



## CREOLIZED ENGLISH AS A DECOLONIAL TOOL: AN ANALYSIS OF DABYDEEN AND L.K. JOHNSON'S POEMS

Dekolonizasyon Aracı Olarak Kreolleştirilmiş İngilizce: Dabydeen ve L.K.  
Johnson'ın Şiirleri Üzerine Bir İnceleme

Alican ALBAYRAK\*

### ABSTRACT

David Dabydeen and Linton Kwesi Johnson's poetry centers on the experiences of the oppressed communities and portrays systemic discrimination and violence against them. These poets proudly employ creole language in their poetry to resist cultural and linguistic imperialism, which eradicates cultures in order to serve the interests and profits of hegemonic powers. In this context, through a close reading of David Dabydeen's and Linton Kwesi Johnson's selected poems, this study examines how creolized English functions in their works, explores the embrace of native cultures and languages through Creole, and simultaneously analyzes the struggles faced by non-standard English speakers in the periphery and center. To conceptualize and articulate the destructive nature of English as a form of soft power imposed on Black people, this article mainly draws on the ideas of Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o and Chinua Achebe. It highlights the impact of English as a neocolonial tool that leads to language-based discrimination and linguistic extinction.

**Keywords:** linguistic imperialism, linguisticism, linguisticide, creole, poetry.

### ÖZ

David Dabydeen ve Linton Kwesi Johnson'ın şiirleri, baskıya uğramış toplulukların deneyimlerine odaklanır ve onlara yönelik sistemsel ayrımcılığı ve şiddeti tasvir eder. Bu şiirler, kültürleri ortadan kaldıran ve egemen güçlerin çıkar ve kârlarına hizmet eden kültürel ve dilsel emperyalizme direnmek için şiirlerinde kreol dilini gururla kullanırlar. Bu bağlamda, David Dabydeen ve Linton Kwesi Johnson'ın seçilmiş şiirlerinin yakından okunması yoluyla, bu çalışma kreolleştirilmiş İngilizcenin eserlerinde nasıl işlev gördüğünü açıklar; kreol aracılığıyla yerel kültürlerin ve dillerin benimsenmesini ve aynı zamanda çevre ve merkezdeki standart dışı İngilizce konuşanların karşılaştığı zorlukları analiz eder. İngilizcenin ötekileştirilmiş bireylere dayatılan bir yumuşak güç biçimi olarak yıkıcı doğasını kavramsallaştırmak ve ifade etmek için bu makale başlıca Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o ve Chinua Achebe'nin fikirlerinden yararlanır.

\* MA Student. University of Göttingen. Germany. E-mail: alicanalbayrak00@gmail.com. ORCID: 0009-0001-3371-0119.

Çalışma, İngilizcenin dil temelli ayrımcılığa ve dilsel yok oluşa yol açan neo-kolonyal bir araç olarak etkisini vurgular.

**Anahtar Sözcükler:** dilsel emperyalizm, dil temelli ırkçılık, dil katli, kreol, şiir.

## **Introduction**

The English language has historically functioned as a tool of discrimination, particularly in the aftermath of British colonization in Africa. Beyond its communicative role, it has operated as a mechanism of categorization and exclusion, contributing to the systemic marginalization of certain groups. During the neo-colonial period, hegemonic powers legitimized the denigration of local tongues and linguistic stigmatization, especially through English, as part of broader economic and ideological agendas. While such marginalization was enforced through overt, coercive means during the colonial era, it has transformed into a more subtle and pervasive form under neoliberalism. As Phillipson asserts, “[L]inguistic imperialism (which continued under neocolonialism) is transmorphing into linguistic neoimperialism during the transition from neoliberalism into empire.” (2009: 134) In this context, linguistic domination operates as soft power worldwide with the guise of globalization through the global imposition of a “proper” or standardized form of English. This pressure to conform linguistically serves assimilationist goals and can function as a barrier for certain individuals to inclusion in a mainstream society, resulting in isolation, exclusion, and discrimination.

As English has become the global lingua franca, it can often be functional for gaining access to opportunities and resources, thereby one’s mother tongue might be perceived as primitive or inferior to English. When English is valorised in education, the media, and the workplace, individuals may devalue their linguistic and cultural identities in pursuit of upward mobility. This perception can motivate people to adopt standard English pronunciations and cultural norms, frequently developing feelings of linguistic insecurity. As a result, they might pathologically and obsessively prefer to mimic the standard accented English speakers or assimilate into the target culture while developing an inferiority complex. It may prompt individuals to abandon their original identities to master and use the standardized form of the dominant language, seeking greater acceptance, social mobility, and protection from systemic oppression. This belief in the fruitful outcomes of

the English language at the individual level drives people to be a “proper other” within the neocolonial center.

Numerous postcolonial writers have directly challenged English’s status as a superior global language, highlighting its role in the endangerment of indigenous tongues, which is referred to as “linguicide”. Linguicide results in profound sociological, psychological, and cultural harm in communities that seek to exist within another culture because of economic or social conditions. Some African writers like Chinua Achebe expressed this resistance against this phenomenon by rejecting standard English, and others like Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o entirely ceased using the colonizer’s language. It has been an attempt to liberate themselves from the norms of the West and to affirm their culture and traditions by preserving native accents and languages. Thus, Creole English as a postcolonial weapon is deployed by prominent authors and poets in order to create consciousness and awareness through literature. In their novels and poems, they have given voice to the oppressed who, for example, struggle to make a living in the neocolonial center and mention their challenges in these literary works in their accents. Therefore, this technique has been employed to challenge imperialist norms and unveil unfair threats to specific linguistic communities. In this context, by drawing on *Decolonizing the Mind* by Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o and the ideas of Chinua Achebe for the usage of the English language, this paper aims to focus on the purpose of creolized English as an attempt to resist the norms imposed by the West. By tracing details and highlighting the struggles faced by the creolized English users in the selected poems of David Dabydeen and Linton Kwesi Johnson, it also addresses assimilation processes and articulates some difficulties that the non-standard English speakers face in the neo-colonial center.

### **1. Decolonizing the Mind from Linguistic Imperialism**

Even after the formal end of the colonial era, not all individuals in the neo-colonial periphery and center have undergone ideological decolonization. Although certain populations have achieved political and economic autonomy to some extent, many continue to perceive themselves through the lens of Western discourse. In response, Creole languages have become powerful tools for postcolonial writers seeking to resist imperialism and decolonize the minds from linguistic and cultural hegemony. The use of creolized English has thus become a literary weapon against the norms imposed on immigrants, refugees, and other marginalized communities attempting to integrate into mainstream white society without erasing their

identities. Authors and poets have employed this hybrid linguistic form, which consists of a fusion of English and native languages, to represent these communities and give voice to their experiences.

Although some scholars continue to devalue local languages by reinforcing binary oppositions and thereby upholding entrenched hierarchies, in an interview, DeGraff states that a global movement led by educators, linguists, activists, and artists is increasingly promoting Indigenous languages, demonstrating a resilient, postcolonial effort to claim linguistic and cultural agency (Dey, 2018: 88). Regarding this, whereas some authors fully rejected using the colonizer's language, others strategically appropriated the modified version of English to reach the masses, raise awareness and challenge the perceived superiority of English language and culture over others. Although both approaches share the goal of critiquing the perceived superiority of English, those who advocated for creolized English differed in their intention to engage with global literary discourse. Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o is among the authors who fully embraced writing in his native language, Gikuyu, promoting resistance to imperialist linguistic norms through his influential work *Decolonising the Mind*. In this book, Ngũgĩ emphasizes the intrinsic connection between language and culture:

Language carries culture, and culture carries, particularly through orature and literature; the entire body of values by which we come to perceive ourselves and our place in the world. How people perceive themselves affects how they look at their culture, at their politics and at the -social production of wealth, at their entire relationship to nature and to other beings. Language is thus inseparable from ourselves as a community of human beings with a specific form and character, a specific history, a specific relationship to the world (1994: 16).

He states that language shapes an individual's perception of their status in the world, which in turn influences their culture, politics, and social relations. During colonialism, language and, therefore, culture were weaponized to facilitate exploitation. Regarding this, he articulates that "[e]conomic and political control can never be complete or effective without mental control" (1994: 16). Thus, by "decolonizing the mind," he means resisting the internalization of imperialist ideologies and liberating oneself from the colonizing norms and narratives. Besides, through the metaphor of a "cultural bomb", he illustrates the destructive and lasting impact of imposed culture, which causes individuals to adopt colonial narratives about their identity, environment, and language (Wa Thiong'o, 1994: 3). He further

explains, “[i]t makes them see their past as one wasteland of non-achievement, and it makes them want to distance themselves from the wasteland,” ultimately positioning the imperialists as the supposed remedy (1994: 3).

Globalization has elevated the role of English, making it essential both individually and internationally. However, the mechanisms sustaining English’s dominance today are rooted in more overt practices of linguistic hegemony than those of the colonial era. To illustrate, this role of English is particularly evident when children become alienated from their sociopolitical environment, as the erasure of a language often begins when it is no longer taught to children and when no child learns or speaks it. When they are directly or indirectly forced to speak English, they must read the books teaching their history, geography and music as peripheral; thereby, they perceive themselves through Western depictions (Wa Thiong’o, 1994: 17). Consequently, these children are exposed to representations of their world refracted through European language, while their own languages become associated in their minds with “low status, humiliation, corporal punishment, slow-footed intelligence and ability or downright stupidity, non-intelligibility and barbarism” (Wa Thiong’o, 1994: 18). As a result, children become “alienated from the values of [their] mother tongue, or from the language of the masses.” (Wa Thiong’o, 1994: 71). Also, to conceptualize this mechanism, Edward Said’s definition of Orientalism provides a relevant framework; Said states that “the collective notion identifying ‘us’ Europeans as against all ‘those’ non-Europeans” and “the major component in European culture is precisely what made that culture hegemonic both in and outside Europe: the idea of European identity as a superior one in comparison with all the non-European peoples and cultures” (2003: 7).

Like Ngũgĩ, Achebe states that European languages exert a hegemonic influence over African societies. However, Achebe also emphasizes the beneficial role of English as a unifying lingua franca. In his essay, “The African Writer and the English Language”, he argues that English unites African peoples and facilitates interregional dialogue (1997: 344). Achebe further advocates using English to articulate the feelings and emotions imperialism evokes in colonial subjects. He asserts “[t]he African writer should aim to use English in a way that brings out his message best without altering the language so much that its value as a medium of international exchange will be lost. He should aim at fashioning an English that is at once universal and able to carry his peculiar experience.” (1997: 347). At the conclusion of

his essay, Achebe adds: “But it will have to be a new English, still in full communion with its ancestral home, but altered to suit its new African surroundings.” (1997: 349). To adequately present the language, culture, and oral tradition and create empathy in the reader while decolonizing the linguistics, Achebe advises using vocabulary, rhythms, spellings, and concepts of his native language in the English written language. Thus, the incorporation of Creole syntax in literary works constitutes both a political choice and a symbolic act, reflecting cultural creolization that asserts identity while resisting dominant norms (Breiner, 2005: 30). When local textures, such as rhythms, syntax, Creole words, social themes, and oral traditions are incorporated into poetry, this literary form can support people’s acceptance of their identity by celebrating and critically engaging with shared experiences. In doing so, poetry helps people resist oppression through strengthening their sense of community.

Despite the possible drawbacks of using Creole in literary works, such as essentialism, commodification, exoticism, and limited accessibility to broader audiences, it remains a powerful medium of resistance against neocolonial structures that threaten linguistic and cultural diversity. For example, commodification occurs when Creole speakers are portrayed exotically because the focus shifts from cultural and social problems to stereotypes that obscure the political and historical realities of their communities. Publishing in Creole also poses structural challenges, as writers struggle to gain recognition in “prestigious” literary markets like London or Paris because of Creole’s association with “low status”. Another challenge would be reaching a limited audience, but this may also be the primary goal of certain writers (Breiner, 2005: 30). Accessibility remains another concern; as L.K. Johnson admits, Creole texts can be harder to read than works in standard English (URL-2). Similarly, Dabydeen is aware of the difficulty, yet he thinks that in written form they become “quite readable,” (2005: 12). Literary works written in Creole can be more accessible, especially when accompanied by analyses and explanations, as in Dabydeen’s *Slave Song*. Importantly, the writers’ aim is not to present Creole as inherently superior or more revolutionary than other languages but rather to challenge the notion of linguicism. In spite of its risks, ultimately, Creole is a functional literary strategy that foregrounds authenticity, exposes language-based discrimination, and creates political and social consciousness.

DeGraff critiques the racialization of Creole speakers through the term “Creole exceptionalism,” a dogma that degrades Creole by labeling it

“simpler,” “abnormal,” or “lesser,” and he argues that this dogma, rooted in racial ideologies, served colonial academia and White supremacist thought (2020: 294). Similarly, Mufwene critiques the bias imposed on Creoles, advocating for their recognition as natural languages, the undermining of Creole exceptionalism, and the acknowledgment of linguistic varieties across societies and communities (2020: 291). These critiques show that, even in the era of globalization, the marginalization of Creoles persists in serving similar purposes. At the same time, it is crucial to consider today’s power dynamics more comprehensively. Although the addressed injustice might appear rooted in language usage, framing the issue narrowly as linguisticism, without attending to intersecting factors of identity and class, risks hiding the deeper structures of injustice. Building on these critiques and considering the intersectional nature of redistribution and recognition claims, Creole exceptionalism should be addressed as part of recognition-based injustice.

## **2. Linguistic Imperialism**

Linguistic imperialism refers to one language’s intellectual, ideological, and cultural superiority and dominance over others. As Phillipson articulates “the dominance of English is asserted and maintained by the establishment and continuous reconstitution of structural and cultural inequalities between English and other languages.” (1992: 47). The dominance of English language has been manifested in two main periods; the first is in colonial period, and the second is in the era of globalization (Rose, 2017: 386). The spread of English linguistic imperialism began in the 16th century because of the imperial expansion of the British Empire (Shah, 2019: 34). English spread under the influence of imperial powers, driven by both British and American economic and political policies. Moreover, the promotion of English has propagated its perceived intellectual and cultural superiority while shaping popular attitudes to serve Anglo-American economic, social, and political interests. Regarding today’s continuing imperial influence of English, Zeng states that English language imperialism extends beyond education, dominating global institutions and opportunities, and often determining social and economic advancement in peripheral countries (2023: 3).

During colonization, English served as a primary medium of communication between colonizers and indigenous peoples. It was promoted as a benevolent, missionary endeavor. To exemplify, for the Native Americans, Westernization with the language and customs was framed as a means to

“protect” them by the authority and U.S. laws through civilization and to save them from living in vice, misery, and purportedly “weak” indigenous practices (qtd. in Lomawaima, 2006: 45). In addition, Aboriginal children (also known as the Stolen Generations) have experienced similar kinds of “civilization” practices by the Australian government in order to help them “sustain” their lives; so-called half-caste children were removed from their families and compelled to speak in English. They were under constant surveillance in schools and dormitories. When caught speaking their native languages, they faced severe punishment from the authorities. These practices led to the eradication of their languages as well as their oral culture. Similar to the situation of Native Americans, the main purpose of the white people in Australia was to remake Aboriginal people’s identities to fit them into the dominant society and make them “proper servants” of privileged white people (qtd. in O’Brien, 2023: 186). Although such overt hard power has recently been dramatically reduced, linguistic power hierarchies persist in more covert and indirect forms.

Language might serve multiple purposes; it is employed not only for communication but also as a social force (Cargile et al., 1994: 211). It might function as a tool for both inclusion and exclusion of people. The English language can confer prestige and economic benefits, but it may function as an instrument for erasing individual differences. Regarding this, Robert Phillipson reframes English not as a neutral “lingua franca” but as a “lingua frankensteinia”, invoking Mary Shelley’s fiction, *Frankenstein*, using the protagonist’s role of being the creator of the monster rather than the monster itself, and prompts us to question the agents promoting English. Because while English is perceived as the language of international understanding, human rights, development, progress etc., it might also create language competence, injustice, and inequality in daily life and indirectly lead other languages to linguicide (Phillipson, 2008: 2). Holders of symbolic capital of English systematically impose and dictate their truths to marginalized communities through various institutions like the media, school system, academia, and judicial system to have a hegemony over social, cultural, and political systems (Bourdieu, 1989: 21–22).

Tove Skutnabb-Kangas coined the term linguicism to describe the systemic oppression of minority groups based on language. She argues that linguicism is analogous to other forms of discrimination, such as racism and sexism (Kangas, 2015: 1). Like other systems of oppression, language-based marginalization functions as a social and political construct de-



signed to regulate and dominate marginalized populations. Although Cynthia Willis Esqueda notes that even white European languages, such as German, have faced exclusion in the United States during periods of perceived threat, linguicism is primarily associated with white supremacist ideology (2022: 155, 156). Thus, immigrants, refugees, or other minority groups who do not speak English are controlled by the English-only policies in order to integrate them into the social structure and profit from them for the advantage of the imperialist countries.

Linguicism often operates as a form of soft power, subtly and effectively targeting non-English speakers and individuals with non-standard accents. Even when individuals do not consciously intend harm, their language-based biases may contribute to what Gynter terms indirect institutionalized discrimination, wherein prejudice becomes embedded in the system itself (2003: 47). This dichotomy between “proper” and “improper” English often reduces non-native or non-Western speakers to a homogenized identity as the Other. Therefore, neo-colonial subjects may encounter injustice, inequality, derision of their language or accent in formal and informal environments. This devaluation of the native language may lead individuals to internalize feelings of cultural inferiority and alienation.

In *Reversing Language Shift*, J.A. Fishman argues that mother tongue and accent are inherited and largely immutable aspects of ethnicity and identity (qtd. in Jaspal, 2009: 17). Like ethnicity and class, they shape how individuals are perceived by others. Such linguistic markers may influence first impressions and assumptions about a person’s background. However, this perceived fixity can lead to stigmatization, marginalization, criminalization, and victimization of certain groups. Numerous empirical studies across different contexts support the theory of language-based discrimination. For example, Seligman et al., in the article “The Effects of Speech Style and Other Attributes on Teachers’ Attitudes Towards Pupils”, observe that teachers often make negative inferences about students’ personalities who do not speak “proper” English, particularly regarding their intelligence, background, and academic potential. Also, Seggie highlights the injustice faced by the speakers in Australian and Asian accents in the legal settings; judges were more likely to associate violent crimes with non-standard English speakers, while “proper” English speakers were more often linked to white-collar crimes (qtd. in Cargile et al., 1994: 225). In addition, in workplace contexts, limited proficiency in the hegemonic language can lead to the marginalization and exploitation of employees. As Dick and Nadin note,

such individuals may internalize a sense of inferiority despite performing the same tasks as their native-speaking peers (2011: 32). Moreover, in job interviews, while British accent speakers are seen as “cultured” and selected for the job, others’ speech might be observed as “unintelligent” due to the forms of their language and stereotypical traits associated with their languages (Giles and Billings, 2004: 2). Therefore, internalization of the inferiority of their language and evaluating themselves through discourses or the perpetrators’ views might be a symbolic barrier for those who want to be accepted, visible, and recognizable in the neo-colonial center.

Power structures and material incentives often shape individuals’ language preferences, especially when sociocultural or sociopolitical environments change. Considering this, while English might make a person politically and culturally close to a mainstream society, it does not necessarily lead to full inclusion or acceptance. In addition to language, individuals may be expected to conform to dominant cultural standards, values, and belief systems in order to be seen as a recognizable Other. However, even complete assimilation might not guarantee complete inclusion, as xenophobia often persists in various subtle or systemic forms. English, in this sense, can be regarded as a commodity. Thanks to the mastery of English, which holds a symbolic value, one might not only illusorily overcome the feeling of unbelongingness, rootlessness, and an inferiority complex, but also s/he can escape from the oppressive economic realities of the capitalist mode of production (Bağlama, 2019: 78, 79).

### **3. Creolized English in the Poetry of David Dabydeen**

UNESCO ambassador, novelist, poet, and academic, David Dabydeen, was born on a former Dutch slave plantation in Guyana. He experienced difficulties during his time in England because of a racist environment, which might have shaped his personal and professional identity. His exposure to the lives and cultures of Asian, African, and Caribbean communities might also significantly influence his academic trajectory. These formative experiences became a central motivation in his effort to authentically represent marginalized communities in his literary works. He employed the emotional depth of Guyanese Creole to reconstruct English, enabling him to portray the discrimination faced by Black people “with a greater degree of freedom,” because Creole can convey the lived experiences and emotions of its speakers in a more expressive and potent way (Binder and Dabydeen, 1989: 76). In doing so, Creole helps to challenge the stereotypes associated with its use, to realistically voice the struggles of the subaltern, and to po-

liticize protest poetry (Welsh, 1997: 2). Dabydeen benefits from the splintering which makes the language sound “more barbaric” with words such as “wha” (what), “haan” (hands), “taak” (talking), “waak” (walks) (2005: 13). This omission of the letters can also be considered as a reaction to the culture that has been taken from them. In addition, the poet does not tend to be polite and uses swearing and the snarling sounds that Creole has in soft vowels, which contribute to the lyrical effect (2005: 13) as well as his political stance of not being obedient and kind to the oppressor.

### **“Slave Song”**

The poem “Slave Song”, through its form and Creole diction, embodies cultural resistance and rejects conformity to colonial authority. As suggested by Achebe, Dabydeen employs creolized English to reflect his culture as a literary weapon. This allows him to address the hegemonic powers and insist on the existence of cultural identity with its authenticity. As the title suggests, the juxtaposition of captivity and joy represents a refusal of victimhood while celebrating the existence of his culture. The resistance to the systemic violence and oppression of the Black people by brutal force through identity, vitality, and joy live through creolized English in the poem.

In “Slave Song”, Dabydeen depicts the brutalization of Black people at the hands of white slaveholders. The poem foregrounds individual subjectivity and the resilience of Black identity. It argues that Black identity persists despite the physical and psychological tortures imposed by dominant powers. By employing a first-person narrative and Creole diction, the poem empowers the speaker’s sense of self. The first and third stanzas illustrate the exercise of hard power used to suppress, dehumanize, and brutalize the speaker. Dabydeen employs metaphors and epithets in lines such as “put chain rung me neck” (line 5) and “Tell me I’m an animal / An African orang-utan” (lines 13-14) to emphasize the dehumanization and systemic oppression. The second and fourth stanzas shift to the defiance theme of the poem: “Bu yu caan stap me cack dippin in de honeypot / Drippin at de tip a happy as a hottentot!” (lines 19-20), which emphasizes the endurance of the colonial subject. The speaker celebrates his independence through the image of “cack”, which may refer to “cock/penis” (line 19). These lines, on the one hand, might symbolize the libido that connects him with his life and pleasure. On the other hand, they sound “revengeful” against the white man through “degrading the Master’s wife” (49). The images of “goldmine” “sunshine”, “honeypot” stand for the blondness of the white woman (lines 9, 10, 19). The slave addressing his master in this mocking tone with “the

role of a cannibal” depicts his lust for the white woman (49), which can be read as a counterattack through the labels historically imposed on Black people by the West. With the objectification and Africanization of the white woman, the poem represents a symbolic reverse domination over the language, land, and possessions of the white man by means of its verbal, linguistic, and poetic strategies.

The speaker asserts that his vital spirit cannot be suppressed despite the threats, humiliations, and cruelties; hence, he foregrounds the resilience of Creole identity, challenging colonial narratives that seek to devalue him. This resilience can be interpreted as a decolonial exercise to gain the mental control that Ngũgĩ suggests (1994: 16). Thus, across the first four stanzas, the poet claims that the inner self resists all attempts at degradation. After the fourth stanza, the speaker’s inner celebration of nature, despite suffering, signifies resistance to the internalization of inferiority imposed by slavery. Even in the face of his master’s cruelty, his instinct to live and enjoy life remains irrepressible, as illustrated in the following lines:

Look how e’ya leap from bush to bush like a black crappau  
Seeking out a watahole,  
Blind by de sunflare, tongue like a dussbowl-  
See how e’ya sip laang an full an slow!  
Till e swell an heavy, stubban, chupit, full o sleep  
Like camoudie awalla calf an stretch out in de grass, content,  
Full o peace... (lines 21–27).

The speaker’s defiant, provocative, and celebratory tone underscores Dabydeen’s strategic use of Creole as a form of linguistic resistance against English, transforming language into a tool of empowerment rather than subjugation. The poem’s irregular stanza and line lengths further reinforce this defiance, visually and rhythmically subverting the rigid norms imposed by colonial and hegemonic structures through Creole. In the final exclamation, the speaker asserts psychological freedom and vitality despite dehumanization and attempts at control, emphasizing the inseparability of language, identity, and resilience (line 35).

### **“Brown Skin Girl”**

In the poem “Brown Skin Girl,” the speaker addresses women assimilated into Western norms with a predominantly sarcastic, disdainful, and melancholic tone, which encourages reflection on the predicament of the neo-colonial subject and erasure of the culture. Using Creole, the male speaker instructs the brown-skinned woman to pursue material goods with

white men, highlighting the ways colonial and racial hierarchies foster internalized inferiority. The Creole syntax embodies the cultural voice, authenticity, and identity of Guyanese men, reflecting the Creole identity that standard English cannot fully convey. Moreover, the poet critiques assimilation and linguistic imperialism into Western societies by telling her to “learn to speak properly” in a complaining or negligent tone (lines 3, 4), while affirming the resilience of local cultural and linguistic traditions through the sustained use of Creole throughout the poem. The use of Creole also functions to convey the emotional experiences of Guyanese men more powerfully, as the migration of subordinated women not only results in their objectification but also fosters a sense of inferiority among men who might internalize blame for these circumstances, as reflected in lines: *Me wid ricebowl tinkin far / An me wid fishnet waitin tide / Dreams like bleedin deep inside* (lines 8, 15, 16).

The main argument of the poem is that imperialists’ compelling material and symbolic apparatuses produce indifference and alienation from one’s country and culture. Dabydeen underscores the soft power’s significance in portraying the situation through the mechanism of “neo-racism”. Étienne Balibar defines this kind of discrimination as “racism without races”: not based on biology but on the condition of conformity to prescribed rules, laws, norms, and moral values (1991: 21). This helps explain Dabydeen’s choice of brown skin color to signify the possibility of inclusion of the subjugated, irrespective of her skin color. Whereas traditional racism relied on exclusion and forced exploitation because of traditional forms of discrimination such as race and religion, modern-day discrimination often operates without overt coercion. Since the world is more globalized and migrants are an essential factor for profit, capitalism indirectly shapes people to act in a certain way to integrate them into the system. According to this theoretical framework, the poet points out the “willingly” acceptance and women’s attitude to let themselves become a subordinate partner of the white man in the depiction of the poem. Their perceived inferiority drives them to be Westernized and therefore “civilized” by offering their bodies because they do not have other currency with which to engage with white men.

Sercan Hamza Bağlama’s description of neo-racism might also be useful to theorize and conceptualize the condition of the brown skin girl in the poem. Bağlama uses Hamid Dabashi’s concept of “house Muslim” to explain this type of discrimination. The colonized subject internalizes the

discourses designed to undermine their culture. S/he, thereby, attempts to fit into the proper “Other” image through speaking, acting, thinking, feeling, and living like the “superior”, because neoliberal ideologies promise acceptance through cultural homogenization and assimilation. By being useful and profitable to the neo-colonial center, formerly marginalized people can be a part of the mainstream white society (Bağlama, 2020: 1646). Similarly, the “brown skin girl” symbolizes the oppressed who seek “civilization” and distance themselves from their own labeled “primitive” cultures.

The “Brown Skin Girl” poem consists of two stanzas, and both discuss migration to America and the Americanization of Guyana with the effect of global capitalism. The first stanza mainly focuses on the possible changes in the culture and traditions of the girl with references such as being with a white man, learning how to speak properly, dressing, driving a car, and table manners (lines 2-6). On the other hand, the second stanza revolves around the theme of leaving nature behind, which might also signify leaving the culture, people, tradition, and anything else that belongs to Guyana. Furthermore, Dabydeen names the girl according to her skin color, which functions rather than her name, as a symbol for constructing a collective identity rather than representing an individual. In doing so, he portrays a certain type of people, highlighting broader social and racial experiences rather than focusing on a specific person. In the speaker’s view, the girl’s journey to America erases her individuality, objectifies her, and reduces her to an assimilated subject seeking acceptance and financial gain. During colonial rule, white men exercised hard power over Guyanese women. Cultural imperialism depicts white men as the essential bearers of “civilization,” leading subordinated women to internalize the ideology that their recognition depends on a relationship with white men, conformity to “proper” behavior, and the use of standard language. Therefore, the colonization of the mind through symbolic and cultural means continues to reinforce the linguistic imperialism and hegemonic structures of colonial rule.

### **“Two Cultures”**

“Two Cultures” by David Dabydeen is another poem that explores the themes of assimilation and language. It centers on the mimic identity of a Guyanese man. The first-person speaker, a father, denounces his son’s adoption of white mannerisms in an angry and mocking tone because his son does not represent his father’s culture. Usage of Creole voice in the poem emphasizes the father’s attachment to his culture and identity, stand-

ing in sharp contrast to his son's "willingly" submission to assimilation. This prompts the reader to see the son as a person who internalizes the superiority of English culture in order to distance himself from the "inferiority" associated with his language and culture. Through the father's Creole syntax and spelling, Dabydeen critiques those who abandon their own culture to conform to Western norms. Thus, the poem functions as an anti-imperialist denunciation of cultural assimilation.

In the first stanza, the speaker describes his son's return from England, whose pretentious behavior reflects the influence of English culture. The father, representing postcolonial sensibilities against assimilation and the voice of decolonized subjects, expresses irritation at the son's way of speaking, walking, and dressing:

'Hear how baai a taak  
Like BBC!  
Look how a baai a waak  
Like white maan,  
Caak-hat pun he head, wrist-watch pun he haan! (1-5).

These lines satirize the glorification of the colonizer's language and the rationalization of such mimic behaviors in the Creole language. By getting close to the center through imitating white people, the colonized subject hopes to attain "superiority" and escape marginalization. Dabydeen characterizes the young man's behavior as a performative assertion of superiority through white manners and speech (Dabydeen, 2005: 64). Subjected to Western cultural hegemony, individuals may become estranged from their roots. Commodity fetishism then offers a placebo effect for the individual's inferiority complex, providing illusory relief and pleasure in the dominant culture (Bağlama, 2019: 78, 79). However, as the Guyanese father articulates, his son's adoption of some Western norms does not guarantee him any recognition in the West: in addition, his way of speaking is unlike his father's, and this situation distances him from his father as well which can be a representation of his past and his traditions. The father believes that his son deserves oppression and victimization by the White people. Ironically, this might align with the father's internalization of the Western norms and judgment of a mimic person through a White supremacist lens (lines 12-16). Nevertheless, in this way, he embodies and perpetuates the symbolic power of the West. Therefore, these lines might reveal the inescapable grip of the colonial mindset, which persists even when one ostensibly supports one's own culture.

Similar to the poem “Brown Skin Girl”, “Two Cultures” foregrounds the use of Creole English as a means of sustaining Guyanese identity, symbolically resisting linguistic imperialism and imposed culture. Dabydeen, in this poem, critiques the illusion of assimilation by presenting the son’s adoption of Standard English as a synecdoche that stands for the cultural assimilation or loss of cultural identity, which is articulated through the father’s English-based creole language. Through the father’s voice, the poem also underscores the impossibility of achieving full recognition within the dominant culture: “no Guyanese can ever evolve into ‘whiteness’” (Dabydeen, 2005: 64). As the title implies, these two cultures are completely and unconditionally separate. After being in England for a short time illegally (line 11), the young Guyanese man’s attempt to fit into White norms results in his alienation from his culture and being unaccepted by his father.

#### **4. Creolized English in the Poetry of Linton Kwesi Johnson**

Linton Kwesi Johnson is a Jamaican British poet, musician, and committed political activist. At seventeen, he joined the Black Panthers, a political organization established to combat police brutality. He also fought injustice and inequality through his poetry, and for him, “writing was a political act, and poetry was a cultural weapon” (URL-1). He used this cultural “weapon” to give a voice to the oppressed and to create a collective resistance identity among the “people of the African diaspora” aiming to free them from “feeling guilty of their blackness” (Sarıkaya, 2011: 161). Poetry can engage with political issues while being aesthetic. Johnson’s style of performing has helped his art and his argument to become unique and popular. He coined the term “dub poetry”, which originated from Jamaican performance poetry, and this style of poetry predominantly centers around political and social issues. Dub poetry is a combination of reggae music and Johnson’s performance poetry, incorporating his Jamaican English Creole, which reflects the experiences and identity of its speakers (Coşkun, 2019: 157). In an interview, when asked about his style and language, Johnson explains:

I could relate it [his poetry], in a sense, to my idea of what the real African tradition was, in terms of telling the story of the tribe. (...) I wanted to draw upon my Jamaican heritage, use the everyday language of Jamaican speech. I was also heavily influenced by dub – I wanted my verse, the actual words, to sound like music, to sound like a bass line. So when I was talking, I wanted to use my voice like a talking bass, and that’s how I developed my style as well as my poetics (Wheatle, 2009: 38).



By employing his own accent and culture, Johnson “protects” his African identity and culture from what Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o terms “the cultural bomb”, which makes one’s culture seem inferior (1994: 3). He proudly uses his Jamaican heritage as a postcolonial tool to challenge British English hegemony. Moreover, Johnson articulates immigrant experiences to raise awareness and foster solidarity among Black communities by drawing on Jamaica’s oral heritage and rhythmic musical traditions. Thanks to these pioneering ideas, Dabydeen and other poets are inspired to employ poetry as a means of resisting symbolic violence and systemic oppression (Binder, 1989: 79).

### **“Sonny’s Letter”**

Johnson’s poetry slightly diverges from David Dabydeen’s poetry in its more overt anger and provocativeness. In “Sonny’s Letter”, Johnson realistically conveys the feelings and emotions of the subjugated masses who were criminalized and beaten by the brutal police force. In this poem, Johnson addresses the injustices inflicted on immigrants by British police officers:

Dear mama  
Good day  
I hope that when these few lines reach you they may  
Find you in the best of health  
I doun know how to tell ya dis  
For I did mek a solemn promise  
To tek care a lickle Jim  
An try mi bes fi look out fi him (lines 1-7).

The poem opens with the lines “Dear Mama and Good Day,” which establish an intimate, familiar tone that sharply contrasts with the violence and injustice the narrative soon reveals (lines 1, 2). This juxtaposition reflects the unsettling familiarity of such experiences within the community. The son’s letter, likely written from jail, becomes both a confession and a testimony to systemic oppression. A tone of desperation and vulnerability pervades the poem, reflecting the dominant emotions of the marginalized Jamaican community. The son’s lack of agency may represent the oppressed who strive to defend themselves and their loved ones while being compelled to survive within oppressive systems.

The speaker inadvertently kills an officer while defending Jim, possibly his brother, and his desperate situation, shaped by racial oppression, becomes a reason for his and Jim’s victimization:

Mama, I really did try mi bes  
But none a di less  
Sorry fi tell ya seh, poor lickle Jim get arres  
It was de miggie a di rush hour  
Hevrybody jus a hustle and a bustle  
To go home fi dem evenin shower  
Mi an Jim stan up waitin pon a bus  
Not causin no fuss (lines 8-15).

The setting is a street where they wait for a bus without causing any disturbance to draw the attention of the police. Despite their peaceful demeanor, the officers target them for abuse due to racial stereotypes of African people. This depiction allows readers to perceive Black people through a Black person's explanation of the situation rather than through Western depictions. The street, being in a rush hour as a setting, might hold significance in this stanza as everyone can observe the situation, yet the lack of intervention can be read as social indifference, normalization of such incidents, and criminalization of Black identity. Moreover, the stanza's tone and imagery convey the speaker's profound sorrow and desperation. Through this tone and imagery, Johnson tells the story of his community and its Jamaican heritage. Using the sound of the Jamaican language and Creole, he draws attention to the challenges faced by Black people living in the neo-colonial center and represents them.

Following the second stanza, the poem describes the brutal harassment and suffering inflicted by three police officers. Their enjoyment of this attack might also be interpreted as revealing the unprovoked nature of the incident because they "giggle" while practicing unfair treatment towards the speaker and Jim (line 27). The speaker's defensive act in protecting Jim results in the death of a police officer, and this line embodies the confrontational nature of Dub poetry against the hegemonic power (line 39). Although Johnson foregrounds the resistance of Black people and unity against police violence, he also underscores the futility of such resistance at the individual level through the speaker's desperation throughout the poem. Accordingly, the poem concludes with Jim being charged under the Sus law, potentially leading to his imprisonment. In the final lines, the son tries to console his mother despite the hopelessness of his situation. Johnson's use of creole situates the conflict and emotional weight of the poem within a broader framework than racism, emphasizing the linguistic identity of immigrant communities as well.

### **“Inglan Is a Bitch”**

The poem addresses political and social issues such as discrimination and class struggle. Johnson portrays the working life of an African migrant in postcolonial England. Despite working diligently, the speaker is unable to earn a sufficient living wage. The poem opens by depicting the oppressive working conditions the speaker faced upon his arrival in England:

w'en mi jus' come to Landan toun  
mi use to work pan di andahgroun  
but workin' pan di andahgroun  
y'u don't get fi know your way aroun' (lines 1-4).

The repeated reference to “underground” suggests both the literal workplace and a symbolic absence of light, windows, or connection to the outside world (lines 2-3). The speaker is thus alienated from society and nature through the isolating conditions of his workplace. This alienation may also reflect his disorientation and lack of support as a new arrival in London.

From the second stanza onward, the poet reflects on the harsh working conditions faced by a Black person and the cost of being perceived as “different”. He emphasizes his status as a “proper” employee, noting that he “didn't turn clock watcher.” (line 8). Articulation of his oppression through Creole spelling highlights the significance of the poem's message that working hard alone might not be enough to be recognized. Because the speaker remains committed to his job despite exploitative conditions; nevertheless, his language, race, and perceived otherness become grounds for exploitation in the modern era.

The speaker critiques racial stereotyping, particularly the fixed notion of Black identity and the stereotype of Black men as inherently lazy. In spite of working multiple jobs and having almost no leisure, he is still accused of laziness. The representation of fixed identity imposed on immigrants recurs throughout the poem. Besides, the final stanzas reveal the consequence of stigmatization that even after fifteen years of labor, the speaker's experiences of discrimination persist, and his future remains uncertain as capital owners render him redundant. These stanzas draw attention to the systemic mechanism of neocolonialism through labeling, marginalization, exploitation, and dehumanization.

A refrain follows each stanza, giving the poem a song-like rhythm typical of performance poetry. In these refrains, the poet sharply critiques England as a prison that lures migrants only to entrap them. For example, the

final line of the first stanza highlights the inescapability of wage slavery endured by Black laborers:

Inglan is a bitch  
dere's no escapin it  
Inglan is a bitch  
dere's no runin whe fram it (lines 45–48).

In addition, the motherland is traditionally associated with motherhood, care, and a sense of belonging for Black people in Africa; thus, the “mother’s” symbolic abandonment of her Black children, leaving them in misery in England is rendered even more disheartening (Coşkun, 2019: 153).

The speaker feels compelled to reinforce his credibility by asserting, “a noh lie mi a tell, a true” in the third refrain (line 24). This is followed by the line, “mi use to work dig ditch w'en it cowl noh bitch” (line 25), which may reflect the speaker’s internalization of inferiority, or the social positioning imposed by dominant society. He thinks people will not believe him and has the feeling of proving himself by saying this. The poem ends with a provocative question in the last lines of the last refrain, challenging the audience to reflect and respond: “Inglan is a bitch” and “is whey wi a goh dhu 'bout it?” (lines 55–56).

“Inglan is a Bitch” is another poem by Johnson in which a desperate and angry tone permeates the overall mood, conveyed in a Creole language. In addition, the speaker’s use of an informal, Creole voice to describe the harsh realities faced by Black immigrants may symbolize resilience and resistance, a characteristic stance among postcolonial writers, who often challenge colonial narratives, expose systems of domination, reclaim marginalized voices, and assert cultural agency. Rather than adopting a submissive tone that internalizes the stereotypes about Black men, the poet articulates a struggle for survival and a resistance to xenophobia. The use of creole and class struggles prevents the poem from conveying an impression of thoroughgoing discrimination based on a one-dimensional reading of racial victimization. Rather than embracing British values and abandoning Caribbean culture through Standard English, the speaker constructs the image of an immigrant who resists British oppression and cultural erasure (Coşkun, 2019: 152).

### **“Fite Dem Back”**

“Fite Dem Back” is another of Linton Kwesi Johnson’s poems composed for oral performance, whether sung or spoken aloud. It might be one of the

most aggressive and provocative poems that highlights a postcolonial strategy of resistance through confrontation by means of fighting, writing, or attacking back rather than passively accepting humiliation and victimization. The title may allude to *The Empire Writes Back* by Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin, reinforcing the idea of reversing colonial discourse. However, the speaker of the poem advocates for violent retaliation in the first stanza, stating, “We gonna smash their brains in / Cause they ain’t got nofink in ’em” (lines 1–2), rather than employing symbolic or nonviolent forms of resistance. He then attempts to justify this stance in the second stanza:

some a dem say dem a niggah haytah  
an’ some a dem say dem a black beatah  
some a dem say dem a black stabah  
an’ some a dem say dem a paki bashah.

Fashist an di attack  
Noh baddah worry ’bout dat  
Fashist an di attack  
Wi wi’ fite dem back (lines 5–12).

These lines indicate that the fascist groups in the colonial center targeted not only Black individuals but also other racialized minorities like Pakistanis. Considering their lived experiences of oppression under the hegemony of the British Empire and their history of slavery, exploitation, suffering, and humiliation, it is expected to find an intensity of hatred, anger, and resentment in Johnson’s poems (Sarıkaya, 2011: 172). This angry tone of the speaker might reflect the intensity of oppression, subjugation, and victimization experienced by the neo-colonial subjects.

Johnson employs Creole syntax as a rhetorical weapon to assert his identity and resist linguistic and cultural domination. Creole also contributes to holding a symbolic value of identity, and its employment, particularly in this antagonistic poem, can be analyzed as a symbolic attack against the ideology of linguistic imperialism. Besides, by distorting English, the poem might confront Western norms in order to function as a tool to raise awareness, foster solidarity, and decolonize the minds. This repurposing of language challenges the normative authority of British English. In the second stanza, through colloquial language, he reclaims the racial epithets with “nigga” and “paki” that are used for humiliation and mocking (lines 5–6). Johnson comfortably uses these epithets in vernacular speech to whom

he labels as “fascist” (line 9). Through the assertion that “We gonna smash their brains in / Cause they ain’t got nofink in ’em” (lines 14–15), Johnson also mocks the white supremacist ideologies and attacks them by favorably using his creole voice with the dub poetry tradition of being political, confrontational, and rhythmic.

### **Conclusion**

Both Linton Kwesi Johnson and David Dabydeen emphasize the emotional and psychological struggles experienced by those at the margins of society under systemic oppression. As literary works often reflect the experiences, their poems serve to articulate the marginalization, criminalization, and victimization faced by immigrants. They illustrate both the challenges posed by cultural imperialism and its psychological effects on marginalized individuals. Given the challenges depicted through various poetic personas, Creole emerges as a vital linguistic tool in their resistance. Besides, these diverse speakers challenge the fixity of Creole speakers, revealing the heterogeneity of their identities and expressions. Moreover, the poems aim to raise awareness of linguistic imperialism and other sources of soft power in the periphery and center. Therefore, these literary works can be employed as a tool to “decolonize the minds” from the hegemonic discourses that are imposed on marginalized people and lead them to suppress their cultural identity. To prevent linguistic genocide, critique normativity and the marginalization of native languages, the poets advocate for the preservation of linguistic diversity.

Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o advocates writing in his native language as a form of resistance against imperial powers and their assimilationist agendas. Alternatively, Chinua Achebe supports modifying English to better convey postcolonial experiences; similarly, David Dabydeen and Linton Kwesi Johnson employ both English and its creolized forms to articulate resistance and reach broader audiences. They transform English to both articulate marginalized perspectives and remain intelligible to English speakers. This strategy simultaneously critiques Western-assimilated subjects for being perpetrators of the system by conforming to and provide benefit to it. As “Two Cultures” poem demonstrates and exemplifies, mimicry does not help to prevent dichotomization and categorization in the neo-colonial center or periphery. Through their themes, settings, and tones, these selected poems invite readers to empathize with the speakers and to challenge the linguistic privileges that threaten the survival of other languages.

Language has been a political instrument for social control. Particularly, the English language has effectively been employed for the marginalization of non-English speakers and non-standard English speakers. Across various social contexts, both English and its standardized form have been imposed to facilitate the exploitation of marginalized groups. Therefore, persons who want to be included in the mainstream society and climb the social ladder in the neo-colonial center accept the superiority of standard English over their mother tongue. This dynamic might lead to linguistic and cultural hegemony of the West, as language and culture are inextricably linked. However, to resist imperialism and specifically the idea of the superiority of a language, poets like Linton Kwesi Johnson and David Dabydeen write their works in Creole and offer an alternative to conformity to Western norms. Their purpose is to employ the field of literature to represent the victimized. Within this framework, David Dabydeen and Linton Kwesi Johnson foreground themes of anti-assimilation, racial injustice, and the lived challenges of non-standard English speakers. Thus, their poetry facilitates decolonization by subverting Western norms and celebrating the native cultures and languages.

## References

- Achebe, Chinua (1997). "English and the African Writer". *Transition*, 75/76: 342-349.
- Bağlama, Sercan Hamza (2020). "Kamila Shamsie's Home Fire: Neo-Racism and the 'House Muslim'". *Motif Akademi Halkbilimi Dergisi*. 13(32): 1641-1652.
- Balibar, Étienne & Wallerstein, Immanuel (1991). *Race, Nation, Class*. Verso.
- Binder, Wolfgang & Dabydeen, David (1989). "David Dabydeen". *Journal of West Indian Literature*, 3(2): 67-80.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1989). "Social Space and Symbolic Power". *Sociological Theory*, 7(1): 14-25.
- Breiner, Laurence A. (2005). "Creole Language in the Poetry of Derek Walcott". *Callaloo*, 28(1): 29-41.
- Cargile, Aaron C., et al (1994). "Language Attitudes as A Social Process: A Conceptual Model and New Directions". *Language & Communication*, 14(3): 211-236.

- Coşkun, Kübra K. (2019). "Johnson's Artistic Resistance to British Brutality: 'Inglan Is a Bitch' and 'Sonny's Lettah'". *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 5(1): 151-158.
- Dabydeen, David (2002). *Turner*. Peepal Tree Press.
- Dabydeen, David (2005). *Slave Song*. Peepal Tree Press.
- DeGraff, Michel (2020). "Toward Racial Justice in Linguistics: The Case of Creole Studies (Response to Charity Hudley et al.)". *Language*, 96(4): e292-e306.
- Dey, Sayan (2018). *Different Spaces, Different Voices: A Rendezvous with Decoloniality*. BecomeShakespeare.com.
- Dick, Penny & Nadin, Sara (2011). "Exploiting the Exploited: The Psychological Contract, Workplace Domination and Symbolic Violence". *Culture and Organization*, 17(4): 293-311.
- Erbil, Cihat; Özbilgin, Mustafa F. & Bağlama, Sercan H. (2023). "Duality of Language as A Tool for Integration Versus Mobility at Work: Utility of A Polyphonic Perspective". *Understanding the Dynamics of Language and Multilingualism in Professional Contexts: Advances in Language Sensitive Management Research*. Edward Elgar Publishing, 155-168.
- Esqueda, Cynthia Willis (2022). "Linguicism". *Moving Toward Antibigotry*. Center for Antiracist Research, 155-169.
- Fishman, Joshua A. (1991). *Reversing Language Shift*. Multilingual Matters.
- Giles, Howard & Billings, Andrew C. (2004). "Assessing Language Attitudes: Speaker Evaluation Studies". *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishing, 187-209.
- Gynter, Päivi (2003). "On the Doctrine of Systemic Discrimination and Its Usability in the Field of Education". *International Journal on Minority and Group Rights*, 10(1): 45-54.
- Jaspal, Rusi (2009). "Language and Social Identity: A Psychosocial Approach". *Psych-Talk*, 64: 17-20.
- Johnson, Linton Kwesi (1991). "Sonneh's Lettah". *Tings an Times*. Bloodaxe Books.
- Johnson, Linton Kwesi (2002). *Selected Poems*. Penguin Group.
- Lawson Welsh, Sarah (1997). "Experiments in Brokenness: The Creative Use of Creole in David Dabydeen's Slave Song". *The Art of David Dabydeen*. Leeds, Peepal Tree Press, 27-46.



- Lomawaima, K. Tsianina & McCarty, Teresa L. (2006). *To Remain an Indian: Lessons in Democracy from a Century of Native American Education*. Teachers College Press.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. (2020). "Decolonial Linguistics as Paradigm Shift: A Commentary". *Colonial and Decolonial Linguistics: Knowledges and Epistemes*. Eds. A. Deumert, A. Storch, & N. Shepherd. Oxford University Press, 289–300.
- O'Brien, Grace M. & Bobongie-Harris, Francis (2023). "Revitalization of First Nations Languages: A Queensland Perspective". *The Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 46: 183–193.
- Phillipson, Robert (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford University Press.
- Phillipson, Robert (2008). "Lingua Franca or Lingua Frankensteinia? English in European Integration and Globalisation". *World Englishes*, 27(2): 250–267.
- Phillipson, Robert (2009). *Linguistic Imperialism Continued*. Orient Black-Swan.
- Rose, Heath, and John Bosco Conama (2008). "Linguistic Imperialism: Still a Valid Construct in Relation to Language Policy for Irish Sign Language". *Language Policy*, 17(3): 385–404.
- Said, Edward (2003). *Orientalism*. Penguin Group.
- Sarikaya, Dilek (2011). "The Construction of Afro-Caribbean Cultural Identity in The Poetry of Linton Kwesi Johnson". *Journal of Caribbean Literatures*, 7(1): 161–175.
- Shah, Naeema (2019). "English as a Tool of British Political and Linguistic Imperialism in Chinua Achebe's A Man of the People". *University of Chitral Journal of Linguistics & Literature*, 3(2): 34–40.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove (2015). "Linguicism". *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Wiley.
- URL-1: "I Did My Own Thing". <https://theguardian.com/books/2008/mar/08/featuresreviews.guardianreview11> (Accessed 05.07.2025).
- URL-2: "Mi Revalueshanary Fren – Linton Kwesi Johnson". [www.walkerzone.org/everybookreviewed/2020/12/9/mi-revalueshanary-fren-linton-kwesi-johnson](http://www.walkerzone.org/everybookreviewed/2020/12/9/mi-revalueshanary-fren-linton-kwesi-johnson) (Accessed 05.07.2025).
- Wa Thiong'o, Ngũgĩ (1994). *Decolonising the Mind*. Zimbabwe Publishing House.

- Wheatle, Alex (2010). "A Conversation with Linton Kwesi Johnson". *Wasafiri*, 24(3): 35-41.
- Zeng, Jie; Ponce, Ariel R. C. & Li, Yuxin (2023). "English Linguistic Neo-Imperialism in the Era of Globalization: A Conceptual Viewpoint". *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14: 1149471.

The following statements are made in the framework of "COPE-Code of Conduct and Best Practices Guidelines for Journal Editors":

**Acknowledgment:** I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Dr. Brigitte Glaser for her guidance and constructive feedback throughout this project. I am also thankful to Mariia Shitik for her careful proofreading and support.

**Ethics Committee Approval:** Ethics committee approval is not required for this study.

**Declaration of Conflicting Interests:** The author has no potential conflict of interest regarding research, authorship or publication of this article.