

16.

Decolonising English Studies in India

Susheel Kumar Sharma

Professor of English, University of Allahabad, Prayagraj, UP, India

Abstract

The paper deals with the theory and praxis of decolonising English Studies in India. The paper suggests appropriate measures to pull out English Studies from the Macaulayan paradigm and to recast the priorities in English Studies in the light of changing role for emerging India in the unipolar world realities, rising aspirations of the middle classes, and democratic and egalitarian needs. The project of 'decolonising' education at the macro-level and English Studies at the micro-level has been discussed with reference to curriculum, teaching methods, materials, evaluation, research and publication and medium of instruction in all possible details in the paper. The paper attempts to deal with contemporary realities like various treaties and market economy and issues like making a distinction between real knowledge and colonial knowledge along with the historical context of English Studies. Several measures have been suggested to make English Studies in India relevant to contemporary times, to save them from being derivative and to reshape Euro-American knowledge about English culture, Literature and Language from an Indian perspective. Practical suggestions to decolonise curriculum have been made keeping in view the distinction between teaching literature and language in the first and the second language situations.

Keywords: Curriculum, Decolonisation, Education, English Literature/ Language, Gandhi, India, Macaulay, Publications, Research, Teaching Methods.

Introduction

To set the tone of my paper let me begin by citing three different authorities separated by time and place:

"If I were to look over the whole world to find out the country most richly endowed with all the wealth, power, and beauty that nature can bestow—in some parts a very paradise on earth—I should point to India. If I were asked under what sky the human mind has most fully

developed some of its choicest gifts, has most deeply pondered on the greatest problems of life, and has found solutions to some of them which well deserve the attention even of those who have studied Plato and Kant—I should point to India. And if I were to ask myself from what literature we, here in Europe, who have been nurtured almost exclusively on the thoughts of Greeks and Romans, and of one Semitic race, the Jewish, may draw that corrective which is most wanted to make our inner life more perfect, more comprehensive, more universal, in fact more truly human, a life, not for this life only, but a transfigured and eternal life—again I should point to India.” (F K M Max Müller 5)

“... the official intelligentsia of post-independence India [eschew] their own culture and [turn] to Western, mechanistic dogmas, from Marxism to neoliberalism. Whether they worship the State or the Market, such intellectuals dishonour their [country’s] noblest traditions. They are as craven as those American and British academics who place politically correct considerations before the pursuit of truth and intellectual freedom. In the best of Indian popular culture, however, [one may find] an integrity, a latitudinarian tolerance and a connectedness to nature lacking in intellectual circles - and lacking in Western civilisation today.” (Rankin Aidan viii-ix)

“O members of the Indian intelligentsia! ... speaking polished English, and putting down your own countrymen, specially anybody who has a Hindu connection, makes you an intellectual. But in the process, you have not only lost your roots, you have turned your back on a culture and civilisation that is thousands of years old and has given so much to the world. You are forgetting what a privilege it is to be born an Indian — and a Hindu at that — inheritors of a spirituality that accepts that God manifests Himself under different names, at different times, when today the world’s two biggest monotheistic religions still think their God is the only true one and it is their duty to convert everybody by guile or force.” (Francois Gautier n.pag.)

Decolonization

The term decolonization has been a part of academic discourse since 1932 though it perhaps first appeared in 1836². *Britannica* defines decolonization as “the process by which colonies become independent of the colonizing country.” (*Britannica*) The process is “often long, tortuous, and violent, by which colonies achieve their national aspirations for political independence from the colonial metropolitan power.” (Watts 361) It involves a kind of “restorative justice” in the form of racial, ethnic, social, cultural, legal, physical, emotional, intellectual, cultural and spiritual well-being through the

process of economic, cultural and psychological freedom. The term is also used to refer to the intellectual decolonization from the colonisers' ideas that made the colonised feel inferior. (Mignolo) Because "decolonization is an interrogation of the European concept of territoriality" (Kubayanda 26) true decolonisation seeks to challenge and change White superiority, nationalistic history and the colonisers' "truth". Bill Ashcroft et al. therefore, correctly describe decolonization as "the process of dismantling the hidden aspects of those institutional and cultural forces that had maintained the colonialist power and that remains even after political independence is achieved." (Ashcroft et al 56) Some scholars also argue that "the term decolonization should be replaced by 'elimination of the white supremacy mindset'." (Binagwaho et. al 2)

Why Decolonise English Studies in India

Gauri Viswanathan rightly holds that the study of English and the growth of the empire proceeded from a single ideological climate (*Masks*). "Valid knowledge" is different from "colonial knowledge" because of their different objectives. While the goal of the former is to explore truth, the latter is a tool in the hands of the colonisers for the consolidation and perpetuation of their rule in the colony. Chinweizu in his "Colonizer's Logic" puts it very cogently with a tinge of irony: "The Natives are unintelligent—/ We do not understand their language" (Chinweizu 32). Because the "civilized imperialist" pretends not to understand the "primitive colonised's languages" the former undertakes the civilising mission, coupled with religious fervour zestfully, and uses his euro-centric knowledge to help "the natives come out of their ignorance and darkness in their lives". With the emergence of postcolonial theory to the centre stage of theoretical studies in Humanities, the need for scrutinising various colonial institutions, including "knowledge" and "knowledge production" has been felt more intensely. Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's *Decolonising the Mind* (1986) and *Globalectics: Theory and the Politics of Knowing* (2012) have accelerated the process of scrutiny that was started by Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978). A close audit of "the institutions of knowledge production" that set the canon of studies is the crying need of the hour in postcolonial India, a society that happens to be the oldest surviving civilization in the world. The project of colonial

education in India was undertaken with a target to make the Indian mind “barren of any originality”, to keep Indians perpetually “in ignorance” by “paralysing and stupefying [their] minds”, to feed Indian minds with stories of England’s greatness and “mission” in the world, and to obliterate their race-consciousness from their minds.

The modern education system in India, the brainchild of Macaulay, is a highly respected colonial remnant which runs on the presumptive principle of the “intrinsic superiority of the Western literature” (columbia.edu). English studies in India greatly strengthen the Macaulayan presumptive principle. In India both of them (Education system and English Studies) continue to be highly derivative; the only dent that has come to them since 1947 is because of the growing influence of the USA in several spheres of life. While education, especially higher education in India was Anglo-centric earlier, as a result of the new political and economic order, it is Anglo-American-centric now. Even a cursory comparison of the course lists, items/ topics therein, and the lists of prescribed and recommended books will prove my point. The decolonisation of education including English studies in India is much needed if India has to stand on its own, assert her identity in the world, provide some sort of vision for an alternative world and also, if “*Bharat ko vishguru banana hai*” (India is to be a world leader) to use an expression from the right-wing rhetoric. Decolonising is to take place in respect of the following four main components of an educational system: Curriculum and Courses, Research and Publications, Medium of Instruction, and Examination and Writing.

Colonial Legacy of Curriculum and Courses

A cursory glance at the prescribed books and recommended books in the curricula of the UG/PG programmes in the Universities will make one realise that almost all the books are by either British or American authors or from Indian authors who parrot Western ideas and arguments. There are hardly any books from the countries where English is taught as a second/ foreign language or from the Indian authors who present an Indian perspective/ point of view. This ignoring of a vast reservoir of the knowledge and experiences of the similarly situated people is to our detriment. The curricula developed

by the Curriculum Development Centre are no different. Their study also highlights the fact that an undue emphasis on teaching English Literature is there in the curricula. This is a sort of colonial hangover which is justified unabashedly by many intellectuals located in India and abroad. Let me illustrate it with an example from a typical PG course titled “Literary Criticism (From Plato to Leavis)” (though it covers critics up to Showalter) being offered at Indian Institute of Technology Madras (archive.NPTEL). The course deals only with Ameri-Euro Critics and ignores Indian critics altogether. It is well known that reading literature evokes certain emotions. But, in this course in particular and the curriculum at large, no course is offered that talks about these emotions and the process of evoking them. In the Ameri-Euro tradition, Aristotle is the only literary critic who refers to emotions; he mentions two emotions (pity and fear) with reference to tragedy and refers to one (comic) in the context of Comedy. In his *Natya Shastra*, Bharata, on the other hand, discusses eight *rasa/emotions*)¹⁰ in detail. Naturally, a student who knows about twenty-three emotions/rasas is in a better position to understand and appreciate literature and life than one who knows only about two. Bharata is ignored in this course because he is a native; this ignorance of the teacher/ students helps in maintaining colonial hegemony; besides the student’s understanding of literature remains incomplete.

The modern Indian education system has not only impacted our collective epistemological viewpoints but our society as a whole has also been impacted; we seem to be a rootless society that suddenly came into existence in 1947 out of nothing. Racism is not basically about colour; it’s about power. The present education system does not empower the Indians; it becomes so visible in the matter of economic achievements. This is very clear from the statistics about imports and exports. “India’s share of the world economy was 23 per cent, as large as all of Europe put together [when Britain arrived on it’s shores, but] by the time the British departed [from] India, it had dropped to just over 3 per cent.” (Tharoor 4) “India’s share of global gross domestic product (GDP) rose to 7.09 percent in 2019” (O’Neill Oct 27) The exports and imports of India in 2019 were: the total value of exports (FoB) was 323,251 million; the total value of imports (CIF) was 478,884 million.” (wits.world bank) This powerlessness can also be

measured in terms of the meagre number of publications from Indian universities on one hand and those from Western university presses like Oxford, Cambridge, Harvard, Durham etc on the other. It is so obvious that the opinion-building power (soft power) rests with the West. Money-minting-power by way of the export of the books and ideas also lies with them. So, decolonising the curriculum is not needed solely for cultural or intellectual reasons but also economic reasons.

There are a large number of academicians who claim that the teaching of English literature in India (TELI) is necessitated because English is a *lingua franca* in India and is patronised by the Government of India as an Official language. Such persons speak only half-truths as no literature can be the “*lingua franca*”; they deliberately gloss over the fact that English Language and English Literature are two different issues/disciplines. The belief that by teaching English Literature *alone* proficiency in the English Language can be achieved/ increased is not backed by any authentic data/ research. Even the postulation that English Literature/ Language are synonymous or interdependent does not prove English to be the *lingua franca* in India. As regards, the English Language being the official language, the Constitution does not envisage perpetuating its status forever as the provision has been inserted to meet a particular contingency. Again, if English is the *lingua franca* of the anglicised Indian academicians or the Indian people needs scrutiny based on some authentic data. That English is the “*lingua franca* of the people” is just a presumption, not backed up by the figures in the Census (2011). According to the 2011 Census, just 0.02 % of the total Indian population (Males: 1,29,115, Females:1,30,563, Total 2,59,678) (census India) recognized English as their mother-tongue and only 10.6% of the total population use it as a second and third language. (Wikipedia, censusindia). While 8,27,17,239 persons (6.835% of the total Indian population) use it as their second language, 4,55,62,173 Indians (3.765% of the total Indian population) use it as their third language. In the Census its decadal (2001-2011) percentage growth has been reported to be 14.67, much less in comparison to several other languages. In a nationally representative sample survey conducted by Lok Foundation and Oxford University, administered by the Centre for Monitoring Indian Economy in 2019, “just 6% of

respondents said they could speak English, less than what the 2011 Census showed.” (livemint) If about 90-95% population of this huge multi-lingual and multicultural country do not know/use English is it justifiable to describe the English language as the lingua franca of India? Again, it has been reported in a Lok Foundation survey that “English speakers are richer, more educated and more likely to be upper caste.” (livemint.com) This minority group because of the colonial hangover holds considerable economic power and assumes the role of opinion and decision-makers in this country. Can this minority group be allowed to continue the social ostracization of the majority by holding power against the egalitarian norms? Can this socially elite group of people be the sole representative of India against all democratic norms? These academicians argue in the manner of Macaulay who believed that scholars of English could be produced in this country by teaching them English literature. If their arguments had been valid English courses in India would have seen the presence of Indian scholars in various syllabi.

In countries like France, Germany, Russia Japan etc. (where English is not the medium of instruction) foreign scholars (who go there for higher studies) are taught the language (of the respective country) in one year with such proficiency that they are not only able to complete their higher studies but also write doctoral dissertation and publish papers in that language in the journals of international repute. On the contrary, in India despite teaching English literature for more than sixteen years the students fumble for words to express themselves, what to say of writing and publishing a research paper in correct English. If my testimony on the worthlessness of the approach/ course is any good, here it goes: “I, along with some others, was associated with the evaluation of the answer scripts in a recently held competitive examination for the post of lecturer in Government intermediate colleges. This examination was open to the Indians holding at least an MA (English) degree; about 1500 candidates appeared in this examination after passing a screening test. Only a few answer scripts were written in tolerably correct English; the answers largely gave no clue of the examinees’ comprehension of the questions and the instructions — neither in the literature section nor in the grammar section. Having examined such scripts, I felt I had wasted forty years of my life just to earn wages.

My experience of interviewing candidates for the post of Assistant Professor (English) has rarely been better.”

On the question of the value of native literature, the opinion of the Oriental and Occidental groups was unanimous as is apparent from the following two opinions. Macaulay haughtily held, “that a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia. The intrinsic superiority of the Western literature is indeed fully admitted by those members of the committee who support the oriental plan of education.” (columbia.edu) Likewise, a member of the Oriental group, Henry Thoby Prinsep, held:

“It is laid down that the vernacular dialects are not fit to be made the vehicle of instruction in science or literature, that the choice is therefore between English on one hand and Sanscrit and Arabic on the other—the latter is dismissed on the ground that their literature is worthless and the superiority of that of England is set forth in an animated description of the treasures of science and of intelligence it contains any of the stores of intellectual enjoyment it opens. *There is nobody acquainted with both literatures that will not subscribe to all that is said in the minute of the superiority of that of England... .*” (emphasis added) (Sharp 121)

The unanimity on the issue of denigrating native literatures seems to be emanating from their “national pride” which to an Indian is a euphuism for colonial pride. Indians have been quite meek to ask about the qualification of the members of both the groups i.e., occidental and oriental plan to know the extent of their familiarity with European and Indian languages and literatures to pass a judgment. The educated Indians have largely accepted Macaulay’s judgment as they have been taught just to accept English opinions without any critical scrutiny. The Indian teachers of English go a step further and act as Macaulay’s trumpeting agents who spread unsubstantiated claims and propagate myths like “English is used all over the world”, “English Literature is the best/ universal literature”, “Shakespeare is a universal dramatist”, “India/Indians will not prosper without English” and “For a majority of Indians English has become their own language, their only language of expression” (Banu 17) etc. for they have their axe to grind at the cost of truth and the cost of national mental freedom.

English Language and English Literature

The word “English” as a noun does not find a place singularly in the Constitution of India though the expression “English Language” finds a mention at fifteen places in the Constitution. English is not find mentioned in the list of the Indian languages given in the eighth schedule of the Constitution. It is very clear from this that the role of English in the Constitution has simply been envisaged as a means of communication for different purposes. It is also to be noted that nowhere has it been specified that “English” stands for “British English” (or any other variety of English) as a means of communication. It is an unwritten law/ convention for the custodians of English in India (the neo-colonialists), the public service commissions, the university/college departments, the intellectual elites, and the authors that by English they understand “British English”. The reason for this hegemony lies in the colonial hangover which is continued and glorified as “tradition”. Though Braj B Kachru and his spouse Yamuna Kachru tried their level best to establish the identity of Indian English²⁹ as an independent variety of English their intellectually rich research efforts neither got support from the highly colonial Indian authors in English nor the Indian academia. Little do the intellectual elites realize that it is the tradition of “intellectual slavery” that they have been cherishing and promoting. Whether this slavery springs up from historical positioning, ignorance, lack of synergetic language planning, lack of initiative and intellectual prowess or helplessness or some other factors is more a matter of common sense than of some deep research.

Most of the people who wish to join higher education in India need English language. People also see English as a passport to better jobs and better social positioning. Because of their ignorance, many of them do not make any distinction between the English language and English literature. R N Srivastava in *English, August* says, “... I began to read English on my own. I had to because English was compulsory for the Civil Services exam. So I read Shakespeare and Wordsworth and people like that, very difficult. It’s still important to know English, it gives one ... confidence.’... .” (Chatterjee 59-60) With the Government policy of taking higher education to the doorsteps of people one finds universities and colleges in the remote corners of

India. With this even English has also reached all the nooks and corners of the country. The teachers and the institutions either very subtly hoodwink or push the learners to join a course in English Literature. R N Srivastav says, “That a young man in Azamganj should find it essential to study *something as unnecessary as Hamlet, that is absurd*, no, but also inevitable, and just as inevitably, if we behave ourselves, in three generations it will fade.” (emphasis added Chatterjee 60) Unlike the situation in Germany or Russia where a foreign student studies the language of the country in India, a student has to study English for about 12 years before joining a university. Then the realization dawns upon him/her that (s)he is not sufficiently proficient in English to pursue a course satisfactorily. I wish our teachers could just compare 12 years to one year of training to teach an alien language to meet the needs of society.

While most of the foreign universities in the EFL/ ESL situation do not lay emphasis on literature in teaching the second/foreign language, in India, it is almost mandatory to talk of dated authors like Shakespeare, Milton, Dryden, Wordsworth and the like. Most of the universities have been awarding degrees in “English” or “English Literature” after teaching almost the same content in English Literature. The course contents also consist of largely British Literature; there is hardly any paper dealing with teaching/ learning skills of a language. The result of this is reflected in the following sentence of a very senior teacher: “A student who writes ten pages about Hamlet’s madness is unable to draft an application in English.” This indicates not only the quality of teaching but also the misdirected effort of emphasising teaching English Literature in place of the English Language against the spirit of the Constitution. Our over-enthusiastic teachers either fail to grasp the basic fact or they pretend to ignore the fact that learning literature in any language is possible only after some basic proficiency in the language has been achieved. No wonder our post-graduates in English literature fail to deliver what is expected of them. A fictional account of Agastya by Upamanyu Chatterjee in his *English, August* is sufficient to prove my point.

For the development of ELT and related issues, to improve the standard of teaching of English and to undertake relevant research in the field the Government opened a new Institute, Central Institute of

English in 1958 with the mandate: “instructional, research and extension facilities in the teaching of English and foreign languages and literatures in India” (efluniversity). In 1972 it was converted to Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages. However, this did not deter other universities from changing their policies of teaching and propagating English Literature on a very unusually large scale in an independent country. In other words, the cultural imperialism of English Literature has kept on spreading undeterred even in independent India. With the passage of time, it became English and Foreign Language University, a Central University. The phenomenon is so powerful that even EFLU came under its influence and it has emerged as a new centre for spreading and disseminating English literary culture, spreading the idea of the “inherent superiority of the Western literature” and colonising the Indian mindset further.

The governance of the country according to the colonial rules and colonial mindset is rubbing the salt to the wound. For example, the 1921 rules that govern the recruitment of teachers in a school/college affiliated to UP Secondary Board specify the minimum qualification as a graduate in English Literature though in matters of other languages it just mentions Hindi Urdu or Sanskrit. It is to be noted that the job of a trained graduate teacher in a UP Board secondary school is to teach both English literature and English language. The situation has been prevalent and continuing since the days of Macaulay who designed a course of English literature for imparting training in English. All those graduates who take their graduation in English Language are denied a job opportunity as per the existing law and are put in a disadvantageous position. Nobody seems to have noticed this anomaly. While a course in English literature should have been replaced by one in English Language after independence, those who study the English language are discriminated against. This also means that those who are competent to discharge his/her duties are declared technically unqualified to their peril. Some of such persons have been contesting cases in the High Court at Allahabad and a verdict is still awaited.

Decolonising Teaching Strategies in English Studies

If the reading lists in the university courses are any evidence, it is clear that Indian universities are Indian only in their location. There is hardly a book in the lists that does not come from either the US or the UK authors or the presses located there. In terms of syllabus, almost all the Indian universities have introduced papers on American Literature and New literatures like Australian/ Canadian/ Caribbean / Commonwealth Literature, Indian Aesthetics, Linguistics, and World Literature etc. along with British Literature. However, the reference books and the reading lists in these courses are full of Anglo-American critics. Again, even the canon of the texts is defined and set by Anglo-American critics. This also proves that not only the flow of knowledge is uni-directional i.e., from the West to the East but also that the Indian intellectuals do not show any sign of independent thinking and judgment. Again, even if some Indian names are there in the list, they hardly represent the Indian perspective. Thus, it may safely be said that all the recommended books represent the typical Western point of view. This tendency is indicative of either the absence of the Indian perspective or considering Indians as brain-dead. Let me illustrate this with an example. In Allahabad University there used to be a tradition of printing the Lecture Lists which comprised the list of the authors and works prescribed for detailed and non-detailed study, reference books, pattern of question paper and the topics of the lectures that the concerned teachers were supposed to deliver.

Conclusion

The primary purpose of education is the betterment of society as a whole by developing rational, mature and empathetic human beings. All teaching activities including reading, writing and evaluating students focus on this and have to be organised with this objective in mind. The objective of a course in literature is to develop understanding of an individual by honing his/her analytical skills. By carefully selecting literary works, the teachers try to show their students how the world works, how to find relevance and meaning in their lives, how to enjoy reading literature and how to find out merit and meaning in a text. With this view in mind, a close, objective and text-centred literary analysis is the primary focus in a literature course/ classroom. Certain evaluation strategies are used to evaluate

the performance and understanding of the learners. Whether the evaluation of candidates is possible in English or other languages (mother tongues) has been a point of controversy in the second language situation. The related issue is if the research articles have to be written in English or in the regional languages. Currently, in the Indian situation, only Sahitya Akademi felicitates some sort of bilingualism in matters of publications — e. g. a paper on a Punjabi author may get published in English, in the literary magazine, *Indian Literature* or a paper on Vikram Seth's poetry may be published in Hindi in *Samkāleen Bhārtiya Sāhitya*.

Bilingual methods of teaching (materials, medium of instruction and evaluation) and research are very well recognised all over the world and have gainfully been used at primary and secondary levels. It has also been used in some Indian universities (un)officially to teach English literature as is clear from the popularity of various bilingual university level textbooks in different states. However, this sort of teaching and book production is frowned upon by some of the Indian academicians who deride it as substandard teaching/learning material for the rustics.

There appears to be a symbiotic relationship between economic prosperity and attitude towards languages. If the figures of bilinguals and tri-linguals in the Indian Census 2011 are any proof monolingualism leads to poverty. Those states that have the higher number of bilinguals and tri-linguals are developed but the states where predominantly monolinguals stay, are backward. Of late, a new class of monolingual, English speaking, social elites have emerged particularly in the metros through expensive English medium schooling; they are not only blind to several dimensions of culture but they also perceive reality only through one lens. Their appreciation of literature also is just an extension of the Christo-Anglo-American literary view. On the other hand, we have a large number of colleges and universities in the far-flung areas where the students wish to acquire some skills in the English language somehow and the teachers wish that the students should somehow be able to follow, understand and appreciate their lectures. The bilingual method comes handy to such teachers and students. However, some professors and their sponsor, British Council of India or American agencies and some publishing house, close their eyes to

this issue. Ignoring the advantages of bilingualism they advocate the monolingualism of English and try to thrust it on people in several ways. It may not be out of place to mention that the books published by the so-called elite publishers are exorbitantly priced in comparison to bilingual books or the books in the regional languages as the publishers are eyeing people from different economic backgrounds.

One may note that the idea of decolonisation was initiated by African scholars though African scholarship has always been ignored not only in the Euro-American intellectual world but also in Asia. The African scholars' ideas are being appropriated in almost all the former colonies because they are so convincing and down to earth. One sometimes wonders why books like *Decolonising the Mind* or *The Wretched of the Earth* or *The Colonizer and the Colonized* could not be produced by Indian (leftist/moderate/ liberal) scholars though the idea of communism in India is as old as communism itself. Otherwise, also there is hardly any seminal book by such scholars about Indian reality or human reality in the colonial world to my mind. In the prevailing situation, there is hardly any possibility in the future either. After all no nation can survive only on the borrowed ideas and technology in the long run. One needs to have a sense of pride and attachment to one's roots to produce an influential work of this nature. I also realize that unless our education/ English Studies are oriented towards the nation there is no possibility of any important work being produced in English either. A crown is never put on a borrowed head. The above discussion/article is the result of exploring such questions.

Homi Bhabha has written about the ambivalence and hybridity of cultures and people. There are no "original" or "pure" cultures or people and there have perhaps never been. In fact, if someone tries to retrieve the past and claims to gain the "inherent authenticity or purity of cultures" as exists in some texts or in someone's imagination the person is moving against the natural tendency of moving ahead by learning appropriate lessons from various encounters. One has to struggle to look for the roots and has to see that the grafting of some ideas on the plant should not endanger the plant itself. The purpose of decolonisation is to save the mother plant, the original culture of the native people so that the inhabitants are not rendered "nowhere men". The process is not easy but is desirable. The needs of the

society, bureaucracy and people have changed since the times of Macaulay. A cosmetic surgery of the syllabus by way of the replacement of one text by another is not enough. Drastic changes are needed in attitude, syllabus, teaching materials and methods, medium of instruction, evaluation strategies and research to cater to these needs. The movement to decolonise English Studies will get momentum in the coming days; NEP 2020 will give it the required impetus. 'Learning Outcomes based Curriculum Framework' is a step in that direction. The times of basking in the sunshine of the Raj seem to be over for the teachers of English.

Works Cited

- Ahmed, Akbar. *Jinnah, Pakistan and Islamic Identity: The Search for Saladin*, Routledge, 1997.
- Aidan, Rankin. "Foreword", *Hinduism and the Clash of Civilizations*, David Frawley (auth.). New Delhi: Voice of India, 2002.
- Arthur Symons, "Introduction", *The Golden Threshold* (1905), https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/The_Golden_Threshold/Introduction
- Ashcroft, Bill et al (Ed.). *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- B. A. *Indo-Anglian Literature*. Calcutta: Thacker, Spink and Co., 1883. PDF.
- Bachchan, Harivansh Rai. *Basere se Door* (Hindi). New Delhi: Rajpal, 1978.
- . *W. B. Yeats and Occultism*. New York: Samuel Weiser Inc., 1974.
- . *W. B. Yeats and Occultism: A Study of His Works in Relation to Indian Lore, the Cabbala, Swedenborg, Boehme and Theosophy*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1965.
- Banu, Afeefa. "Modern Indian English Poetry", *Contemporary Indian Poetry in English*. Eds. Mohan Ramanan et al. New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, 2010.
- Beni Prasad Vs. Hardai Bibi (ILR 1892 (14) Allahabad 67 (FB), www.casemine.com/judgement/in/5ac5e3254a93261a1a73902f
- Binagwaho, Agnes et al. "Eliminating the White Supremacy Mindset from Global Health Education." *Annals of Global Health*, vol. 88,1 (32), pp. 1-9. 17 May. 2022, doi:10.5334/aogh.3578
- Birje-Patil, J. *Beneath the Axle-Tree*. Delhi: Macmillan 1977.
- Chatterjee, Bhabatosh. *John Keats: His Mind and Work*, Bombay: Orient Longman, 1971.
- Chatterjee, Kalika Ranjan. *Studies in Tennyson as Poet of Science*, New Delhi: S. Chand & Co (Pvt) Ltd, 1974.
- Chatterjee, Upamanyu. *English, August: An Indian Story*. London: Faber and Faber, 1988.
- Chinweizu. "Colonizer's Logic" in Chinweizu. Ed. *Voices from Twentieth Century Africa: Griots and Town Criers*, London: Faber and Faber, 1988.

- Consortium for Academic Research and Ethics: CARE*. New Delhi: University Grants Commission. 2019. PDF.
- Constitution of India*, Part XVII, Clause 343 (2). Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India, 2020.
- Cousins, James H. *The Renaissance in India*. Madras: Ganesh & Co., n. d. PDF. <https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.20391419>.
- Davidson, Allan K. "Grant, Charles," *Biographical Dictionary of Christian Missions*, ed. Gerald H. Anderson. New York: Macmillan Reference USA, https://archive.org/details/biographicaldict0000unse_p1w3/page/n5/mode/2up. 1998.
- Dharampal. *Civil Disobedience in Indian Tradition, Collected Writings, Volume II*, Mapusa: Other India Press, 2000.
- Dinkar, Ramdhari Singh. "समर शेष है", https://bharatdiscovery.org/india/समर_शेष_है_-_रामधारी_सिंह_दिनकर
- Dr Rajbir Singh Dalal v. Chaudhari Devi Lal University, Sirsa & Anr., Civil Appeal No. 4908 of 2008, August 2008, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1268797/>
- Dryden, John. *All for Love*. <https://www.fulltextarchive.com/page/All-For-Love/---.Aureng-Zebe>. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1971. <https://archive.org/details/aurengzebe0000dryd/page/n7/mode/2up>
- Dutt, Romesh Chunder. *Economic History of India*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. 1902.
- Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of The Earth*, Translated from the French by Richard Phi/cox with commentary by Jean-Paul Sartre and Homi K Bhabha, New York: Grove Press, 2004.
- Gandhi, M K. "My Own Experience", *Harijan*, 9-7-'38, <https://www.mkgandhi.org/indiadreams/chap44.htm>
- Gandhi, M K. *Hind Swaraj or Indian Home Rule*. Ahmedabad: Navajivan Publishing House, n.d. PDF.
- Gautier, Francois. "Cry O my beloved India!" <https://www.rediff.com/news/2004/jun/07franc.htm>
- Gikandi, Simon. "Editor's Column: The End of Postcolonial Theory? A Roundtable with Sunil Agnani, Fernando Coronil, Gaurav Desai, Mamadou Diouf, Simon Gikandi, Susie Tharu, and Jennifer Wenzel". *PMLA*, Vol. 122, No. 3, May 2007, pp. 633-651.
- Gokak, Vinayak Krishna. *The Golden Treasury of Indo-Anglian Poetry*, New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi, 1989, p. 22
- Griffin, Gabriele (Ed.). *Research Methods for English Studies*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd, Second Edition, 2005.
- Gurung, Shaurya Karanbir. "Urban Naxals: How the term came about", *The Economic Times*, English Edition, Aug 30, 2018, 12:19 PM IST. <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/defence/urban-naxals-its-not-such-a-new->

thing/articleshow/65598483.cms?utm_source=contentofinterest&utm_medium=text&utm_campaign=cppstl

- Higley, John. "Elite Theory and Elites", *Handbook of Politics: State and Society in Global Perspective*, Kevin T. Leicht, J. Craig Jenkins (eds.), New York: Springer-Verlag, 2010.
- Indian National Party [The]. *British Rule in India Condemned by the British Themselves*. London: The Indian National Party, 1915.
- Kalgavda Tavanappa Patil v Somappa Tamangavda Patil (ILR 1908 (33) Bom 669, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/682888/>)
- Katju, Justice Markandey (Ed.). *K. L. Sarkar's Mimamsa Rules of Interpretation: Tagore Law Lectures-1905*, New Delhi: Thomson Reuters, 4th edition, 2013.
- Klose, Fabian. "Decolonization and Revolution". *European History Online*. 2014, <http://ieg-ego.eu/en/threads/europe-and-the-world/european-overseas-rule/fabian-klose-decolonization-and-revolution>.
- Kubayanda, Josaphat B. "On Discourse of Decolonization in Africa and The Caribbean". *Dispositio*, Vol. 14, No. 36/38, *Colonial Discourse* (1989), pp. 25-37.
- Kumar, Sudhir. "Reflections on Deen Dayal Upadhyaya's Vision of Chiti and Dharma-Centric Indian Culture", *Madhya Bharati: Research Journal of Humanities and Social sciences*, No 75, July-Dec 2018, pp. 292-313.
- Laurie, Colonel W. F. B. *Sketches of Some Distinguished Anglo-Indians: (Second Series) Including Lord Macaulay's Great Minute on Education in India; With Anglo-Indian Anecdotes and Incidents*. London: W. H. Allen, 1888. PDF.
- Macaulay, T B. "Minute on Education", *Macaulay Prose and Poetry*. G M Young (Ed.). London: Rupert Hart Davis Soho Square, 1861.
- . "Minute by the Hon'ble T. B. Macaulay dated the 2nd February 1835", www.columbia.edu/itc/mealac/pritchett/00generallinks/macaulay/txt_minute_education_1835.html
- Madiou, Mohamed Salah Eddine. "The Death of Postcolonialism: The Founder's Foreword", *Janus Unbound: Journal of Critical Studies*, 1(1, 2021), pp. 1-12.
- Mahabharata* [The]
- Mahapatra, Dhananjay. "Must teach ancient Indian jurisprudence, throw out colonial law system: Nazeer" <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/must-teach-ancient-indian-jurisprudence-throw-out-colonial-law-system-nazeer/articleshow/88512602.cms>
- Mallhotra, Rajiv. *Being Different: An Indian Challenge to Western Universalism*, Noida: Harper Collins, 2013.
- Mallhotra, Rajiv & Satyanarayana Dasa Babaji. *Sanskrit Non-Translatables: The Importance of Sanskritizing English*. Noida: Amaryllis & Harper Collins India, 2020.
- Max Müller, F. K. M. *India: What Can it Teach Us? A Course of Lectures Delivered before the University of Cambridge*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, Publishers, n. d.

- Mignolo, Walter D. *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options*. Durham: Duke UP, 2011.
- Mustaque, Mr. Justice A. Muhamed. Fathima Thasneem (Minor) & ors vs. *The State of Kerala & ors*, WP(C). No. 35293 of 2018, Kerala High Court, 04th Day of December 2018.
- Naoroji, Dadabhai. *Poverty and Un-British Rule in India*. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co, 1901.
- Narayan Pundlik Valanju v. Laxman Daji Sirekar (ILR 1927(51) Bom784, <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/494653/>)
- O'Neill, Aaron. "India's Share of Global Gross Domestic Product (GDP) 2026", Oct 27, 2021, <https://www.statista.com/statistics/271328/indias-share-of-global-gross-domestic-product-gdp/>
- Paranjape, Makarand R. "The End of Post-Colonialism", <http://www.makarand.com/acad/TheEndofPost-Colonialism.htm>
- Prabha, M. *The Waffle of the Toffs: A Sociocultural Critique of Indian Writing in English*, Oxford & IBH, 2000.
- PTI. "Indianisation of our legal system is need of the hour: Chief Justice of India", *The Times of India*, Sep 18, 2021, http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/articleshow/86316597.cms?utm_source=contentofinterest&utm_medium=txt&utm_campaign=cppst
- Raghavan, V. *The Number of Rasas*. The Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1975 [1940].
- Raghavan, V. and Nagendra, editors. *An Introduction to Indian Poetics*. Macmillan, 1970.
- Rajan, B (Ed.). *T. S. Eliot: A Study of His Writings by Several Hands*, London: Dennis Dobson Ltd, 1947.
- . *The Overwhelming Question: A Study of the Poetry of T.S. Eliot*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976.
- . *W. B. Yeats: A Critical Introduction*, London: Hutchinson, 1965.
- Rajnath. *T.S. Eliot's Theory of Poetry*, Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press, 1980
- Rocher, Ludo. "Lawyers in Classical Hindu Law", *Law & Society Review*, Vol. 3, No. 2/3 (Nov., 1968 - Feb., 1969), pp. 383-402. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3053008>.
- Rocher, Ludo. *Studies in Hindu Law and Dharmasāstra*, Donald R. Davis Jr, (Ed.). London: Anthem Press, 2012.
- Sardar Mohammad Ansar Khan v. State of U.P. Allahabad Highcourt. CMWP No. 8249 of 1990, decided on October 11, 1992.
- Shah, Ramesh Chandra. *Yeats and Eliot: Perspectives on India*, New Delhi: Associated Publishing House, 1983.
- . *Yeats and Eliot: Perspectives on India*. Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press, 1983.
- Sharp, H. (ed.). *Selections from Educational Records, Part I (1781-1839)*. Superintendent, Govt. Printing, Calcutta, 1920. p. 121. PDF.

- <https://archive.org/details/SelectionsFromEducationalRecordsPartI1781-1839>.
- Southey, Robert. *The Curse of Kehama*. London: Printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, Paternoster-Row. 1812.
- Stallworthy, Jon. *Yeats: Last Poems: A Casebook*. London: Macmillan, 1968.
- Steiner, Peter. "Russian Formalism." *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*. Ed. Raman Selden. Vol. 8. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. 11-29. 9 vols.
- Swami, Kishordas (Ed. & Tr.). *Parthasarthi Mishra's Shastra Dipika*. Delhi: Swami Rama Tirtha Mission, 1996.
- Tennyson, Alfred. "The Defence of Lucknow". <https://www.telelib.com/authors/T/TennysonAlfred/verse/ballads/lucknow.html>
- Tharoor, Shashi. *An Era of Darkness*, New Delhi: Aleph, 2016.
- The Indian National Party. *British Rule in India Condemned by the British Themselves*, London: The Indian National Party, 1915.
- Trevelyan, George Otto. *The Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay*. Vol I. London: Longmans, Green, 1876. PDF.
- Udai Shankar Singh v. Branch Manager, LIC, Bharwari, CMWP No. 3807 of 1993, <https://www.aionline.in/legal-articles/The+Mimansa+Principles+of+Interpretation>
- V Subramania Ayyar v. Rathavelu Chetty (ILR 1917 (41) Ma 44 (FB), <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/631973/>
- Viswanathan, Gauri. *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India*, New Delhi: Oxford UP, 1998.
- Watts, M. "Neocolonialism and the Process of Decolonization", *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*, Elsevier, 2009.
- Wenzel, Jennifer. "Editor's Column: The End of Postcolonial Theory? A Roundtable with Sunil Agnani, Fernando Coronil, Gaurav Desai, Mamadou Diouf, Simon Gikandi, Susie Tharu, and Jennifer Wenzel". *PMLA*, Vol. 122, No. 3, May 2007, pp. 633-651.
- Wesseling, H.L. "Towards a History of Decolonization". *Itinerario*, 11, (1987). pp. 95-106.