

632

# Society, State and Education

Essays in the Political Sociology  
of Language Education

*"Since the State is the form in which the individuals of a ruling class assert their common interests, and in which the whole society of an epoch is epitomised, it follows that all common institutions are set up with the help of the state and are given a political form" - MARX & ENGELS*

370.193  
B 226 S

370.193

B 229 S cations



INDIAN INSTITUTE OF  
ADVANCED STUDY  
LIBRARY SHIMLA

# *Society, State and Education*

Essays in the Political Sociology  
of Language Education

B.R.BAPUJI



T.R. Publications

Copyright © 1993 The Author  
First Published 1993

 Library IAS.



62671

ISBN 81-85427 - 53 - 4

Published by  
T.R. Publications Private Ltd.  
57, South Usman Road  
PMG Complex, (II Floor)  
T.Nagar, Madras 600 017.

Laser typeset & Printed at  
THE PRINT SHOP  
33, Durganagar Colony  
Opp. R.B.I. Quarters  
Ameerpet, Hyderabad-500016.

Author's Address for Communication:  
B.R.BAPUJI  
C-44, Film Nagar  
Jubilee Hills  
Hyderabad - 500033.

# CONTENTS

## PREFACE

1. The Coming Crisis of Linguistics in India: A study in the Sociology of Education	1
2. Political Sociology of Language Education: A study of Three Language Formula	21
3. Imperialism, Linguistics and Language Education	37
4. Social Meaning of Translation In Modern Times	52
5. Concept of Social Class in Sociolinguistics	60
REFERENCES	71

# Preface

This book is a collection of five papers presented on four occasions at three places in two years.

I chose "*Society, State and Education: Essays in the Political Sociology of Language Education*" as the title of the book because all the essays (except the last), though with a certain amount of overlapping, talk extensively of Society and State (i.e. Political Sociology) and their linkages with Education in general and Language education/Linguistics in particular. Even the last essay deals with a concept (of Social Class) that has bearing on (Socio-)Linguistics and (Language-) Education.

It may not be out of place to mention the attention and response these essays received. The essays 2, 3 and 4 were presented at two UGC Refresher Courses in Linguistics held one at the Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages (CIEFL) and the other at the University of Hyderabad. Several teacher - participants in these courses found these essays useful and some of them even suggested me to get these papers to a wider audience.

The first and the last papers also received considerable attention from the participants of a National Symposium held at Osmania University and a local meeting of Linguists at CIEFL respectively. Thus the attention and response which these papers received prompted me to prepare this volume to reach a wider audience. Further, these essays, I believe, are relevant not simply to the students of (Socio-)linguistics but also to those of Sociology, Political Science and History.

While working on these papers I had benefited from the discussions with *P. Harinath*, Lecturer in Political Science, V.V. College, Hyderabad, and *Ranganayakamma*, a Telugu Authoress. However, I, alone, am responsible for errors, if there are any, of either fact or interpretation.

August, 1993

**B.R. Bapuji**

# The Coming Crisis of Linguistics in India : A Study in the Sociology of Education<sup>1</sup>

**ABSTRACT:** *This paper, while discussing the social relevance of Linguistics, observes that Applied Linguists have not realised the importance of the question as to why, how, under what circumstances, to what extent and to which discipline the State renders financial support. The paper points out that the social relevance of disciplines in general depend essentially on their theoretical and/or practical utility either in the "base", i.e., economy or "super-structure" viz. politics, law, art, literature, etc.*

*This paper also isolates the potentials of Linguistics research and examines the education policy in India in terms of its scope for the utilization of the knowledge of Linguistics.*

*The paper tries to locate the "Shylock-ian" attitude of the educational planners in India towards academic disciplines and establishes a causal link between the attitude that education is an investment and the world economic*

---

1. *The title of the paper is obviously an analogical creation of Alvin Gouldner's book "The coming crisis of Western Sociology" (New York: Basic Books Inc., 1970). However, the difference between the two is : Gouldner's study refers to the crisis internal to the discipline itself while our study refers to the crisis of the discipline in terms of its academic prestige and state patronage.*

*An earlier version of this paper was originally presented at a National Symposium on "Linguistics and Social Relevance" held on March 5, 1992 at the Centre for Advanced Study in Linguistics (CASL) Osmania University, India. C. Rama Rao and B. Vijayanarayana acted as Director and Secretary respectively of the symposium. They, alongwith their colleagues in the CASL, are referred to in the text of this paper as Ramarao et al.*

## 2 Society, State & Education

*crisis. It also indicates the coming crisis of Linguistics as an academic discipline in India owing to the ever mounting fiscal crisis of the Indian State.*

*Finally, this paper proposes an alternate Linguistics- practice in the context of crisis in both economy and education. On the analogy of Paulo Freire's "Emancipatory Literacy" programme, the paper proposes the notion of "Emancipatory Linguistics", a programme for Applied Linguists to conduct research in the socially relevant areas and disseminate the results of the research among the oppressed people and utilize it to struggle for the solution of the language-related problems.*

### 1. EARLIER PRESENTATION OF THE PROBLEM :

The organizers of this symposium (hereafter Ramarao et al) deserve lot of appreciation for drawing the attention of the community of Linguists in India to the most urgent as well as an extremely important professional problem. This symposium reminds us of a similar concern expressed earlier by the Western Linguists. Way back in 1969, Bertil Malmberg, in his plenary session paper on "Applications of Linguistics", presented at "the Second International Conference of Applied Linguistics, Cambridge", suggested a programme of persuasion. To quote him: "What we all, as representatives of different branches of linguistics and of applied linguistics, can do, and must do, is to persuade administrators and politicians of the extreme importance of research, make them understand the basic part played by language in all human activities and the importance of linguistic competence in all planning and directing of such activities, *make them understand that this research costs money and needs personal resources*, make them realise that, for the immediate needs of humanity in all countries and all continents independently of political and social systems, linguistic research is considerably more urgent than the conquest of the universe and considerably cheaper" (Malmberg, 1969: 17-18, emphasis added).

At the third Congress of the "Association International De Linguistique Appliquee" in Copenhagen, Pit Corder (1972) pointed out the importance of Malmberg's Programme of persuasion. In 1973, at the Georgetown Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, Kuhlwein (1973:24) talked of "Social obligations" and "Social integration" of Linguistics. Once again, at Georgetown Round Table in 1974, Bruce Fraser too



lamented that Linguists have enjoyed merely a consultative and not a participatory involvement in the area of 'education'. He emphasized the need for a constructive dialogue between 'Linguists' and 'Educators' (Fraser, 1974: 93-7). And now after two decades, Ramarao et al are cautioning the Indian Linguists about the coming crisis of Linguistics in terms of its existence in the field of education in India. Their main concern (as appealed in the Symposium circular) is that Linguists must impress upon the 'educational planners' and 'administrators' about the 'applicational side' of the subject and thereby make them realise the 'social relevance of Linguistics'. To achieve this goal they expect the community of Linguists to perform three inter-related tasks: (i) giving directions for future research in Linguistics in the present Indian context; (ii) offering suggestions for popularizing the potentials of Linguistics for other fields; and (iii) focusing on the need for inter-disciplinary research.

Though overtly not mentioned as to what they expect from the education planners and administrators (i.e., state), the plea of Ramarao et al implies what Malmberg earlier had explicitly pleaded for, i.e., Linguistics "research costs money and needs personal resources" and hence the state should provide all necessary financial support. In other words State patronage is one of the prerequisites for the continual existence of an academic discipline. However, the 'applicational side' of a discipline is also considered essential. Thus, while Malmberg stressed the importance of 'Linguistic competence and research', Ramarao et al point out "the potentials of linguistics training".

While appreciating their concern for Linguistics, we feel that their programme of persuasion will not yield desired results since the ultimate basis for the existence of Linguistics or any academic discipline is non-academic in nature. No doubt this realization is not totally absent in Malmberg and Ramarao et al. That Malmberg and Ramarao et al (hereafter "Linguistics Lobby", using the term 'Lobby' in its positive sense realized the non-academic basis of the existence of a discipline is obvious from their plea to the state for financial support, i.e., 'money and personal resources' needed for Linguistics research. What the Linguistics Lobby has not realized is as to why, how, to what extent, under what circumstances, and to which discipline the state renders financial support. This point will become obvious as we proceed further in our paper.

#### 4 Society, State & Education

### 2. OUR PRESENTATION OF THE PROBLEM

*2.1 Conceptual Premises:* The problem of studying the existence/status of an academic discipline/profession may be better understood if we situate it in a broader context of education which in turn be studied in its social context. Such a study shall proceed from certain conceptual premises and theoretical formulations which may be briefly stated as follows:<sup>2</sup>

- a) Production of social existence/life viz. Production and reproduction of human life take place in the context of human society.
- b) Social production of human life involves production of necessities of life: physical (food, clothing, housing etc.) and intellectual (art, literature, linguistics, philosophy, etc.); material and non-material; concrete and abstract.
- c) Society consists of a 'base' (i.e., economy) and a 'super-structure' (i.e., politics, education, art, literature, religion etc.) which corresponds to and interacts with the base in a dialectical manner.
- d) Human society historically varies according to the modes of production of social existence. Broadly speaking, the known modes of production are Ancient, Feudal and Capitalist.
- e) Contemporary human society worldwide is dominated by Capitalist Mode of Production (hereafter CMP) which exists with varying degrees of development in various countries.
- f) CMP is characterized by, besides others, a tendency to perceive every activity/profession (scholarly or non-scholarly) in terms of productive vs. unproductive activities/professions related to either 'base' or 'superstructure' or both.
- g) In CMP too the 'superstructure' corresponds to and interacts with the base in varied forms: reflection, articulation, mediation, representation, reshaping and the like.
- h) The 'State' machinery under CMP administers/plans/manages the common affairs of the ruling class and its fractions by means of its various apparatuses: 'education' being one of them.
- i) Education, as one of the superstructural elements of the CMP or the society, corresponds to and interacts with the capitalist base. The Education system which reflects/articulates/mediates/represents/reshapes/serves the capitalist society in a better (i.e., productive) manner

---

2. For a detailed understanding of the conceptual categories mentioned in the following formulations, see Bapuji (1993a, b & c).

is considered by the capitalist state (i.e., its educational planners and administrators) as 'socially relevant' education.

- j) The individual disciplines in a capitalist society emerge, expand, contract or vanish depending upon their relevance to the social (i.e., economic, political, ideological etc.) objectives which the Capitalist State lays down in its education system. The 'representatives' or scholars of individual disciplines, consciously or unconsciously, attempt to "impress" upon the "education planners and the administrators" of the Capitalist State and "make them realise" the social relevance of the disciplines and try to get "money" and "personal resources" needed for the existence and expansion of their disciplines.
- k) Under Capitalism, certain of the individual disciplines/professions are immediately relevant while certain are remotely relevant (in varying degrees) to the social objectives/priorities which a capitalist state lays down in its educational policy.
- l) Contradictions (competition, recession, inflation etc.) inherent in Capitalism produce periodic economic crises, both on the world-scale and in individual countries, which in turn adversely affect the education system in general, and individual disciplines/professions in particular in varying degrees.

2.2 *Relevant Questions* : Having arrived at conceptual premises, we need to formulate relevant questions whose answers may enable us to grasp the problem of our study in depth. We have identified the following questions and our answers will be tentative in nature since there is a dearth of empirical studies on this theme at the moment.

- a) What are the criteria which the educational planners in India emphasize and how they affect the state funding to the field of education in general and Linguistics in particular?
- b) What is the State policy on education in India and which aspects of the policy can utilise the services/applications of Linguistics?
- c) What is the social relevance of academic disciplines in general and of Linguistics in particular and why knowledge of Linguistics is not being utilized adequately?
- d) What is/will be the impact of the economic crisis (both around the world and in India) on Indian education in general and Linguistics in particular?
- e) How to utilize the knowledge of Linguistics with or without state patronage?

## 6 Society, State & Education

- i) What should be the direction for future research in Linguistics in the present Indian context?
- ii) How to popularize the potential of Linguistics training?
- iii) How Linguistics and other disciplines can benefit from each other?

*2.3 Towards an answer:* Though we have formulated relevant questions separately, it is not possible to answer them individually one by one. This is owing to the interrelated nature of the answers. We, therefore, propose to offer answers by way of a discussion of certain aspects of the problem of social relevance of Linguistics in the context of society in general and Education in particular.

### 3. IS LINGUISTICS SOCIALLY RELEVANT? YES! BUT .....

As the relevance of Linguistics may be understood in relation to the relevance of other disciplines, we will begin with the social relevance of the disciplines in general and the relevance of Linguistics in particular.

*3.1 On the relevance of disciplines in general:* While focusing "the uses of socio-Linguistics", Fishman (1969:21) observed that "all knowledge is useful and if at any point in time we nevertheless grope towards a consideration of the 'uses of X' it is merely because for some particular proposals at some particular time some knowledge may seem more useful than others" (emphasis in the original).

Fishman's observations hold good only in certain specific historical conjunctures. Malmberg (1969 : 4) and Dittmar (1978 : 85-86) provide relevant examples for this. For instance, one of the reasons for the "sudden birth" of Applied Linguistics during and shortly after World War II, as Malmberg pointed out, was the need for practical acquaintance with foreign languages of those countries which were "liberated"/"Occupied" and which were to be administered by "big" powers like U.S.A. and U.K. Similarly, in the early sixties, the social sciences (particularly Linguistics, Sociology and Psychology) in America were given the task of conducting numerous investigations, at great financial cost, into the behaviour of the "Lower" class. This was because, as Dittmar informs, economy required high educational attainment and highly developed skill in the use of language as per the standards of the "middle" class. As a result, the American book market, at the end of 1960s, was flooded with volumes containing analysis of the "dis-advantaged child".

Whatever be the specific historical conjunctural uses of disciplines, the social relevance of disciplines in general depend essentially on their theoretical and/or practical utility/use/function either in the 'base', i.e., economy or "superstructure", viz., politics, law art, literature etc. Thus, modifying Moore (1970 : 234), we may state that the social utility of disciplines or professions varies depending upon: (a) the importance of the goals pursued either in the 'base' or 'superstructure'; (b) the necessity of advanced knowledge of the disciplines in the achievement of goals and (c) the social classes/strata benefited/affected by the knowledge. Thus, for example, knowledge of those disciplines which are commonly grouped under "humanities", viz., classical and modern languages, Linguistics (partly) and philosophy (including Ethics, Logic, Religion etc.) are useful in achieving the goal of training the stratum of prospective literary/philosophical representatives necessary for the ideological reproduction of bourgeois social relations. The people who benefit from/are affected by the knowledge of these disciplines by and large belong to the ruling class/strata. Similarly, most of the disciplines commonly grouped under "Social Sciences", viz., Political Science, Public Administration, Economics, Sociology, Psychology, History and Linguistics (partly) are useful in achieving the goal of training the strata of prospective state functionaries and conceptive ideologists needed for a Capitalist society. However, Social Science disciplines commonly called "Commerce" and "Business Management" are useful in realizing the goal of training the prospective class of Business Managers of Capitalist enterprises in squeezing as much surplus labour as possible from the working class. Finally, disciplines commonly referred to as Science, Technology, Engineering, Agriculture and Medicine are extremely useful in achieving the goal of training prospective class of 'highly skilled - productive - intellectual workers' as well as 'professional-Managerial' class who (by performing fundamentally contradictory roles viz., Performers Vs. Controllers) will contribute to the economic growth (i.e. accumulation of Capital in the form of surplus value). This differential utility of the disciplines is perceived, either consciously or unconsciously, by the educational planners who accordingly plan the education system.

There is ample empirical evidence to show that the educational planners and administrators perceive consciously the relative importance/utility/relevance of the disciplines and sponsor/patronage/fund accordingly.

## 8 *Society, State & Education*

For example, Nathan Pusey (1976), a one time President (= Vice-Chancellor) of Harvard University provides excellent data relating to higher education in American Universities in general and at Harvard in particular in his book "The American Higher Education 1945-1970, A personal Report". We, however, guided by our conceptual premises (mentioned above), can view the data from a fundamentally different perspective. Here is our reinterpretation of the events which Pusey considered natural, sensible, good and desirable.

America attained a new dominant (= Imperialist) economic position in the world by the end of the Second World War. This economic position led to a "virtual explosion" of academic interest (which reinforced the Imperialist interests) in International studies of all kinds in general and foreign (exotic) languages (that had earlier been ignored) in particular. At Harvard, for instance, about sixty languages were taught and students were financially encouraged to study existing cultures of distant people. Thus the post-war educational policy of America aimed at the production of the highly trained people familiar with the languages and cultures of other nations. Another important aspect of the policy during mid-1940s was that the National Defence Committee of America pursued the policy of contract system according to which contracts were awarded for the performance of research on a competitive basis. Thus, the total amount spent on research in 1940 was only 74 million dollars while this figure soared to 1.5 billion dollars during the war years. Major share of this research funding went to research in sciences. For instance, the National Defence Committee brought out a report, on the importance of research in sciences with the title "Science: The Endless Frontier" in 1945, which appealed for greater attention to science. The American government's interest in science and its readiness to 'appropriate' large sums for its development owed much to its concern for defense. "These were repeatedly stimulated in the early post-war years by such occurrences as the outbreak of the cold war, the Berlin Blockade, and the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia in 1948, the explosion of an atom bomb by the Russians in the summer of 1949, and the Communist takeover in China that year. It should not seem surprising in retrospect that, faced with this dismaying set of circumstances, President Truman urged American Scientists to proceed quickly to develop the hydrogen bomb" (Pusey, 1976: 73). Thus, anxieties created by the outbreak of the Cold War with the Soviet Union led to increased expenditures for

defense and the allocation of new large sums to the American colleges and universities for research and for training for research in Chemistry, Physics (especially Nuclear Physics), Mathematics, Engineering, Biology and the Medical sciences.

America's intense rivalry short of actual War (i.e. Cold War) with the Soviet Union in the fields of economy, politics, military and ideology prompted the flow of not simply American dollars but also officers of American government and Agents of American Business across the world, more particularly the ex-colonies of Asia, Africa and Latin America. As a result, a new field of study called "Area studies" came into existence. Careers in government and in private service required intimate knowledge of distant places and languages. To meet one such requirement Harvard University, for instance, established a Center for Middle Eastern Studies in 1954 to reinforce instruction and research in the languages, literature, history, economics, politics and cultures of the vast geographical areas extending from the Mediterranean to the frontiers of India which was considered as "a region of frightening economic and political importance" for America. Harvard University introduced several other programmes and courses to suit the American Imperialist interests. Thus, a center of International Legal Studies was set up at Harvard to study laws that bear upon international trade, foreign investment, economic development and the legal problems of "multinational corporations". The programmes at Harvard's graduate school of Public Health were concerned with the predominantly rural and economically poor areas of the world, namely Asia, Africa and Latin America. Harvard Divinity School began to pay more attention to the religions of peoples in distant places which culminated in the setting up of a center for World Religions in 1958. Similar attempts in various disciplines were made at Columbia University, University of California at Berkeley, Michigan, Yale, Princeton, Cornell, Stanford, the University of Washington and other universities.

The launching of the first Sputnik by Russia in 1957 was the greatest incentive for increased state expenditure for the Sciences, especially as they related to space. Thus, the National Aeronautics and Space Agency (NASA) was established in 1958. The passage of the National Defence Education Act of 1958 made large numbers and amounts of Fellowships available for graduate study in various fields considered to be critical for

## 10 Society, State & Education

defense. Also to the "delight" of the Humanities, fellowships were liberally extended to the study of modern foreign languages.

President Kennedy's 1961 announcement of America's goal to land a man on the moon before the end of the decade prompted the Congress to allocate more funds for scientific activities. Thus spending on Research in Sciences rose from 8 billion dollars in 1960 to 15 billion dollars in 1965. This situation created such an intense competition that scholars were drawn into fields of research not because of preference but because of the availability of research grants or training funds. The governmental funds were not and could not have been distributed evenly among the nearly three thousand institutions in America. Therefore, private foundations such as Rockefeller (an Oil magnate) Foundation, Carnegie (a Steel magnate) Corporation, Ford (an Automobile magnate) Foundation too contributed substantial funds. The Educational institutions too behaved themselves by devoting to discussions of "the goals of the Corporate enterprise and the appropriate programmes for reaching it". Hence, *"it cannot be maintained that the incentive for it (education) originated within the academic world."* (Pusey 1976: 44 emphasis added). It was owed rather to the increased (imperialist-) involvement of the United States in all part of the globe that came about following initially the Second World War and subsequently the "ideological Third World War" (i.e. Cold War) characterized by an intense rivalry between America and the Soviet Union for World domination.

*3.2 On the Relevance of Linguistics in particular:* Linguists are certainly aware of the social fact that they should also "contribute maximally to better conditions in all kinds of human affairs" (Malmberg, 1969: 17). They, therefore, stress the utilization of "Linguistic Research for the improvement of the efficiency of some practical task in which language is a central component" (Corder, 1972: 5). They believe that Linguistics can fulfill its "social obligations" by socially integrating the subject and the goals of its research (Kuhlwein, 1973: 24).

There are several socially relevant applications of Linguistics which have been identified by Linguists (e.g. Crystal, 1968; Fishman, 1969; Malmberg, 1969; Corder, 1972). They are as follows;<sup>3</sup>

---

3. *Applications of Linguistics mentioned here may be worded differently by different scholars. Also there may be variation in the characterization of fields and sub-fields within Linguistics.*



Socially relevant applications of Linguistics	Different fields (within Linguistics) involved	Disciplines (other than Linguistics)
<p>Graphization (creation &amp; revision of writing system);                      Modernization (creation of technical terminology, development of styles in various kinds of discourse);                      Standardization (evolving a common variety);                      Translations across different languages (theory, practice and evaluation);                      Lexicographic activities (preparation of various kinds of dictionaries, viz: mono-, bi-, and trilingual and special dictionaries);                      Language status planning; Teaching and testing, of the first, second and foreign language to both children and adults;                      Teaching hard-of-hearing children; Problems of Aphasics;                      Bilingualism and Multilingualism; Problem of social attitudes in a language contact situation;                      etc.</p>	<p>General/Descriptive Linguistics (including theories of phonology morphology, semantics and syntax);                      Sociolinguistics;                      Psycholinguistics;                      Clinical linguistics                      Lexicography;                      Stylistics;                      Pragmalinguistics;                      Historical linguistics;                      Dialectology                      etc.</p>	<p>Sociology;                      Psychology;                      Anthropology;                      Political-Science;                      History;                      Information Technology;                      Mathematics;                      Neurology;                      Audiology;                      etc.</p>

Having identified the potentials of Linguistics research, we have to examine whether the Educational Policy gives any scope for the applica-

tions of Linguistics. Only then we can conclude whether or not it is possible to impress upon the educational planners and administrators about the applicational side of the subject and make them realize the social relevance of Linguistics, as per the Programme of persuasion suggested by the Linguistics Lobby.

#### **4. EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND POSSIBLE APPLICATIONS OF LINGUISTICS:**

The aim of Education Policy in India has been 'modernization' (in its capitalist sense). It has been the theme right from the famous Report of the Education Commission of 1964-66 (hereafter REC, 1964-66). That education is basically meant to serve the needs of the economy is a fact as is evident from this Report too. Item 1.73 of this Report categorically states that quick, 'modernization' is the immediate goal and education should produce "educated and skilled" citizens and "adequate and competent intelligentsia". Modernization in its capitalist sense is nothing but rapid industrialization by means of which high productivity is achieved. High productivity essentially means a way to squeeze more and more surplus labour than before from the 'Skilled' workers and technical 'intelligentsia'. The thirst for this modernization is so much that REC (1964 - 66 : 1.50) equated the development of modern Indian languages with the "progress of industrialization". Item 1.50 stressed the need to produce books, particularly scientific and technical, in the regional languages and advised U.G.C. (University Grants Commission) to "allot adequate funds" for the purpose. This is one area where the knowledge of Linguistics may be utilized. Academies, Universities and Central Institutes (eg. Universities of Tamil and Telugu; Central Institute of Indian Languages, Telugu Academy etc.) have been utilizing the services of Linguists in this area. Yet another area in which Linguists are relevant is the spread of study of English, to use the Commission's phrase, "our most significant window on the World". Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages (CIEFL) is one such institute where the services of Linguists are utilised. The recommendations of the REC, 1964 - 66 were accepted and incorporated by the educational policy of 1968 whose essential provisions are accepted literally by the National Policy on Education, 1987 (hereafter NPE, 1987). Yet NPE, 1987 specifically identified certain areas of research in which knowledge of Linguistics is useful. The areas are: promotion of the link language, translation of books from one language to another, and publication of

multilingual dictionaries and glossaries (item 3.7); development of the curricula and preparation of instructional material in tribal languages (item 4.6 (ii)); adult literacy (items 4.10 and 4.12); and special emphasis on Linguistic competence to meet the demands of specialization (item 5.29). All these provisions are intended to promote National Integration and these Linguistics activities are undertaken by Central Institute of Indian Languages (CIIL), Language based Universities and Academies. In addition to these state-run institutions, several departments of Linguistics in various Universities are engaged in teaching and research in these areas in varying degrees either directly to indirectly.<sup>4</sup>

In view of these provisions of NPE of 1987, it is not difficult to make administrators realize the social relevance of Linguistics. In fact these provisions imply that the administrators, consciously or unconsciously, are able to perceive the social relevance of Linguistics.

Despite the above mentioned provisions for the utilization of Linguistics, Linguistics Lobby, it appears, is worried about the increased role and funding for Linguistics. But is it possible to convince the educational planners of the necessity of encouraging/financing Linguistics still further? Let us see what the educational planners think of education (of which Linguistics is a part) as such.

##### **5. EDUCATIONAL PLANNERS AND ACADEMIC DISCIPLINES:**

Educational Planners in India have always been treating education as an "investment" and this view is obviously detrimental to the free development of almost all disciplines of Humanities and some of those of Social Sciences. This attitude is exclusively concerned with the "exchange value" and not with the "use value" of various disciplines. Exclusive concern for "exchange value" is characteristic of capitalism and hence it treats everything including education as an 'investment'. Thus, the emphasis of the educational planners on the "costs", "proportionate returns", "maximum economy", "tangible returns in economic terms", "productivity", "demands of the economy" and "marginal returns". The educational planners often do not hesitate to declare with pride their "Shylock-ian" attitude towards education. Thus, V.K.R.V. Rao, a renowned economist, educational planner and administrator unhesitatingly confessed thus: "I must confess that I

---

4. For details, see UGC (1982) report on "Status of Linguistics in Indian Universities" prepared by the panel on Linguistics.

## 14 Society, State & Education

have always held the view that education can not be treated as an end in itself. It has to be treated as an investment in human resources" (Rao, 1983:12).<sup>5</sup>

Educational Planners of his ilk too followed his footsteps in trampling mercilessly the field of education. Thus Nayar (1983 : 60) argues : "As education is an investment it must show like other investment effective resource utilization and bring tangible returns in economic terms". Young (1983 : 200) laments that "We have come almost to a point of negative marginal returns from investment in higher education. The more we invest, the less total output we may have".

Similar yells are heard also from the West even from those who are connected with Applied Linguistics. Thomson (1973 : 231) estimates that America allocates nearly one billion dollars annually for language training and yet does not get "full measure for this costly investment". All the educational planners are mainly concerned with knowledge or education to be put in the effective service of the economy, hence of economic returns. In fact they are not merely interested in money alone. Like the "usurers" of the Middle-ages, their "interest" is to make more money than the money invested. Therefore it is not an easy task to impress upon the educational planners and make them realise the social relevance of Linguistics because investment in Linguistics does not yield tangible results in economic terms.<sup>6</sup>

Only disciplines like Science and Technology possess the quality of "Productivity" and meet the "demands of the economy" as they are directly linked with agriculture and industry. However, social science disciplines like "Management" enable these educational planners to reap "proportionate returns" because the Management courses train Managerial class in

---

5. *It is significant to note that the "Education Ministry" is now renamed as 'Hman Resources Ministry' thus turning human being into a means for an end that ostensibly is non-human.*

6. *We could not collect data relating to the total funds that are made available to Linguistics vis-a-vis other disciplines within and outside Humanities and Social Sciences. Also we could not gather information regarding the review of funding to individual disciplines including Linguistics by the educational planners.*

"Scientific" methods of extracting surplus value from the working class. Other Social Science disciplines like Political Science, History, Sociology and Psychology secure at least "marginal returns" owing to their contribution in training the prospective strata of state functionaries and conceptive ideologists needed for capitalist society. But from the purely economic point of view, no discipline except Science and Technology (covering Medicine, Engineering, Agriculture and Technology courses) secures "tangible returns".

## **6. WORLD CRISIS IN EDUCATION AND THE COMING CRISIS OF LINGUISTICS IN INDIA:**

We have seen above that educational planners, like "usurers", treat education as an investment. This tendency is found not only in India but throughout the World. It has its roots in the world economic crisis which in turn has drastically affected the field of education. Philips Coombs, in his study "The World Crisis in Education" (1985) provides us useful information relating to the impact of World economic crisis on the World's educational systems<sup>7</sup>. His description is worth-mentioning.

"The prolonged world recession and inflation that began in the early 1970s had multiple and most adverse repercussions on educational systems everywhere. The recession subverted educational budgets and teachers' salaries. It also wrought major changes on other fronts: in employment prospects that dashed the hopes and plans of students; in the curriculum and student academic choices; in the career expectations and morale of teachers and administrators; and in the public's attitude towards support of schools and Colleges" (Coombs, 1985:120)

Coombs' study gives useful clues as to why educational planners were obsessed with the idea of 'education as an investment'. It is no wonder that tremors of World economic crises are felt in every individual country and the educational planners will have to be excessively concerned with the economics of their educational planning. Once again, we may refer to Coombs who emphasized the 'interdependence' and 'close linkages' between the economies of individual countries, both "developed" and "developing".

---

7. *Owing to the limitations of space, we are not citing relevant economic data from Coombs (1985). However, it may be noted that Coombs' study does not give us economic data relating to individual disciplines.*

## 16 Society, State & Education

"First, the economies of individual countries have become more inter-dependent than ever before: prosperity in the developed World and that in the developing World are intimately linked and they will generally move up or down together. Second, because of these close linkages, whatever happens to general World economic conditions will have a profound impact, for better or worse, on all national budgets and, thus, on all education budgets" (Coombs, 1985 : 161).

The specificity of Indian situation in the context of World economic crisis has been, since the 80s, an ever mounting fiscal crisis of the state. Indian State has been, for historical reasons, an interventionist state. Its intervention in the economic, ideological and educational fields has been, in the thirty years since formal independence, very crucial for a number of reasons. Its intervention in terms of welfarism wasn't small either. All these have involved whopping amounts of public expenditure. Education too has been an important item of expenditure.

The ongoing measures of the new economic policy have primarily meant a reduction of state expenditure in the public sector industries, infrastructure services, and education too. Although it is not clear as to what kind of ultimate shape the Government's educational expenditure is going to take, it is quite evident that the state funding to the 'unproductive' areas of education are in for drastic reduction.

At the moment, i.e., even in the early 1990s recession and inflation are at their peaks throughout the World as well as India and this economic crisis has its adverse effect on education. Thus, for example, the Harvard University, the wealthiest University in terms of economic resources in the World ended its 1991 budget with a deficit of 41.9 Million dollars. (Andhra Prabha, dt. 16-2-1992, P.5). In India too the tremors of deep economic crisis are felt in elitist institutions like Indian Institute of Management (IIMs) and the Indian Institute of Technology (IITs) which, according to the Government, occupy an "important place" in the "country's development".

"Anticipating a financial squeeze", a report in the *Indian Express* says, "two IIMs (in Ahmedabad and Lucknow) are said to have already substantially hiked their fees. IIM Ahmedabad, the most prestigious management institute of the country, has raised its fees from a paltry Rs.500/- per year to about Rs.5,000/- (Indian Express, dt. 15-2-1991, P.1)

According to the Report, the Government feels that both IIMs and IITs have the potential to generate internal revenue by way of consultancy projects, technology transfers, testing services, surveys, book-writing, fees etc. Thus, the Government is shifting its financial responsibility on to the students and industry, the real "users" of these institutions. We the Linguistics lobby should not harbour any illusion that such a policy of "self-supporting" will not be extended to the Universities and hence to Linguistics departments.<sup>8</sup> The report categorically stated that the Government's new philosophy of "self-supporting" is applicable not only to IITs and IIMs but also Universities and other technological education Institutions. The U.G.C. Chairman, as per several news reports, has already spoken about the undue and excessive importance attached to Humanities, Social Sciences and Pure Sciences Vis-a-Vis Governmental planning so far, and has asked for the restructuring of the education to meet the needs of the new economic policy and in the direction of the global trends. This, however, does not mean that Linguistics or for that matter any other existing social science is going to be dropped out of existence in the universities. The continuation of Linguistics as an academic discipline at the University level or in research institute may to a large extent depend on its marginalized utility to the system. Its expansion at the College and School levels is best left as an unlikely proposition.<sup>9</sup>

Therefore, the Linguistics lobby should Psychologically and otherwise be prepared for the coming crisis of Linguistics as an academic discipline.

---

8. *It is interesting to note that the University of Hyderabad issued a circular in early 1993 (i.e., a year after this paper was written) to the Faculty Members of all the Departments/Centres asking them to propose and start "Distant Education" programmes in order to raise financial resources internally in view of the shrinking funds from the UGC and the Government of India. Accordingly, the Centre for Applied Linguistics and Translation Studies (CALTS) started a "Post Graduate Diploma in Translation" programme with a total fee of Rs.2,500/-, an amount higher than the fee normally charged from Regular/Day Post-Graduate students. Few more departments have started their respective Post-Graduate Diploma Programmes.*

9. *Though there are no empirical surveys on the current status of Linguistics, our personal enquiries with fellow Linguists reveal that there is no* →

## 18 Society, State & Education

It is beyond doubt that disciplines other than Science and Technology especially those like Linguistics will not receive considerable financial support from either the Government or its users, namely students.

Students enrollment in Linguistics departments in India is extremely limited in number and, moreover, all the admitted students never remain till the end of the course. Those who remain too do not get employment in the field of Linguistics and thus the training and research experience they receive go almost "waste"<sup>10</sup> In this situation, a possible question may be raised.

Can Linguistics seek financial patronage of the Industry for its survival and extension? The answer is an emphatic 'No', since Industry, including the book publishing industry, does not find potential for market in Linguistics.

A Projected scenario in which Linguistics would regain its importance or usefulness could be one in which language becoming a political issue involving various speech communities or dialects which were hitherto considered 'unworthy' of recognition become important as media of instruction or as new official languages of newly formed politico-administrative units (Possible egs. Jarkhand, Bodo, etc.) come to the fore on a large and national or seminational scale. However such a political situation is unlikely in the near future. Then, Linguists are left with only one option if they are serious about practising the socially relevant Linguistics even in the periods of crisis. We call it "Emancipatory" Linguistics.

---

→ *department of Linguistics proper in the eastern part of India. For example, no Linguistics department has been started either in Bihar or Orissa during the last decade. Further, no new Bachelor's Programme in Linguistics has been introduced in the recent past, and the enrolment figures in the old programmes of Osmania, Calcutta and Baroda Universities have been gradually diminishing.*

10. *This is another instance where systematically conducted empirical surveys are absent. However, the author of this paper is making these observations based on his personal experience as a student of Linguistics (right from his B.A. in 1967), researcher and a teacher in Linguistics in the department of Linguistics at Osmania University.*



## 7. TOWARD AN "EMANCIPATORY" LINGUISTICS:

We propose the notion of "Emancipatory Linguistics" on the analogy of Paulo Freire's notion of "Emancipatory Literacy". For Paulo Freire and his associates in the radical education reform movement in Latin America, "Emancipatory Literacy" is a new literacy programme by which oppressed people are able to participate in the socio-historical transformation of their society (Freire and Macedo, 1987: 157). Similarly, our notion of Emancipatory Linguistics is a programme for Linguists to conduct research in the socially relevant areas of Linguistics and to disseminate the results of the research among the oppressed people, both literate and illiterate and to utilize it to mobilize them in order to struggle for the solution of the language related problems created and unattended by the civil society as well as the state.<sup>11</sup> The language related problems are those aspects of Applied Linguistics which we mentioned above in section 3.2. Obviously, Literacy is one such problem created by the exploiting Ruling Class. The Ruling Class poses the question of Literacy as a mechanical process of teaching/learning of reading and writing (Freire & Macedo, 1987: 161). Further, it dichotomizes reading the text from reading the social essence/context of the text. An Emancipatory Literacy consultant or Linguist, therefore, should try, as far as possible owing to one's employment by the state, to effectively, tactically and intelligently intervene in such programmes to minimise the harm that may be caused to the oppressed people who are adult literacy students.

In this context, Paulo Freire's commitment to Emancipatory Literacy is worth mentioning.

"I could never be a consultant to a Government that, under the guise of prioritizing learners' acquisition of reading and writing techniques, would require me (for simply suggest to me) to dichotomize reading the text from reading the context. A Government for which the reading of the concrete world and the unveiling of the World are not the natural rights of the people reduces reading to a purely mechanical level" (Freire & Macedo, 1987: 64).

---

11. *This Programme needs the help and active co-operation of class and/or mass organisations which are aimed at a social revolution that emancipates people from all kinds of oppression : economic, political and cultural.*

## 20 *Society, State & Education*

Like literacy, language status planning is also a language problem created and/or properly unattended by the dominant fraction within the Ruling Class. For example, the dominant fraction within the Indian Ruling Class, unilaterally and undemocratically formulated a policy making Hindi as the official language (Ramachandrarao et al, 1988). Similarly, most of the tribal population is deprived of an opportunity for education through their mother tongue and they are involuntarily integrated into the majority - dominant language of the region through structures of education, administration and trade. Emancipatory Linguistics can enlighten the oppressed people in these matters and mobilize them to take initiative in reformulating a democratic language policy and its implementation.

Other research areas in which Emancipatory Linguistics can play a role are: Language and Class, Language and Socialization, Social Psychology of Language Learning etc., where conceptual categories relating to social sciences (Eg. Class, Nation, State, Socialization, Cultural deprivation etc.) can be critically examined and utilized after demystifying them.

Finally, it is necessary to clarify that Emancipatory Linguistics activities by themselves cannot resolve language related problems created by the civil society and state. Only a radical transformation of the present society by the oppressed people alone can emancipate them from all kinds of problems, both social and language - related. Yet, we hope that Emancipatory Linguistics can serve as one of the several supplementary forms of socio-academic struggle.

# Political Sociology of Language Education in India: A Study of Three Language Formula<sup>\*</sup>

**ABSTRACT:** *This paper tries to identify the links between the economic and political interests of social classes/groups and their proposals on Language Education. Basing on certain theoretical premises, the paper tries to explain the political-sociological bases of Language Education in India since the colonial period. It tentatively suggests a rudimentary but sociolinguistically oriented policy on language education.*

## 1. Introduction:

The term 'Language Education' refers not simply to the teaching of languages but such other aspects as "instructional language of the class room, and the sociocultural aspects of language teaching" (Halliday, 1977:103). In this paper we make an attempt to study the "political" nature of "language education" in the context of Indian "society". In other words we study the Political Sociology of Language Education in India<sup>1</sup>. Such a study has been necessitated by the inadequacies of the existing literature which largely deals with a description of empirical nature, and does not offer critical theoretical analysis. Thus, for example, studies on Language

---

*\* An earlier version of this Paper was presented on 19-8-1993 at the UGC Refresher Course in "Linguistics & Language Education" held at the Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages (CIEFL), Hyderabad 500 007.*

- 1. 'Political Sociology' is the study of links between 'Politics' and 'Society'. Further, "Politics" mainly refers to the "Power relations" in general and "State" (an apparatus of Power) in particular. State is further stratified into Legislature, Executive, Judiciary, Standing Army, the Police and so on. "Society", on the other hand, essentially refers to the sum of social relations which divide the population into Social classes which in turn are stratified into "Social Groups or Strata" with specific interests.*

## 22 Society, State & Education

Education in India give exhaustive empirical descriptions of what happened during the Colonial period and what has been done since 'Independence'. These empirical descriptions, however, are not based on a sound theory having explanatory adequacy. Therefore, it is necessary, while relying on the available empirical evidence, to explain how "Politics" in a "Society" influence the shaping of a policy relating to language education. Such an explanatory study requires us to start with certain theoretical premises.

### 2. Theoretical Premises:

Based on certain earlier studies (The Author 1993a, 1993b and 1993c), we offer the following theoretical premises as points of reference and departure for our study.

- i) The structure of human society consists, metaphorically speaking, a 'Base' and a corresponding 'Superstructure'. Base is the totality of social relations of production into which individuals enter through their direct/indirect participation or non-participation in the production of social existence. The structure of these relations constitutes the structure of the different social classes (and groups within those classes).
- ii) Corresponding to the structure of production relations, i.e., Base, there arises a "Superstructure" which articulates the interests and struggles of Social classes (and their groups) in various spheres of life, viz., political, literary, legal, artistic, philosophical, linguistic, etc.
- iii) Individuals are embodiments of particular social class relations and class interests.
- iv) Inside each class [groups included] one part appears as its political, literary or Ideological representatives.
- v) The 'State' is the institutional form in which the individuals of a ruling class assert their common class interests.
- vi) The State, as a rule, is an instrument in the hands of an economically dominant class, which, by means of the State, becomes also the politically dominant class.
- vii) The State, at certain times, acts as a mediator when classes (and their groups) balance each other in their conflicts.
- viii) The State, by and large, functions as a committee that manages the common affairs of the Ruling classes.

With the help of these theoretical premises we may now move on to the available empirical evidence: both past and present.

### 3. Language Education in the Colonial Period:

The British Colonialists took various measures - legally and otherwise - to exploit economically, oppress politically and dominate culturally the then native Indian population. By the time the British Colonialists established their hegemony over India by defeating their opponents - both native and foreign (eg. the French and the Dutch) - that is at the end of 18th century, Education in general and Language Education in particular were revolving around the then prestigious languages: Sanskrit, Persian and Arabic<sup>2</sup>.

Mughal rule of more than two centuries established Persian as the official language. Owing to the numerical strength of the native Hindu population, the Mughal rulers let Sanskrit to exist as traditionally prestigious language of scholarship along with Persian and Arabic. However, the upper social strata of the Hindu population began to pursue Persian education in order to join the ranks of the Mughal administration: civil and military. The British however did not prefer to resort to offensive acts of linguistic colonialism in the early phase of their rule.

Thus, they encouraged the establishment of a Madarassa at Calcutta (where Persian and Arabic are taught) in 1781 and a Sanskrit College at Benaras in 1792. Further they made a provision, in the Act of 1813 passed by the East India Company, of one lakh rupees to encourage language education through Sanskrit, Persian and Arabic. The political strategy behind such a move was to pacify the native traditional scholars who were exercising intellectual hegemony owing to their mastery of the then socially prestigious languages, viz., Sanskrit, Persian and Arabic. However, this policy of appeasement was shortlived. In 1835, William Bentinck, the then

---

2. *An individual attempt, as ours, which suffers from the limitations of resources: material and non-material, will invariably have to rely on secondary sources. These secondary sources vary in the nature, extent and interpretation of the historical data they present. We relied upon the following sources without necessarily subscribing to their interpretations: OLC, 1956; Apte, 1973; Flynn & Flynn, 1973; Spencer, 1974; Pillai, 1981; Khubchandani, 1981; and Sridhar, 1989. To these we may add Ramachandrarao et al 1988 as an exception. We subscribe to the views expressed in this paper since it was written by the present author jointly with two others.*

## 24 *Society, State & Education*

Governor General passed an official resolution that thenceforth all the state funds relating to education would be spent on English education. The English education, according to the Colonialists, was not simply teaching English language but all European knowledge relating to Arts, Science, Philosophy and so on through preferably English language. Bentinck's resolution was inspired by 'Lord' Macaulay's categorical articulation of the political interests of the British Colonialism which aimed at the creation of "a class of persons Indian in blood and colour, but English in tastes, in opinions, in morals and in intellect". Thus, the colonialist policy of education in general and language in particular was intended to create a class of compradore intellectuals. In other words "Colonial education was not designed to prepare young people for the service of their own country, instead it was motivated by a desire to inculcate the values of the colonial society and to train individuals for the service of the colonial state" (Nyerere as cited in Spencer, 1974:164).

In response to Bentinck's resolution, the former Hindu officials, clerks, and the like had quickly switched over from Persian to English language education while Muslims continued to pursue Persian education for some more time. The Indian traders, however, on the whole, saw advantages in learning English. In 1844, 'Lord' Hardinge proclaimed the British rulers' preference for English educated in Government recruitment. Bentinck's resolution, followed by proclamations such as of Hardinge, encouraged the spreading of English medium schools and colleges teaching western education. However, certain other colonialist administrators and intellectuals (e.g. 'Sir' Charles Wood and other so-called "orientalists") realized the importance of native Indian languages as better means to spread European knowledge. They thought that the majority of the native population understands only native languages and not English and hence the indigenous languages are the better vehicles than English. Despite such realization of the importance of native languages, the main trend was toward the establishment of linguistic hegemony of English. In 1857, for example, the British Colonialists established the Universities of Bombay, Calcutta and Madras with English as sole medium of instruction. Similarly, Indians of upper social strata began to compete for entry into Indian Civil Service Examinations which were started in 1860. There were occasional commissions and reports on the use of native languages as media of instruction. In 1872, the report of Sodler Commission emphasised the necessity of acquir-

ing "fluent" and "correct" knowledge of Mother Tongues by the natives. Subsequently in 1882, the Hunter's Commission recommended the use of "vernaculars" in primary education. Further in 1902, the Education Commission recommended Mother tongues as media of instruction up to higher secondary level.

Around this period the Indian National Congress which was formed in 1885 by mostly westernized Hindus from the cities demanded, amongst other things, opportunities for natives to join Government jobs. This demand, when achieved, implies on the part of native Indians preference for English language education over their mother tongues. Thus, English dominated the Indian linguistic scene as language of administration for over 150 years during the British rule. The status of a language as language of administration (e.g. English) necessarily implies and assures a predominant place in the field of education too.

#### **4. 1924 Congress Proposals on Language Use :**

The political movement directed against the British Colonial rule was heterogenous and as such it articulated varied economic, political and cultural (including linguistic) interests of different social classes and strata that led or participated in the movement.

The then social classes fall broadly into two categories: the prospective Indian Ruling Classes and the Working Classes. The former included Industrialists, Landlords, Plantation-owners, Mine-owners, Traders, Bankers and such other socially - i.e., economically and hence politically and otherwise - dominant social strata together with their political and Ideological representatives. The latter included Industrial workers, Agricultural labourers, Poor and Middle Peasantry, Plantation Labourers, Mining Workers, Commercial workers, Self-employed handicraftsmen, Small Proprietors, the lower and middle level Government employees and such other economically exploited and politically oppressed social strata together with their political and Ideological representatives<sup>3</sup>.

---

3. *It may be cautioned that this categorization of social classes is exceptionally tentative. In the absence of a systematic, concrete and comprehensive social class analysis of India, we are forced to resort to a very broad, tentative and non-rigorous identification of certain empirically observable/verifiable social groups. This categorization, however, does not contradict the Social Class universals proposed elsewhere. For de tails, see the Author (1993 b :Ch.2)*

The Indian National Congress was the main political organization around which different social classes and strata rallied in varying degrees of participation. Though there were different economic aspirations and hence political trends within the Congress Party that led subsequently to the emergence of other political parties, the Congress Party remained as the most 'popular' and 'representative' political party that led the so-called "Freedom Struggle" or 'Nationalist Movement'. In view of this conspicuous fact, it is imperative for us to examine the language proposals of the Congress Party.

The Indian National Congress (hereafter the Congress Party or Congress), through its chief spokesperson M.K. Gandhi, articulated for the first time a language policy to be adopted in the 'future' 'Independent' India. In 1924, at the Belgaum Congress Session, Gandhi proposed that (i) Regional languages would be used by the Provincial governments; (ii) Hindusthani (a harmonious synthesis of Hindi and Urdu) by the Central Government and in the final Court of Appeal; and lastly (iii) English in the domain of International Diplomacy (Satyanarayana, 1977:32). This policy accommodates the political interests of all the relevant sections within the prospective Ruling Classes.

The political basis for the place assigned to Regional Languages in the Congress proposal may be explained as follows: The British division of India into Presidencies such as Bombay, Calcutta and Madras created some dissensions among the dominant social classes belonging to different speech communities. Thus, in Madras Presidency, for example, the literary and political representatives of the dominant social classes of Andhra found themselves in a disadvantageous, if not totally subordinate, position vis-a-vis their Tamil speaking counterparts in the spheres of employment, education and even Congress Politics<sup>4</sup>.

---

4. Prakash (1973:7) notes that it was the *Telugu brahmins* who first felt that they were deprived of certain political and economic benefits in the composite Madras province where they suffered adversely in competition with the *Tamil brahmins*. Such feelings of relative deprivation have not been uncommon in other parts of the country too. Further, these may be found even within the same state or speech community. Thus, Brass (1974:54) identifies "discriminatory allocation of political power and →



Then, the demand for a Telugu speaking state began to express itself through library and literary movements from 1913 onwards. Thus, at 1917 Calcutta Congress, the Andhra Delegates officially raised and discussed the issue of linguistic reorganization of India as well as Congress Provincial Committees. As a result, the Nagpur Congress Session in 1920 drew a resolution in favour of the principle of linguistic reorganization of India. In 1921, the Congress Party set up its Provincial Committees based on language (Prakash, 1973:32-3). This was the Political Sociology underlying the Congress proposal of Regional Languages at provincial level as Official Languages in future India.

The function or status assigned to Hindusthani (Hindu-Urdu) was motivated - consciously, unconsciously or subconsciously - by those sections of the Ruling Classes whose economic and hence political interests were spread over across the geographical regions in which all speech communities live. In other words, a unified country-wide market and a centralised political power require a common language to interact with different speech communities which meet in various social domains - viz. Central Administration, Central Legislature, Central Judiciary, National Trading Centres, Intellectual Exchange at National Level and so on.

The selection of Hindusthani as a Central Official Language was due to couple of political factors. The primary factor was that the dominant social groups within the prospective Ruling Classes of India together with their political and literary representatives in the Nationalist Movement either hailed from or operated in the "Hindi Heartland" (the now Bihar, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh) and its adjacent Indo-Aryan speech areas where a sort of admixture of Hindi-Urdu was used for about three centuries of Mughal rule.<sup>5</sup>

---

→ *economic resources among the regions" of Bihar as one of the "objective bases" for the separate Mithila demand. We, furthermore, have examples of separate Telangana and separate Vidarbha.*

5. *The Ruling classes in general or a dominant class (e.g. class of Capitalists) in particular opt a language as a central/official/link language whether or not that language is their Mother Tongue. What matters is the extent/degree to which a language serves their economic and political goals. Thus, Gandhi, though a Gujarati by virtue of his speech community but a spokesperson of the prospective Ruling Classes by virtue* →

## 28 Society, State & Education

The other, secondary, factor was that the Leaders of the Nationalist Movement, in order to arouse the Nationalist sentiments of the people against the British rulers for the transfer of power into their hands, chose Hindusthani, a Native or National Language and not English, a 'foreign' language.

The inclusion of English, as a language of international diplomacy in Congress proposal may be attributed to the International economic interests of the Industrialists, Traders, Mine-owners, Plantation-owners and such other sections of the Ruling Classes. The fact that Britain occupied the most dominant role in the international economy and politics, owing to its vast colonial empire, prompted Congress to select English as the language of International Diplomacy. Further, most, if not all, of the leaders of Nationalist Movement received their higher education either in Britain or British India through English language. These leaders were already using English language in their political negotiations with the British rulers.

These proposals of Congress concerning language use, we may conclude, implied that the language education in the future 'Independent' India would include instruction of all these three languages.

### 5. Constitutional Provisions and Language education:

As a result of British Cabinet Mission's discussions with Indian Nationalist leaders in February 1946, the elections to the Constituent Assembly were held in July, 1946. However, the Constituent Assembly was elected not on the basis of adult franchise but by the provincial legislatures on the basis of communal electorate which consisted about 20 to 24% of the then Indian adult population which did not include the working classes. Further, of the total 292 members, 93 were representatives of the princely states. Thus, the Constituent Assembly was undemocratic in the sense that it represented a minority of the population and a quarter of its members were "not even elected but claimed their seats by feudal right" (Bettelheim, 1977:106).

---

→ of his politics, long ago in 1917 proposed Hindusthani as a Link language in his Presidential Address to the Second Gujarat Educational Conference (Dwivedi 1981:9)

The Congress, which won the majority in a Constituent Assembly elected indirectly by minority of the population, formed the Interim Government headed by Nehru in September 1946. The Constituent Assembly appointed a Committee under the Chairmanship of Ambedkar to draft the Constitution, and the Committee started its work in December 1946 and completed the draft by the end of November 1949<sup>6</sup>.

The Constitution of India was later approved by the above explained undemocratically elected Constituent Assembly and came into force on 26 January 1950.

For the purpose of our study we are interested not in the undemocratic nature of the Constitution as a whole but of the relevant part XVII that deals with language question.

Generally speaking, the 1924 Congress proposals relating to the use of languages had found official expression in the constitution. The Regional languages or mother tongues, for example, retained their position as languages to be used in Administration and Education at the provincial or state level. Articles 245, 347, 350, 350A and 350B highlighted the importance of the regional languages. However, this importance is secondary when compared with that of Hindi as official language at the National level<sup>7</sup>.

The Constitution assigned to Hindi the status of official language of the union vide Article 343. Further, the Constitution, vide Article 344, made a provision for the appointment of a Language Commission after five years (i.e. around 1955) to make recommendations as to how Hindi should progressively be used for the official purposes of the Union by restricting the use of English. Furthermore the Constitution directed the Union Government to promote the spread of Hindi vide Article 351.

The Constitutional provisions relating to the status of the languages - i.e. Regional languages at the state level and Hindi at the National Level make it abundantly clear that instruction of these Languages constitutes

6. *Hardgrave, a Political Sociologist (as cited in Flynn & Flynn 1973) observed that 250 out of 395 articles in the Constitution were taken verbatim or with minor changes from the 1935 Government Act of India Promulgated by the British.*

7 *The word "Huindusthani" was replaced by "Hindi" on the ground that it was associated with a "non-Indian" (Arabic) alphabet.*

### 30 Society, State & Education

Language Education and this Language Education is aimed at the realization of the economic and political goals of the Ruling Classes both at the regional as well as National level as explained above (in Section 4).

Our discussion of the constitutional provisions relating to Language Education will be incomplete if we do not touch upon those clauses (and sub-clauses) which refer to the place/status of English assigned under Articles 343, 345 and 348.

It is interesting to note that though Clause 1 under Article 343 proclaims Hindi as the Official Language of the Union, Clause 2 states that "notwithstanding anything in clause (1), for a period of fifteen years from the commencement of the constitution, the *English* language shall continue to be used for *all official purposes* of the Union for which it was being used immediately before such commencement" (emphasis added). Further more, Clause 3 provides for the use of English even after the said period of fifteen years. It is still more interesting to note that Article 345, which assigns the status of Official Languages to the Regional Languages, in the same breath also provides for the continuous use of English "for those official purposes *within the state* for it was being used immediately before the commencement of this Constitution" (emphasis added). Thus English enjoys, more or less, equal Constitutional status as that of Hindi and the Regional Languages. In addition to this status of Co-official language of both the states and the Union, English is made as the language of Supreme Court and High Courts under Article 348. The three Articles 343, 345 and 348 raise in us the question as to how and why English, which occupied the third place in 1924 Congress proposal, is able to occupy the first and second places simultaneously. The answer to this question is two - fold.

The first and foremost component of the answer is that the persons/personnel who were running the 'State' (including Legislature, Executive, Judiciary, Military and the police) before and during the transfer of power were English - educated. The members of: the Constituent Assembly (the M.Ps), the Executive (Ministers as well as the Secretaries of the Ministries), Judiciary (Judges and Lawyers), and Military (Generals and other Commanding Officers), - many of them, if not all, received their higher education through English and English "was being used immediately before the commencement of the constitution". In other words English was instrumental in the creation of administrative personnel and Intelligentsia under the British. Further, the modern forms of administration, Judiciary

and Education dictate the necessity of English educated natives to manage the common affairs of the Ruling Classes.

The second component of the answer is that there has been strong resistance to Hindi from certain sections of the Ruling classes who were operating at the regional level and who were unable to compete at the national level in the spheres of economy and politics<sup>8</sup>.

Finally, it may be noted that the place assigned to English met with equally stubborn resistance from the advocates of Hindi<sup>9</sup>.

However, the new state functionaries like Nehru, Patel, Azad and others acted as ostensible mediators between the warring claims. Moreover, the advocates of Hindi withdrew from their linguistic war, as it appears, in view of the provision, vide Article 344, that a Commission would be formed in respect of implementing Hindi as the official language of the Union by restricting the use of English gradually.

#### **6. From Official Language Commission (1956) to Education Commission (1966):**

In pursuance of the provision made vide Article 344, a Commission named Official Language Commission (hereafter OLC) was formed in 1956 consisting of Scholars, Educationalists and State functionaries. The first and foremost term of reference of the OLC is to recommend steps to facilitate the progressive use of Hindi for the official purposes of the Union. The OLC did not include, in its terms of reference, basic issues such as the media of instruction in the educational system and the development of regional languages equally and harmoniously with the development of Hindi. The questionnaire issued by the OLC did not care to know the language-related feelings and opinions of the Non-Hindi people. The

---

8. *We will discuss this aspect in detail in the following section. In the meantime, it may be mentioned that the Congress Ministry under the leadership of C. Rajagopalachary introduced Hindi as a Compulsory subject in the Madras presidency in 1937. In the wake of a serious agitation, the Congress Government made Hindi as an optional subject in Schools. (Hardgrave, 1979:26-7).*

9. *Seth Govind Das, Purushotham Das Tandon, Dr. Raghuvira and other members from the "Hindi-hearland" vehemently argued against equating*

### 32 *Society, State & Education*

OLC started with a false assumption that all the non-Hindi speakers voluntarily accepted Hindi and were ready to give their opinions as to "what steps would be necessary to facilitate the progressive use of the Hindi and to put restrictions on the use of English language (i) for all or any official purposes of the union, (ii) for communication between one state and another state and between a state and the union and (iii) all or any official purposes of the state". An analysis of the 1957 Report of the OLC reveals that the dominant section of the Indian Ruling Classes which favour Hindi as its official language wanted to get its language policy ratified by a legitimate commission consisting of well known scholars and educationalists.

However it was not a smooth sailing. For example, S.K. Chatterjee, an eminent Professor of Indian Linguistics and P. Subbarayan, another Non-Hindi Speaking member of the Commission submitted their dissent notes separately. They criticised that the Report was prepared on the false assumption that "Hindi has been already voluntarily accepted by the whole of India and that non- Hindi people are as much eager to its use in most spheres of All- India affairs as speakers of Hindi" (OLC:276 & 317). The dissenting notes of the Minority characterized the attitude of the majority report as "far from democratic".

The OLC was both preceded and followed by several other non- Constitutional and non-mandatory Conferences, Councils and Commissions that made recommendations relating to Language Education. Thus, in 1948, the conference of the Vice-Chancellors of Universities recommended the replacement of English by Indian Languages as medium of instruction at the University level within five years. In the same year the Conference of the Education Ministers of the states suggested that Mother Tongues be introduced as media of instruction in primary and secondary schools. In 1949, the University Education Commission recommended three languages: the Regional language, the general or link language Hindi and English. Secondary Education Commission of 1953 generously advised to teach not three but five languages: i) the Mother Tongue, ii) the Regional Language, iii) & iv) two federal languages viz. Hindi and English, v) classical language optionally: Sanskrit, Pali, Prakrit, Persian or Arabic. In 1956, the Council for Secondary Education recommended, in addition to Mother Tongue and English, Hindi and any other Indian language for Non- Hindi students and Hindi-students respectively. This policy was endorsed by the Central Advisory Board of Education in 1957. The 1961

Conference of Chief Ministers called this policy of Language Education as Three Language Formula (hereafter TLF). Finally the Education Commission of 1964-66 formulated the TLF in its 1966 Report as follows: 1) The Mother Tongue or the Regional Language; 2) The Official Language of the Union (i.e. Hindi) or the Associate Official Language of the Union (i.e. English) as long as it exists; 3) A modern Indian or Foreign language not covered under (1) and (2) and other than that used as medium of instruction. (EC Report 1966:192).

The Three Language Formula strikingly reveals the fact that there has been no change in the balance of power between the warring sections within the Ruling Classes in respect of Language Policy except that clause 3 of Article 343 resulted in favour of the advocates of the continuation of English for an unspecified time. The section favouring Hindi as the Official Language is satisfied with the first mentioning of Hindi as the official language of the Union while the section favouring English is contented with retention of English as an *Associate Official Language*, not simply for fifteen years, but, *as long as it exists*.<sup>10</sup> This kind of "pragmatic discretion" exhibited by the Union of India - i.e., the State (chiefly its Legislature, Executive and Judiciary) prompts us to study the objective basis of the Anti-Hindi Movement<sup>11</sup>.

### 7. The Objective basis of Anti-Hindi Movement:

Though the first phase of Anti-Hindi movement began in 1937 when the Congress Ministry under the Chief Ministership of C. Rajagopalachary introduced Hindi as a Compulsory subject in the schools of South India, we

---

10. *The advocates of Hindi were already anyway happy with the newly established Hindi-promoting agencies such as: Central Hindi Directorate, Commission for Scientific and Technical Terminology and Hindi Division in the Central Secretariat. All these agencies were provided with abundant and attractive funds and incentives. Das Gupta (1973) notes that since 1960s public expenditure on Hindi increased and the main beneficiaries of the financial and intellectual gains were Hindi Language Associations and Hindi-speaking Intelligentsia.*

11 *It is again Das Gupta (1973:205) who uses this expression. This feature of "Pragmatic Discretion", according to us, is characteristic of any State which sometimes plays the role of a mediator between warring sections in a Ruling class.*

### 34 *Society, State & Education*

may have to go still further back into the history. In this context, Robert Hardgrave's "Essays in the Political Sociology of South India" (1979) will be of immense empirical value.

Basing ourselves on the theoretical premises mentioned above (in Section 2), we argue that the contradictions that existed between various social strata of the Indian Ruling Classes led to a movement which may be called Dravidian or South Indian Movement.

In the context of unequal distribution of economic resources and political power that existed in the Madras Presidency between the Brahmin and Non-Brahmin sections of the Ruling Classes, an Organisation called "South Indian Liberal Federation" was founded by Non-Brahmin Industrialists (eg. P. Theagaroya Chetty) and their political representatives (eg. Dr. T.M. Nair) in 1917. The movement was intended to check the domination of the Brahmin Power Elite which was wielding power in the domains of economy, politics, education and employment. Around 1920, E.V. Ramaswamy Naicker came out of the Congress Party opposing the domination of Brahmin leadership in respect of issues like 'opening of temples to Harijans' and joined the South Indian Movement.

Gradually, the South Indian Movement (hereafter SIM) equated Brahmins with Indo-Aryans and finally 'the North'. Later, the Congress Party was looked upon as an instrument of Northern and Brahmin domination. The SIM began to organise agitations against various forms of Northern and Brahmin domination. Introduction of Hindi as a compulsory subject in 1937 in South Indian was perceived as an act of Northern assault. The SIM further conducted Anti-Hindi agitations in 1952-53. In 1955, President Rajendra Prasad had to clarify that there would be no question of "imposing" Hindi on any one. He declared pragmatically that "Sheer Practical necessities may drive us to an All-Indian Language, but it cannot be forced" (Hardgrave 1979:46).

The real motive force behind Anti-Hindi and Anti-North movement in 1957 became very clear when the political representatives of the SIM (e.g. DMK) expressed their fears that the 'Northern Brahmin-Baniya' combine was dominating the business and Industry in Madras. Though the industrial and commercial houses were owned by the South Indians, the South Indian firms had to depend largely on the North Indian bankers. The political representatives came out with facts and figures revealing the financial domination of the Hindi-speaking Northerners. (Hardgrave, 1979:51-53).



The SIM was launched, led and supported by the powerful Non- Brahmin South Indian Industrialists (e.g. Naidus, Chettiars).

The above economic and political circumstances led to corresponding language policy formulations. Thus, at its 1956 Trichy Conference, the D.M.K. a political party of South Indian Movement declared its language policy as item 7 in its election manifesto: "The medium of instruction at all stages must be in the students' Mother Tongue. The fanaticism with which Hindi is being imposed upon the South is to be deplored. English, being an International language, should be given due encouragement and should be treated on a par with the Mother tongue to facilitate the spread of the technological and scientific knowledge. To concede Hindi in our State would be dangerous" (cited in Hardgrave, 1979:54)

This Anti-Hindi politics was met with a "pragmatic discretion" of the Indian State when in 1959 Nehru assured the Non- Hindi people that there would be "no imposition" of Hindi and English would continue for "an indefinite period" as long as the Non-Hindi people want it. Despite such assurances, the Non-Hindi students especially those from the South feared about their future if Hindi is made as official language because most coveted jobs are in the central government service (Hardgrave, 1979:81). Therefore, they organised Anti-Hindi conferences just few days before Hindi would become the official language in pursuance of Article 343 (i.e. by 26.1.1965). Ironically, Rajagopalachari, who introduced Hindi as compulsory subject in 1937, presided over a conference at Tiruchirapally and considered making Hindi as official language "unwise, unjust and discriminatory tyranny" (Hardgrave, 1979:81).

Whatever be the actual motives behind the Anti-Hindi movement, it succeeded in retaining English "as long as it exists".

### **8. Toward a Democratic and a Sociolinguistically oriented Language Education:**

As there is no dispute between Pro-Hindi and Anti-Hindi advocates on the question of introducing Regional languages/Mother tongues as medium of instruction at all levels, let us confine ourself to the question of the union 'official' language: Hindi or English<sup>12</sup>.

*12. It may, however, be observed that the State Governments which use Regional Languages as their respective official languages, do not endeavour to provide education through Mother Tongues to the Linguistic minorities, who mainly consist of 'tribal' people.*

### 36 *Society, State & Education*

The first prerequisite we propose is total literacy to all the citizens. This requires total and radical restructuring or redistribution of economic resources and political power. Once this is achieved the role of Linguistics/Sociolinguistics becomes meaningful. Sociolinguistics will be assigned with the task of conducting three kinds of surveys: i) Language Choice Survey ii) Language Use Survey and iii) Language Competence Survey. Based on the actual use, competence and choice of languages in multi-lingual contexts in various domains, viz. Central Legislature, Central Executive/Administration, Central Judiciary, Intellectual Exchange at the National Level, so on and so forth, we will be able to come out with one or more languages as official or link language. The Language or languages so arrived at may be English, Hindi or something else. But, the process that leads us to such a conclusion is very important because it involves democratic and sociolinguistic orientation toward the problem of a 'link' language<sup>13</sup>.

---

13. *The three kinds of surveys suggested here are taken from Ramachandrarao et al (1988). As mentioned in one of the foot notes above, it is a joint paper. Hence, reproduction of certain views from that paper.*

# Imperialism, Linguistics and Language Education \*

**ABSTRACT :** *This Paper makes an attempt to draw our attention to the Socio-historical context in which Linguistics in general and Language Education in particular are pursued. It clarifies concepts of 'Imperialism', 'Linguistics' and 'Language Education' and then proceed to formulate few theoretical assumptions to provide a direction for the study of the interrelationship between "Imperialism, Linguistics and Language Education". The paper also provides some historical instances involving "Imperialism, Linguistics and Language Education". Finally, it tentatively suggests an Anti-Imperialist programme for Linguists and (Language-) teachers.*

## 1. Introduction:

There is no dearth of studies which are devoted exclusively to 'Language Education' in general and 'contribution/relation of Linguistics to Language Education' in particular. This is evident from the bibliographies that are appended to numerous books in the area of 'Applied Linguistics'. The less conspicuous, if not totally absent, aspect of Language Education is the study of social context and the history which produced that context in which 'Linguistics' in general and 'Language Education' in particular exist. This paper makes an attempt to draw our attention to the socio-historical context in which Language Education is pursued.

## 2. Some Basic Concepts:

Before we proceed to reconstruct the socio-historical context of 'Language Education', it is necessary to clarify certain basic concepts in order to clear the ground for our study. The term "Imperialism", for example, has both general and specialized meanings attributed by laypersons and specialists respectively. Therefore in order to situate the problem of study in

---

\* *An earlier version of this paper was presented on 12-8-1993 at the UGC-Refresher Course on "Linguistics and Language Education" held at Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages (CIEFL), Hyderabad-500 007.*

## *38 Society, State & Education*

its proper conceptual framework/matrix, we present some basic ideas and brief descriptions that are relevant for our study.

*2.1 Imperialism:* A semi-lay and semi-scholarly perception defines Imperialism as "the policy of extending the rule or authority of an empire or nation over foreign countries, or of acquiring and holding colonies and dependencies" (The Random House Dictionary of English Language). Definitions as this, however, are not adequate to be taken seriously because they do not perceive the social essence of the phenomenon. For example, economic exploitation, political oppression, military coercion and such other forms of domination are the essential features of Imperialism and many definitions of Imperialism do not cover these aspects of the phenomenon.

Imperialism (including Colonialism and Neo-Colonialism) may be described more adequately as follows: Imperialism is a social system in which one country is able to invade, occupy or bring under its direct or indirect control-economically, politically and in other ways - other countries or territories of other countries. The country which resorts to such acts is an 'Imperialist' or 'Colonialist' or 'Neo-Colonialist' Country while its victims are 'Exploited' countries, 'Colonies', 'Neo-Colonies', or 'Dependencies'.

Imperialism has been in existence in various forms since the days of slavery and feudalism too. Thus, the history of human society witnessed innumerable invasions, occupations, wars, bloodshed, assaults on women, plunder (of precious metals - Gold, Silver and other valuable goods), forced-acquisition of colonies, extracting tribute and many other forms of oppression. These traits, with necessary variations, have been retained also by the new, capitalist form of Imperialism.

An Imperialist country exploits and oppresses its Colonies, Neo-colonies, or Dependencies in several ways. It is able to sell a considerable part of its commodities at high prices in its Colonies, Neo-Colonies or Dependencies without 'Competition' from other Imperialist Countries. It is able to purchase at cheaper rate raw materials necessary for its Industries from its Colonies, Neo-Colonies or Dependencies and extracts exorbitant rate of interest. It exports 'Capital' to its Colonies, Neo-Colonies or Dependencies by establishing its own or Collaborative Companies that engage in Production, Commerce and Banking activities and earns huge profits. In addition to economic exploitation, it wields direct or indirect political power over its Colonies, Neo- Colonies or Dependencies. In the event of

war-actual or possible - with other Capitalist - Imperialist countries, it uses its Colonies, Neo-Colonies or Dependencies as Military Bases<sup>1</sup>.

Finally, an Imperialist Country exercises 'Linguistic Domination' by imposing or assigning a prestigious status/role to its language on the one hand and suppressing or discouraging the languages of the Colonies, Neo-Colonies or Dependencies on the other.

*2.2 Linguistics:* Linguistics is most commonly understood as "the science of language, including phonetics, phonology, morphology, and syntax and often divided into historical linguistics and descriptive linguistics" (The Random House Dictionary of English Language). What is *not* overtly perceived or categorically acknowledged is the fact that Linguistics is a branch of knowledge which is pursued consciously or unconsciously by its practitioners in accordance with the social goals of the classes/strata in a given society. It is therefore necessary to understand Linguistics as a scientific study of languages pursued by scholars in order to realize the social - i.e. economic, political, cultural - goals of the social classes in the sphere of language. It is not an idealistic, neutral and exclusive scholarly activity devoid of any social meaning. It is subject to the social - i.e., economic, political, cultural - interests of the social classes/strata in a given country.

*2.3 Language Education:* Education in general and Language Education in particular are the means of social control and serve as instruments for disseminating the culture (i.e., ideological reflection of economy and politics of a given society) of the ruling/ruled classes.

Language Education is by no means teaching/ learning one or more languages per se but also imparting/receiving any kind of education through one or more languages in a particular socio- cultural context<sup>2</sup>. Such a Language Education involve languages either imposed on or

- 
1. *An outline description of Imperialism given here is based on Ranganayakamma (1993:Ch.5). For an elaborate discussion in English, see Lenin (1916:185-360); and Brown (1974).*
  2. *Here we may recall Halliday's definition to support our understanding of Language Education. Halliday (1977:103) defines: "By the term language education, I understand not simply the teaching of languages but ... "such areas as teacher training, curriculum and syllabus construction, instructional language of the class room, and the sociocultural aspects of language teaching (emphasis added).*

#### 40 *Society, State & Education*

adopted (due to need-filling motive or prestige motive) by the Speech Community or Communities in question.

### **3. Theoretical Assumptions concerning Imperialism, Linguistics and Language Education:**

To provide a direction for our study of the interrelationship between "Imperialism, Linguistics and Language Education", we need to formulate certain theoretical assumptions. Such assumptions clarify the problem under study. They sketch the lines of data needed. Based on the already existing body of relevant literature and on the conceptions which we consider to be scientific, we may offer the following theoretical assumptions<sup>3</sup>.

1) The essence of Imperialism is not only economic exploitation, political oppression, military coercion and cultural domination but also linguistic imposition.

2) Imperialism pursues the policy of spreading its own language as a means of social - i.e., economic, political, etc - control. Where Imperialism tolerated the use of indigenous languages, it established hierarchical relationship among languages. Imperialism sees Education in general and Language Education in particular as the main instruments for disseminating its culture. Ideas of Imperialism about 'which languages are suitable for teaching' reflect beliefs about its own cultural and/or racial superiority.

3) Like all other disciplines, Linguistics too has been utilized as an Intellectual tool by Imperialism to realise its goals in the sphere of language. Various branches and sub-branches of linguistics came into existence in response to the language needs of Imperialism.

### **4. Some historical instances involving Imperialism, Linguistics and Language Education:**

*4.1 Imperialism in Africa, Asia and Latin America:* European countries which experienced Industrial Revolution anxiously searched and found fascinating, new, markets for their surplus commodities in Africa, Asia and

---

3. *We have benefited from the following (with or without subscribing to their views) while formulating the assumptions: Lenin (1916), Hertzler (1965), Malmberg (1969), Dittmar (1974), Edwards (1985), Newmeyer (1986), Cooper (1989), Piatt (1990), Romaine (1992) and Ranganayakamma (1993).*

the Latin America where Industrial Revolution did not take place. Portugal, Spain, Holland (The Netherlands), Britain and France were the early Imperialist countries which established vast colonial Empires during the period from the sixteenth to eighteenth century. Each of these Imperialist countries desperately attempted to oust the other through competition and war. By the end of the eighteenth century, only Britain and France continued to be powerful and extend their Empires while Imperialist countries such as Spain and Portugal declined. However, the new Imperialist countries, for example: Germany, Italy, Belgium, USA and later Japan emerged on the scene. By the middle of twentieth century, when majority of the colonies were given formal political independence, USA, UK, France, Germany and Japan constituted major Imperialist Powers.

The present 'Nations' of the world which hitherto were subjected to Imperialism belong to three continents: Africa, Asia and Latin America (including Southern, Northern & Central Parts of the Americas). To cite few examples, Portuguese Colonialists began to take African Blacks as slaves to America since fifteenth century. Red Indians and Eskimos of North America; and, Mayas and Aztecs of Old Mexico were exterminated in large numbers by the Spanish, Portuguese, English and other Colonialists in the sixteenth century. Most of the Australian aboriginal tribes were exterminated by the British Colonialists by the end of seventeenth century. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the Dutch, the Portuguese, the French, and the English Colonialists established their rule over several parts of Asia and Africa. The only major exception of an European country that has been subjected to Imperialist rule is Ireland. England invaded Ireland several times and finally conquered it in the middle of the seventeenth century by suppressing the Irish people and their language. Some Irish rebels were captured and even sold as slaves in America<sup>4</sup>.

---

4. *This brief historical account is based on not one but several books on World History. Any 'popular' or 'standard' text-book of World History will refer to the 'facts' mentioned here. The interpretations, however, may vary.*

## 42 Society, State & Education

4.2 *Imperialism and Language Education:* Consider the following table.

---

Ex-Colonies/Neo-Colonies/Dependencies	Principal Imperialist Powers	Official languages of the Imperialist Powers which still occupy the position of the Official/Unofficial, Principal/Auxilliary or Socially prestigious languages of the Ex-Colonies/Neo-Colonies/Dependencies.
---------------------------------------	------------------------------	---

---

### **A F R I C A :**

1) Algeria	France	French
2) Angola	Portugal	Portuguese
3) Benin	France	French
4) Botswana	U.K.	English
5) Burundi	France	French
6) Cameroun	U.K., France	English, French
7) Cape Verde Islands	Portugal	Portuguese
8) Central African Republic	France	French
9) Chad	France	French
10) Comoro Islands	France	French
11) Congo	France	French
12) Djibouti	France	French
13) Egypt	U.K.	English
14) Equatorial Guinea	Spain	Spanish
15) Ethiopia	U.K., Italy	English, Italian
16) Gabon	France	French
17) Ghana	U.K.	English
18) Guinea	France	French
19) Guinea Bissau	Portugal	Portuguese
20) Ivory Coast	France	French
21) Kenya	U.K.	English



22) Lesotho	U.K.	English
23) Liberia	U.S.A.	English
24) Libia	Italy, U.K.	Italian, English
25) Madagascar	France	French
26) Malawi	U.K.	English
27) Mali	France	French
28) Mauritania	France	French
29) Mauritius	U.K.	English
30) Morocco	France	French
31) Mozambique	Portugal	Portuguese
32) Namibia	U.K.	English
(South West Africa)		
33) Niger	France, U.K.	French, English
34) Nigeria	U.K.	English
35) Rwanda	France, Germany	French, German
36) Sao Tome		Portuguese
E-Principe	Portugal	
37) Senegal	France	French
38) Seychelles	U.K.	English
39) Sierra Leone	U.K.	English
40) Somalia	U.K., Italy	English, Italian
41) South Africa	U.K.	English
42) Sudan	U.K, France	English, French
43) Swaziland	U.K.	English
44) Tanzania	U.K.	English
45) The Gambia	U.K.	English
46) Togo	France, U.K.	French, English
47) Tunisia	France	French
48) Uganda	U.K.	English
49) Upper Volta	France	French
(Burkina Faso)		
50) Zaire	France	French
51) Zambia	U.K.	English
52) Zimbabwe	U.K.	English
<b>A S I A :</b>		
1) Afganisthan	U.K.	English
2) Bahrain	U.K.	English
3) Bangladesh	U.K.	English
4) Bhutan	U.K.	English
5) Brunei	U.K.	English

#### 44 Society, State & Education

6) Burma	U.K.	English
7) China	England, France, Japan, USA.	English
8) India	U.K.	English
9) Indonesia	The Netherlands	Dutch
10) Iran	U.K.	English
11) Iraq	U.K.	English
12) Israel	U.S.A.	English
13) Japan	(Exception)	English
14) Jordan	U.K.	English
15) Kampuchea (Cambodia)	France	French
16) Korea (North)	Japan	English
17) Korea (South)	U.S.A.	English
18) Kuwait	U.K., USA	English
19) Laos	France	French
20) Lebanon	U.S.A.	English
21) Malaysia	U.K.	English
22) Maldives	U.K.	English
23) Mongolia	Imperial China	English
24) Nepal	U.K.	English
25) Oman	U.K.	English
26) Pakistan	U.K.	English
27) Philippines	U.S.A.	English
28) Qatar	U.K.	English
29) Saudi Arabia	U.K., USA.	English
30) Singapore	U.K.	English
31) South Yemen (PDR)	U.K.	English
32) Sri Lanka	U.K.	English
33) Syria	France, U.K.	English
34) Taiwan	U.S.A.	English
35) Thailand	U.S.A.	English
36) U.A.E.	U.S.A., U.K.	English
37) Vietnam	France, U.S.A.	French, English
38) Yemen Republic	U.S.A.	English
<b>NORTH &amp; CENTRAL AMERICA: (EXCLUDING U.S.A.)</b>		
1) Bahamas	U.K.	English
2) Barbados	U.K.	English
3) Belize	U.K.	English
4) Bermuda	U.K.	English

5) Canada	U.K., France	English, French
6) Costa Rica	Spain, USA	Spanish, English
7) Cuba	Spain, USA.	Spanish, English
8) Dominica	U.K.	English
9) Dominican Republic	Spain, USA.	Spanish, English
10) El salvador	Spain, USA.	Spanish, English
11) Grenda	U.S.A.	English
12) Guatemala	Spain, USA.	Spanish, English
13) Haiti	France, USA.	French, English
14) Hondurus	Spain	Spanish
15) Jamaica	Spain, U.K.	Spanish, English
16) Mexico	Spain, USA.	Spanish, English
17) Nicaragua	Spain, USA.	Spanish, English
18) Panama	Spain, U.S.A.	Spanish, English
19) St. Christopher (St. Kitts) & Nevis	U.K.	English
20) St. Lucia	U.K.	English
21) St. Vincent & the Grenadines	U.K.	English
22) Trinidad & Tobágo	U.K.	English
<b>SOUTH AMERICA</b>		
1) Argentina	Spain, USA.	Spanish, English
2) Bolivia	Spain, USA.	Spanish, English
3) Brazil	Portugal, USA.	Portuguese, English
4) Chile	Spain, USA.	Spanish, English
5) Colombia	Spain, USA.	Spanish, English
6) Equador	Spain	Spanish
7) Guyana	U.K.	English
8) Paraguay	Spain	Spanish
9) Peru	Spain, USA.	Spanish, English
10) Suriname	Holland, U.S.A.	Dutch, English
11) Uruguay	Spain	Spanish
12) Venezuela	Spain	Spanish

Table. *Linguistic Imperialism in Africa, Asia and Latin America*<sup>5</sup>

5) *The data have been drawn from the following sources (in addition to the Encyclopaedia Britannica (in 30 Volumes) : Katzner (1975), Edwards (1985), Laponce (1987), and Cooper (1989). However, none of these books gives us a total picture of all the languages of the 'Imperialist Powers' which still occupy socially prestigious position in the Ex-Colonies, Neo-Colonies or Dependencies.*

## 46 *Society, State & Education*

This table tells us that a small number of Imperialist countries -- mainly three or four -- held majority of the countries as their Ex-Colonies, Neo-Colonies or Dependencies. Further, only three languages of the Imperialists - Viz. English, French and Spanish - enjoy the status of the official/unofficial, Principal/Auxiliary and/or socially prestigious languages in the Ex-Colonies, Neo-Colonies or Dependencies. Thus, while the first two columns represent Imperialism in general, the third column represents "Linguistic Imperialism" in particular. The table, on the whole, supports our first and second assumptions relating to the essence of Imperialism and Imperialist policy of language education.

The Imperialists, always, took their language with them and maintained it as long as possible. The languages of the Imperialists have either completely or partially been adopted in all or many domains including 'Education' by all or certain social classes of the former Colonies, Neo-Colonies or Dependencies (Hertzler, 1965:198-200). Each case of the 'Language Imposition' by Imperialists is "an act of Linguistic Imperialism designed at to produce and control a workforce" (Romaine, 1992:54).

Our table, however, does not describe the actual process of 'Linguistic Imperialism'. Yet, we can cite historical examples of such a process. It is also possible to isolate such historical instances within one country. For example, Bill Piatt (1990) in his book "? Only English?: Law and Language Policy in the United States" gives a vivid description of the acts of Linguistic Imperialism of the European Colonialists in America - viz. the English, the Spanish, the French, the Dutch and the German Colonists<sup>6</sup>. As he records, the English Colonialists and succeeding American administrations exterminated the native American Indian Population and their languages. The Colonialists brutally herded the American Indians on to isolated reservations; forced the native Indian children into an English-speaking educational system and environment. The result has been the replacement of native languages with English. In the early seventeenth century Spain established settlements in now Colorado, Arizona and Texas with the politi-

---

6. *We heavily draw this historical evidence from Piatt (1990:4-6) without necessarily subscribing to all his views. He appears to talk more about the rights of Non-English colonialist languages (eg. Spanish, his mother-tongue) of the U.S.A., but not much about those of native American Indian languages*

cal goals of spreading the Spanish Empire and its Language. The French Colonialists founded Quebec in 1608 and brought their language down to Ohio, Mississippi rivers to Louisiana in 1682. The Dutch Colonialists established a New Netherlands Colony along the Hudson River in 1626. The Germans arrived in Pennsylvania in 1683 and constituted one-third of the local population at the beginning of American War of Independence.

Thus the European Colonialists in America exterminated, oppressed and dominated not only the native population but also its native languages. However, the Colonialists maintained solidarity among themselves. For example, the leaders of American War of Independence realised the importance of multilingual communication in spreading the aims of the war through not only English but also through the languages of other Colonialists. Ironically, the Colonialists in America, who brought slaves from West Africa through the nineteenth century, did not allow the African slaves to communicate in their languages "under the fear of fostering rebellion". Further, slaves were denied formal education (Piatt, 1990:12).

The European Colonialists in various parts of different continents resorted to various kinds of Linguistic Imperialism ranging from extermination to suppression depending upon the nature and extent of resistance from the native populations and their languages. On the whole the native populations of the Colonies adopted their conquerors' language either "under duress or because of its utility, prestige and the social rewards connected with its employment" (Hertzler, 1965:198). The adoption of English in its Asian Colonies (including India) is an obvious example.

*4.3 Imperialism and Linguistics:* Imperialism, in order to exercise its linguistic domination over its Colonies/Neo-Colonies/Dependencies, presses Linguistics into its service. Though 'thirst for knowledge' and 'search for truth' may inspire individual scholars to undertake research in Linguistics, the decisive force that gives a general direction to Linguistic research in the modern times has been 'Imperialism'. We may provide considerable number of historical examples. The Imperialist Philosophy of Britain required systematic facts- linguistic, archaeological, ethnographic, sociological, demographic, economic, etc - so as to avoid the type of "disaster of 1857." This Political purpose motivated the British scholars to engage busily in data collection in India during the decade 1860- 1870 (Pandit, 1971:71). George Grierson took thirty years to complete Linguistic Survey in eleven volumes which became pioneering work in Indian

## 48 *Society, State & Education*

Linguistics. The origin and development of Comparative/Historical Linguistics owes largely to the European Colonial expansion. For eg, the "discovery" of Sanskrit, as rightly observed by Newmeyer (1986:20), was a by-product of the conquest of India.

Founding of the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) in 1917 by British Colonialists was aimed at, as King George V himself declared, to provide a place where British Civil and Military Officers may learn the languages and literatures of their Colonies in Asia and Africa (Newmeyer, 1986:57-8).

Similarly, the American Imperialism as well as the British Imperialism gave "sudden birth" to Applied Linguistics during and shortly after World War II. The Applied Linguistics fulfilled the need for practical acquaintance with foreign languages of those countries which were "liberated"/"occupied" and which were to be administered by "big" powers like U.S.A. and its allies (Malmberg, 1969:4). Thus, in 1947, Rockefeller Foundation, an Academic Imperialist organisation established by a giant oil manufacturing corporation, allocated one lakh dollars to the "American Council for Learned Societies (ACLS) to conduct an "Intensive Language Programme" (ILP) under the directorship of the then Secretary - Treasurer of Linguistics Society of America (LSA). As per Newmeyer's (1986:52-53) account, by the summer of 1943, about 56 courses in 26 languages at 18 Universities were conducted for about 700 students. The ILP, however, was terminated at the end of the war. The Linguistics products of ILP included pocket Language Guides in 56 languages and complete Self-teaching language courses in 30 languages. The same period witnessed the founding of Journals like "Studies in Linguistics" and "Word". Further, the Foreign Service Institute (FSI), of the State Department of the U.S.A., started a Language Training Programme in 1947. The FSI became sponsoring centre for research in Linguistics. An American official went to the extent of characterizing "Competence in Languages and Linguistics as the big guns of American armament in the Ideological World War III" (Newmeyer, 1986:55)

Another interesting aspect of the support to Linguistics to achieve Imperialist goals of the USA is the National Defence Education Act of 1958 (NDEA). The NDEA's major thrust areas include Linguistics and Language Education. Certain of the provisions of this Act assured finan-

cial support to Linguistics graduate students and Language teachers' institutes for language study and language research.

A striking example is that the American Imperialism gave away a grant of 6 lakhs 50 thousand dollars for the study of the Ural- Altaic languages of Soviet Union, the then political rival of America for World hegemony. Nearer home, we have the example of Central Institute of English (CIE) which was established in 1958 at Hyderabad "to provide for the study of English language and literature, to organise research in the teaching of the subject and to train teachers". (CIE Souvenir, 1970:2). Though this institute was legally under the control of Government of India, it received huge funds from the British Council (an agency of British Imperialism) and the Ford Foundation (another Imperialist academic organisation founded by a giant automobile manufacturing Corporation of America). The Ford Foundation, for example, spent 10,42,000 dollars on CIE during 1958-69 for the appointment of "British and American Specialists, training of Indian Staff abroad, the import of books and equipment and short-term rupee expenditure" (CIE Souvenir, 1970:3). It is needless to repeat that all these funds were aimed at not the development of the Corpus of native Indian languages but spread and consolidation of political prestige of English.

In the early sixties, Sociolinguistics (along with other Social Sciences) in America was given the task of conducting numerous investigations, at great financial cost, into behaviour of the "lower" class. This was because, as Dittmar (1978:85-86) informs, the imperialist economy required high educational attainment and highly developed skill in the use of language as per the standards of the "middle" class. As a result, the American book market, at the end of 1960s, was flooded with volumes containing analysis of the "disadvantaged child" and his social group.

In 1973, it was estimated that America, the most aggressive Imperialist, allocates nearly one billion dollars annually for language training (Thomson, 1973:231).

##### **5. Toward an Anti-Imperialist Linguistics and Language Education:**

Having understood the decisive role of Imperialism in giving general direction to Linguistics and Language Education, "WE" are expected, by the linguistically suppressed people of the Ex- Colonies, Neo-Colonies and Dependencies, to pursue an Anti- Imperialist Linguistics and Language

## 50 Society, State & Education

Education. "WE" include not only the Linguists and Language teachers in the Ex-Colonies, Neo-Colonies and Dependencies but also those in the Imperialist - America, Imperialist Britain and Imperialist France.

An Anti-Imperialist Language Education implies: a) literacy to the native illiterate population through Mother Tongues/First languages; b) imparting all kinds of education at all levels through the Mother Tongues/First Languages; and c) not assigning a Socially prestigious position or politically dominant role to the languages of the Imperialist powers at the expense of languages which the majority of the native population speaks. It however does not imply 'hatred' to the language of the Imperialist power as such but opposition to its imposition on the subject population. Thus, English, for example, need not be hated but at the same time we must hate, to use the expressions of Cooper (as cited in Kachru, 1984:176), the "hunger" and an "indecent passion" for English. This kind of 'decent hatred' is urgently needed because "the roots of English are deeper now than they were during the period of political colonization" and "the power bases for English today exist in almost all continents" (Kachru, 1984:191-2).

To 'erode' the "power bases" of languages of the Imperialist powers, Linguists and Language teachers will have to endeavour to build strong power bases for the languages of the Ex-Colonies/Neo-Colonies/Dependencies in terms of Corpus Language Planning (Graphization, Modernization and other forms of 'Language Development') and enable them to function in all the social domains within the boundries of that Nation-states or speech communities. This endeavour will raise the utility, status and prestige of the languages spoken by the majority of the population in a Nation-state or Speech community<sup>7</sup>. It is an urgent need of the hour - the hour of 'hunger' and 'indecent passion' for English - because people, espe-

---

*7 The question of 'Link Language' - the language that 'links' different speech communities which come into contact in various domains of social life - is a separate issue. Whether to continue or not to continue the languages of the Imperialist powers (eg. English, French, Spanish) as 'link languages' in Ex-Colonies, Neo-Colonies and Dependencies will be resolved by not simply the already educated elite but by the whole population, majority of which is still illiterate. Therefore, it is a problem to be tackled later. The immediate and the fundamental problem is making Mother Tongues as instruments of Language Education - in the sense of* →



cially the large majority of Illiterate people derive immense social power if they receive education - both language education and non-language education - through a language which they always speak than a language which they never spoke <sup>8</sup>.

---

→ "instructional languages of the class room". The educated minority, on the other hand, need not abandon the languages of the Imperialist Powers through which they received higher education but use them in international or inter-speech community context. Also, if necessary, they will have to 'reeducate' themselves through their Mother Tongues/First Languages which they speak in several informal domains. This should not be a major problem for them because they will have to simply learn certain terminological and stylistic equivalents in their language for those of their language of education.

8. It does not mean that Illiterate people, i.e. largely exploited people, derive social power through mother-tongue education only. We have no doubt that we must radically change the structure of all our institutions before we can effectively solve any of our language problems.

# **Social meaning of Translation in Modern Times\***

**ABSTRACT:** *This paper treats Translation not simply as an autonomous scholarly activity but as a social activity whose meaning is perceived either consciously or unconsciously by the participants of that activity. It tries to study the social, i.e. economic, political, cultural, aspects of translation with the help of relevant concepts, research questions and hypotheses. It offers certain tentative theoretical formulations accompanied by empirical evidence drawn from the modern history.*

## **1. Statement of the Problem:**

Very often, if not always, translation has been perceived as an autonomous scholarly activity aimed at the 'reproducing' (Nida, 1949-76), 'substituting/replacement' (Catford, 1965:1 & 20), 'transfer' (Brislin, 1976:1), 'Conversion' (Tweney & Hoemann, 1976:138), 'replacement/transfer' (Pinchuk, 1977: 30 & 35), or 'rendering' (Newmark, 1988:5) of the 'message' (Nida), 'text' (Catford), 'thoughts/ideas' (Brislin), 'meaningful utterance' (Tweney & Hoemann), 'Words/meanings (Pinchuk), or 'meaning' (Newmark) of one language into/by another language. Though there exist different theories of translation (Philological, Linguistic, Sociolinguistic), all are primarily concerned with "the principles and procedures of translation" (Nida, 1976:67). None of the existing mainstream theories of translation analyses translation as not simply an autonomous scholarly activity whose social meaning is perceived either consciously or unconsciously by the participants of that activity.

## **2. Earlier studies:**

As far as accessibility and hence our acquaintance with the relevant literature goes, we are able to find limited number of studies which specif-

---

\* *This paper was originally presented on 20-3-1993 at the UGC Refresher Course in Linguistics held at the University of Hyderabad during February-March, 1993.*

ically dealt with the social meaning of translation. Winter (1961) and Shouldice (1982) discuss Translation as political action in two political contexts: one in the global context of Coldwar between Russia and America and the other in the local context of political relations between the English speaking and French speaking social groups in Canada. Newmeyer (1986) depicts from an Anti-Imperialist perspective in great detail the social nature of the contemporary Linguistic research in general accompanied by few brief references to the social goals of translation in particular taking American and British Imperialist interests as reference points. Mahasweta Sengupta (1990, hereafter Sengupta, M.) and Tejaswini Niranjana (1992, hereafter Niranjana, T.) site Translation in the context of British Colonialism. Sengupta, M. demonstrated as how Tagore, in his English Translation of Bengali "Gitanjali", made adjustments in style, imagery, tone and register to suit not only the poetics but also ideology of the dominating culture of the British Colonialists. Niranjana, T. argues that Translation as a practice is "deployed" in different kinds of discourses" to renew and perpetuate colonial domination". She calls translation as a "significant technology of Colonial domination" because translation shapes, takes shape within the unequal relations of power that operate under Colonialism.

While taking certain relevant insightful observations made by the earlier studies as points of reference and departure, we intend to further explore the social meaning of translation in terms of social classes/strata and their social - i.e. economic, political, cultural-interests as motivating factors.

### **3. The Conceptual categories:**

Our study of the social meaning of translation in modern times has been guided by the following concepts.

**3.1 Social:** By social, we mean everything and anything related to society which consists of a 'Base' (economic structure) and a corresponding 'superstructure' (politics, culture, religion, ideology, etc). These social instances or aspects carry particular meanings in particular historical periods.

**3.2 Meaning:** Meaning, for us, is the purpose or the goal aimed at or pursued consciously or unconsciously.

## 54 Society, State & Education

**3.3 Translation:** Translation is a socially meaningful communicative activity carried out by its practitioners to achieve the goals set by respective social classes/groups.

**3.4 Modern times:** Modern times refer to that period or periods which begin from the Renaissance (15th century) to the present day in Europe. The Modern times, however, roughly begin from the colonial rule (i.e. 18th century) in 'Oriental' and African countries.

### **4. Questions and Hypotheses:**

With the help of the above concepts and earlier studies, we intend to answer relevant questions and test plausible hypotheses, some of which may be tentatively singled out as follows.

#### *4.1 Tentative questions:*

**4.1.1** Is translation scientifically/technically a neutral exercise or an activity aimed at realizing the goals specifically set by various aspects/instances of society (economic, political, cultural, religious, ideological, etc.)?

**4.1.2** Is the social meaning of translation perceived by its participants (sponsors and/or translators) consciously or unconsciously?

#### *4.2 Tentative Hypotheses:*

**4.2.1.** Translation has always been undertaken in order to realize economic, political, cultural, religious or ideological objectives aimed at by various social classes/groups in a speech community.

**4.2.2** Intentionally or Unintentionally assimilated social class/group interests prompt translators (individual scholars, groups and organizations) to undertake the work of translation.

### **5 .Method of Analysis:**

As this is mainly a theoretical exercise concerned with a particular period (i.e. modern times), we choose the Historical method of analysis whereby we study particular social phenomena (e.g., Translation as a Social Action) in the background of entire historical period or periods of societies in question. Further, the conception of History we hold is Materialist in the sense that social life is fundamentally based on production and reproduction of real life. In other words, for any society, the economic situation is the basis and the political, legal, philosophical, religious, liter-

ary, artistic etc., development (despite its occasional relative autonomy) is based ultimately on economic development. (the Author, 1993 a & c).

With the aid of this Historical and Materialist method, we analyse the historical evidence. However in view of the scanty nature of this historical evidence and our limitations in collecting primary data, we are compelled to make our theoretical formulations in a tentative fashion.

## 6. FINDINGS: THEORETICAL FORMULATIONS AND EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE:

Our formulations are not self-sufficient but interdependent and therefore overlapping. Similarly the empirical evidence that we draw from the history too is overlapping because each piece of evidence has several dimensions and hence the same may be cited differently for different formulations.

(1) *Translations do not simply arise out of the subjective inspiration of individual intellectuals but are largely inspired by social conditions/movements:* This formulation is supported by the historical fact that the spirit of Renaissance inspired and gave rise to numerous translations of scientific and religious texts in England and elsewhere (Amos 1973:81; Finlay 1971:18). Further, translation activity is intimately tied up with the rise of Protestant Movement during the period of Reformism (Bassnett-McGuire 1980:48). Martin Luther, the leader of the Protestant Movement, translated Latin Bible into High German and used it as an ideological weapon of the Protestant Movement against the Roman Catholic Clergy. Thomas Munzer, the Revolutionary Leader of the German Peasantry during the Reformation Movement, had translated, unlike Luther, the entire Bible and used it against both the Catholic Clergy and Protestant-Saxon kings (Engels 1850 : 60 & 62). To add one more example, Erasmus, a Dutch theologian of sixteenth century consciously aimed at spreading of Bible across all speech communities and social groups, while under the influence of Protestantism (Bassnett-McGuire 1980:48). Nearer home, we have many publications of translations of Russian and Chinese works in Telugu during Forties, Fifties and Sixties owing to the influence of Communist Movement in the Telugu speaking areas. (Personal acquaintance with the literature).

2) *Translation is pursued by Social forces (State, Religious groups etc) as a Social action often aimed at opposing Social forces and/or self-consolida-*

*tion*: It may be noted that there were periods in the history when translation was an affair of state and a matter of religion (Bassnett - McGuire 1980:55). For example, King James I of England Commissioned scholars to translate a text of Bible that could be authorized for reading in the Churches (Nida 1964:17). To cite an Indian example, Rama Mohana Roy (1774-1834) translated *Vedanta* treatises, *Upanishads*, and *Bhagavat Gita* to resist the Serampore Dutch missionaries who were critical of Hinduism (Sengupta, S. 1993:Ch.1). In the recent times Soviet translations of works of Asian origin were thought to have a special appeal among the non-European groups and presented a major challenge to America and the challenge was more subtle than that offered by armaments and economic aid (Winter 1961:176). In the religious and academic context, translation as a social action has been consciously pursued by the so-called 'Summer Institute of Linguistics'. Though there are several organizations which practice Linguistics research as a preliminary step to Bible translation, only the Summer Institute of Linguistics (also called 'Waycliff Bible Translators') is the largest, most influential and visible organization with 3,700 members working on 675 languages in 29 countries. Each member of this organisation is led by the belief that he or she should be able to have the New Testament translated in his or her own language (Newmeyer 1986: 59-60).

3) *Translation enables the dominant social classes/groups to: become informed of, prepare responses to, and exert control over the dominated social classes/groups*: We may cite translations of *Ramayana* and *Mahabharata* from Sanskrit to Bengali as evidence in support of this formulation. During the Early-Middle Bengali period, i.e., 1300-1500 A.D., the Mohemmedan emperors who ruled Bengal realised the "wonderful influence" which *Ramayana* and *Mahabharata* exercised in "moulding" the religious and family life of the Hindu subject-population and therefore employed Sanskrit- knowing Bengali scholars to translate them into Bengali (Sengupta, S. 1993: Ch.1). Further, we find many such instances during the colonial rule of India by the British Imperialism. There were instances when the English scholars advised their State to encourage discovering, collecting and translating the ancient works of subject - Indian population. Similarly, William Jones, Scholar-Judge of the Calcutta Supreme Court perceived translation as a tool that can serve to "domesticate" the Orient and impose European capitalist ideology on it. The scholarly officials of the East India Company fancied that translation would help them to "gather in" and "rope

off' the Orient (Niranjana, T. 1992:12). There were also instances when the Colonial rulers established institutes of learning (e.g. School of Oriental and African Studies) which provide a place where their civil and military officers could learn the languages and study the literature, the religions and the customs of their subject-population. Such centres also made use of translation as an instrument of Colonial domination (Newmeyer 1986:57). In the recent times, Canada serves as an excellent example where translation is used as "a means of penetration and possession, a necessary step in the process of becoming informed, in preparing responses, and of exerting control". For example, more translations have been done from Quebeccan French to Canadian English than vice-versa (Shouldice 1982:79).

4) *Translations in the areas of Humanities (e.g. literature, religion, philosophy), Social sciences (e.g. Politics) or Natural Sciences (e.g. Agronomy) from the socially dominated source language communities constitute cultural, political or economic (knowledge of production processes) appropriation while translations in the opposite direction, i.e., from the socially dominant source language community constitute cultural, political or economic domination:* The evidence from the history of colonialism shows that it was Christian missionaries who had been active as early as the sixteenth century as colonialist agents of cultural appropriation. They prepared word lists and grammatical descriptions of the languages of the conquered peoples in the colonial empires of European powers. They were not unaware of the fact that good grammatical analyses greatly facilitate the creation of orthographies for the unwritten languages of the colonies which eventually lead to the translation of Bible. Similar attempts were made by the political administrators also. Thus, for example, the Marquess of Wellesley, the then governor-general of India had proposed in 1789 to establish an institute to study the languages and cultures of the British Empire. The same approach may also be found in the mid-twentieth century America. The key officials in the American administration understood thoroughly the importance of the study of languages, linguistics and cultures of other nations for the consolidation of the American Imperialistic interests in the context of cold war. (Newmeyer 1986:54-9). There were also instances where translation had been made from the dominated speech communities to the dominating speech communities. In the nineteenth century which is often called as the century of missionaries, many translation into English from other languages were done in various

parts of the world. (Finlay 1971:21). Once again we have the example of more number of translations from the politically dominated Quebecan French into politically dominant English than vice-versa (Shouldice 1982:80). Such translations enable the politically dominant groups to understand their subjects better. Hence such works are better appreciated. For example, Arthur Waley who translated classical Chinese works into English was awarded Queen's medal (Bauer 1964:14).

5) *Since Translation involves transmission of values and concepts in modes and terms of the Receptor Language, dominant social groups of the Source Language can change/influence the perceptions of the dominated social groups of the Receptor Language:* It is no wonder that the motives, feelings, attitudes, values and concepts which the readers of a Receptor/Target language discover in the terms and modes of their own language change their existing perceptions and beliefs. It is obvious that many modern Indian languages served as vehicles for the transmission of emotionally and politically charged ideas which were positively received by the native elite if not all the literates. It is reported that translations from Canadian English into Quebecan French brought about a change in the perceptions and beliefs of the Quebecans (Shouldice 1982:81).

6) *Selection and/or Acceptance of the material (to be) translated is/are dependent on the dominant social life of the Receptor Language community:* Translations of D.H. Lawrence's works in Chinese confirm our formulation. During the decade of Cultural Revolution of 1966-76, the dominant literary circle was under the influence of some sort of xenophobia: anything and everything western was proscribed, condemned, criticised or discouraged. When the memories of the Cultural Revolution almost vanished from the literary scene there developed 'hunger' and 'indecent passion' for anything western or capitalistic. That is why the present day literary critics in China wonder at the ways in which Lawrence's works have been received in the past and present (Liu 1991:38; Dong Gu 1991:43; Jin 1991:48). It is reported that Lawrence's works which dealt with the themes of sex and religion and which were literary taboos in China earlier are now received favourably.

7) *Source Language texts with a high social (e.g. political or religious) content over those with little or no obvious social import are preferred for translation:* The nineteenth century translations produced by the colonial administrators or christian missionaries were largely language/literature



oriented or religious texts. In the recent times, for example in China, translation was a political mission during fifties and early sixties (Bauer 1964:7). In the bibliography of existing translations of Canadian writers, texts with a high political content constitute majority as compared with those with little or no obvious political import (Shouldice 1982:76).

8) *The quantity as well as the quality (themes) of the translations depend on economic factors such as profitability, law of supply and demand, patronage of publishers, educational programmes, the rulers, the State, etc:* This is evident from certain translations which were funded by either private or public institutions. It is reported that one translator by name Thomas Norton of the sixteenth century was encouraged by two royal printers in connection with the translation of Calvin's book on Christ. One Lord Morley complained at the time about the English translations which were motivated by economic factors (Amos 1973: 83 & 89). To cite a recent situation, all publication activities in China in the past were controlled by private publishers who decided the quantity and quality (themes) of the translations (Bauer 1964:5). Certain kinds of translation research (e.g. Machine Translation) have been patronized by certain Interest groups, e.g. MIT, IBM Research Centre in USA (Nida 1964:22).

9) *Each Social Class/group strive to translate only those texts which express their social interests; but the same principle of translation (e.g. Dynamic Equivalence) may be followed by two mutually contradictory social classes/groups in their translation practices:* Both Martin Luther, who articulated the interests of Saxon Kings against the Roman Catholic church, and Thomas Munzer, a Revolutionary Leader of the German Peasantry during the Reformation Movement, had translated Bible. However, Luther translated specific parts read only on Sundays while Munzer did the entire Bible but both based on the principle of total intelligibility (Engels 1850:60 & 62; Nida 1964:14).

# Concept of Social Class in Sociolinguistics\*

---

"Indeed, if linguists aspire to social relevance, they cannot avoid a concept so crucial to society as that of class, however awkward it may seem to them" (Ronald Macaulay, 1976:187)

"Sociolinguistics cannot rest autonomous, but must be founded on sociological analyses" (Frans Gregersen, 1979:175)

---

**ABSTRACT :** *This paper reviews the concept of social class underlying empirical sociolinguistic studies. It argues that the social class indicators such as occupation, education, income, housing and locality are inadequate and inaccurate. It proposes an alternate concept of social class which defines and explains the causal link between the chosen categories of class analysis, viz. Production relations, Property relations, Division of labour and Distribution relations. It also suggests relevant questions to analyse occupational groups and to classify them into social classes. Finally, this paper indicates briefly that language and social class do not have one-to-one mechanical correlation but are mediated through complex structures of culture and psychological processes which constantly interact with the class structure.*

## 1. Introduction:

The importance of social class as the most crucial aspect of social differentiation/stratification prompted sociolinguists to study the relationship between social class and language use. However, in this paper, we are mainly concerned with the concept of social class in sociolinguistics but not with the "correlations" between the social classes and their language behaviour as depicted by sociolinguists. Further, we are confined to studies conducted by Labov (1966), Wolfram (1969), Fasold (1972), Trudgill (1974) and Macaulay (1976). These sociolinguists, however, did not make their concept explicit by presenting their conceptual premises and propo-

---

\*An earlier version of this paper was presented at the "Linguists Meet" held in the Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages (CIEFL), Hyderabad, during October 21-22, 1991.

sitions. They simply adopted/adapted certain indicators proposed by sociologists and quantified them into an index of social class. Thus, Labov adopted Joseph Kahl (1953) via John Michael and Mobilization For Youth Survey of the New York School of Social Work of Columbia University. He also referred Warner et al (1949) and other works like U.S. Bureau of the Census. Wolfram adapted Hollinghead and Redlich's (1958) scale. Fasold used Warner et al's (1949) Index of Status Characteristics. Trudgill and Macaulay followed Registrar General's Classification of Occupations. (1966) in Britain. On the whole, all these sociolinguists uncritically and without examination accepted the inheritance from the kind of Sociology which relied heavily upon scales, ranks, ratings and index scores to reveal its theoretical position.<sup>1</sup>

## 2. Social class indicators in empirical Socio-linguistics:

Of the five sociolinguists mentioned above, all of them used 'occupation' as an important indicator of social class<sup>2</sup>. However, only one of them used 'occupation' as the "best single" indicator while four of them used 'education' and 'income' in addition to occupation. Three of them used 'housing' while two of them used 'locality' as additional indicators of social

- 
1. *As we are not directly concerned with the sociological literature referred by sociolinguists, we are not giving any bibliographical information relating to it. However, for a discussion of the concept of social class in the sociological literature, see Bapuji (1993a)*
  2. *A special mention may be made regarding the occupational status ascribed by sociolinguists to women, children and students. Only Labov and Trudgill specifically mentioned this point. Labov (1966:267, note 5) adopted the following rules: "(1) Husband's occupation was used for all married women except in cases where the wife is working and the husband is retired; (2) Widows who do not work were classified by their dead husband's occupation; (3) College students were assigned the highest occupational rank to represent their probable occupational distinctions." Trudgill (1974:38) rated married women and widows on the basis of their husbands' occupation; and unmarried-women on their fathers'. He considered working women's occupational status only when it was higher in status than that of their husband or father. For an alternate classification of these social categories, viz. women, children, students, etc, see note 10 below.*

## 62 Society, State & Education

class. Each of these social characteristics is treated as a scale consisting of several levels (four, six or seven) and each level is assigned a rank/rating (one to four, six or seven) and an index score which are not based on any defined objective criterion<sup>3</sup>. Respondents possessing the chosen social characteristics with similar rank/rating and index score are grouped together as social classes which in turn are assigned a rank and a score. The chosen criteria of social class membership, viz. occupation, income, education, housing and locality are not defined. Moreover they are treated as "basic axioms" that do not need any definition (Gregersen, 1979:172). The causal link between the chosen criteria is not explained. The absence of such an explanation led them to lump together qualitatively different occupations into the same social class. Any number of examples may be given. Labov, for example, classifies "professionals" and "managers" as the same class. Wolfram groups "doctors" and "divisional managers of large industrial enterprises" into the same class. Fasold places "lawyers" and "regional managers of large enterprises" in the same class. Macaulay groups a "civil engineer's wife", "physician's wife" and a "deputy head teacher" into one class along with the "director of a family business".

This kind of classification of occupations misses an important and fundamental distinguishing criterion, viz. role played by a respondent in the social division of labour.<sup>4</sup>

Thus, the occupational label 'manager' does not tell us whether the person holding the position of a "manager" performs the labour of management necessitated by the inherent nature of the process of production of

---

3. *Thus, for Labov, lower the number of rank, lower the social status while for others it is the reverse: lower the number of rating and score, higher the social status. Labov, however, used relative social prestige accorded to "head work" over "hand work" as the basis for ranking certain occupations. Yet he did not point out the characteristic feature that secures higher social status and prestige for head work. He simply attributes it to the behaviour of "most people" towards the "head work". For an understanding of the objective basis for status, rank and prestige, see section 4 and note 11 below.*
4. *For the meaning of the term social division of labour, see point 5 of section 3 in the text.*

social existence or performs the labour of management necessitated by the antagonism between the ownership/control of means of production and the labourers.<sup>5</sup> Further observations may be made regarding the "inadequacy" of the criterion of occupation in depicting the social class reality. Thus, occupational labels mentioned by all the sociolinguists do not distinguish between strata within classes in terms of, say, coercive and non-coercive activities; productive and unproductive labour; supervisory tasks and non-supervisory tasks and so forth.<sup>6</sup>

Similar observations may be made on the criterion of 'income'. As usual, the causal relationship between occupation and income is not explained. Of the four studies which chose income as a social class indicator, three are concerned with only the size of the income by ignoring the source of income. One study, though mentioned the source of income as an indicator concerned mainly with the form of income but not the social relations in which the said form of income is received. For example, the source of income of the respondents may be either through sale of labour-power or through appropriation of surplus labour of others. The former source derives income in the form of wages, salary etc., while the latter source derives income in the form of profit, rent, merchant's commission etc.<sup>7</sup>

The validity of 'education' as an indicator of social class in sociolinguistics has already been questioned by Gregersen (1979:176). As he rightly observed, the social class position of a respondent cannot be deduced from her/his schooling measured in quantitative terms for two reasons: firstly, the "kind" of education may be relevant. Secondly, the amount of education a child receives is in itself related to the parents' class position.

Regarding the 'housing' and 'locality' it may be observed that these indicators are deducible from the income of both the respondent and her/his parents. However, no explanation is given as to the nature of the influence of 'housing', and 'locality' on the speech behaviour. In fact no

---

5. *For a detailed understanding of these two aspects of the so-called labour of management, see Bapuji (1993a, b & c)*

6. *For further details of these characteristic features of certain kinds of labour, see Bapuji (1993: ch.2)*

7. *These terms have specific social meanings. See Bapuji (1993b: ch.1)*

## 64 *Society, State & Education*

sociolinguist mentioned above has explained as to what aspect of each of the three, five or six of the chosen indicators influences the speech behaviour of the respondents.

### 3. **An Alternate concept of social class:**

In view of the foregoing observations on the inadequacy of the social class indicators, we find it necessary to propose an alternate concept of social class which defines and explains the causal link between the chosen categories of analysis.

We may state our concept of social class by way of certain conceptual premises and propositions as follows.<sup>8</sup>

- 1) Human individuals always engage in the production of social existence which may be physical, intellectual, material, non-material, concrete, abstract, etc.
- 2) The social existence encompasses various spheres of activity: economy, politics, law, philosophy, art, religion, ideology, etc.
- 3) In the process of production of their existence, individuals enter into certain social relations called "production relations". If the production relations between individuals in a society are that of "Producers" and "Appropriators" they are exploitative production relations which constitute two opposite social classes, viz. class of Producers and class of Appropriators. If the production relations between individuals in a society are that of producers associated with each other based on their free will, they are non-exploitative production relations which constitute a classless society.
- 4) In order to carry on the process of production of social existence, means of production (including raw material, instruments of production, etc) are needed. The social relations of individuals to the means of production are called "Property Relations". If the property relations between individuals vis-a-vis means of production are that of property owners/property controllers and propertyless/non-controllers of property, they are exploitative property relations which constitute two

---

8. *These conceptual premises and propositions are based on certain earlier studies on Marx, Marxists and Non-Marxists. For an elaborated discussion, see Bapuji (1993a, b & c)*

opposite classes, viz. class of Property owners/ controllers vs. class of Propertyless/ Non-controllers of property.<sup>9</sup> If the property relations between individuals in a society are that of bearers of socialized property, they are non-exploitative property relations which constitute a classless society.

- 5) Production of social existence is carried out by means of social labour. The manner in which social labour is organized is called "Division of Labour". If the Division of Labour is such that it divides individuals into Labourers and Lords over Labour on the one hand and ties individuals to a particular kind of labour throughout the working life on the other hand, it is an exploitative Division of Labour which constitutes two opposite classes, viz. class of Labourers and class of Lords over Labour. Labourers perform social labour that is necessitated by the inherent nature of the process of production of social existence, whereas Lords over labour perform social labour that is necessitated by the exploitative relations of production and property. Further, the class of Labourers and class of Lords over Labour are further divided into the following subclasses according to certain characteristic features of the kind of labour they perform: Labourers/Lords over Labour in relation to:- (a) skilled/unskilled labour; (b) mental/ manual labour; (c) coercive/non-coercive activities; (d) activities related to Base/Superstructure/Both; (e) genuine/faulty social production of existence; (f) supervisory labour/non-supervisory labour; (g) necessary labour/surplus labour.<sup>10</sup> If the Division of Labour is such that it not only turns

---

9. *For the purpose of making theoretically significant generalizations, the existence of small property owners and persons who exercise little control over the large property is considered immaterial for our analysis and hence subsumed under the category "class of Propertyless/non-controllers of property".*

10. *Besides those mentioned here, there are other sub-classes, viz. Family labourers (women who work exclusively within their family), Immature labourers (children), Incapacitated labourers (elderly and sick persons), Potential labourers (unemployed and students), and Ruined labourers (beggars, prostitutes, thieves and the like). Another sub-class which deserves mention is productive/unproductive labourers who are specific to capitalism which is solely interested in the capitalization of surplus labour. Also see Bapuji (1993b Ch.1 passim)*

## 66 *Society, State & Education*

Lords over Labour into Labourers but also does not tie individuals to one particular labour and enables them to perform as many kinds of labour as possible, it is not an exploitative Division of Labour and it constitutes a classless society.

- 6) The process of production of social existence results in some social product: physical, intellectual, material, non-material, concrete, abstract, etc. The social relations into which individuals enter while sharing the newly created social product are called "Distribution Relations." In other words, the forms and sources of income which individuals receive constitute "Distribution Relations." If the Distribution Relations are such that individuals are divided into recipients of value of Necessary Labour on the one hand and recipients of value of Surplus Labour of others on the other, they are exploitative relations of distribution which constitute two opposite classes, viz. class of Exploited and class of Exploiters. If the Distribution Relations are such that each individual receives a portion of the social product according to her/his needs and no individual receives the surplus labour of others, then the Distribution Relations are non-exploitative social relations that constitute classless society.
- 7) The concepts Production relations, Property relations, Division of labour and Distribution relations are synonymous in the sense that Property relations are the legal expression of Production relations; Division of labour is the activity and property is the product of that activity; and Distribution relations are the 'other' side of production relations. Therefore each social class is a particular set of Production relations, Property relations, Division of labour and Distribution relations. Thus, a Director of a large business enterprise is an Appropriator (= Production relations); Property controller (= Property relations); Lord over Labour (= Division of labour); and the recipient of Surplus Labour of others (Distribution relations) while an operative in a factory is a producer (Property relations), Propertyless (Property relations); Labourer (Division of labour) and the recipient of value of Necessary Labour only (Distribution relations).
- 8) The value of labour power is determined in the same way as that of other commodities, by the socially necessary labour time required for its production/reproduction. There are at least four elements that constitute the value of labour power: (i) physical maintenance of the labourer; (ii) the specific nature of the labour performed by the labourer; (iii) the cultural level of the society in which labourer lives;



and (iv) reproduction of the labourer. The specific nature of the labour of a labourer involves acquisition of particular degrees of training and skill. The required training includes means of subsistence for both the trainees and the instructors, and instruments required for training, etc. during the required period of training of the particular labour. Thus the value of all the relevant factors of training enter into the formation of the value of the labour power of those who perform certain labour. The specific nature of the labour further gives rise to the distinctions like manual and mental, skilled and unskilled etc., and corresponding distinctions in their value too.

#### 4. Comments on 'status' and 'rank':

Any discussion of the concept of social class in sociolinguistics will not be complete if it does not make observations on the categories of 'status' and 'rank'. Sociolinguists equated 'social class' with 'social status' and 'social rank' and used these terms interchangeably. These terms were introduced into sociolinguistics through the sociological literature. However, the objective basis for the existence of 'status' and 'rank' has never been explained either by sociologists or sociolinguists.<sup>11</sup> Based on subjective evaluation, mere empirical observations on 'status' and 'rank' have been made. These categories may be better understood in terms of Distribution relations which of course are always based on the synonymous and more fundamental criteria of Production/Property relations and Division of labour.

Thus, occupational groups, classes or fractions of classes derive respective levels of status and rank depending upon their relative share in the value of the newly created social product which is composed of value of necessary labour and value of surplus labour of others. For example, the class of exploited derive less status and is ranked low vis-a-vis the class of exploiters owing to the latter's appropriation of major part of the newly created value. Similarly, within the exploited classes, the sub-classes consisting of performers of supervisory, mental, skilled labour derive higher status and rank vis-a-vis their counter parts, viz. performers of non-supervisory, manual, unskilled labour, owing to their share in the newly created social product due to the inherent value of their respective labour powers.

---

11. For an elaborate review of the sociological literature on class, status, rank and other social characteristics, see Bapuji (1993a)

In view of these observations on 'status' and 'rank', the ratings, scores or ranks given to various occupational groups on the one hand and the adjectives such as 'lower', 'middle', 'upper' added to the social class designations on the other will have little or no meaning in the absence of a proper explanation of the objective criterion.

### **5. Essence Vs. Appearance:**

Having presented our concept of class briefly, we may now relate the social indicators, viz. occupation, income, housing, locality and education, used by sociolinguists to our criteria viz. Production relations, Property relations, Division of labour and Distribution relations.

"Occupation" is the outward appearance of the Division of labour and hence of Production as well as Distribution relations. "Income" is an expression of distribution relations. "Housing" and "Locality" are consequences of Distribution relations of either the respondents or their parents while "education" is deducible from the Distribution relations of the parents of the respondent.

### **6. Questions for class analysis:**

Based on the concept of social class outlined above, we may set up social class groups by examining any given occupation (including those listed by the sociolinguists mentioned above) in the light of the following questions.<sup>12</sup>

*Questions relating to Production relations:*

- 1) Does the occupation of a respondent involve Production or Appropriation of social existence? (class of Producers vs class of Appropriators)

*Questions relating to Property relations:*

2. Does the occupation of the respondent involve legal ownership/control over the means of production of social existence? (class of Property owners/Property Controllers vs. class of Propertyless/Non-controllers of property)

*Questions relating to Division of labour:*

- 3.a) Does the occupation of the respondent involve labour: that arises out of the inherent nature of the process of production of social existence or that arises out of the antagonism that exists between the owners/con-

---

12. *These questions are largely based on an earlier study. See Bapuji (1993.b:ch.2).*

trollers of means of production of social existence and the labourers?  
(class of Labourers Vs. class of Lords over Labour)

3.b) Does the occupation of the respondent involve performance or control in relation to :-

- i) skilled/unskilled labour (Sub-class of performers of skilled/unskilled labour Vs. Sub-class of controllers of skilled/unskilled labour);
- ii) mental/manual labour (Sub-class of performers of mental/manual labour Vs. Sub-class of controllers of mental/manual labour);
- iii) coercive/non-coercive activities (Sub-class of performers of coercive/non-coercive activities Vs. Sub-class of controllers of coercive/non-coercive activities);
- iv) activities related to Base/Superstructure/Both (Sub-class of performers of activities related to Base/Superstructure/Both Vs. Sub-class of controllers of activities related to Base/Superstructure/Both);
- v) genuine/faulty social production of existence (Sub-class of performers of genuine/faulty social production of existence Vs. Sub-class of controllers of activities related to Base/Superstructure/Both);
- vi) supervisory labour/non-supervisory labour (Sub-class of performers of supervisory/non-supervisory labour Vs. Sub-class of controllers of supervisory/non-supervisory labour);
- vii) necessary labour/surplus labour (Sub-class of performers of necessary labour/surplus labour Vs. Sub-class of controllers of necessary/surplus labour);
- viii) productive/unproductive labour (Sub-class of performers of productive/unproductive labour Vs. Sub-class of controllers of productive/unproductive labour).

*Questions relating to Distribution relations:*

- 4) Does the occupation of the respondent get her/him:
  - a) the value of the necessary labour only; and not the surplus value newly created by herself or himself (class of exploited).
  - b) the value of surplus labour newly created by others (class of exploiters).

## **7. Mediations between social class and Language:**

Having stated an alternate (supposedly objective and hence more comprehensive) concept of social class accompanied by a list of relevant questions, it remains for us to answer a possible and pertinent question: How do we explain the correlation shown between the social class membership

## 70 Society, State & Education

and the linguistic behaviour despite the inadequacy/inaccuracy of the concept of social class held by sociolinguists?

We may offer an answer to this question by way of certain tentative observations as follows.

- 1) The said correlation that is shown between social class and language use does not explain any thing. It does not tell us what aspect of the social class causes speakers to speak in a particular manner.
- 2) The social correlation is not reliable since the same pattern of correlations are shown by all the sociolinguists despite their use of various and varied number (1,3,4 or 5) of criteria of social class membership.
- 3) As the causal link between the chosen indicators of social class on the one hand and between the social class and the particular language behaviour on the other is not explained, the cause for such correlation may be seen elsewhere but not in the social class.
- 4) Since language behaviour is not a mechanical reflection of social class position, the so-called correlations are of little or no relevance.
- 5) Language and social class are mediated through complex structures of culture and psychological processes which constantly interact with the class structure. For example, the kind of education various classes receive, the kind of social and linguistic interaction between and within classes, the kinds of attitude towards social and linguistic behaviour of other classes, the degree of exposure to mass media including written literature are some of the cultural and psychological mediations.<sup>13</sup>

---

13. *The biggest limitation of this paper is that it is not accompanied by empirical evidence to demonstrate that social class and language are mediated through complex structures of culture and psychological processes. However, it may be mentioned that a theoretical exercise concerning this aspect was under-taken earlier. See Bapuji (1978). See also Bapuji (1979) for a preliminary empirical exercise.*

## REFERENCES

- AMIN, R.K. 1983. Efficiency of Investment in Education. In *Singh (ed)*, 1983. PP.194-201.
- AMOS, Flora Ross. 1973. *Early Theories of Translation*. New York: Octagon Books.
- ANDHRA PRABHA, (Telugu Daily News Paper). 16-2-1992. naStaalloo haarward varsiTii (Harvard University in Losses). Hyderabad edition, P.5.
- APTE, Mahadev, L. 1973. Multilingualism in India and its Sociopolitical Implications: An overview. In *O'Barr & O'Barr (Ed)*, 1976. pp: 141-164.
- BAPUJI, B.R. nee A. Bapuji 1978. Towards an under-standing of 'sociolinguistics'. *OPIL*. 4. 23-24 (1978).
- \_\_\_\_\_ nee A. Bapuji Chowdary .1979. Language standardization versus identity in Hyderabad Telugu. (unpublished Ph.D dissertation). Hyderabad: Department of Linguistics, Osmania University.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1993a. *Perspectives in Social Stratification*. Madras: T.R. Publications.
- , 1993b. *Conception of Social Class in Marx*. Madras: T.R. Publications.
- , 1993c. (Edited with an Introduction). *Anatomy of Modern Society. Excerpts from Marx and Engels*. Madras: T.R. Publications.
- BASSNETT-McGuire, Susan. 1980. *Translation Studies*. London: Methuen.
- BAUER, Wolfgang. 1964. *Western Literature and Translation Work in Communist China*.
- BETTELHEIM, Charles. 1977. *India Independent*. Translated from the French by W.A. Caswell. Delhi: Khosla & Co.

72 *Society, State & Education*

- BRASS, Paul R. 1974. *Language, Religion and Politics in North India*. Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.
- BRISLIN, Richard. 1976. Introduction. In *Brislin (ed), 1976*. PP.1-44.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (Ed). 1976. *Translation Applications and Research*. New York: Gardner Press, Inc.
- BROWN, Michael Barratt. 1974. *The Economics of Imperialism*. Penguin, 1978.
- CATFORD, John C. 1965. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.
- CIE SOUVENIR. 1970. Central Institute of English, Hyderabad 1958-1969. Decennial Celebrations Souvenir (February 1970).
- COOMBS, Philip H. 1985. *The World crisis in Education. The view from the eighties*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- COOPER, Robert L. 1989. *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge University Press.
- CORDER, Pit. 1972. Problems and Solutions in Applied Linguistics. In QVISTGAARD, J., SCHWARZ, H. and SPANG HANSEN, H. (Ed). 1972. *Applied Linguistics: Problems and solutions*. Association International De Linguistique Appliques Third Congress. Copenhagen 1972. Heidelberg: Julius Groos Verlag. pp. 3-23.
- DASGUPTA, Jyotirindra. 1973. Practice and Theory of Language Planning: The Indian Policy Process. In *O'Barr & O'Barr (Ed), 1976*. pp. 195-212.
- DITTMAR, Norbert. 1974. *Socio-linguistics. A critical survey of theory and application*. Edward Arnold, 1976.
- DONG GU, Ming. 1991. D.H. Lawrence and the Chinese Reader. In *The D.H. Lawrence Review*, Vol.23, No.1, Spring 1991, pp.43-47.
- DWIVEDI, S. 1981. *Hindi on Trial*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House (P) Ltd.
- EC REPORT (Report of the Education Commission), 1966. New Delhi: Indian Education Commission.
- EDWARDS, John. 1985. *Language, Society and Identity*. Basil Blackwell in association with Andre Deutsch.

- ENGELS, Frederick. 1850. *jermanii loo raytu yuddham* (Telugu version of "The Peasant War in Germany"). Moscow: Progress Publishers (n.d.).
- FASOLD, Ralph W. 1972. *Tense Marking in Black English. A Linguistic and Social Analysis*. Centre for Applied Linguistics.
- FINLAY, Ian. F. 1971. *Translating*. London: Teach Yourself Books.
- FISHMAN, Joshua. 1969. The Uses of Socio-linguistics. In *Perren, & Trim. (Ed) 1971*. pp.19-40.
- FLYNN, Barbara W. & FLYNN, John M. 1973. The Evolution of Courts, Councils, and Legislatures in India. In *O'Barr & O'Barr (Ed), 1976*. pp 165-194.
- FRASER, Bruce. 1974. The State of the Applied Linguistics. In DINNEEN, S.J. & FRANCIES P. (Ed). 1974. *Linguistics: Teaching and Interdescriplinary Relations*. In Georgetown Univesity Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1974. Washington DC: George-town University Press.
- FREIRE, Paulo and MACEDO, Donaldo. 1987. *Literacy. Reading the Word and the World*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- GREGERSEN, Frans. 1979. Relationship between Social Class and Language usage. In JACOB L. MAY (ed) 1979. *Pragmalinguistics: Theory and practice*. The Hague: Mouton. pp: 171- 194.
- HALLIDAY, MAK. 1977. Some Reflections on Language Education in Multilingual Societies, as seen from the standpoint of Linguistics. In YAP, Arthur (Ed). 1978. *Language Education in Multilingual Societies*. Singapore University Press. pp:103-109.
- HARDGRAVE, Robert. 1979. *Essays in the Political Sociology of South India*. New Delhi: Usha Publications.
- HERTZLER, Joyce O. 1965. *A Sociology of Language*. New York: Random House.
- INDIAN EXPRESS (Daily Newspaper). 15-2-1992. Government may cut funds for IITs and IIMs. A report by Angana Parekh. Hyderabad Edition, P.1.
- JANKOWSKY, Kurl. R. (Ed). 1973. *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics, 1973: Languages and International Studies*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

74 *Society, State & Education*

- JIN, Youcheng. 1991. D.H. Lawrence Studies in China: A Checklist of works by and About Him. In *The D.H. Lawrence Review*, 23.1 (1991) pp.47-55.
- KACHRU, Braj B. 1984. The Alchemy of English. Social and Functional Power of Non-Native Varieties. In *Kramaroe Chervis et al* (Ed). 1984. *Language and Power*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- KATZNER, Kenneth. 1975. *The Languages of the World*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977.
- KHUBCHANDANI, Lachman M. 1981. *Language Education and Social Justice*. Poona: Centre for Communication Studies.
- KUHLWEIN, Wolfgang. 1973. Some Social Implications of Language Study. In *Jankowsky (ed) 1973*, pp.19-26.
- LABOV, William. 1966. *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Centre for Applied Linguistics.
- LAPONCE, J.A. 1987. *Languages and their Territories*. Translated from the French by Anthony Martin Sperry. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- LENIN, V.I. 1916. *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. A popular outline. In *Lenin: Collected Works*, Vol. 22. Moscow: Progress Publishers. pp. 185-360.
- LIU, Xianzhi. 1991. The Reception of D.H. Lawrence in China. In *The D.H. Lawrence Review*, 23.1 (1991) P.37-42.
- MACAULAY, Ronald K.S. 1976. Social class and Language in Glasgow. *Language in society* 5, 173-188.
- MALMBERG, Bertil. 1969. Applications of Linguistics. In *Perren and Trim* (Ed), 1971. PP.3-18.
- MOORE, Wilbert E. 1970. In collaboration with Ferald W. Rosenblum. *The Professions: roles and rules*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- NATIONAL POLICY ON EDUCATION, 1986. New Delhi: Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India (Dept. of Education), May 1986.
- NAYAR, D.T. 1983. The Returns from Education. In *Singh (Ed )*. 1983 PP. 47-79.
- NEWMARK, Peter. 1988. *Translation Theory*. Prentice Hall.



- NEWMAYER, Frederick J. 1986. *The Politics of Linguistics*. The University of Chicago Press.
- NIDA, Eugene. 1947. *Bible Translating. An Analysis of Principles and Procedures, with special reference to Aboriginal languages*. London: United Bible Societies. Revised Edition, 1961.
- 1964. *Toward a Science of Translating. With Special reference to Principles and procedures involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden: Brill.
- A. 1976. A Framework for the Analysis and Evaluation of Theories of Translation. In *Brislin (ed), 1976*. PP.47-91.
- & TABER, Charles R. 1969. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Second Photomechanical Print. Leiden; The Netherlands: E.J. Brill, for the United Bible Societies, 1982.
- NIRANJANA, Tejaswini. 1992. *Siting Translation. History, Post-structuralism and the Colonial Context*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- O'BARR, William M. & O'BARR, Jean F. (Ed) 1976. *Language and Politics*. The Hague: Mouton.
- OLC REPORT (Report of the Official Language Commission 1956). New Delhi: Govt. of India Press, 1957.
- PANDIT, Prabodh B. 1971. The Linguistic Survey of India - Perspectives on Language Use. In *O'HANNESSIAN et al (ed)*. 1975. *Language Surveys in Developing Nations. Papers and Reports on Sociolinguistic Surveys*. Virginia: Center for Applied Linguistics. PP.71-85.
- PERREN, G.E. and TRIM, J.L.M. (Ed), 1971. *Applications of Linguistics, Selected papers of the second International Congress of Applied Linguistics, Cambridge 1969*. Cambridge at the University Press.
- PIATT, Bill. 1990. *?Only English?: Law & Language Policy in the United States*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- PILLAI, Ramachandra P. 1981. *General and Technical Education in Andhra Pradesh*. Hyderabad: Telugu Akademy.
- PINCHUK, Isadore. 1977. *Scientific and Technical Translation*. London: Andre Deutsch.

*76 Society, State & Education*

- PRAKASH, Karath. 1973. *Language and Nationality Politics in India*. Bombay: Orient Longman.
- RAMACHANDRARAO, C. et al 1988. *Towards a Language Policy for India*. Paper presented at the International Conference on "Language and National Development (ICLAND): The Case of India" held on Jan. 4-6, 1988 at the Dept. of Linguistics, Osmania University.
- RANGANAYAKAMMA. 1993. *maarks kaapiTal: paricayam [A Telugu Introduction to Marx's "Capital"]*. Vol.5. Vijayawada: Sweet Home Publications.
- RAO, V.K.R.V. 1983. *Education as investment*. In *Singh (Ed) 1983* pp. 11-23.
- REPORT OF THE EDUCATION COMMISSION 1964 - 66. Ministry of Education, Government of India, 1978 (First Reprint).
- ROMAINE, Suzanne. 1992. *Language, Education and Development. Urban and Rural Tok Pisin in Papua New-Guinea*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- SATYANARAYANA, Moturu. 1977. *The Place and Position of a Link Language in the Multi-lingual Set-up of India*. Bombay: Mahatma Gandhi Memorial Research Centre and Hindusthani Prachar Sabha.
- SENGUPTA, Mahasweta, 1990. *Translation, Colonialism and Poetics: Rabindranath Tagore in Two Worlds*. In BASSNETT, S. and LEFEVERE, A. 1990. *Translation, History and Culture*. London: Pinter Publishers. PP.56-63.
- SENGUPTA, Sushmita. 1993. *Translation of Linguistic Terms: A Study of Tagore's Linguistic Writings*. M.Phil Dissertation. Hyderabad: Centre for A.L.T.S., University of Hyderabad.
- SHOULDICE, Larry. 1982. *On the Politics of Literary Translation in Canada*. In LABOSSIÈRE, Camille R. 1983. *Translation in Canadian Literature Symposium 1982*. University of Ottawa Press. pp.73-82.
- SINGH, Baljit. (Ed). 1983. *Economics of Indian Education*. Meerut: Meenakshi Prakashan.

- SPENCER, John W. 1974. Colonial Language Policies and their Legacies in Sub-Saharan Africa. In FISHMAN, J. (ed). *Advances in Language Planning*. Mouton. pp. 163-176.
- SRIDHAR, Kamal K. 1989. *English in Indian Bilingualism*. New Delhi: Manohar Publications.
- THOMSON, Richard T. 1973. Language Resources and the National Interest. In *Jankowsky (Ed) 1973*. pp.225-231.
- TRUDGILL, Peter. 1974. *The social differentiation of English in Norwich*. Cambridge University Press.
- TWENEY, Ryan D. & HOEMANN, Harry W. 1976. Translation and Sign Languages. In *Brislin (Ed), 1976*, pp.138-162.
- WINTER, Werner. 1961. Translation as Political Action. In *ARROW-SMITH, W. & ROGER SHATTUCK. 1961. The Craft and Context of Translation*. The University of Texas Press, 1971.
- WOLFRAM, Walter A. 1969. *A Sociolinguistic Description of Detroit Negro Speech*. Centre for Applied Linguistics.
- YOUNG, Robert C. 1983. Educational Planning and Economic Criteria. In *Singh (Ed) 1983*, pp.80-102.

\*\*\*\*\*

**ABOUT THE BOOK:** This book is a collection of five papers presented on four occasions at three places in two years. The author has chosen the title "Society, State and Education: Essays in the Political Sociology of Language Education" because all essays, though with a certain amount of overlapping, talk extensively of Society and State (i.e. Political Sociology) and their linkages with Education in general and Language education/Linguistics in particular. These essays, the Author believes, are relevant not simply to the students of (Socio-) Linguistics but also to those of Sociology, Political Science and History.

**ABOUT THE AUTHOR:** B.R. BAPUJI is currently working as a Reader in the Centre for Applied Linguistics and Translation Studies, University of Hyderabad. He has a Master's degree in Linguistics as well as Sociology. He obtained his Ph.D degree both in Linguistics and Sociology. He has published by T.R. Publications, Hyderabad, the following books: Social Stratification (1993a), Language and Marx (1993b) and Anatomy of Modern Society (1993c). He has also edited Marx & Engels: edited with an Introduction (1993c).

ISBN 81-85427 - 53 -4

Rs. 55.00

\$ . 5.00



Library

IAS, Shimla



G2671