

The Legacy of the Colonial Project of English Education in Pakistan

Filza Waseem

Assistant Professor

In charge Department of Humanities

COMSATS Institute of Information Technology

Lahore, Pakistan.

Abstract

This review article explores the aims, implementations and results of the British Imperial education policies in the Indian Subcontinent which installed English language as a measure to establish British influence and control over the colony. It looks into the historical beginnings of English in Pakistan in the postcolonial context, which resulted in the loss of Persian, the end of the indigenous system of education, formation of hybrid identities, and the establishment of elite institutions. These issues are still plaguing the education system in present day Pakistan.

Keywords: Colonial, literature, indigenous, elite institutions, segregation, hybrid

1. Introduction

English owes its present position in Pakistan to the British colonization of the united South Asian Subcontinent. Pakistan inherited the colonial legacy of educational policies and practices when it became independent in 1947. This review article explores the aims, implementations and results of the British education policies in the Indian Subcontinent which installed English language as the imperial language, as a measure to establish British influence and control over the colony. It looks into the historical beginnings of English in Pakistan in the postcolonial context in terms of the loss of Persian, the end of the indigenous system of education, formation of hybrid identities, segregation in society and the establishment of elite institutions. These issues are still plaguing the education system in present day Pakistan.

The Western colonization process started in the 16th century. The Renaissance had led to the emergence of national consciousness and to the philosophy of mercantilism in Britain which entailed self-reliance in areas of defense, governance, economy, and navigation and even in arts and literature. Britain established its political and commercial domain over vast areas of Africa, Asia and the Far East. The immense economic potential of these areas offered raw materials for its factories and provided lucrative, “markets for the manufactured products of the home country” necessitated by the Industrial Revolution (Southgate 1953). The colonies offered a suitable space not only for the dumping of the outcasts of the British society, but also for carrying out experimentation for social and educational reforms at home. Kipling’s ‘white man’s burden’ was thus not entirely motivated by philanthropic purposes, as is claimed, but also had a certain utilitarian aspect to it by virtue of the imperialist position of Britain.

The British East India Company had been operating in Indian Subcontinent for almost a century before the British government officially took political control of it by taking over power from the last Mughal Emperor, Bahadur Shah Zafar. The decline of the Mughal Empire had given a chance to the company to increase its strength in 1764, and by 1818 the British were firmly in command of India (Ali 1993). The western notions of nationhood had not yet united the diversified populaces of India, into a single entity with common interests. The British cashed on the heterogeneity of the Indian masses, and used this to their own advantage. By the policy of divide and rule the British had gradually managed to control the entire continent. Shah (1990) cites Seeley: “The Subcontinent was conquered by Indian arms, Indian men and Indian resources”. The reformation measures for control of the natives were implemented after Britain gained political stability and its influence in the areas of education policies and planning is still a major force in the ex-colony.

2. Education for Control

After establishing its political control over India, the next logical step for Britain was to create a situation in which the vanquished people should willingly accept their inferior position, whereby making the job of administration easier for the colonial power. It was the creation of a situation which the Marxist critic, Antonio Gramsci (1971) has called “submission by consent”, in which the subjugated people concur in their own subjectivity and accept their inferiority before the imperial power. Domination achieved by combining coercion and acceptance is more effective and lasting because the dominated is willing to cooperate with the colonizer to further the state of affairs. This “hegemony”, to use the term as Gramsci used it in the 1930s, is best achieved by ‘interpellation’ of the native by using such ideological state apparatuses like education, church and the media (Althusser 1992). Education particularly is very effective in influencing assumptions, beliefs and values. Thus, “domination by consent” is achieved through what is taught to the colonized, how it is taught and the subsequent emplacement of the educated subject as a part of the continuing imperial apparatus. This was suited to the Indian situation, because the locals were intellectually and politically, if not superior, at least at par with the British colonialists (Graham 1970) and could be expected to have intellectual curiosity towards an education that had led the British to progress. Even today English owes its present popularity to the power and progress, which the English-speaking countries have made as compared to the rest of the world. The teaching of English language and literature came to assume significance in the imperial educational project as it was thought to be an important medium in communicating the European culture to the natives.

3. The Charter Act, 1813

Although the British East India Company had been involved in the education of Indians since 1781, the Charter Act of 1813 is regarded as a major milestone in Indian educational history because it made two major changes in Britain’s role in India. The first was that the British Government now felt itself responsible for the education of its Indian subjects and allocated a sum of a “lac” (a hundred thousand) rupee for this (Shah 1990:41). Education was to be imparted on the lines of the existing oriental traditions and the British sought to bolster the existing indigenous system in an effort to bring it somewhat at par with western standards.

The second major result of the Charter Act was the permission given to missionaries to establish schools on the lines of British models, in India. However this was to be done on the condition that they would not carry out any proselytizing activities because up till now the British government had, publicly at least, maintained a policy of non-interference in matters of faith. But privately, it believed that many advantages would flow from, “missionary contact with natives and their many immoral and disgusting habits” (Viswanathan 1995:432). The British government by this time had had the experience of the negative fruits of the Industrial Revolution with the whole fabric of the uprooted society riven with poverty and squalor. Thorpe says, “It was popularly believed that lack of character had something to do with all this upheaval and that education was the antidote” (1965:11). Viswanathan too, finds, that comparisons made between the lower classes of England and Indians as a whole, were based upon the theory that their “degradation” was the “offspring of ignorance”. For the British it all seemed to tie up with the lack of moral education, in Britain as well as in India.

The two schools of thought in Britain, namely the Anglicists and the Orientalists, took opposing positions on the issue of the type of education the Indians should be given. The Orientalists advocated the continuation of the indigenous system of education, which used Persian, Arabic and Sanskrit as the medium of instruction. By this, they argued, the loyalties of the natives would be ensured for the smooth running of the British Empire. The Anglicists, on the other hand, favoured western education in English language, which would result in the formation of a class of individuals who would look up to the British for having conferred upon them the privileges which they would eventually reap from this education. It is interesting to note that both these viewpoints were motivated by the same political desire, “that of the consolidation of the new-found empire” (Rahman 1999).

There was so much difference in opinion and controversy in India as well as in the British Parliament regarding the implementation of the Charter Act regarding the type of education to be imparted to Indians, that the Committee of Public Instruction reached an impasse. Finally, it was its legal member, Lord Thomas Babington Macaulay, whose assertive and forceful arguments finally took the issue to its head, and a decision was reached. Macaulay in his famous *Minute* of 1835 decided the issue in favour of English language and literature. The Governor General, Lord Bentinck, an Anglicist, officially accepted Macaulay’s recommendations.

He had no sympathy with the Orientalists' point of view, which was advocating Indian traditions and non-interference in the religious and social life of India. The medium of instruction was changed to English, and in 1837, steps were taken to make English the court language. The Governor General took a further revolutionary step by giving instructions that "all the funds appropriated for education would be best employed in English education alone" (Shah 1990: 46).

4. Teaching of English Literature

Lord Macaulay, the author of the *Minute* was very candid about his reasons for framing his recommendations. For him English language and literature were the embodiment of all universal, human values. Besides this he thought that, "English stood eminent even among the languages of the West" (in Ashcroft et al: 1995). It was the culmination of the intellectual endeavours of ninety generations of the wisest of the nations and thus it gave its users access to all this vast wealth. Its use would bring about a renaissance in India just as Latin and Greek had done in England, as a result of which, "the literature of England is now more valuable than that of classical antiquity" (ibid: 429). He believed that English teaching would be as beneficial for the Hindus, as the European languages had been for Russians, enabling India to take, "its place among civilized communities" (ibid). Since the Indians could not be educated in their own languages, so it was best to educate them through English, which was soon to become the language of commerce in the East.

Up till now the British curriculum of English in India was based primarily on English language. Macaulay's recommendations now paved the way for the teaching of English literature. Because of the social conditions back in England there was a growing skepticism about the efficacy of a purely secular education. It was thought that English could act as a sort of a religious substitute and by teaching it to the lower classes the possibility of a Chartist agitation of the 1830s could be avoided (Barry 1995). Viswanathan (1995) notes that literary education was introduced in India as an effective substitute to moral and religious education, which the British felt, the faiths of the Hindus and Muslims did not provide. English literature seemed, "to represent a perfect synthesis of two opposing positions". Liberal, western, and religious education could be imparted without the fear of subversion or questioning of the British authority, because religious education, it was argued, seldom evokes feelings of revolt: "Historically, Christianity had never been associated with bringing down governments." As such there would be no danger of inculcating radical ideas that would upset the British presence in India. Thus to include English literature in the curriculum provided a perfect solution for implementing the two apparently divergent objectives spelled out earlier, that of imparting western knowledge to the natives as well as instilling a sense of morality in them. "The tension between increasing involvement in Indian education and enforced noninterference in religion was resolved through the introduction of English literature". It provided a perfect guise to achieve both these objectives "without having to throw open the door of English liberal thought to natives" (ibid: 433). Literary studies have never been associated with political unrest so the British "discovered an ally in English literature to support them in maintaining control of the natives under the guise of a liberal education...and (its) affiliation with Christianity as a social institution" (ibid:434). Viswanathan further opines that the teaching of English literary education was based on the belief that: "humanistic functions traditionally associated with the study of literature --- are essential to sociopolitical control".

Besides this, the literary text represented the superiority of English literature over all other forms of knowledge. More than this, it propounded the western values embodied in the texts as being universal and normative and claimed the superiority of the civilization, which had produced them. Ashcroft et al find that the literary texts claimed the "superiority of civilization embodied /encoded through the fetish of the English book" (1995: 426). Ali notes "The definition of civilization as given by the West is patently one-sided and decidedly Western, taking the state of West alone as a criterion and exemplar, or model or norm of the level of a man's cultural development" (Ali 1993: 6). Viswanathan (1995) says that according to Macaulay the natives would benefit intellectually and morally by studying English literary texts, which would function as a "surrogate Englishman in his highest and perfect state". Furthermore studying these texts gave natives the daily opportunity "to converse with the best and wisest Englishmen through the medium of their work" (Macaulay 1835). Added to this, it would broaden the outlook of the natives by giving them secular education and to help in loosening the hold of rigid religious fanaticism, the dangers inherent in which were obvious, and to ultimately "westernize the people and impress upon them the superiority of western culture and knowledge" (Viswanathan 1995).

5. Subject Construction

The system of education that was envisioned as most effective in the Indian context had to be one which would form, in Macaulay's words, "a class of persons, Indian in blood and color, but English in opinions, in morals, and in intellect". The ensuing hybridity, of trying to become a "brown sahib" of Macaulay's project, is a class of people to which, wryly observes Ali, "many of us South Asians belong today" (1993). The British obsession with "conformity" has been pointed out by Bach (2000) who says that the Virginia Company, "dreamed of taking Indian children and transforming them into obedient Englishmen", this "colonial transformation" to be achieved through "the conversion of the natives to the knowledge and worship of the true {god} of {canc.} and their redeemer Christ Jesus" (141-8). Ashcroft et al (1995) equate the teaching of a language for political control as a powerful strategy for social control as well: "Education (thus) remains one of the most powerful discourses within the complex of colonialism and new colonialism" (425). They point to ways in which subject construction is achieved through the teaching of English literary texts:

It establishes the locally English or British as normative through critical claims to 'universality' of the values embodied in English literary texts, and it represents the colonized to themselves as inherently inferior beings — 'wild', 'barbarous', 'uncivilized'. (ibid: 426). Phillipson (1992) has argued that the basic tenets of ELT point to its assimilationist agenda and have always accompanied English language teaching projects of both the USA and Britain.

6. The British- Indian Education Policy

The British education policy was motivated by various imperatives by virtue of its position as a colonial power. Kazi (1994) says that the language policy was designed for political control. Rahman (1999) agrees with this view: "the teaching of English would create Anglicized elite which would be loyal to the British rule since it would owe its power and social status to it" (1999). Matthew Arnold had seen English literature as a means of social control in England. With the dwindling influence of religion following the Industrial Revolution, there was a need for a philosophy to hold together the 'Philistines' of society, to give them a feeling of having a stake in the state affairs. The same formula could be applied to the colonial populations to bring them under control (Barry 1995).

It emerges from the above discussion that in framing the education policy, the British were not motivated only by philanthropic motives. It can be said that the political and hegemonic aims were crucial factors behind the measures that were taken to formulate Britain's Indian education policy. But of more immediate and practical nature was the ground reality of having to administer such a diverse and vast area as the Indian subcontinent. Shah says: "On grounds of practical and administrative convenience, the government wanted English educated subordinates and the people wanted jobs...Essentially the idea of duty to the people seemed to coincide with interests of trade and government"(1990: 45-6). Britain's education policy had to take into account the fact that it needed educated locals who could act as Macaulay said, "interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern" (1835). To educate the Indians, according to Bellenoit (2007) was "crucial for the British during the generation of Macaulay and after to fill the lower tiers of a rapidly spawning-out colonial bureaucracy. Most of these clerk jobs were either undesired by the British or could only have been filled by Indians with bilingual abilities". As later developments show this policy of education did yield the desired results for the British administration in India. Quddus has argued this point: "Such a class of people could obviously be placed in the lowest slot of the government, in order to ensure their complete submission to authority, clerks and subordinates necessary for carrying on the administration of the country in English under the British" (1979: 41).

7. Abolition of Persian

In 1837, Lord William Bentinck abolished Persian and took steps to make English the court language. This was in accordance with the Anglicist policy of increasing the use of English in all domains of power. Another step was taken in 1844 to make English "eventually the language of public business throughout the country", with the resolution that government jobs would be given to those Indians only who had knowledge of English. Thus English became the prerequisite for certain kinds of employment. This policy decision increased the importance of English, and it was henceforward not only an economically profitable language but also a means of social difference. Shah (1990) finds that this decision was crucial in raising the status of English in the eyes of the natives, by giving it, "the form and sustenance, and soon it was to confer prestige and class distinction."

The economic utility of Persian as a language which provided jobs and means of livelihood was finished by a single decree; “the crowning stroke” as Trevelyan called it (in Rahman 1996). The economic incentives provided by the official policy made the acquisition of English particularly lucrative. Hereafter one sees that the Indians were more receptive towards British education. Many middle-class Indians, and not just those in the burgeoning scientific establishment, saw the Western language as empowering, a passport to the better jobs to which they were entitled and that conferred on them the right to be equal beneficiaries in the new system.

8. The Woods Dispatch

The *Woods Dispatch* of 1854, reiterated the official policy laid in 1835, of extending, “European knowledge throughout all classes of the people” (Nurullah and Naik, in Thorpe, 1965: 23), and that English would be used for higher education of a select few, and the vernaculars for the “great mass of the people” (ibid). Qualified staff for directing and supervising these educational activities was hired to “provide the highest test and encouragement of liberal education”. However, special mention was made of the education of the middle and lower classes, which was to remain according to the existing indigenous system of education.

Certain flaws have been pointed out in this plan for Indian education (Kazi 1994; Rahman 1996). First, it professed to modernize the system on Western lines but did not attempt to advance knowledge in a broad sense. As Kazi documents: “A crucial part of this education policy is that the British, through English education, did not introduce the knowledge of economics, technology and politics but instead introduced English literature, philosophy and metaphysics in an imitative fashion.” (1994:58). At the most, students graduating out from the British sponsored institutions were low ranking officers in the hierarchy, who depended on their knowledge of English alone for their livelihood.

Arnold (2004) in his well researched book establishes the fact that the developments in the field of technology, medicine and science in colonial India have to be seen as a collaborative effort in which the local philanthropists - the landed, industrial and business elites, contributed handsomely. The scientific project in India was always regarded by British in the context of it as ‘an alien territory inhabited by a foreign race’. Whereas science ‘symbolised reason and order, the colonial power’s ability to ‘know’ India and bring it under effective and productive control, but, no less significantly, science was also part of the self-identity of the European elite and its self-declared mission to ‘improve’, to ‘civilise’, ultimately to ‘modernise’, India’. Paradoxically the scientific project in India was always ‘tinged with a suspicion that tradition suited India better’. There remained a sense in which, in imperial eyes, science belonged uniquely to the ruling race, and hence Indian scientists’ efforts were better recognized in Berlin, Stockholm and Germany than in London. Even after this international recognition, British scientists showed increasing pessimism about the contribution science could make to India’s future.

Second, in its very conception the *Wood’s Dispatch* aimed at establishing a polarity in society by a system of differentiated education. It would have been a truly “democratic” document as some have called it, had it addressed the needs of the entire country. But whereas, as Ali (1993) comments, “the innocuous rural population of India lived its life of hardship unconcerned and unaffected by the canker of ‘Westernism’, we of the urban elite went to Government or missionary schools, as no other existed and tried to become Englishmen”. The policy led to a situation in which, gradually, the Indian society came to be divided into roughly two strata - the small westernized, English educated, urban elite and the teeming uneducated rural masses. In this context Iqbal (1977) says: “In the days of the alien rule, one of the distinguishing features between the rulers and the ruled was that the rulers spoke in English, and the ruled were left over to speak the so-called vulgar tongues” (1977: 34).

Elite academies and colleges where English was the medium of instruction and informal interaction, were established for this purpose as part of the British policy of educating the Indian elite. These “Chief’s Colleges” for the hereditary aristocracy (Rahman 1999), as well as the European or English schools for the newly emerging professional classes, were meant to anglicize young rulers. Commissioned officers in the army were equally anglicized and assumed a British point of view. Only the very wealthy among the Indians could send their wards to these institutions because of the exorbitant fees and therefore they came to signify a very small elite generally supposed to have a world view which was loyal to the British government.

Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan, the reformer who orchestrated the educational revival of the Indian Muslims was also skeptical about the efficacy of the British education system. He had told the British about the shortcomings of their education system in that it would remain ineffective until some changes were introduced.

In his memorandum – ‘*Strictures upon the Present Educational System in India*’, in 1869, he based this argument on his paradigm of progressive education. It envisaged a truly progressive system, productive of three educated strata. The top most strata comprised of the intellectual elite or the creative scholars. The teachers stood in the middle, and transmitted to their fellowmen the knowledge thus acquired by them. The third layer of the pyramid was divided into three subdivisions: the professionals, the administrators and managers and then the working classes, all of whom were to be literate.

He argued that when the accomplishments of the indigenous system of education are compared with the British educational system, the former had excelled as compared to the latter, in producing many creative scholars of the top and middle strata. This number bore a just proportion to the existing population of India. However those belonging to the lowest strata were very few and this he admitted was a great deficiency of the traditional education system. As compared to this, nearly after a century in operation, the modern system had not produced one learned person who could be considered a member of the highest or the middle class. The modern system, Sir Sayyid maintained had produced only letter writer, copyist, signalmen and railroad ticket collectors (Malik 1988), or as Quddus (1979) says, “Clerks and subordinates necessary for carrying on the administration of the country in English under the British masters” The number of the very few who had reached the highest strata bore no sensible proportion to the whole population of the country.

9. Results of the British Policies

The repercussions of the British education policies are significant and far-reaching. In the first place, both by its policies and by their implementation, the British educational plan disturbed the indigenous system of “self-help” prevalent in India for centuries, and which suited the genius of the people. In the same way the British abolished the system of paying the schoolteacher from the revenue collected from villages, and these funds were diverted to “selected government schools in urban areas for providing ‘modern’ education” (Baqir 1997). With the deterioration of the general economic condition of the Muslims after the war and neglect of the British government, the traditional system of education could not continue. Hunter (1964) argues this point well: “A hundred years and seventy years ago it was impossible for a well-born Muslim in Bengal to become poor; at present it is almost impossible for him to continue rich.”

Second, the substitution of Persian with English as the state language had been a calamity for the Muslims’ education. Qureshi points out that this measure reduced the otherwise well-educated Muslims to the level of illiterates: “This served the double purpose of seeking to make the English language popular and striking at the root of Muslim influence” (Qureshi, in Thorpe: 231). The once influential language has not been able to recover from this setback till today.

In the long run, the British policies resulted in the “growth of illiteracy which turned an educated community into one of the most illiterate in the world” (ibid). Baqir (1997) deplores the deliberate destruction of this traditional system, which led to the collapse of universal literacy: “The areas that constitute Pakistan had in place a very sound and firm tradition of providing education on the basis of self-help by beneficiary communities, a little more than a hundred years ago. This system provided universal education to males and females....” He cites Leitner as forewarning that: “If the community-based system of education was demolished under the pretext of modernization of education, literacy would be wiped out from the Punjab” (in Baqir 1997:181). Baqir finds that this prediction came to be prophetically true. Later, the founder of Pakistan, Muhammad Ali Jinnah was to level his greatest criticism of the British on these grounds, as “one of the greatest reproaches against the British is the neglect of elementary education in the country” (Jalil 1997:33). However, Bellenoit (2007) opines that the British education did not penetrate to the wider level and the traditional system went on as before, and there was “In theory, much room of maneuverability for Indians to carry on reproducing their own social, religious and caste ethos within a transformed institutional structure”. Hoodbhoy’s (1998) argues on the same lines, saying that though it is justifiable and natural to resist a colonial implantation, but objectively seen, the indigenous education system in pre-partition India could not have had much value in the present day:

Every society must look to the form of education which serves its needs best. However... one must necessarily ask whether the traditional education of Muslims, Hindus or Sikhs has relevance in a modern society and can enhance employability and social consciousness, and be an instrument of liberation and positive social change?

Even if we accept that there was universal literacy on the subcontinent a hundred years ago, why did that period leave behind no sign of philosophical and scientific achievement? It is one thing to idealize the past and another to soberly deal with the consequences of having the past as the present (pp.1-22)

This leads us to the third result which is of more concern for the present study: the British education policy helped in the creation of polarity in Indian society. The British educational system, based on utilitarian objectives, focused on the urban elite and the middle-classes and ignored the masses. Of more significance for this study is the fact that the British education policy favored elitist patterns that have persisted to this day. Jinnah had foreseen that such educational policies would produce patterns of inequality in society. Jalil states: "Jinnah criticized elite concepts and institutions like the public schools and appreciated the need for mass and non-elitist elementary education", which he saw as the basis for creating a "viable social infrastructure in the long run" (ibid: 34). Even in pre-partition India this policy of differentiated education had divided the Indian society into roughly two strata - the westernized, English educated elite and the uneducated, vernacular-taught masses. This was significant because now language had become a means of not only defining ethnic linguistic groups but also of conferring economic, social and political privilege. The project aim of educating the natives, as its founding father, Macaulay, had frankly admitted was to produce a class of people who were, 'Indian in blood and color, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals and in intellect'. This assimilationist objective of English teaching did produce a hybrid Indian class, a combination of the lower grade government functionaries - the '*Babus*', and the Angelized elite - the '*Brown Sahibs*' (Vittachi 1987 in Rahman 1996) who assumed the British norms in dress, speech, behavior and outlook. Ashcroft et al (1998) have drawn attention to such a class in post colony as the 'comprador intelligentsia', who 'include the intelligentsia – academics, creative writers and artists – whose independence may be compromised by a reliance on and identification with colonial power'. The segregation thus created in the Indian society in which English became instrumental as a divider, has persisted in present day Pakistan.

What is significant in the British education policy in India is that it was primarily designed to act as an instrument of social and political control for the natives, and as a means of providing the government low paid functionaries. Kazi (1994) asserts in this context: "During the British rule, the education system of India was modified to fit the perceived needs of the British colonizers. The goals of the British educational policy were those of political control and production of a cost-effective administrative bureaucracy." (1994:57). It can be argued that the British had some 'moral' excuse for having ignored the down-trodden of their empire, some justification on grounds of paucity of resources, etc., but for an independent, sovereign state to ignore a huge section of its society, is not only callous, but seriously calls into question the integrity and sincerity of its leaders.

This leads us to the present scenario of education in Pakistan. At the time of independence, Pakistan was handed a system of education which used English as the official language for the government, the judiciary, the armed forces and the diplomatic corps. The westernized Pakistani elite monopolized it as a prestigious language which conferred power and high social status. It is a medium of instruction for higher education in the civil/defence academies and cadet colleges. Even in pre-partition India this system had created a cleavage in the society, dividing it into two distinct entities, a situation that was essentially based on the way English had been used in the distribution of power and privileges. The main issues which emerge from the discussion about the historical background of English in the Indian Subcontinent show that the same patterns in policy and practice have persisted in post-independent Pakistan. The westernized powerful elite have maintained a system of using English in important domains and higher education which excludes the masses. Having made English a must for educational, economic and social mobility, the state has failed to provide English education to all sections of society. This has resulted in an unequal distribution of resources. On the one hand it empowers those who have access to English, and on the other, disempowers those who are the have-nots of the system. The situation has assumed more seriousness as the same language has become a means of conferring or deferring power, economic privilege and social status.

10. Conclusion

The present study relates the British colonial education policies to the present times. A cursory glance at the overall educational scenario in Pakistan shows that most of these policy patterns still exist, in the form of a differentiated education system for various sections of society, official government policies, distribution of power and privileges, formation of hybrid identities, social aspirations for English education, the permanent loss of Persian language in the area and the danger of a similar loss of national languages because of the massive prestige and economic value of English. The British policies were basically for the control of the vanquished populace of the Indian subcontinent and aimed to create a small section of English educated urban elite which could act as intermediaries between the government and the masses. These lower level state functionaries and the sons of the landed, aristocratic local elites who received British style education, gave rise to a class which was English 'educated'. The chasm created thus between the English educated elite and the vernacular educated masses, the urban and the rural has persisted to the present day in the form of state-run institutions and elite institutions, and has become a sources of alienation of those who perceive themselves as the have-nots of elite system of education. By making English a prerequisite for better jobs, the language policy has implicated it in social as well as economic formulations. The elite have used English to maintain their power and the less privileged section of society has been left disempowered by the inability to access English. English has become a divider not only economically but also socially as the present policies are favorable to those who are English educated. The chasm remains between the elite institution students, the "brown sahibs" of yore, in the form of westernized, hybrid identities and the students of the state-school educated masses.

References

- Ali, A. (1993). English in South Asia. A Historical Perspective. In Robert J. Baumgardner (Ed.). *The English Language in Pakistan*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Althusser, L. (1992). Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses. In Anthony Easthope and Kate McGowan (Eds.), *A Critical and Cultural Theory Reader* (pp.50-57). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Arnold, D. (2004). *The New Cambridge History of India III • 5 Science, Technology and Medicine in Colonial India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ashcroft, B., Gareth G. & Helen T. (1998). *Post-Colonial Studies The Key Concepts*. London: Routledge.
- Ashcroft, B., Gareth G. & Helen T. (1995). In Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. (Eds.). *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Ashcroft, B., Gareth G. & Helen T. (1989). *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. London: Routledge
- Bach, R. A. (2000). *Colonial Transformations: The Cultural Productions of the New Atlantic World, 1580—640*. New York: Palgrave.
- Bakir, F. (1998). The Role of NGOs in Education. In Pervez Hoodbhoy (Ed.), *Education and the State*. (pp.177-98), Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Barry, P. (1995). *Beginning Theory An introduction to literary theory*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.
- Bellenoit, H. J. A. (2007). *Missionary Education and Empire in Late Colonial India, 1860–1920*. Pickering & Chatto Limited, London.
- Graham, G. S. (1970). *A Concise History of the British Empire*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). Selections from Prison Notebook of Antonio Gramsci. In Quintin Hoare & Geoffrey Nowell Smith. (Eds.). London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Hoodbhoy, P. (1998). Preface Out of Pakistan's Educational Morass: Possible? How? In Pervez Hoodbhoy (Ed.). *Education and The State: Fifty Years of Pakistan*, (pp.1-22), Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Hunter, W. W. (1968). *The Indian Mussalman*. Lahore: Premier Book House.
- Iqbal, M. (1977). *Education in Pakistan*. Lahore: Aziz Books.
- Jalil, N. (1998). Pakistan's Education — The First Decade. In Pervez Hoodbhoy (Ed.). *Education and the State: Fifty Years of Pakistan* (pp.23-42), Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Kazi, A. A. (1994). *Ethnicity and Education in National Building in Pakistan*. Karachi: Vanguard.
- Kipling, R. (1899). *The White Man's Burden*. In Stephen Greenblatt (Ed.). *Norton Anthology of English Literature*, New York 2006 ISBN 0-393-92532-3.
- Leitner, G. W. (1991). *History of Indigenous Education in the Punjab since Annexation and in 1882*. (Reprint) Lahore: Republican Books.

- Macaulay, T. B. (1995). Macaulay, T. B. (1995). Minutes on Indian education. In B. Ashcroft, G. Griffins & H. Tiffin (Eds.), *The post-colonial studies reader* (pp.428-30). London and New York: Routledge.
- Malik, H. (1988). *Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan and Muslim Modernization in India and Pakistan*. Karachi: Royal Book Company.
- Quddus, S. A. (1979). *Education and National Reconstruction of Pakistan*. S. I. Gillani.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rahman, T. (1996). *Language and Politics in Pakistan*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Rahman, T. (1999). *Language, Education and Culture*. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- Shah, S.G.M. (1990). *Legacy of the British. A Brief History Educational and Cultural Survey of British Rule in India*. Karachi: Sindhi Kitab Ghar.
- Southgate, G. W. (1953). *The British Empire and the Commonwealth*. London: J. M. Dent and Sons Ltd.
- Thorpe, C. L. (1965). *Education and Muslim Nationalism*. Pakistan: Pakistan Historical Society.
- Viswanathan, G. (1995). *The Beginnings of English Literary Study in British India*. In Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffins & Helen Tiffin (Eds.), *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader* (pp.431-46). London and New York: Routledge.
- Vittachi, V. (1987). *The Brown Sahib (Revisited)*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.