Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 Vol. 22:11 November 2022

Socio-Political Origins of Linguistic Inequality in Indian Education

Neema Chaurasiya, Ph.D. Scholar
Department of Education
University of Delhi
chaurasiya.neema@gmail.com
Address for correspondence: CIE, Dept. of Education, 33, Chattra Marg, North Campus
University of Delhi, Delhi -110007

Abstract

The paper delves into the origins for Linguistic Inequality in India which persists despite various efforts to support multilingualism especially in the context of education. It enquires into the socio-political and theoretical basis for the present situation of language use in educational context.

It begins by examining some theories of linguistic analysis with their strengths and shortcomings, and then demonstrates how some of these can assist in understanding the complex linguistic situation and resulting marginalization of languages and associated communities in a multilingual set up such as India.

A generalized theory of language synthesizing different perspectives is elusive till now, but appropriating the structure of power hierarchies, derived from the usage of language in social context by sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, I've tried to make sense of the issue dominant languages in a multilingual set up and how these interact with the socio-political discourse of power. Analysing the linguistic situation from this socio-linguistic theoretical framework and touching upon the interaction of education and other 'significant domains' through brief outlines from the constituent assembly debates, the constitution itself and subsequent educational policies and their implementation, I've attempted to arrive at a basis for the inequality that we witness today in Indian education in terms of language.

Keywords: Linguistic Inequality, Education and Multilingualism, Language and Education.

Language used as means of communication comes laden with several other functions; it is a repository of cultural wealth and knowledge. Some scholars have argued that language constructs reality[1], while others have listed the structure of language as a major determining factor in shaping the perception and experience of its native speakers, such as the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis by American Linguists stating that structure of language determines or

[1] Bhartrhari, the Indian poet and philosopher who propounded the theory of '*shabda-brahma'* – Absolute word

greatly influences the modes of thought and behaviour characteristic of the culture in which it is spoken. The latter idea is closely related to 'Linguistic Determinism' or 'Linguistic Relativity'. "Language is not only a rule-governed system of communication but also a phenomenon that to a great extent structures our thought and defines our social relationships in terms of both power and equality." (NCERT, 2006)

Elaborating upon the profound relationship between language and culture, and the role that they play in shaping an individual's worldview, Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o (1986) states-

> "Language as communication and as culture are then products of each other. Communication creates culture: culture is a means of communication. Language carries culture, and culture carries, particularly through orature and literature, the entire body of values by which we come to perceive ourselves and our place in the world."

Thus, language and culture together play a crucial part in defining an individual's identity and their role in the social context. Lyons says, "*Language interpenetrates with almost all walks of life and varieties of experience. It does not exist 'for its own sake'. Nor does it exist mainly for the sake of broadly referential communication*." (Lyons,1968, p. 3). Language thus can be analysed from a thousand different lenses depending upon where one stands whilst looking at it. Language and its development have therefore been studied in various ways by several scholars belonging to different fields of enquiry.

The designated field of language study is 'Linguistics' whose specific branches deal with the study of specific features of language. There has not been any theory so far that can study language 'macrolinguistically' from a sociological, cultural, psychological, and biological viewpoint (Lyons, 1981). There have been interdisciplinary approaches though, mainly psycholinguistics and ethnolinguistics. An important interdisciplinary branch is sociolinguistics, 'the study of language in relation to society' (Hudson, 1980/2001). Though many scholars including French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu have argued that sociolinguistics became increasingly preoccupied with variations in usage and accents of language in the social context, rather than studying the complex interplay between language and society.

While Bourdieu believed that by studying the relationship between units, rather than the units themselves, a comprehensible generalized meaning can be arrived at, language as studied by the linguists in isolation will not be able to provide a holistic picture, unless viewed in its relationship with other fields. The study of language in isolation was criticized by Bourdieu on several other grounds including the hegemonic influence of one language model in socio-cultural analysis, the neglect of the socio-historical conditions in which the language or the text emerged, and the disregard of the analyser's own context and his/her relationship with the object of analysis, i.e., language. The last is a major contributing factor in any linguistic analysis since language shapes thoughts and perceptions so an analyst's own

position cannot be completely overlooked. The dangers of one language or language model's hegemony over socio-cultural analysis are also vast, evident in the effects of English being projected as language of international academic exchange and learning, especially in countries such as India; this will be further elaborated upon later.

Bourdieu also had reservations with the way the linguists regarded the social aspect of language to be limited to it being an equally accessible resource and their projection of an objective common language that exists out there. This has been elaborated through the work of linguists such as Saussure and Chomsky, that presupposes an ideal objective language, described by the terms '*langue*' and '*competence*' respectively; while there is no homogeneous common form of language which a speaker can draw from. This illusion of an objective, completely homogeneous common language which lends itself to linguistic analysis is what Bourdieu refers to as the '*illusion of linguistic communism'* (1991). One can also equate the standard form of language as the homogeneous language which such theories presuppose. Furthermore, linguists regard language to be an equally accessible resource shared by all. Whereas language is not an autonomous isolated element, it is affected by the social and political context in which it is embedded that is marred by hierarchies, which makes language a site of power and hierarchy as well. In specific contexts languages are also used as 'mechanism of power' (Bourdieu, 1991) their multiple interpretations therefore have cultural, sociological, economic, and psychological repercussions for the stakeholders.

Bourdieu's own theory of symbolic power and violence was rooted in concrete social practices of power and hierarchy rather than abstract conceptions of social life. He argued that language itself is a socio-historic phenomenon and needs no outside theories for its analysis, therefore instead of applying any outside theory to language, he derived a theory from language usage which combines theoretical and empirical details, a '*theory of practice*', and elaborated that everyday language use, has bearing of social structures that it expresses as well as helps to reproduce.

Bourdieu's work was based upon the dominant language variety, especially in the context of the French language, appropriating this structure of power hierarchies, I have tried to make sense of the issue of dominant languages in a multilingual set up and how these interact with the social and political discourse of power; along with examining the linguistic situation of India from this socio-linguistic theoretical framework and touching upon the interaction of education and other 'significant domains' with it.

Lyons suggests that the 'so-called language problems' are infact a representation of much bigger issues of cultural and social domination and discrimination (Lyons, 1981) which is evident in the fact that in spite of promotion of multilingualism being widely accepted as one of the goals of the Indian education, the marginalization and discrimination against the native languages continue in the language policies of the country, which favour a select few languages.

Indian society has been multilingual since its very conception. The linguistic space in India today comprises of four major language families - the Indo-Aryan, the Dravidian, the Austric, and the Tibeto-Burman, and several minor ones such as Tai Kadai. This huge diversity is attributed to several factors including the migration of people and races of different ethnic descent, multiple invasions, and the process of colonization. The linguistic scene is further complicated by the fact that apart from the major languages in every state, several minor languages exist, many of which have been termed as 'dialects' of the major variety. Some of these 'dialects' have their own scripts while some do not. Due to the lack of consensus among linguists about formal delineation of languages and dialects, it is very hard to determine the exact number of languages spoken in India. Prior to the Indian Independence, Sir George Grierson's ***Linguistic Survey of India*** (1903-1923) spread over twelve volumes enlisted 179 languages and 544 dialects. Post-independence the various population censuses have recorded different numbers of languages, mother-tongues, and dialects. The 2011 census lists 121 languages and 270 mother tongues (with 10,000 or more speakers) while the 2021 census has been delayed due to COVID-19. Ganesh Devy's ***People's Linguistic Survey of India*** (PLSI), a non-government effort conducted by Bhasha Research and Publication Centre between 2010 and 2013, identified 780 languages and surmised there could be another 100 more. With such a vast variety, the question naturally arises - why only a select few languages find recognition and space in significant domains such as law, education, and administration?

Pattanayak states that 'Western nationalism, based on dominant monolingualism and dominant mono-culturalism, is naturally distrustful of multilingual, multi-ethnic, and multi-cultural societies such as India.' (Pattanayak, 1984, p. 125) and therefore a numerosity of languages is feared. Language has also historically proven to be one of the means of consolidation of political power. With rise of modern nation states it was thus no surprize that the idea of one unified language was sought as a tool for the consolidation and political identification of the masses with their newly formed states, thus arose the idea of a national language. 'Linguistic diversity, it is claimed, aggravates political sectionalism; hinders inter-group co-operation, national unity, and regional multinational co-operation; impedes political enculturation, political support for the authorities and the regime, and political participation; and holds down governmental effectiveness and political stability' (Pool, 1972, p. 86) thus, 'the search for a single language as a symbol of unity is typical of most modern nation states' (Krishna, 1991, p. 44).

A national or official language not only gains recognition and sanction, it gains political patronage where resources are dedicated for its development and growth. Education, job market, books, and texts, even the language of law and justice are monopolized, at the cost of the other languages. On the surface, this appears to be arbitrary, political processes playing its part in the rise of power and dominance of a select few languages, but which languages are to be conferred with this honour? This question is fraught with sociological

implications. As 'the hegemony enjoyed by the standard languages of the state is part and parcel of the cultural hegemony of the ruling elite' (Saxena and Mahendroo, 1993, p. 2446). Bourdieu demonstrates this through the example of French Revolution that "the upper classes had everything to gain from the policy of linguistic unification" and this was a 'gradual process of normalization' through collective effects of social and political processes that induced the lower-class people "to collaborate in the destruction of their instruments of expression" (Thompson, 1991, p. 6-7).

The national language or official language debate when viewed from this lens is not a debate of mutual intelligibility amongst the population, not even of convenience or political unification through identification, but a tussle for dominance of linguistic capital that can be interchanged into economic and social benefits.

At the time of formation of the Indian Union, the search for a national language as a symbolic aspect of national integration was an important task before the Constituent Assembly. The founding fathers were aware of the dichotomy - the necessity of unification symbols as well as the necessity of preservation of diversity for safeguarding the rights of the people from various backgrounds. Therefore, when it came down to the issue of a national language the debates ranged from Hindi to Sanskrit to Hindustani, which is combination of Hindi and Urdu. Hindi was favoured by many, so was Hindustani, however, no consensus could be reached. Hindi was opposed by several representatives of non-Hindi speaking regions, the most vehement oppositions came from the speakers of Bengali and Tamil, who felt that Hindi was a more recent language compared to their languages. The search for a national language ended in two official languages and the Eighth Schedule under Article 344(1) and 351 listing down the major Indian languages. Initially there were 14; these were of course amended and added to later and stand at 22 as of date. There were a number of other 'safeguards' ensuring the preservation of the culture and languages of the so-called minorities, which together constituted the majority of the Indian population - the Fundamental Rights gave the citizens the right to conserve its language, script or culture, under Article 29, Article 30 provided the linguistic and religious minorities to establish their own educational institutions. But these were rights that were granted to individuals and communities, as far as the nation's responsibility was concerned for the preservation of the linguistic and cultural diversity in a manner that will promote their sustenance and further development, nothing was said. At the same time stressing upon the requirement of one unifying language and passing on the responsibility of dealing with this very complex and complicated linguistic and cultural situation to the next generation, the Constituent Assembly suggested revision of official languages after 15 years.

Language planning should be future oriented (Dua, 1990) but Jawaharlal Nehru opined that the free nation will decide for itself, and that the Constituent Assembly needs to hurry up in framing the constitution considering the precarious condition of the population of the newly independent nation. He stated, "Some people imagine, that what we do now, may

not be touched for 10 years or 20 years; if we do not do it today, we will not be able to do it later. That seems to me a complete misapprehension" (1947). Nehru and the other founding fathers of the nation had the foresight to see the necessity of preservation of diversity or plurality amongst the masses, but in the effort of framing a constitution within a small period of time postponed one of the very crucial decisions in the shape of an undefined stance on the issue of language or languages of the Union. D.P. Pattanayak sums it up very powerfully when he says that "in the name of pragmatics of the situation, the will and the courage to take bold action were wilfully blunted" (Pattanayak, 1984, p. 128). Constituent Assembly thus passed on the burden of decision to the future generations to avoid present conflicts, with a fifteen-year review policy as a saving grace, which did not harbour much affect till date. E. Annamalai very rightly points out that though the Constitution specifically prescribes language for administration, legislature and judiciary, and a review timetable for use of English language, it is silent on the issue of language of education, except for the 7th amendment that recommends use of mother tongue for primary education, article 350-A (Annamalai, 1995).

Apart from the national language debate and English being an established official language, the listing down of the major languages in the eighth schedule also posed problems, many languages such as Rajasthani were rejected as being dialects, this opened up the language-dialect debate as well as the issue of standard language. The term 'standard language', 'national language' and 'official language' are not synonymous, but there is a close connection between them. Any language that is accepted by its speakers as a symbol of nationhood or is designated by government for official use will tend to be standardized, whether deliberately or not, as a precondition or a consequence of this very fact (Lyons, 1981).

A major shift also emerged with the reorganization of states on linguistic basis in the 1950s. In British India, the provinces were divided on the basis of administration, but in Independent India the linguistic reorganization of states was more or less in sync with the listing of languages of the eighth schedule (Krishna, 1991). This lent one regional language or language variety more authority than the rest on the state level, a situation that led to what Mohanty (2009) refers to as the 'Double Divide Framework', which will be discussed in detail in a while. Krishnamurti elaborates that the languages which were already dominant before independence, had their scripts and literature and were used in newspapers and radio, were the natural and undisputed candidates for inclusion in the Eighth Schedule (Krishnamurti, 1995). Constituent Assembly members thus unintentionally helped forwarding the cause of the elite classes, in "giving recognition to a single language as the language of education, administration and mass communication in plurilingual society bestows advantages on the speakers of that language" (Pattanayak, 1990, p. *v*). As Prof. Mohanty would say the native languages were 'pushed out' of the significant domains; including education, which leads to a dwindling effect on the use, spread and status of the native languages (Mohanty, 2009). Mohanty terms this as the 'Double Divide Framework' where

English, on the top of the hierarchy, pushes Hindi and other vernacular languages down, and in turn the vernacular languages push out other languages of the region. He also states that, "In most multilingual societies of the world the languages that are spoken and not spoken are related to power and hierarchy and access to resources" (Mohanty et. al., 2009, p. 282).

The languages or the language variety that thus emerges out has a capital, a '*linguistic capital*', a subdomain of cultural capital[2] , that the upper classes now possess by default, owing to the political and social position that their language or language variety occupies. But capital needs to have a market too, since where would the capital derive its value from if it does not have a market? Words don't have a value of their own, political, and social institutions are the markets where linguistic capital derives its value from. "In the process which leads to construction, legitimation and imposition of an official language, the educational system plays a decisive role", as the "educational market is strictly dominated by the linguistic products of the dominant class and tends to sanction the pre-existing differences in capital" (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 48).

Let us take a brief look at some of the educational policies of India with regard to language, in the light of this statement. Even before Independence, Macaulay was of the view that English education was necessary for the Indian Education system. Indians also at the time demanded for an English education as it could provide them with jobs in the British government. Macaulay's Minute 1853 and Wood's Dispatch 1854 both laid the foundation for English Education in India. After independence only the elite, who had access to English education before, benefitted and stood to profit from its continuation. Subsequent policies based on the recommendations of various commissions upheld the established norms. Warning against which Nehru had already remarked in the educational conference 1948 that, "Whenever conferences were called to form a plan for education in India, the tendency, as a rule, was to maintain the existing system with slight modification. This must not happen now…The entire basis of education must be revolutionized".

The first amongst these was the report of the University Education Commission (1950) a result of the Radhakrishnan Commission (1948), referring to the issue of language, it mentioned that students 'should be familiar with three languages-regional, federal and English at the university stage and that English be replaced as early as possible by an Indian language'. Though most of the recommendations were considered by CABE (Central Advisory Board of Education) in 1950 and adopted, the ones dealing with the issue of language were said to lack practical applicability. The next major and perhaps the most important commission on Indian education was the Kothari Commission (1964-1966) under the chairmanship of Dr. D. S. Kothari, which recommended the three-language formula on the issue of medium of educational instruction in schools, most of its recommendations were adopted under the National Policy on Education (NPE) 1986. However, the three-language

[2] Bourdieu argues that capital is not just limited to economic arena, there are various forms of capital such as social and cultural, and one form of capital can be converted into another

formula was watered down and manipulated at every stage of implementation due to the loopholes left in the policy. Several other policies and commissions fleetingly mentioned the issue of language in education, the recommendations of the commissions were either based upon the previous ones, or they were mellowed down during implementation. Thus, the situation of language education as well as the medium of educational instruction remained more or less unaltered as far as policies were concerned.

When states were reorganised on the basis of linguistic lines under the seventh amendment in 1956, the constitution had directed the states under article 350A to provide for adequate facilities for mother tongue as a medium of instruction to children belonging to linguistic minorities up to the primary stage. This was again emphasized under the Right to Education Act in 2009, but primary educational instruction in mother tongue still remains a distant dream.

One of the chief reasons behind this being the vested political, economic, and social interests of the mainstream elite who had been enjoying the benefits of development as a result of the exclusive access to educational and other resources. Education is not only the source of awareness but also grants access to resources and opportunities. And medium of educational exchange and instruction is the key through which these doors are opened. Thus, the majority of the population whose languages had not found representation in the constitution and therefore in the subsequent policies remained devoid of the benefits of the socio-economic development of the country.

The implementation of policies on the grass root level was even sparser when it came to diversity in language, there were and are loopholes in the three-language formula (for details see Krishna 1991), higher education lacks clarity upon the issue of medium of education, educational instruction in mother tongue has hardly been practised on the scale on which it was envisaged. “There is evidence to show that teachers, like most educated members of the community whatever their own social origins, are prejudiced, in various ways, against non-standard regional and social dialects. They may even, unwittingly, judge a child to be of lower intelligence simply because of his dialect” (Lyons, 1981, p. 287).

Bernstein’s work on restricted code and elaborated code highlights the so-called language-deficit that children from working class homes face in educational setup. But his work is controversial from the sociolinguistic point of view and he himself warned that these two codes are not to be equated with standard and non-standard varieties of a language. Regardless of the differences in the underlying reasons and theoretical explanations, “No one denies, however, that, as things are at present, children who come to school speaking a dialect that differs significantly from the standard face a problem that speakers of the standard do not have” (Lyons, 1981, p. 289). The same applies in case of preferred languages in education vs. the regional languages as well. It has also been demonstrated that the higher one scales on the

educational ladder, "the greater is the demand for lesser number of languages" (Pattanayak, 1981, p. *xv*).

In a democratic setup like India, this is catastrophic to say the least, especially in the context of education, since "It is difficult to separate education and literacy from the struggle for rights and self-determination" (López and Sichra, 2008, p. 295). The impacts on the marginalized population range from widespread illiteracy to unemployment, resulting in the unequal distribution of the nation's advancement benefits, be it in the area of technology, economy or knowledge. Pattanayak (1981) argues that such an approach of elitist monopolisation of culture and education in a democratic set up is opposed to the democratic goals of the nation. Dua sums it up the larger implications of this, "The language-status decisions about language allocation and use in the domain of education have far-reaching consequences for the developing multilingual countries. They determine not only the function, status and development of indigenous languages but also the pattern of communication and socio-economic and political processes of change and modernisation since patterns of language choice and use are related to distribution of knowledge, resources and power in the society" (Dua, 1990, p. 87).

The survival of a language also depends upon its functionality and usage in the social context. As mentioned earlier, education has a say in this 'market', it is in itself a market for creating value of a language. The unification of labour market gave education an even larger share in the power to decide access to jobs and resources. The position which the educational system gives to the different languages is such an important issue only because this institution has the monopoly in the large-scale production of producers/consumers, and therefore in the reproduction of the market without which the social value of linguistic competence, its capacity to function as linguistic capital would cease to exist (Bourdieu, 1991).

The educational set up goes a step beyond acting as a market for linguistic capital, it instils a sense of inherent value in its own product. Bourdieu expounds that there is an overt relationship between educational qualifications and access to resources, but covert one when it comes to defining the relationship between educational qualifications and cultural capital[3]. The beneficiaries of the system thus can justify to themselves and others, the logical basis of their privilege through the former and the deprived sections cannot understand the basis of their deprivation due to the latter concealment. The basis of the power and domination itself is thus veiled from the eyes of both the dominant classes and the dominated ones. The dominated thus have a firm belief not only in the superiority of the dominant languages and the standard variety of language, but also in the system and the institutions which provide the language with this power; Institutions such as education. This is 'Symbolic power' because it does not require any external force or violence, it manifests itself through beliefs. Bourdieu explains symbolic power as "that invisible power which can be exercised only with the complicity of those who do not want to know that they are subject to it or even that they

[3] linguistic capital is a part of cultural capital

themselves exercise it" (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 164). No form of 'Symbolic power' thus can be exercised without the compliance of those who are subjected to it, it "requires, as a condition of its success that those subjected to it believe in the legitimacy of power and the legitimacy of those who wield it" (Thompson, 1991, p. 23). Thus, when there is a demand for English medium education the desire of moving up the socio-economic ladder to claim a share in the power is being manifested. The '*silent violence'* in the context of standard language, manifests itself most when the dominated group tries to imitate the sanctioned diction, fails and feels devoid of voice. This violence is silent and "all the more absolute and undisputed for not having to be stated" (Bourdieu, 1991, p.52). Antonio Gramsci's concept of 'hegemony' also highlights the non-coercive aspects of power, where people submit under the pressure of an invisible cultural power. "This non-coercive power penetrates consciousness itself, so that the dominated become accomplices in their own domination" (Corson, 1997, p. 18).

Moreover, as we use language to make sense of our world when that itself becomes the site of politics and a resource, then our very ability to claim our rights or even make sense of our world becomes severely limited. The power wielded by language and other domains is thus a power of constructing reality since the ideologies of the dominant class and their language define the nature of social transactions and the world in general. These ideologies and languages are not only produced and reproduced by the dominant communities through usage, but also by specialists of the field, who came with the rise of division of labour and took the 'instruments of symbolic production' out of reach of the layman. In the context of language, the field specialists being intellectuals, writers, teachers, lexicographers and so on, who define the validity and lend power to the dominant language or forms of language.

The 'process of continuous creation' too lends the dominant and legitimate languages the power to continue. The field of written word especially accords a kind of sacrosanct value to the languages in its domain, be it one dominant language or a dominant form of a language, and instruments such as educational texts and dictionaries contribute towards this value creation. The circle continues as Bourdieu explains with "the devaluation of the common language which results from the very existence of a literary language" and thus "those who operate in the literary field contribute to symbolic domination" whether by conscious or unconscious association (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 60).

The resultant effects on the linguistic communities thus marginalized, and largely unaware of the domination exercised over them, are not limited to linguistic, sociological, economic or political dimension, it extends on to the psychological as well, since languages are not just medium of education or communication, language is "an organic process through which the visions and values of a society are passed on…People's social, cultural and political identity is bound by the language that they speak, and hear, that they think in and that they use to communicate" (Saxena & Mahendroo, 1993, p. 2445).

Regarding the consequences of this for linguistic diversity, Dua (1990) states that if language-education planning decisions are not made on an unbiased and balanced basis then the whole structure of a multilingual set up will collapse and smaller native languages will disappear completely. In the context of Indian linguistic situation this is already evident by the dwindling number of languages used in education, as indicated by the data supplied by NCERT over the years, as well as the languages used in communication, shown by the census data.

Indian linguists have suggested some relevant innovative solutions for the inclusion of multiple languages in education. Prof. Agnihotri talks about developing multilingual classrooms on the school level which will provide the learner with varied knowledge of multiple languages and their respective vocabulary, thus developing the languages along with or rather through the process of language instruction itself. But the problem lies in the fact that language is not a value neutral resource. Outside the classroom especially when the social relationship between languages is a hierarchical one, when the constitution and the language policies grant a legal base for this hierarchy, the struggle to make languages a part of value free instruction becomes an impossible one to win. Khubchandani states, that "the battle over the role of language in education and other privileges has been fought largely in the political arena. Often language has been used as a weapon in the struggle for political power" (Khubchandani, 1995, p. 38). Therefore, the efforts such as the formation of Central Institute of Indian Languages (CIIL) for the development of languages, the three-language formula, the additions of more languages to the 8th Schedule and the recent efforts for revival of Sanskrit and Hindi through the school education system and university education courses respectively, have not brought about any considerable results.

A further complication is added by the prestige accorded to English (Sridhar, 1996). Some have argued for English as a link language, while the most potent argument posited for English medium education has been Globalization. But arguing in favour of an education which is global, in its perspective of looking at other discourses apart from its own, Spivak underlines that such an education does not necessarily mean sacrificing the wealth of world languages in the name of global communication. She says, "one of the primary dangers that result from globalization is the creation of monolithic categories that erase difference, ignore unique identities, and minimize the importance of diversities" (Spivak, 2012, p. 2).

The argument that English is an International language of communication and is therefore desirable, does not pose well for the development of the native languages in education also, since "by acknowledging English as the international language, the language of science and technology, and the neutral language, a climate is sought to be created where Indian languages are relegated to the background. They are labelled regional, if not local, unfit for science and technology, and representative of vested interests" (Pattanayak, 1984, p. 127) thus demonstrating the effects of Mohanty's Double divide framework. "Moreover people have to participate in a wider society within a national framework before they join the

wider international society. English which is confined to a minority elite may not measure up to the challenges of national integration" (Pattanayak, 1981, p. 10).

With a dwindling situation at hand in terms of linguistic diversity, education's role as preserver of equality, and the inequality meted out to the communities whose languages are not provided with their due recognition and fair share in nation's development, the solution cannot be limited to either political, social, educational, or linguistic front alone. Still a good start will be being aware of the arbitrary nature of this symbolic violence. As the power wielded by the dominant languages, and the communities who use them, is dependent on sanction by the dominant and the dominated classes through silent participation, its obliteration, therefore, depends on being aware of its arbitrary nature, and destruction of the belief in its inherent value.

==========

References

Annamalai, E. (1995). Language and the Indian Constitution. In: R. S. Gupta, A. Abbi & K.S. Aggarwal (Eds.) *Language and the State: Perspectives on the Eighth Schedule.* New Delhi: Creative Books.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). On Symbolic Power. In Thompson, J.B. (Ed), *Language and Symbolic Power* (pp. 163-170). G. Raymond & M. Adamson Trans. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Corson, D. (1997). *Language Diversity and Education*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dua, H.R. (1990). Multilingualism from a Language Planning Perspective: Issues and Prospects. In: D.P. Pattanayak (Ed.) *Multilingualism in India*. New Delhi: Orient Longman.

Hudson, R.A. (1980). Languages. In *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Khubchandani, L.M. (1995). The Eighth Schedule as a Device of Language Engineering. In: R.S. Gupta, A. Abbi & K.S. Aggarwal (Eds.) *Language and the State: Perspectives on the Eighth Schedule*. New Delhi: Creative Books.

Krishna, S. (1991). Official Languages and the Administration. In Krishna S. (Ed.) *India's Living Languages*. New Delhi: Allied Publishers Limited.

Krishnamurti, Bh. (1995). Official Language Policies: With Special References to the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution of India. In: R.S. Gupta, A. Abbi & K.S. Aggarwal (Eds.) *Language and the State: Perspectives on the Eighth Schedule*. New Delhi: Creative Books.

López, L.E. & Sichra, I. (2008). Intercultural bilingual education among indigenous peoples. In J. Cummins & N.H. Homberger (Eds.) *Encyclopedia of Language and Education Vol. 5 Bilingual Education*. New York: Springer.

Lyons, J. (1968). *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. London and New York: Cambridge University Press

Lyons, J. (1981). *Language and Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

==========

Mohanty, A.K. (2009). Multilingual Education-a bridge too far? In A.K. Mohanty, M. Panda, R. Phillipson & T. Skutnabb-Kangas (Eds.) *Multilingual Education for Social Justice Globalising the Local*. New Delhi: Orient BlackSwan.

NCERT (2006). *Position Paper- National Focus Group on Teaching of Indian Languages*. NCERT.

Parliament of India (1947). *Constituent Assembly Debates Vol. 2. 22nd Jan. 1947*. Retrieved on 25.09.2016 from http://parliamentofindia.nic.in/ls/debates/debates.htm

Pattanayak, D. P. (1984). Multilingualism and Language Politics in India. *India International Centre Quarterly*, 11(2), 125 – 131.

Pattanayak, D.P. (1981). *Multilingualism and Mother-Tongue Education*. Delhi: Oxford University Press

Pattanayak, D.P. (1990). Introduction. In D.P. Pattanayak (Ed.) *Multilingualism in India*. New Delhi: Orient Longman.

Pool, J. (1972). National development and language diversity. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Advances in the Sociology of Language* Vol. II. Paris: Mouton.

Saxena, S. & Mahendroo, K. (1993). Politics of Language. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 28(45), 2445-2447.

Spivak, G. C. (2012). *An Aesthetic Education in the Era of Globalization*. Harvard: Harvard University Press

Sridhar, K. K. (1996). Language in Education: Minorities and Multilingualism in India. *International Review of Education*, 42(4), 327 – 347.

Thiong'o, Ngũgĩ wa (1986). *Decolonising the Mind: The politics of Language in African Literature*. Portsmouth: Heinemann Publishers.

==========