observation and perception and interpretation. [4] Worf discusses how previously one's mother tongue amounted to shackles constraining our capacity to reason. Eventually linguistic
scientists realized that there was no evidence for this, and came to understand that people of all cultures think in fundamentally the same way.

This is profound when it comes to considering that English has become tantamount to a "global language". Many believe that within another one or two generations everyone in the planet earth will have at the very least, a conversational command of the English language. Wait until the end of this century, and if things continue in this direction, English will have evolved into the world’s mother tongue.


[4] "Since there is no evidence that any language forbids its speakers to think anything, we must look in an entirely different direction to discover how our mother tongue really does shape our experience of the world. Some 50 years ago, the renowned linguist Roman Jakobson pointed out a crucial fact about differences between languages in a pithy maxim: Languages differ essentially in what they must convey and not in what they may convey. This maxim offers us the key to unlocking the real force of the mother tongue: if different languages influence our minds in different ways, this is not because of what our language allows us to think but rather because of what it habitually obliges us to think about.

When your language routinely obliges you to specify certain types of information, it forces you to be attentive to certain details in the world and to certain aspects of experience that speakers of other languages may not be required to think about all the time. And since such habits of speech are cultivated from the earliest age, it is only natural that they can settle into habits of mind that go beyond language itself, affecting your experiences, perceptions, associations, feelings, memories and orientation in the world.

Languages like Spanish, French, German and Russian not only obliges you to think about the sex of friends and neighbors, but they also assign a male or female gender to a whole range of inanimate objects quite at whim.

The area where the most striking evidence for the influence of language on thought has come to light is the language of space — how we describe the orientation of the world around us.

Recently, it has been demonstrated in a series of ingenious experiments that we even perceive colors through the lens of our mother tongue. There are radical variations in the way languages carve up the spectrum of visible light; for example, green and blue are distinct colors in English but are considered shades of the same color in many languages. And it turns out that the colors that our language routinely obliges us to treat as distinct can refine our purely visual sensitivity to certain color differences in reality, so that our brains are trained to exaggerate the distance between shades of color if these have different names in our language."


International Media

In modern times, the international media has been directly responsible for communicating and regularizing many words on a global scale. Many English words, and to a lesser extent French, German, and Spanish words, are shared or “loaned” to the international lexicon by repeated usage. The loan words frequently employed by the international media are a convenient way to deliver their messages to a wide audience. A morning spent channel surfing the international morning news shows results in not only the same stories being reported, but also a remarkably similar delivery of the stories in terms of choice of language, image, and structure. This amounts to the homogenization of the news among the major channels.

Whether intended or not, this commonality of presentation has a cumulative affect on both the news sources as well as their respective audiences. After all, if enough people on major networks are saying the same thing, then most audience members think that it’s probably true. Admittedly, and fortunately, 99% of the time the reporting is accurate and responsible. Obviously, the more broadcasters, bloggers, and newspapers that say the same thing in the same way, the more powerful the message.
A government’s control over the media operating within its borders is directly related to the extent and type of bias found in the local press. However, in terms of international media, it is the language used within the context (usually English) that helps maintain the balance of truth. Because we don’t have two sides of the story we are led to believe one thing. The language used within international media is mainly to inform the audience of current events. A very broad spectrum of individuals receives the news, with the predominant common denominator being the ability to understand English. With this ability, audience members can include everyone from the Archbishop of Canterbury to Ayatollah Ali Khamenei and from a 16-year-old gang member from South Central Los Angeles to Rahmi Koc (Chairman of Koc Holding). For this reason, although all of the audience members may be listening in the same language, this doesn’t guarantee that they will react in the same manner or process the information in the same way.

The entire breadth of the CNN global audience saw the same images and heard the same reports about the Gezi Park protests. Likewise, they are receiving information about the conflict in Syria in much the same way. The questions for analysis are: (i) to what degree can an international news source such as CNN influence the personal opinions of its audience members; (ii) to what extent does CNN and/or other international English language news organizations have any affect on the decisions made by elected officials and military commanders; and (iii) does CNN and/or other international English language news organizations have any intention of influencing its private individual audience members?

The article, The CNN Effect from the American Journalism Review states, “Here it is, the nexus of media power and foreign policy, where television's instantly transmitted images fire public opinion, demanding instant responses from government officials, shaping and reshaping foreign policy at the whim of electrons. It's known as the CNN Effect.”[1]

Yes, a nexus of media and foreign policy perhaps, but probably with a more limited effect than media critics might want to believe. To say that CNN (or any other major international news source for that matter) actually changes foreign policy of responsible governments, or reduces military reaction time in response to local violence against innocents is a stretch. Although virtually every US government office has at least once television tuned to CNN, especially after the 9/11 attacks, this doesn’t mean that bureaucrats or military commanders are making instant decisions based on what they see and hear. Rather, information received from the news media simply goes into basket of intelligence accumulated from many sources; both public and clandestine.

A top humanitarian aid NGO representative claims that “private relief agencies received virtually no money whatsoever from the viewing public when images of Rwandans who had been hacked to death were broadcast on television. But contributions began to pour in when refugees stampeded across Rwanda’s borders and there were pictures of women and children... innocents in need.”[2] The same has proven true of the conflict in Syria. Images and written reports concerning battles between the government's forces and revolutionary militias have not resulted in private contributions or substantial donations of government foreign aid from anyone. Instead, the images of refugee children in obvious physical discomfort and emotional distress have generated contributions of money, clothing, food and medical aid/supplies. The reported donations of weapons to the revolutionaries is far more likely to have resulted from intelligence reports and secretive discussions among members of parliament and military commanders concerned with regional security than from anything depicted in the news media.
If anything, the most probable influence of the news media, especially television, on governments and public policy has the least desirable effect from the perspective of victims of war or natural disaster.

White House spokesman Michael McCurry stated "We are developing an ability now to see incomprehensible human tragedy on television and understand no matter how horrible it is, we can't get involved in each and every instance," "We are dulling our senses." The gap between the outrage expressed by interviewees who are protestors during the Gezi Park demonstrations and the responsive actions of third party governments was substantial. Despite graphic images and written descriptions of police brutality appearing on virtually every major international news channel as well as in highly credible newspapers such as The New York Times, International Herald Tribune and The Wall Street Journal, and innumerable blogs and other forms of social media, there was absolutely no foreign intervention. Sharp criticism yes, especially from certain U.S government and EU officials, but no UN, NATO, or other foreign "boots on the ground".

The demonstrations at Gezi Park occurred over 6 months before this essay was written, and the conflict in Syria is ongoing. Except for those who participated in the Gezi Park demonstrations and strong opponents of the Prime Minister, it almost seems like the entire affair has been forgotten, if not in Turkey, certainly by the rest of the world. Although the same cannot be said about the conflict in Syria, which continues to be an important ongoing news story, and despite reports of high level meetings between international officials and representatives from both the Assad Government and various rebel groups, things are far from resolved in Syria. Therefore a significant difference exists between a loud public outcry and actual military or economic intervention. From this we can see that the CNN effect is more limited that one might otherwise think.

The very nature of bureaucracy compels it to meet, analyze, discuss, and write reports and memos, and discuss some more. Very little of significance occurs immediately, except in the case of disaster relief, and as demonstrated in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, Typhoon Haiyan, and the Fukushima nuclear disaster, even these catastrophic events are often not responded to quickly enough by governments and military forces. Something as complicated as a civil war in Syria, or as esoteric as massive socio-political unrest in Turkey isn’t going to get any rapid response from government officials watching CNN in Washington DC seven time zones away.

To be sure, the news media can make individual elected government officials nervous about the reactions of voters if they take unpopular positions with respect to a highly reported event. But these same officials know that in most cases, humans are fickle and have short attention spans, and therefore will usually forget about whatever is bothering them from a news story within a few days or at most, weeks.


International Media and Audience

We have examined how the media can have a greater effect on private individuals than governments. To further complicate matters, we must consider how the media is influenced by factors that are independent of the news itself. Perhaps the most powerful consideration is that
which is most basic; revenue sources. With the exception of government-owned news channels, of which the only one of significance is Al Jazeera (owned by the government of Qatar), advertising revenue is what keeps the lights turned on and the rent paid. Advertisers spend vast sums of money trying to influence audiences to buy their products. Lately, a new trend has emerged; governments advertising to attract foreign tourists and investors. If these advertisers perceive that a news channel is loosing viewers, they redirect their advertising budgets elsewhere. There is constant, substantial pressure on the news channels to primarily report news that keeps the attention of the widest possible audience. This is called the “Revenue Imperative”.

Of less financial importance, but certainly a factor in the way that news is presented (both in print and video) is how a particular country’s prestige and reputation is affected by the news. Although the days when newspapers were merely mouthpieces for powerful government officials are over, it is not impossible to conceive that at least on certain subjects, governments can exert sufficient pressure on the news media to cast a story in a light most favorable to that country’s national interests. Whenever a story is written or told in a manner that specifically intends to distort or shape the facts in a way to convey a specific message, it is called “spin”.

The conflict in Syria doesn’t require any “spin” because Mr. Assad continues to be his own worst enemy when it comes to public relations. The demonstrations known as Gezi Park are quite a different matter. One thing that every Turk still talks about is the government intervention with the media during the initial days of the Gezi Park Protests. The government virtually instructed what the media were to say (blaming the protests on “foreign influences” and “fringe groups”) and what to show (penguin documentaries). It was only the mass use of social media like Twitter and Facebook that brought the size and scope of the demonstrations to international attention.

**International Media and Social Unrest**

It is the international media’s job to inform the world about current events. However, within each news channels appears to be a bias that directs their respective audience to believe the facts the way they are presented. Big international news channels like CNN, BBC and Al Jazeera deliver their messages with the use of *pathos*, *logos* and *ethos*. The main international media sources have gained more credibility, therefore attracting a wider audience and subsequently swaying their opinions subconsciously towards specific events with the use of carefully selected words and images. The words and images employed by these news channels have a strong sense of pathos and logos, which alter the perceptions of the audience through emotion and logical statements disguised as “facts”.

To make matters worse (for discerning truth) but easier for the news media, it almost appears that people (the audience) are gorging themselves on news. It’s as if they are starving for information, therefore not being able to taste (hence, judge) the nutritional value (veracity and credibility) of what the media presents.

Despite the fact that international media is supposedly aimed at “informing” their audience, the power in the language within each article or broadcast provide more that just “facts”. Every word within every sentence seems to bring in more than the basic information regarding a situation. Using connotation, denotation, and value-laden words, language is a tool used to influence and even control the emotions of the audience. Emotion is a primal characteristic of all humans and has the power to supersede reason. When language and emotion are combined, individuals are easily influenced in how they perceive the reality of the situation.
In terms of the Gezi Park demonstrations, local media was censored to the extent that various irrelevant documentaries were aired on Turkish news channels rather than the escalating protests. Prime minister Tayyip Erdoğan used value-laden words such as “capulcu” (marauders), which was meant to imply that the people partaking in the protests were anti-God thugs, hooligans, and drunks. This overwhelmed the judgment of the individuals who were pro-Erdogan and they started to perceive half of Turkey as anti-religion atheists and anti-nationalistic traitors. Erdoğan’s play on words essentially changed the perception of reality for half of Turkey, leading to both pro and anti-government riots. Though Erdoğan aired what he wished and ignored what did not appeal to him, communicating his own brand of reality, social media (such as Twitter and Facebook) was a crucial tool for people to get their voices heard all over the world. This almost instantaneously reached the international media. Social media, especially Twitter, was the first step to bring in international media such as CNN, BBC, Al Jazeera directly into the chaos within the country.

To provide a visualization of what individuals at both ends of the political spectrum were saying, SumAll.org created the chart below to depict daily updated, hourly trending Twitter hashtags referencing Turkey’s demonstrations. The goal of this project was to “remove language barriers and layers of propaganda, by providing a fresh and intuitive map of the conversations related to the Taksim Gezi Park protests.”[7]

The hashtags in the chart were added to tweets that were either anti-Erdogan or pro-Erdogan. Both sides were using words and language to manipulate mass perception of reality, thus both sides demonstrated biased opinions, which manipulated the emotion and the perception of reality in general. Of particular note is that the hashtags relating to Gezi Park were originally in both Turkish and English but soon became exclusively English words, thus attracting a global following.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protestor Hashtags</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answer!</strong></td>
<td>A demand for an explanation of why Erdoğan wanted to demolish a beautiful, centrally located park and replace it with an architecturally unattractive shopping mall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#cevapver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resist Ankara</strong></td>
<td>“Resist”: Engaging with audience through emotion; the word resist connotes unification against the Erdoğan establishment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#direnankara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resist Gezi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#direngezi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resist Gezi Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#direngezipark1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resist Gezi Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#direngeziparks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resist Gezi, we are with you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#direngeziSENINLEYIZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resist, Lice!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#direnlice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resist Mersin!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#direnmersin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resist, resolution!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#direnQUZUM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standing Man</strong></td>
<td>In support of Edem Gunduz, a performance artists and left-Kemalist, who stood facing the Atatürk Culture Center silently for over 10 hours protesting against police brutality. He instantly became known internationally as the Standing Man. “Gunduz’s moving, motionless protest, is a symbol of great peril for the Turkish regime.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#duranadam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupy Gezi</strong></td>
<td>A call to arms from the anti-government protesters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#occupygezi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RedHack</strong></td>
<td>Referring to the Turkish Marxist-Leninist computer hacker group. The group hacked institutions such as the:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#redhack</td>
<td>• Turkish police forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Turkish Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Türk Telekom,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The National Intelligence Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During the demonstrations, protesters supported RedHack as they hacked into government sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Show all pro-government hashtags: 

- Religious Youth following each other
- Stop Lying CNN!
- Turkey stands behind the Prime Minister


Date and time the hashtags were tweeted

Pro government Hashtags

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hashtag Description</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religious Youth following each other</td>
<td>&quot;Religious&quot; (people who are anti- Erdoğan are anti-God) &quot;Following each other&quot; (unification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop Lying CNN!</td>
<td>Stop lying (accusing others for starting a revolution) (CNN- huge accusation - globally based - renowned media source)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey stands behind the Prime Minister</td>
<td>• The word &quot;Turkey&quot; - (generalization - broadening)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• &quot;Stands&quot; - (pride/support/resistant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• &quot;Standing behind Prime Minister Erdoğan &quot;; he's the authority with the main ideology people are following.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shows a unified belief.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each hashtagged word has a power of its own; the power of taking over meaning. In other words, these hashtags portray how words are used to manipulate mass perception of reality and the “actual” situation. We can determine the power of “naming” and “labeling” through each word within the context and content they are presented. Prime Minister Erdoğan used value-laden words in the Turkish language by “labeling” activists. Throughout the protests, the more the “labeling”, the more powerful the word itself became. In terms of the Gezi Park demonstration, there is a vast different between referring to activists as “Students” and “Protesters” or “Capulcu’s”; “Student” portrays an image of youth and innocence (which was used all over the international media) whereas “Protesters” implies individuals who have a “subversive political agenda” (used in the local media) and “Capulcu” goes beyond the movement itself.

For example, the word “capulcu” was intended to dehumanize the demonstrators but ironically resulted in creating a whole new movement – a movement of freedom. Linguist and political critic Noam Chomsky [9] supported the movement, defining himself as a “chapuller”. He recorded the message that “everywhere is Taksim, everywhere is resistance.”[10] As the wider audience became more and more aware of the movement which evolved from a single word, the definition changed over time, – from “bums” and “vandeleur” to “freedom fighters.” The evolution of this word arose from the revolution of a repressed population, creating a sense of outrage and rebellion to the international media, and therefore, influenced the opinions of a global audience.

[6] The Greek philosopher Aristotle divided the means of persuasion into three categories – Ethos, Pathos, Logos. The three persuasive appeals:
1. Ethos: credibility of the speaker
2. Pathos: emotional connection to the audience
3. Logos: logical argument


**Conclusion**

“Give me liberty or, give me death!”[11]. This timeless cry attributed to American revolutionist Patrick Henry has carried via the print media through the centuries to the present day. These words are essentially the same as those proclaimed in Turkish and Arabic at Gezi Park and in the streets of Baghdad.

These are powerful words that evoke passionate emotions. Words that capture thoughts, current attitudes, and beliefs that are intrinsic to a substantial part of a given population; enough to make them go into the streets to risk their lives for what they believe. The purpose of this essay was to examine how language used by the international media, especially in its choice of words, directly influences the strength, credibility, and popularity of a message.
While words may originate from the mind of an individual, the context and medium in which they are expressed greatly affects their credibility and power. Language is the simplest way of communication as it enables strengths such as human creativity due to the development of the language, the emotive aspect that allows inner feelings to be shared. On the dark side, and as is currently evidenced by the political attack advertisements over the past 10 years, words can be employed to put a bias on facts and figures.

Taking the concept of “spin” (using words to manipulate impression) into consideration, language can be divided into two forms; divisive and unifying language. Both these forms are employed depending on the situation at hand. Divisive language is a form in which tends to cause controversy and enmity between people/parties/social groups etc. Unifying language on the other hand, is a form that creates cohesiveness among people who might otherwise have little in common.

In this case, divisive and unifying language is used not only to persuade, but also to manipulate the target groups. Therefore, with the use of these forms, the same event can be interpreted in different ways (creating a bias). Facts, and people’s understanding of them, are easily manipulated in the mass media. The events of June 2013 in Gezi Park and the Syrian gas attack on August 21st 2013 are two examples of controversial events that elicited conflicting reports in the media.

Without question, the respective governments in Turkey and Syria exerted substantial influence on media reporting of these two events, each putting a “spin” to cast them in a light most favorable to their authority. The actual truth about the extent of the protests and police violence in Gezi Park and the origin of the gas attacks only came to light after subsequent independent investigations.

Things are often written in a certain way to support a position. At other times, they are written to be sensationalistic in order to sell newspapers because the general public loves to hate a “bad guy”. Another truism is that an average person loves to see the “mighty fall”. This was exactly the case with respect to the downfall of Saddam Hussein and Muammar Gaddafi. Many people in Turkey were hoping to see the political demise of Prime Minister Erdoğan and certainly many people all over the world are waiting anxiously for the fall of Bashar al Assad.

In the media, bad news sells more than good news. This explains why virtually every time you turn on CNN, BBC, Al Jazeera or any news channel on television, there are always reports of incidents including lurid information about how many people have died or grievously injured. Media is the only way the international public can access on-going events all over the world. During the events immediately after the gas attack in Ghouta Syria, and the Gezi Park incident, it was the international media that provided us with what we presume to be independent reporting of the actual events.

Just as the international, independent media has a responsibility to accurately report events to us, we all have responsibility as members of the global audience. We must train ourselves on how to distinguish between hard facts and conjecture, between opinion and reality, and truth disguised as emotion. We must be sensitive to economic motivations behind which stories are reported and how they are presented. We must investigate the credibility of so-called experts, and the veracity of on-scene witnesses. We must also acknowledge that the CNN effect is more limited than one might otherwise think due to the vast difference between a loud public outcry and actual military or economic intervention. Somewhere between the front page and the want ads, and the interviews and the commercials, the truth must be found.
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Appendices

Linguistic Imperialism:

This domination of the news from America and the UK has led to what can be termed linguistic imperialism. Any news channel or global T.V station is a “transfer of a dominant language to other people” [9]. One of the phenomena’s we have to deal with at the moment, which is absolutely new in history, is that for the first time in recorded history it is possible for the English language in some form to be transmitted and received anywhere in the world. And there will be a radius of its reception point, somebody, or many people who will understand it. This is a real breakthrough in understanding.

Robert Phillipson, an English Research Professor at the Copenhagen Business School’s English Department, and best known for his book Linguistic Imperialism, states that those who promote English - world wide organizations (the British Council, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund), and individuals whom operate the English-language system and schools - utilize three different types of argument:

Furthermore, Phillipson’s other cases regarding the “dominance” of the English language are;

• “Its economic utility: it enables people to operate technology.” [12]
• “Its ideological function: it stands for modernity.” [12]
• “Its status as a symbol for material advance and efficiency.” [12]