

La francophonie: An Alternative to Americanization

A Senior Honors Thesis

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for Graduation in the College Honors Program

By

Elise A. Micale

French Major, Art Minor

The College at Brockport

May 7, 2013

Thesis Director: Donna Wilkerson-Barker, Associate Professor,
French

*Educational use of this paper is permitted for the purpose of
providing future students a model example of an Honors senior
thesis project.*

La francophonie: An Alternative to Americanization

By: Elise Micale

This paper will discuss *la francophonie* as the French response to globalization. Originating during a period of deep cultural and political transformation for the French nation, the Francophone community today has developed into an alternative to the Anglo-Saxon political and cultural model. Through an examination of French national identity, we will look at how *la francophonie* serves as a vehicle in the promotion of French cultural values even while it maintains the French cultural influence in an international context.

It is commonly acknowledged by scholars that France is experiencing an identity crisis. Once the leader in all things cultural, France increasingly seems to be on the defensive. From its ban on the headscarf and, later, the burka to its defense of cultural exceptionalism for French cultural products such as film and music, to efforts to protect the French language and promote its use in the world, France has faced some very serious challenges to its Republican model of universalism in global capitalism; challenges that profoundly effect their cultural make-up.

Culture plays a unique role in France's conceptualization of its identity. Not many nations treat culture as a matter of national importance as France does. The existence of a Ministry of Culture charged with protecting the arts and maintaining French identity in France and abroad, testifies to the central role culture maintains in the French national model. In fact, France spends more of its GDP on culture than

any other industrialized country. (Compagnon & Morrison, 11) In spite of this, France's cultural presence seems to have weakened internationally, to the point where some are willing to declare it "dead."

It is important to explain what people mean when they say that French culture is dead. For Donald Morrison, author of *The Death of French Culture*, the influence of French culture is measured by the consumption of French cultural products in the global marketplace. Because many countries, especially the United States of America, do not import a significant number of cultural commodities from France, Morrison concludes that France is not the cultural superpower it once was. As Morrison puts it, "Once admired for the dominating excellence of its writers, and musicians, France today is a wilting power in the global cultural marketplace." (Compagnon & Morrison, 10) As a cultural presence, France therefore seems dead.

France's relationship to the global marketplace is anything but simple. The French resist globalization largely due to the fact that they associate it with Anglo-Saxon or Anglo-American cultural models. In many ways, globalization is synonymous with Americanization, in France, (Nadeau & Barlow, 290-291) and the omnipotence of American culture is viewed as a threat; however the United States does not return the sentiment. As a former superpower, France is very sensitive to the United States' perceived ease in gaining international power. (Nadeau & Barlow,

288) American culture seems to have become what France's once was and France's reaction is to resist Americanization and to protect and promote its own culture.

If Americanization is the problem, *la francophonie*, one of the biggest linguistic zones in the world, is the solution. French, like English, is the language heard around the world with a presence on every continent and spoken by two hundred and twenty million speakers worldwide. The political and cultural unification of this heterogeneous community resulted in the creation of The International Organisation of Francophonie whose mission is to provide active solidarity to the 75 governments of the Francophone world, which includes 56 French-speaking countries and 19 observer countries. (francophonie.org) *La francophonie* allows France to perpetuate the spread of its culture internationally while fostering at the same time a common cultural diversity through a common language and humanist value. The IOF's four main goals are to promote the French language and cultural and linguistic diversity, to promote peace, democracy, and human rights, to support education, higher learning, and research, and to develop cooperation for durable development. (francophonie.org) These missions not only give support to the member countries of the IOF, but they also bring the value system of *la francophonie* to the rest of the world. This solidarity and cooperation allows Francophone countries to maintain both a strong political and linguistic presence internationally, while providing France with a vehicle by which to promote

their beloved language. Indeed, the French language is the unifying element of the IOF and through its institutionalization; France strives to maintain its own influence in globalization.

The importance accorded to language here is difficult for English speakers to understand. Jean-Benoît Nadeau and Julie Barlow put in perfectly in their book *Sixty Million Frenchmen Can't Be Wrong* when they say that "Anglo-Americans consider language a tool, but the French regard it as an accomplishment... it is their national monument." (Nadeau & Barlow 162) Knowing this, it is no surprise that the French language would be central to maintain French cultural values. By supporting the Francophone world, France is able to continue to promote its universalist humanist values in the face of Americanization and the Anglo-dominance of the rest of the world in global capitalism. *La francophonie* and its cultures thus offer an alternative to the Anglo-American cultural model and perhaps an answer to the identity crisis of the French.

As discussed earlier, France's identity crisis is a result of the overwhelming effect of globalization on French culture. World events from 1945 onward radically transformed the French cultural landscape from all angles: World War II, the rapid modernization of a formerly rural nation, decolonization and immigration, the steadily growing Muslim culture, and the riots of May 1968, had a profound impact on the national identity of the French and their perception of France's place in the

world. Adapting to these changes, which are all part of the bigger picture of globalization, has come to define contemporary France. (Drake, 2)

France sees globalization through an extremely wide lens. Globalization is synonymous with the assimilation of all cultures into the Anglo-Saxon model of global capitalism, technological progress, and Americanization, which is in direct conflict with the French view of the role of the state as a social protector. (Nadeau & Barlow, 291) France resists globalization partly because it rejects the perceived social injustices of liberal capitalism that accompany it. Globalization is thus at odds with France's Republican ideology and the values that inform it.

Globalization from this perspective is not strictly about economics; rather, it has everything to do with a loss of identity and a loss of control over the nation's ability to uphold its founding values. (Compagnon & Morrison, 64) Thus, the French do not react to globalization the way Americans do. The United States sees globalization as an inevitable economic necessity. For the French, globalization is a rupture from how they view themselves and the world. Taking advantage of globalization, Americans have perpetuated a capitalist, Protestant, cultural model that the French resist with great force. France now takes great pains to protect and promote their cultural values as an alternative to Americanization.

For example, in his victory speech on May 6, 2007, President Sarkozy stated that he was dedicated to protecting the European Union from “undue global influence.” (Drake, 213) Sentiments like these that allow anti-globalization rhetoric in France. French politicians openly express aversion to “untamed international capitalism” which has allowed France to become a home for protestors against globalization. (Drake, 212) In France, to resist globalization is to defend French national identity, a task that is made easier by certain government initiatives.

France, for instance, subsidizes its own culture while controlling and limiting the amount of foreign, imported culture, a practice known as the *exception culturelle*. In 2005, France introduced and promoted the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, which was adopted by 151 countries at a UNESCO meeting. (Compagnon & Morrison, 67) Because of this, governments received the right to restrict foreign cultural products in their country. (Compagnon & Morrison, 67) The *exception culturelle* allows France to simultaneously protect their culture domestically and resist Americanization. For example, French law requires that 40 percent of TV shows and music on the radio be French. In addition, there are quotas on the number of French shows broadcast during the prime-time hours to ensure that French programming is not only shown in the middle of the night. (Compagnon & Morrison, 66) There are also quotas on the amount of American-made movies that can be shown in France. Only 40 percent

of all films shown in France can be American or non-European. (Compagnon & Morrison, 66) This may seem extreme, but in many ways, it can be seen as a reaction to the Blum-Byrnes agreement signed by France and America in 1946. The accord stated that American aid after WWII was conditional upon the introduction of American cultural products in France. For example, an annex of the agreement stated specifically that American movies were to be played in French theaters. (Nadeau & Barlow, 287) For the United States, it is a way to open French markets to American cultural products. In this context, France attempts to protect their cultural production via the *exception culturelle* and *la francophonie*.

It is also no wonder that to the French, globalization is generally regarded as a threat made in America and aimed directly at French culture. (Compagnon & Morrison, 64) As mentioned before, the French see themselves as cultural rivals of the United States. Therefore, as the United States continues to promote their culture internationally, the French feel personally threatened. It is not that the French hate Americans as is generally thought. In many cases, the French simply have mixed feelings about America. Some welcome American ways but dislike Americans while some admire America but resist Americanization. (Nadeau & Barlow, 289) Some American ways are welcomed and even seem “cool.” For example, many English words have found their way into the French language and it is even seen as fashionable to speak English. (Nadeau & Barlow, 289)

Though the French admire and welcome certain aspects of American culture, it does not mean they won't resist their influence. France's anti-Americanization can be seen as fundamentally based on the belief that the European way of life is superlative. (Drake, 212) For centuries, the European way of life has been the most popular and widespread throughout the world. This stems from centuries of European imperialism and colonization, which helped to spread European cultures and cultural values all over the globe. France made it their duty to "civilize" the rest of the world by introducing European culture, customs, and thinking to their colonies in what the French call their *mission civilatrice*. In opposition to this idea is the seemingly effortless spread of American culture through what is known as "soft imperialism" which implies that American culture and worldviews have spread throughout the world without shooting a bullet, meaning without colonization. (Nadeau & Barlow, 288)

The relationships between France and the United States, and even between France and the UK, have always been defined by contradictory forces, including "rivalry, jealousy, antagonism, incomprehension, friendship, fascination, mutual attraction, and support." (Drake, 211) Though France and the United States can seemingly get along and there is that mutual attraction, France's way of life is fundamentally opposed to that of the Anglo-Saxons, which includes "a strong Protestant work ethic, with a strong emphasis on community life, individual

liberties, and economics.” (Nadeau & Barlow, 290) American capitalism is opposed strongly in France. The greatest example of this is the dismantling of a McDonald’s, a symbol of American capitalism, by José Bové and a procession of sheep farmers in 1999 in Larzac, France. To protest the effects of globalization, including the strain on their monopoly of Roquefort cheese, the farmers stripped the restaurant of every removable piece leaving only the four walls and foundation. (Nadeau & Barlow, 16)

By placing American staples, such as fast food restaurants, in France, French culture is seemingly being watered down and Frenchmen, like José Bové are taking notice. To keep Americanization from affecting France and the world too deeply, efforts must be made to protect native cultures. *La francophonie* aims to do just that. With the help of *la francophonie* and its institutionalization as the IOF, Francophone countries actively protect their culture in the face of Americanization.

La francophonie is a massive collective of French speakers worldwide. It is, according to the late Léopold Senghor of Sénégal, “une communauté intellectuelle ou spirituelle dont la langue nationale, officielle ou de travail est le français.”

(Majumdar, 2) The IOF consists of sixty-eight countries, most of which are former colonies that initiated the need for such an organization. Newly de-colonized countries were facing the pressing need for development and modernization, which was needed in order for them to have a chance in to gain equal footing in the global

economy. (Majumdar, 3) In the 1960s, Quebec and several newly independent African countries proposed the idea of cooperation amongst all Francophone countries and their governments. (Nadeau & Barlow, 287) Not only do these countries have the French language in common and are therefore able to perpetuate the language, they also represent numerous Francophone cultures and cultural values. Former French Foreign Minister, Bernard Kouchner explained,

“If we can’t make ourselves heard, we will become invisible and inaudible; run the risk of losing our language, our culture, our creativity, our capacity to offer the world an original message. In short, if we can’t be heard, we will count for less, and we cannot resign ourselves to this second class destiny.”
(Drake, 157)

Thus, the French protect themselves via *la francophonie*. Established in 1970, *la francophonie* created a mission to “promote cultural diversity, democratization, human rights, sustainable development, and conflict resolution across the world.”
(Drake, 158)

France’s influence as a physical identity extends far beyond the Hexagon to the Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian Oceans where over two million French citizens live. (Drake, 196) For the countries of the IOF, the speaking of the French language is their greatest common tie. (Drake, 196) By the time Quebec and the African colonies had proposed this cooperation between Francophone countries, French-speaking people had become quite aware of their minority status in the world. In 1960, most of the French African colonies gained independence at the same time as Quebec was

experiencing a *révolution tranquille*. The Quebecois were feeling the pressure from a dominantly Anglophone North America and feared that their relative educational underdevelopment might become permanent if they did not take some sort of action and thus they began to seek cultural and psychological support from France.

(Weinstein, 488-9) At the time, Canadian Prime Minister, Jean Lesage, explained that stronger ties between French-speaking countries would provide Quebec with “necessary oxygen” by providing an international identity as well as new sources of cultural and economic support. (Weinstein, 489) Similarly, many other Francophone countries were feeling the same pressure of becoming a minority in an Anglophone world. Minorities in Africa, Haiti, and Lebanon desired to defend their privileged positions while some countries, such as Belgium and Canada wanted to assert their identities amongst the majority cultures of the world. (Weinstein, 491)

Although the French did not create or propose the idea, creating a commonwealth of Francophone countries has been to their advantage. French elites had begun to realize that they were being cut off from useful information simply because of their use of the French language. (Weinstein, 487) For example, by 1970, less than 10% of scientific publishing was in French and 90% of all technical documents from NATO were written in English. (Weinstein, 487) So, although *la francophonie* was not an original idea of the French, they did take a key role and interest in the organization. At the very least, involvement in *la francophonie* and

the IOF has helped to smooth over some bad colonial legacies and tensions by uniting former colonies with their motherland. (Nadeau & Barlow, 287)

In 1804, Haiti experienced a bloody revolution as they gained their independence from France. However, they have always retained French as the official language of government and instruction. They had always felt threatened by the Spanish and English-speaking dominance in the Caribbean and kept French as a means to protect themselves. (Weinstein, 490) Former French colonies in Africa felt similarly especially with the threat of the powerful Anglophone state, Nigeria. (Weinstein, 490) Though tensions may still persist between France and its former colonies, they both benefit from a symbiotic relationship and said tensions are put aside in favor of the benefits of such cooperation.

However, the bigger picture is France's ability to better promote and defend French language and culture internationally. The *linguistic* goals of *la francophonie* are clear. *La francophonie* strives to strengthen the French language by maintaining controlled variety, to modernize the language through assimilation of English words or the invention of their own, to insure that French is used in all areas of communication, science, literature, interstate relations and organizations, and to be a reminder of the French language's admirable qualities. (Weinstein, 486) However, these goals are simply the base for *la francophonie*, the goals behind the linguistic

cooperation of the organization. This sort of protection of the language allows for more expansive goals such as the influence of French culture and French political policies.

To this end, *la francophonie* has a budget of two hundred million dollars per year and uses it to fund projects in areas such as education, Internet development, and media. (Nadeau & Barlow, 286) One third of this budget goes to TV-5, an international French language television network (Nadeau & Barlow, 286) so that the French language is more easily accessible worldwide. In fact, TV-5 is broadcast in 202 countries which makes it the third largest international network.

(francophonie.org)

But most importantly, membership in *la francophonie* offers France and member countries opportunities to make their voices heard internationally in matters such as security, defense, culture, and trade. (Drake, 196) *La francophonie* uses its constituents within member states to influence their governments' international relations or negotiate directly with foreign governments. (Weinstein, 486) With the cooperation of sixty-eight countries, *la francophonie* has created a political presence that may not have been possible if the countries remained individuals on the world stage. This gives France an advantage in the protection and promotion of their language and culture. With dozens of countries to support them, they have the power to assert themselves in international relations on the same

stage as the United States. This allows them more validity in offering an alternative to Anglo-American cultural models because the French have an international presence. France can more easily showcase what they have to offer in the face of Americanization.

After an initial period of hesitance, the French came to regard the Francophone movement as an asset to French global strategy. (Majumdar, 5) In the 1970s, France began to see *la francophonie's* potential as a vehicle for the defense of French language and culture against that of the Anglo-Saxons. (Majumdar, 5) In other words, the French began to see that because of their more powerful presence brought about by the formation of the IOF, they could more easily challenge the dominance of the United States as well as other Anglo-Saxon countries.

In opposition to American monolithic hegemony, France offers a worldview of pluralism because although language is the unifying factor, difference is possible throughout *la francophonie*. (Majumdar, 4) As stated before, the French fear the assimilation of all cultures into that of the Anglo-Saxons as a result of globalization. This is mostly due to the United States' perceived one-size-fits-all way of viewing the world, including their language. Americans genuinely believe that their culture, technology, and language are spreading throughout the world due to a worldwide love of American culture. (Nadeau & Barlow, 287) It may be true to some extent,

however, the United States government and companies actively exert their influence internationally. (Nadeau & Barlow, 287) Of course, France isn't the only country that resents the United States and Americanization. It is even possible to say that all countries that value cultural diversity and pluralism can be threatened by and resent Americanization and the homogeneous worldview that comes with it.

Therefore, in addition to the desire to protect French culture, there is also a desire to protect all cultures, meaning to protect cultural diversity and pluralism. There is an increasing emphasis on the necessity of multilingualism and multiculturalism. (Majumdar, 5) *La francophonie*, therefore, can be seen as a way to achieve this goal. As former French Minister of Culture and Francophonie, Jacques Toubon, explained, "l'usage commun de français est un moyen offert à nos peuples de refuser l'uniformisation de la planète qui se dessine sur le monde anglo-saxon..." (Majumdar, 5) The French language and *la francophonie* are the ways in which the Francophone countries are able to escape the dominance of the United States. It is their alternative to giving in to or assimilating into the Anglo-Saxon way of life.

In 1986, after organizing the first summit of Francophone leaders in Paris, then-president François Mitterrand urged the participants to "promote collaboration and cooperation and to defend a common patrimony in a diverse world." (Gavari Starkie, 523) The objectives of *la francophonie* aspired to have a worldwide impact by advocating the risks brought about by globalization and

preventing the deepening of inequalities and loss of identities. (Gavari Starkie, 523)

Due in large part to its institutionalization in the IOF, *la francophonie* has become more powerful in its quest.

Since its emergence as an organization in the international sphere, Francophonie has placed at the center of its concerns, the place of culture in the definition of identities. This means that since it was incorporated to the Francophonie each of its members recognizes the existence of different identities, cultures, and patrimonies. In this sense, it is recognized, respecting the universal principles of the human rights of democracy. (francophonie.org) (Gavari Starkie, 524)

By accepting dozens of different Francophone cultures as part of the same organization, *la francophonie* is in itself an advertisement for cultural diversity and the need to protect and promote the French culture and language and all its variations.

Americanization is often seen as threatening to this desire for a multicultural world. The way in which the United States functions promotes a more homogeneous culture that the French do not wish to spread throughout the rest of the world. For example, the United States has no official language although they emphasize the use of just one; English. There is no institutionalized organization that connects all English-speaking countries worldwide. It seems there is less of a need because of the power of the United States' hegemony in the world. However, this promotes

only one Anglophone culture whereas the inclusion of more countries, on the scale of *la francophonie* would promote a more multicultural worldview.

Not only does Americanization promote a mono-cultural worldview, the American worldview is one that *la francophonie* and France wish to avoid. The perceived social injustices that are present in the United States have caused the French to be on the defensive to protect themselves and the rest of the world. These injustices come from the United States government that operates very differently from that of France. In France, the nation is protected by the State, which has become equated with the nation itself. (Drake, 102) The French, in general, are somewhat confused by how the United States government functions. There are differences from state to state and city to city, which cause a lot of discrepancies in how the government is run and how this affects the people.

It is difficult for the French to imagine how the United States government relinquishes power to private interests. Because the state encourages private interests to make charitable donations and therefore have more influence over the people, the French wonder about the point of the *State* in the United States. (Nadeau & Barlow, 125) In France, the State does that which private foundations do in the United States because for the French, the idea of leaving the caretaking up to private interests seems suspicious and irresponsible. (Nadeau & Barlow, 136)

In the Anglo-American system, the State is there to protect Americans' liberties and rights. However, the federal government only does what local, regional, and state governments cannot do. Therefore, as Americans, it is a lot easier to dismiss our government and we certainly do not expect it to care for our well being. In France, the State does a lot more including providing a definition for culture and language, running the economy, dispensing welfare and charity, redistributing wealth, and defending the common good. (Nadeau & Barlow, 126) The French State is the head of the entire French cultural community and has created a national identity by setting standards for beauty and taste. (Nadeau & Barlow, 127) Thus, the duty of protecting and promoting the French identity, including culture and language, falls on the shoulders of the French State. It can be said that the French State feels compelled to protect what they have worked so hard to create; the French identity.

This is where France's cultural exception comes into play. It is a way for the French State to protect what they have created within France as well as abroad. This all falls under the duty of the French State to protect *l'intérêt général* or common good of all Frenchmen. (Nadeau & Barlow, 140) Unlike the United States' government, France strives to protect everyone equally and this includes protecting their identity as Frenchmen. They do not wish for Americanization to influence the rest of the world so significantly because not only does it threaten to assimilate all

cultures, the culture that this assimilation would bring is perceived as being full of social injustice and highly unfavorable for the French. Therefore, the French culture, it seems, would make a better alternative.

With the large world presence that France gained by joining forces with the rest of the Francophone world, they are more easily able to make themselves heard and promote themselves as an important world player. France has become quite influential around the world as head of *la francophonie*. The IOF has even taken on some functions similar to those of the United Nations. For example, Francophone countries send observers to cover elections and send peace missionaries to countries who are suffering from internal conflicts and tensions such as the Democratic Republic of Congo. (Majumdar, 7-8)

The IOF also holds Francophone summits to promote continuous restructuring, the first of which was in Paris in 1986. (Gavari Starkie, 523) One of the strengths of *la francophonie* is its ability to change and adapt by reflecting changing world circumstances. (Majumdar, 9) To stay current globally, these summits take place every two years and in a different Francophone country each time. The 13th and most recent summit, took place in Montreux-Suisse in 2010 and the next will be held later in 2012 in Kinshasa in the Democratic Republic of Congo. By holding these summits, the IOF and Francophone community strive to establish goals to protect their language, cultural and linguistic diversity, peace, and human

rights. (francophonie.org.) They also discuss and establish goals regarding education, youth, international relations, equality of men and women, and durable development for *la francophonie*. (francophonie.org.) Through these summits, *la francophonie* takes part in many political activities and actions of multilateral cooperation. In fact, according to the IOF's website, francophonie.org, *la francophonie* has cooperation agreements with 31 international and regional organizations including the UNO, the European Union, and the African Union. This organization and institutionalization of *la francophonie* has allowed the Francophone movement to create powerful legislation and political actions to meet their goals. For example, one of their most important achievements took place on October 20, 2006, when UNESCO approved the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. (Gavari Starkie, 524) The Convention gave countries the right to implement policies that help establish the equality of all cultures. (Gavari Starkie, 524)

France is faced with what is often described as Americanization of the world, meaning that the global influence from the United States will lead to "normalization of thought, behavior, language, and imagination across the world." (Padis, 275) Globalization and specifically Americanization have had a strong impact on France, their national identity, and their global cultural influence. It is the State's job to protect France and the rest of the world from the threat of unwanted global

influence. In fact, in France there has been a unanimous show of support as France is now taking the lead internationally against globalization. (Meunier, 104)

The threat of globalization on national identity is such a huge issue in France because national identity is of national importance. To protect their culture and identity from “dying” they take great pains in supporting their Ministry of Culture and all of its initiatives, which includes projects such as TV-5. By protecting themselves from globalization, the French are protecting themselves from Anglo-Saxon global capitalism, which is in direct conflict with how the French view their State. For the French, the State is their protector and they can easily rely on their government to protect their interests. France’s *exception culturelle* is just one way that the French State can protect themselves while staving off Americanization. The French public enjoys listening to English-language music and watching American films and sitcoms but also feels it is justifiable to limit the amount of American cultural products that enter France. (Padis, 275) If American culture is going to reach France, it is going to be at a pace set by the French State.

The threat of Americanization seems directly aimed at France and the European way of life. This is because for so long, especially during the period of colonization and imperialism, the European way of life was superior throughout the world. This was evident due to France’s past *missions civilatrices*, as they brought European cultural values to countries such as Africa and even the United States.

Americanization and its cultural values oppose those of France and Europe and the French are generally unhappy with this kind of American influence in France. José Bové and his band of Larzac farmers represented this French mentality when dismantled a McDonald's on the grounds that fast food and American capitalism watered down the strong tradition of high cuisine in France. However, by wishing to protect French cuisine, they were protecting the greater French national identity. In fact, in 2009, a poll in *L'Expansion* discovered that 60% of Frenchmen surveyed said that globalization was directly responsible for worsening inequalities and threatening French national identity. (Meunier, 111) In addition, other polls taken in France have shown that 73% believed that Europeanization has the ability to combat the ill effects of globalization. (Meunier, 114)

The institutionalization of *la francophonie* has allowed the French State to fulfill their duty as protector. France's former colonies as well as other French speaking countries have been able to establish themselves through support from France. In return, France has been able to boost their global presence through support from the other Francophone countries. Thus the IOF seems to work as an advantage to all countries involved. Not only can Francophone countries promote the French culture and language, they are also able to have a say in security, defense, trade, and culture with their voice on the world stage. The support that *la francophonie* provides gives France the advantage of being in the same political

arena as the United States which gives France the opportunity to show what they have to offer to the rest of the world.

What France offers is a worldview of multiculturalism and diversity, which they feel that Americanization does not provide. France feels that Americanization may bring about the assimilation of all cultures into that of the Anglo-American cultural model. In turn, France and *la francophonie* have the ability to promote an alternative model of cultural diversity. The IOF advocates that the changes brought about through globalization and Americanization run the risk of causing social inequalities and a loss of national identity. For the French, Americanization represents a mono-cultural worldview of Anglo-Saxon, Protestant, capitalism, which the French see as causing many social injustices because the American government is not seen as a protector in the same way as the French State.

The French State is responsible for protecting French national identity because it created this identity. Support from *la francophone* helps to make the protection of this identity an achievable goal for France. The French cultural model has become a legitimate alternative for Americanization due to the IOF advocating for the protection of linguistic and cultural diversity as well as human rights, equality, and peace. The francophone community is defined above all by its philosophical “aspirations of humanity to freedom, dialogue, and mutual support.” (Majumdar, 3) Antoine de Rivarol wrote of the French language, “Defined, social,

and reasonable, it is not only the language of the French but the language of humanity." Today, the French language still continues to represent a view of multiculturalism and diversity but also of humanity itself.

Bibliography

- Compagnon, Antoine, and Donald Compagnon & Morrison. *The Death of French Culture*. Malden, MA: Polity, 2010. Print.
- Drake, Helen. *Contemporary France*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011. Print.
- Gavari Starkie, Elisa. "Francophonie: An Alternative Education for Globalisation." *US-China Education Review* 8.4 (2011): 519-25. *Education Resources Information Center*. Web. 5 Mar. 2012.
- Meunier, Sophie. "The French Exception." *Foreign Affairs* 79.4 (2004): 104-16. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 15 Feb. 2012.
- Nadeau, Jean-Benoît, and Julie Barlow. *Sixty Million Frenchmen Can't Be Wrong: Why We Love France but Not the French*. Naperville, IL: Source, 2003. Print.
- "Organisation Internationale De *La francophonie*." *Organisation Internationale De La francophonie*. Organisation International De *La francophonie*. Web. 3 Jan. 2012. <<http://www.francophonie.org/>>.
- Padis, Marc-Olivier. "France and Cultural Globalisation." *The Political Quarterly* 73.3 (2002): 273-78. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 15 Feb. 2012.
- Weinstein, Brian. "Francophonie: A Language-Based Movement in World Politics." *International Organization* 30.3 (1976): 485-507. *JSTOR*. Web. 24 Apr. 2012.

