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ABSTRACT

English has grown into an international language in a double sense, with both an increasing number of users and international varieties. As yet, however, there is no comprehensive explanatory framework for the sociohistorical development of English as an International Language (EIL). This study addresses itself to that task by integrating the hitherto separate areas of study of language change and language spread in a unified approach, language spread and change. The world language theory framework developed here puts forward a sociolinguistic perspective on the development of EIL, connecting the spread of English in the second and foreign language contexts over the last two centuries and accounts for language evolution, the development of international varieties of English, via second language acquisition processes.

Employing a historical-structural approach, the study first examines the sociohistorical context in which English spread, identifying the crucial determinants of that spread within two interconnected processes. The first of these, the imperial spread that accompanied colonial rule in Africa and Asia, is shown to have operated within carefully prescribed boundaries which limited access to English, referred to in the study as the containment policy. A facet of socioeconomic development within colonialism, this imperial side of the development of EIL is ultimately subsumed under the second process, the evolution of the world
Within this economic and cultural world context, world language develops, characterized by its multilingual context and bilingual speakers, and initiating language change via the process of world language divergence and world language convergence. With these two processes, the unity and the diversity found in world Englishes in the postcolonial context is explained. Toward this end, the concept of social second language acquisition—the acquisition of a second language by populations—is developed as a theory of the indigenization of English in Asian and African contexts. At the same time, the world econocultural system maintains the unity of the language.

The study concludes with the implications of the sociolinguistics of language spread and change for English language teaching, developing the construct of cross-cultural pedagogy.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

English has grown into an international language in a double sense. First, it has become the language of an increasing proportion of the world's population; estimates of the number of users range from 670 million to nearly 2 billion, meaning that "a quarter of the world's population is already fluent or competent in English" (Crystal, 1997, p. 4-5). Second, there has also been the development of variety on the world scale, not only the so-called mother tongue or "native" varieties (British English, American English, Australian English, and so forth), but also what are called the Indigenized Varieties of English (IVEs)—among them Indian English and Nigerian English. Using Kachru's (1983) framework of classifying social contexts, English is used in the "inner circle" (English spoken natively, e.g., the United States or Britain), "outer circle" (English acquired as a second language, e.g., India), and "expanding circle" (English acquired as a foreign language, e.g., China, Japan). It is in the latter two "circles" where the vast majority of speakers reside and where the language is acquired "non-natively." Depending on the source, it is usually acknowledged that English is spoken natively by about 350 million people and non-natively by at least a billion more people (Kachru, 1996). Prominent scholars in the fields of English as an International Language (EIL) and second language acquisition (SLA) have taken notice of the ascendance
of the English language to the role of the international language (Sridhar and Sridhar, 1983; Smith, 1987; Kachru, 1990; Phillipson, 1992; Pennycook, 1994; Widdowson, 1994; and others). Building on their work, this dissertation focuses on both the sociolinguistic and sociohistorical development of EIL as well as implications for methodology within the discipline of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) in light of the development of English into an international language.

The understanding of the nature of TESOL methodology has been undergoing significant changes accompanying those in the language. From a focus on particular methods, it has evolved toward a concern with what Richards (1987) calls the principles and understanding that underlie the study of the practices and procedures used in teaching. For this reason, it is the contention of this dissertation that the understanding that underlies English language teaching is intimately bound up with the internationalization of the language. This dissertation argues that when TESOL is grounded in a knowledge of the history of the development of EIL, it can successfully grapple with the complexities of the ESL and EFL contexts and purposes for its existence.

Nunan (1991) points out in his widely used volume on language teaching methodology that one of the most crucial tasks it faces is not to "divorce language from the contexts and purposes for its existence" (p. 248). The contexts and purposes for the existence of English and how they relate to the field of TESOL are the crucial subjects that the present study takes up. In particular, it argues that coming to grips with English as an International Language is essential to the future direction of TESOL methodology. When a language has become an international language spoken by hundreds of millions of people, the
task of discerning context and purpose appears especially complex. This is all the more the case since together with the tremendous increase in the number of English users and the proliferation of the contexts in which they use English, TESOL itself has also developed into an international field.

It might be tempting to conclude from this that the field must thereby fragment, taking on different shapes in different contexts, and different teaching methodologies to suit its various purposes. Indeed, it has been suggested by so prominent a figure in the field as Widdowson (1997) that English in its international sense is merely an aggregate of various and distinct registers, and that English should thereby be taught to speakers of other languages as English for Specific Purposes. On the other end of the spectrum, scholars such as Quirk (1989, 1990) maintain that English teaching must remain the same throughout the world, adhering to one monochrome standard for all. This diversity of interpretation of the effects of the development of English into an international language highlights how critical it is that the field of TESOL be grounded in an understanding of English as an International Language.

Statement of the Problem

The process of the development of EIL is both language development at the microlevel and macrolevel. That is, EIL encompasses the linguistic/structural change of English in addition to its spread on the global scale. What is needed is an integrated theoretical explanation of the development of EIL. The first step in the process is a theoretical understanding of the development of EIL and of the sociohistorical context in
which language spread takes place. This in turn requires an empirical data base on the basis of which the theoretical questions of the nature of EIL development can be analyzed. The study must locate itself in those nations where the international development of English was most pronounced and essential, that is, in those nations where English has functioned as a second language; specifically, in the colonies of the English-speaking colonial powers and the post-independence societies that developed out of them. The development of English as an International Language is to be approached, first and foremost, through a sociohistorical study of language and educational policy in those nations over the period of its formation.

Given the internationalization of English in the double sense alluded to earlier, the vast expansion of the number of its speakers in conjunction with the proliferation of its world varieties, the present work aims to show, in addition, that the question must be approached more broadly than the spread of English in isolation from its change, as it has traditionally been studied. Instead, a comprehensive conceptual framework is needed which takes language spread in the context of language change, as one integrated form of language development. This type of approach, which is language spread and change, rather than language spread by itself, provides the basis for the theoretical model I call world language theory.

To establish a base of empirical data on the spread of English, this dissertation examines first the sociohistorical contexts in which its spread occurred. It also examines the socioeconomic conditions—market forces that had an influential role in English language distribution in a multilingual context in the British African and Asian colonies. Language policy enters as a factor into the sociohistorical development of EIL, but the latter subject is
not confined to the question of language policy. In the present work, the object is not to study language policy in its own right, but as a means of understanding the sociohistorical development of English as an International Language. The present work also incorporates elements of the history of education in the colonies of the British and American empires.

The subject under study shares elements in common with the study of the indigenized varieties of English (IVEs), yet it is not intended as a study of any particular variety of English; it is a theoretical treatment of the development of international language, grounded in the empirical findings within educational language policy. There are works on EIL, but none is a comprehensive sociohistorical and theoretical account of its development. For this reason, as will be discussed subsequently, adaptation and development of the existing methodologies is necessary.

If the IVEs, as Kachru and Nelson (1996) argue, have their own life and process of development, similar to those of American English or British English, then this must have important implications for the evolution of English as an International Language. Whether, for example, there is a sociohistorical evolution of the language and standardization similar to the process of development of national language is a topic that demands scholarly investigation. What is needed, therefore, is a broadening of the current conception of both SLA and EIL theory (cf. Sridhar and Sridhar, 1994).

Traditionally, the fields of SLA and EIL have not taken due cognizance of each other. SLA has not adequately considered the implications of the development of second languages at the macrolevel where entire L2 populations and the sociohistorical processes are to be examined to derive understanding of the development of second languages. At the same time,
EIL and scholarship in the world Englishes has largely remained isolated from research in SLA (Sridhar and Sridhar, 1983).

The spread of English and the development of EIL lies beyond the scope of the current SLA theoretical frameworks. Hitherto, attention has been placed primarily upon the development of a linguistic system within the individual L2 learner making him/her the focus of the investigation. Within this “neoclassical approach” (Tollefson, 1991) the examination of language development focuses at the microlevel of L2 language acquisition. One of the most prominent current SLA theories, the theory of interlanguage (Selinker, 1972), places the development of the L2 learner’s acquisition on the continuum between his first language proficiency and the L2 norm. Although there is an attempt to take into account social (external) factors that might bear upon the development of the interlanguage, the scope of the investigation is confined to the individual L2 learner and not entire L2 learner populations. Furthermore, none of the existing social theories of SLA attempts to place L2 language development within a more global context (Ellis, 1994, p. 239) where individual’s choices might be historically and structurally determined (Tollefson, 1991). In such an event, SLA theoretical frameworks seem to be too narrow to account for the development of the IVEs. Nor can EIL be considered to be an interlanguage as such (Davies, 1989).

The concept of interlanguage does not capture the complexity of the development of international language. In many sociolinguistic contexts, especially in the areas of the outer circle, (e.g., Nigeria, India, Philippines), sociohistorical processes led to the evolution of IVEs as institutionalized varieties (Kachru, 1985: Sridhar and Sridhar, 1983). The emergence of IVEs presents an important aspect in the effort to examine the basis of the development of
EIL. The socio-historical and sociolinguistic processes that brought about the IVEs are one of the central processes within the evolution of EIL. Their examination, therefore, can shed light on the nature of the development of EIL. Further, the examination of the learning context in the expanding circle needs to be taken into account while examining the nature of EIL.

**Significance of the Work**

The present work primarily focuses on the examination of the nature of the process that produced EIL and the IVEs toward an integrated theoretical explanation. As such, this dissertation places the field of TESOL in a sociolinguistic and historical perspective. The history of TESOL, thus, becomes more than a post-World War II phenomenon, but it is intrinsically linked to the development of EIL. In doing so, it establishes an empirical database on the history of language policy in the major English-speaking colonies of Africa and Asia. The present study is also intended to contribute to the integration of EIL into SLA, particularly in addressing the world Englishes bilingual context; the achievement of this goal has wide-reaching implications for TESOL (cf. Kachru, 1997a; Sridhar, 1994).

As such, it contributes to the question of an international standard for English, a question of concern to ESL and EFL professionals, who are agents in the spread of English around the world. The dissertation investigates the nature of the essential unity of English across international variety—a question of particular importance for TESOL methodology in establishing a central context and purpose for English teaching. It addresses the question raised by Widdowson (1994) as to the "ownership" of English (cf. Strevens, 1980; Smith,
1983b). In addition, it impinges on issues of policy-making and language planning internationally, as well as raising issues of concern to multilingual and multicultural societies. The study can shed light on the question of whether English can serve as a "neutral" language in multilingual and multicultural contexts. Finally, the present work furthers the direction charted by scholars such as B. Kachru (1997a), Ferguson (1992), and Sridhar and Sridhar (1994) in moving toward bilingual paradigms as the basis of TESOL and SLA. The framework of language spread and change also has equally important implications for classroom-based research, that are developed in Chapter 8.

Research Questions

Main Research Questions

1. Is imperial British and American English language policy the primary basis for the spread of English?

2. Is language policy a prime determinant of the emergence of English as an International Language?

3. Is the sociohistorical process of development of EIL a product of language imposition alone?

4. What is the relationship between the development of the world market and EIL?

Secondary Research Questions

1. Was there imperial language policy operating in the British empire?
2. Was there an imperial American English language policy? What is its relation to the British policy? Was there an "Anglo-American" language policy?

3. Did the language policies of the British and Americans tend towards the replacement of the indigenous languages?

4. Was there an attempt to make the English language the language of the whole population of the colonies of the British and American empires?

5. Was there an "invisible" ideology in language policy?

6. Was language policy by the British seen as a solution to the communication problems of multilingual societies?

7. Who were the language policy agents? Were they located in the Center or in the colonies?

Definition of Terms

This section provides definitions of some of the major terms used in the study.

1. "Invisible" ideology in language policy is "The policy of requiring everyone to learn a single dominant language is widely seen as a common-sense solution to the communication problems of multilingual societies" (Tollefson, 1991, p. 10).

2. Language planning: It is "generally seen as entailing the formation and implementation of a policy designed to prescribe, or influence, the language(s) and varieties of language that will be used and the purposes for which they will be used" (Wiley, 1996, pp. 107-108). Language planning is often thought of as consisting of corpus planning and status planning. The former concerns itself with linguistic changes of the system (e.g., changes in the spelling); the latter
involves issues such as “designation of the language(s) of instruction in schools and decisions regarding whether (and in which languages) bilingual ballots may be used” (Wiley, 1996, p. 108). This study concentrates on issues of status planning within the sociohistorical context of British Asian and African colonies. More specifically, this study follows Tollefson’s (1991) definition of “the institutionalization of language as a basis for distinctions among social groups (classes). That is, language policy is one mechanism for locating language within social structure so that language determines who has access to political power and economic resources. Language policy is one mechanism by which dominant groups establish hegemony in language use” (p. 16).

3. Educational language planning: It can be viewed as “a sub-type of language planning,” as part of which “the socio-economic determinants and consequences of language planning decisions, and the value judgments of language planners should be identified” (Phillipson, 1993, p. 87).

4. Language spread and change: An approach to the sociohistorical evolution of language that combines the study of language spread with that of language change.

5. Interlanguage: It is a theoretical model of second language acquisition (Selinker, 1972). It refers to “systematic knowledge of an L2” (Ellis, 1994, p. 710) that is not identical to either the L1 or the target language. The ultimate goal of interlanguage development, however, is target language proficiency.
6. International English: The variety of English, either hypothetical, proposed, or actually existing in the world today, that serves as the form of the language appropriate for international communication.

7. Indigenized Varieties of English (IVEs): Varieties of English that have arisen in the postcolonial era in nations in which English serves as a second language.

8. English as an International Language: An international medium of communication arising out of the process of English language spread and change.

9. Linguistic Imperialism: The attempt to impose language on subjugated nations and peoples at the expense of indigenous languages.

10. Imperial language policy: Language policy designed and carried out by the Center directly aimed to impose language on a subjugated nation and people.

11. Local language policy: Language policy developed on an ad hoc basis from within the colonial “outposts” and serving the ends of expediency.

12. Center: The power structures of an imperialist nation, located within that nation and carrying out its interests exclusively.
Limitations

Because of the historical nature of the work, it is only possible within definite limits to obtain accounts of the aspirations, ideas, and motivations of the peoples of Africa and Asia whose lives and struggles make up the untold story of the development of English as an International Language. For the earliest periods especially, such sources are scarce and, to a large extent, unavailable to the researcher.

The maintaining of educational records necessarily differed from place to place, hence the attempt to create a comprehensive statistical picture of language policy in education is hindered by virtue of this.

Review of the Literature

Scholarship within the field of English as an International Language highlights the complexities of the development of an increasingly global language. The field has had to grapple with an inherited discourse which has tended to dichotomize English speakers and English-speaking contexts (B. Kachru, 1996; B. Kachru and Nelson, 1996). There are, for example, distinctions made between the "native" and "non-native" contexts (Medgyes, 1994; Davies, 1991; Phillipson, 1992), and within the latter there is that between the English as a second language and English as a foreign language environments (Gorlach, 1991). Or, again, among the varieties of English, there is a division into the "Old Englishes" (usually British, American, Australian, Canadian, and a few others; cf. Fishman, 1977) and the "New Englishes" that have emerged in such nations as India, Nigeria, Singapore, and Philippines (B. Kachru, 1985, 1986). All of these dichotomies take root within the unprecedented historical
spread of English, a phenomenon which has placed English in a dominant linguistic position in the modern world.

The original construction of the term English as an International Language dates back to Smith (1976; 1987). Smith (1987) writes, "EIL is not English for special purposes with a restricted linguistic corpus for use in international settings.... The EIL concept...is based on the premise that English is the property of its users, native and non-native.... The core argument of EIL is that non-native speakers do not have to use English the way native speakers do...." (xi). Hardin (1979) made the same point: "The simple fact is that international communication cannot be reduced to the limited range and patterns of communication which are, I think, characteristic of ESP. Neither can it be seen as the sum of all kinds of ESP, since it is a language, not a corpus."

B. Kachru has, perhaps, done more to advance knowledge in this field than any other scholar. In addition to his conceptualization of the three concentric circles of English use already cited (1983), Kachru has developed such important conceptual tools as indigenization, a process that figures prominently in the present work. B. Kachru (1980, 1986; B. Kachru and Nelson, 1996) approaches the question from the sociolinguistic implications of the historical spread of English. He introduces the notions of history and change to the question of EIL. From a historical perspective, he argues that every language variety can develop its linguistic and sociolinguistic norms that meet the needs of a particular speech community. B. Kachru (1986) further cogently argues that such a sociohistorical and linguistic process of language development in the former British colonies can be equally productive as that which has led to the development of any of the so-called "native" varieties of English. e.g.,
American English. And the sociolinguistic innovations should not be construed as a sign of language deficiency, as they would be if judged from a hegemonic perspective, which sees the idealized native norm or "mother English" as a point of reference. Toward that end, B. Kachru and Nelson (1996) argue that it is necessary to alter the "notions of deficit linguistics" when we analyze other varieties of Englishes. Rather, such sociolinguistic innovations of other English-using cultures are functionally and contextually productive, and a sign of linguistic nativization and acculturation in "un-English" contexts (B. Kachru, 1986, 1992).

To B. Kachru and Nelson (1996), one of the major shortcomings of the native/non-native dichotomy is that it upholds an "us versus them" polarization (1996:79). Such standpoints do not recognize the development of English in the last two centuries into a world wide phenomenon with vibrant branches in various new cultural and ethnic contexts, with ramifications both at the national and individual levels. B. Kachru's (1985, 1990, 1992) historical and social framework conceives English language development in its global perspective.

Given the magnitude of this historically unparalleled episode of language spread, it might seem that there would be a large body of theoretical work attempting to account for the development of English as an International Language. Yet, we still have no compelling comprehensive theoretical framework for the spread of English. It has not yet been possible to answer the question of how the spread of English resulted in the variegated picture of English users and English-using contexts we find in the world today.

The literature relevant to the development of EIL falls into two main groups: language planning and policy (LPP) and works on the New Englishes. The field of LPP
divides into two main bodies of work, that following the “neo-classical” approach, and that following the “historical-structural” framework (Tollefson, 1991; Ricento and Hornberger, 1996). It is the latter framework that has been most fruitful in shedding light on the spread of English internationally. Drawing partly on the sociolinguistic work of Fishman (1972), the historical-structural work in LPP seeks to connect language policy with the broader sociopolitical development of society. Tollefson (1991), for example, has studied the role of English in such newly independent nations as Namibia, pointing out the important socioeconomic questions involved in the use of that language as a national medium.

On the other side, Phillipson (1992), also grounding himself in sociopolitical context and social science theory, attempts to substantiate the standpoint of linguistic imperialism on a theoretical basis. Phillipson traces the development of English as an International Language to the imperialist domination of the world at the hands of England and the United States. The English language, therefore, attained its predominant world position out of the supremacy of England, and later the U.S., within world politics. Phillipson explicitly sets out to link theories of imperialist supremacy with the spread of English as cause and effect. In particular, Phillipson is concerned to put the work of the British Council and other government organizations of Britain and the United States concerned with the teaching of English around the world within the parameters of linguistic imperialism.

Brosnahan (1973) also places the spread of English under the rubric of language imposition, although he does not distinguish it from the spread of languages, such as Greek, Latin, and Arabic and Turkish, under quite different historical conditions. Strevens (1978) attributes the spread of English to characteristics of the language itself. Mazrui (1973) has
called attention to the connection of the spread of English in African to the “growth of African national consciousness.”

Quirk (1988) divides the spread of English into three separate varieties, imperial, demographic, and econocultural. His imperial model, in which language is spread via the asserting of political control over colonized peoples, essentially recasts Phillipson’s, albeit is a somewhat more limited conception. On the other hand, Quirk notes that the basis of the spread of English to America, and later Australasia, lay in the migrations of English-speaking peoples from the British Isles. This basis has led Quirk to refer to this kind of language spread under the "demographic" model. Finally, Quirk makes econocultural features of language--that is, its combination of economic or commercial centrality and its cultural/intellectual role in the world community--the basis for his third model of language spread. Quirk, however, provides no basis for connecting the different models into a comprehensive theoretical account.

In Widdowson's (1997) understanding of EIL, the international language, as distinguished from the world varieties of English, comprises varieties of English for specific purposes (ESP), "autonomous registers which guarantee specialist communication within global expert communities" (p. 144). By thus conceiving EIL, Widdowson attempts to liberate it from the control of its Inner Circle native speakers. There is, he writes, "no need of native-speaker custodians" (p. 144). At the same time, Outer Circle varieties of world Englishes are not fossilized varieties of interlanguage, as some have attempted to maintain (Selinker, 1992). They are "regional varieties [that] do not have the dependent status of dialects" (p. 142). And yet, Widdowson perceives an inherent problem in constructing EIL
on such a basis. He comments, "But if English is to be an international means of
communication, the evolution of different and autonomous Englishes would seem to be self-
defeating." There is the "paradox" of "independence without autonomy" (p. 142). That is,
world Englishes spoken in the Outer Circle are not subordinated to the Inner Circle Englishes
of which, it would appear, they can only logically be the offshoots. But how can they be
independent of the language that gave rise to them? Widdowson's solution is to make them
languages in their own right, the linguistic offspring of English, but "something else" in
themselves. Thus, we need not speak, for example, of "Ghanian or Nigerian English. but
Ghanian, Nigerian tout court" (pp. 141-142). The result is that Outer Circle world Englishes
find no place in EIL: their "Englishness" is denied.

The emergence of what are called the New Englishes or World Englishes (i.e., the
IVEs), has been documented in great detail over the last two decades (see, e.g., Kachru,
1985; Bhatt, 1995; Platt, Weber, and Ho, 1984; Pride, 1982; Bokamba, 1992; Trudgill &
Hannah. 1994). Yet there is as yet no comprehensive theoretical framework which
adequately fits them into our understanding of larger linguistic processes and so explains their
development as language varieties. Rather, discussions of the origins of the New Englishes
have tended to confine their approach to the role of a particular element in the formation of
the IVEs (Platt et al, 1984; Pennycook, 1994).

The New Englishes perspective is primarily concerned with establishing the separate
linguistic and sociolinguistic identity of varieties of English and the equality of these varieties
as against American and British English (Kachru, 1985; Smith, 1987). Gorlach (1991)
provides a comprehensive survey of this work and critique of its inadequacies, pointing to
what remains to be done. The New Englishes framework sees the spread of English resulting in the development of separate languages, unlike the standpoint taken by linguistic imperialism. The emphasis is placed upon the “nativization” (Kachru, 1991) of the varieties of English and “decolonization” and “deanglicization” of English. Scholars concentrate on attempting to substantiate how the IVEs reflect the uniqueness of the national conditions in which they arise and how they express the national culture (Y. Kachru, 1987; Sridhar and Sridhar, 1983; Gonzalez, 1987).

One attempt to create a theoretical basis (Platt, Weber, and Ho, 1984) for the substantiation of “New Englishes” as separate language varieties relies upon their being learned in educational settings (since the language itself is differentiated from other forms found within the country in question on this basis). Pidgins and basilects of English, for example, are explicitly ruled out on this ground. Ironically, however, this defines the “New Englishes” as languages only insofar as they more closely approximate “Standard English,” which is a paradoxical basis upon which to substantiate the existence of a separate language. Such a basis leaves the impression that there are really only sociopolitical as opposed to linguistic reasons for designating these varieties as separate languages, while other variations of a language are called dialects. Moreover, Pratt, Weber and Ho do no more than suggest an element of an explanation of the development of “New Englishes,” and do not construct a model for it.

Another attempt in this direction has been put forward by Lester (1978), who bases himself on language contact theory to call the varieties of International English, among which he includes “Greek English” and “Japanese English,” “creolized forms of English”—or
contact languages. In this way, he says, "International English is a contact language made up of contact languages" (p. 11). Lester's theoretical framework, which he admits lacks "solid empirical evidence," amounts to an attempt to substitute an inchoate mass of simplified Englishes for Quirk's (1981) one simplified international or "nonnative," version. His underlying assumption is that it is "unrealistic" to expect non-native speakers to learn "native-speaker" English.

Pennycook (1994) deals with political, cultural, and ethical questions of English as an International Language, and its position around the world. Pennycook calls this the "worldliness of English," which, in keeping with his theoretical premise that language has meaning only within definite contexts, he does not attempt to define it—a shortcoming of a theoretical work on International English. He attributes the spread of English to a more complex process than that posited by linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992). He calls attention to the role of social groups in the colonies which facilitated the settlement of English in "alien" contexts. However, Pennycook confines himself to too great an extent to the "cultural politics" of language, and neglects the linguistic side of the development of the New Englishes. His valuable work, therefore, still does not provide a comprehensive model of the development of the New Englishes.

Selinker (1992) has attempted to apply his interlanguage (IL) theory to the emergence of the New Englishes (cf. Platt and Weber, 1980). This framework, however, has been convincingly refuted as an attempt to explain IVEs (cf. Y. Kachru, 1993; B. Kachru, 1994; K. Sridhar and S. N. Sridhar, 1986). Y. Kachru points out, among other things, that IL theory is not applicable to the Outer Circle as the ideal target language (TL) proposed by IL.
theory is not the goal of learners and speakers of IVEs. Moreover, she argues that to label the language of Outer Circle speakers as "fossilized" speech ignores the sociohistorical development of the IVEs and the sociocultural context of the Outer Circle. It may be added that the inadequacy of the IL standpoint for the explanation of the New Englishes is particularly evident in the fact that IVEs have developed their own standard varieties (Kachru, 1986) while the idea of a standard interlanguage contradicts the notion of the IL continuum.

Methodology and Analysis

Tollefson (1991) distinguishes between two main approaches to LPP research: the neo-classical and the historical-structural. The present work will locate itself within the latter. In contrast to the neo-classical, which makes the individual the fundamental unit of analysis, the historical-structural approach aims "to locate individual actions within the larger political-economic system" (p. 35). As the name indicates, the unit of analysis is the historical process (p. 33). The historical-structural study aims at "a social-scientific critique of the goals and aims of plans and policies in such areas as language rights or the distribution of economic wealth and political power" (p. 34). Toward this end, the historical-structural approach makes focuses on class as "the central macrostructural unit of analysis" (p. 35). "The major goal of policy research is to examine the historical basis of policies and to make explicit the mechanisms by which policy decisions serve or undermine particular political and economic interests" (p. 32).

While making use of the basis for LPP set down by Tollefson, the present study intends to modify in conformity with the subject of this study. First of all, as Kachru has
argued (1981), the focus on planning and planners must be broadened into language *policy*. The narrow focus on individual planners and planning-decisions, more appropriate to the neo-classical model, does not hold up in a larger sociohistorical context, nor does it account for comparative analysis of language planning. Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas (1996) argue for the need of “comparative language policy analysis... that goes beyond consideration of language in a few domains and permits valid comparison of fundamentally different sociopolitical units.” Toward that end, taking the emphasis off planning as such and putting it onto policy fulfills the aim of the historical process as the “proper unit of analysis” (Tollefson, 1991, p. 33). This means, essentially, that the *macrostructural unit of analysis* must be located within the development of the macroeconomic structures of society: colonialism, imperialism, neocolonialism: this project explicitly connects LPP to other sciences, and so gives an interdisciplinary content to the field. The advantage of such a methodology is set out by Ricento and Homberger (1996): “[B]y locating the LPP enterprise within broader theories of sociology, economics, and culture, critical approaches uncover implicit ideologies (such as state capitalism, with its various forms of cultural and economic imperialism) that provide, at least, richer descriptions of how language functions within broader sociocultural contexts” (p. 408).

It cannot be expected, however, that in approaching a field as broad as English as an International Language existing methodology can wholly suffice. For, as has been noted by Ricento and Hornberger (1996), “[T]he field of LPP research still lacks sufficient explanatory and predictive analytical tools that can be applied to diverse settings” (p. 411). For the purposes of studying the development of English as an International Language, a process
which occurs in many sites simultaneously, a distinction is needed that has not yet been recognized in SLA: that of social SLA (*macroacquisition*) v. SLA that has its locus in the individual learner. While SLA as traditionally conceived describes the acquisition-process of the L2 learner, *macroacquisition* involves the acquisition-process of L2 learning populations, national and cultural. This distinction is the major methodological innovation for SLA proposed in the present work. The process of development of the international language, English, which is at the same time the process of its differentiation from the national language of England, takes place not in the domain of the individual learner but in that of the acquisition of the language by entire sociocultural groups, a historical process—*the historical change of language at the L2 learner population level as opposed to individual learner interlanguage development*—(and, at the same time, the development of international language) that cannot be meaningfully analyzed as the sum of a large number of individual acquisition-processes. This process is clearly historical, and not individual; it offers a means of explaining through SLA theory how the IVEs have evolved, not merely as a process of linguistic-structural alterations, or language contact, but as a result of SLA processes; SLA, then, has a historical-structural component, and this will be explored through the conceptual tool of macroacquisition. In this way, the goal suggested by Tollefson (1991) and echoed by Ellis (1994) that the historical-structural approach be integrated into SLA—for which there is as yet no workable basis—may be fulfilled. The construct of macroacquisition lends to the historical-structural approach conceptual consistency and completeness, since the historical process is represented now both in the methodological foundations and in the conceptual analysis of historical process as SLA process, and SLA process as historical process. The
outcome of the SLA process must be conceived as more than acquisition by the L2 learner; it must be at the same time development of language—or theory of language (Tollefson, 1991, p. 38): in the present study, the development of language of international language. The construct of macroacquisition provides a means for realizing this goal.

Data Collection

For purposes of the present study, relevant data bears the direct imprint of policy-making processes, hence providing the researcher the means to undertake the historical-structural and comparative analysis of the spread of English. To that end, the sources of data include: (1) administrative policy documents, chiefly British and American for the colonial period, and national for the post-independence era, and collected in government publications; (2) first-hand narrative and analytical accounts by LPP agents, administrators and policy-makers in contemporary books, articles, and documents; (3) educational advocacy materials, expressing the views, findings, and evaluations of educational systems by educational professionals, also published contemporaneously. Since the present study spans the period of the entire century, data collection will span the entire time-period of the study.

In the compiling of data on the history of language policy in English-speaking colonies, the work concentrates on British colonies in Africa and Asia, which are compared with the American colony of the Philippines. The reasons for this choice are as follows:

1. The goal of collecting this data has been to test the hypothesis of English linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992).
2. Great Britain was the main English-language colonizing power. The number of colonies under direct American control accounted for a very small percentage of the total.

3. African and Asian colonies provided the only setting for the working out of language policy. The choice of language in Britain's American colonies was dictated by the absence of a dominant local language population. The majority of the population in the British West Indies was of African descent, but was too linguistically diverse to allow maintenance of mother languages transplanted from Africa (cf. Minority Rights Group, 1995). In African and Asian colonies, on the other hand, local languages continued as before. In addition, the context was multilingual rather than monolingual, thereby necessarily raising the question of lingua francas, language use in education, and other questions of language policy.

Note on the terminology used in the study

This study designates African and Asian nations by the names employed during the period of the study. This choice is made for the purpose of precision as modern political boundaries do not in all cases coincide with the colonial. Hence, for example, Sri Lanka is referred to as Ceylon, Malawi as Nyasaland, etc. Other territorial designations such as the Federated and the Unfederated Malay States and Zanzibar, on the other hand, do not correspond to modern nation states.

Summary of the study

It is the contention of this study that any treatment of the development of EIL must begin by testing empirically the thesis of linguistic imperialism—one of the most compelling current accounts of language spread, which has not yet been empirically verified. Chapter 2
draws out four salient features of the theory of linguistic imperialism. Subsequently, it demonstrates that for linguistic imperialism to represent a separate kind of imperialism, it is necessary that it extend beyond the bounds of what economic and political imperialism would require in terms of language policy. Finally, it examines American language policy in Philippines and early British policy in India.

Chapter 3 takes up language policy in Asia, where the oldest British colonies were, including India, Ceylon, the Straits Settlements. It demonstrates that contrary to the assumptions of linguistic imperialism there was no attempt to impose English beyond the necessary bounds of the requisites of economic and political rule. On the contrary, the detailed historical-structural analysis of the basis of the architecture of the policy presented reveals the contours of the containment policy—or the systematic limitation of access to English. The chapter argues that British colonial educational language policy was intrinsically intertwined with the socioeconomic fabric of the colonial societies ruled by the British empire. It served as a basic means to preserve social stratification and the status quo for the disempowered classes. The chapter details how these concerns led to a policy of local language education for the vast majority and English for the few—those who would serve as civil servants or commercial clerks.

Chapter 4 considers British policy in its African colonies. It demonstrates that since the question of education in Africa came up later than in Asia, British colonial administrators in Africa took account of the experiences of the Asian colonies. In particular, the effects of the prevalent view that political unrest in India was due to the dissemination of English beyond certain definite bounds were felt. This perception that the spread of English was
detrimental to British imperial interests shaped language policy in Africa. The chapter charts the process of the evolution of policy through the post War I formation of the League of Nations Mandates Commission, which oversaw allied rule in former German colonies. It shows that the discussion of language policy in the League of Nations helped prompt the British colonial administration toward finally formulating an empire wide policy— one which merely confirmed the existing local policies in Asia and Africa. It also places the noted American Phelps-Stokes Commission in its historical context.

Chapter 5 summarizes the findings of the preceding chapters and offers additional evidence arguing against the existence of a linguistic imperialist policy. It documents that rather than seeking to promote the spread of the English language, British colonial administrators viewed its spread beyond certain prescribed bounds as a "recipe for revolt." The chapter also presents additional factors which disconfirm the hypothesis of linguistic imperialism. It presents evidence showing that contrary to the notion that English education for the elite was intended to replace the use of local languages, English education under British colonial rule required an extensive grounding in the mother tongue and was thus bilingual education rather than an attempt at the replacement of the local language. The chapter details, in addition, how the British promoted local lingua francas in a number of cases, e.g., Swahili in East Africa, and Malay in Southeast Asia. Subsequently, it is argued that a linguistic imperialist intention on the part of the British in establishing their empire would have required them to establish an empire-wide language policy, whereas they instead left it in the hands of the local administrators to decide in accordance with expediency rather than ideology.
Chapter 6 presents an alternative framework for the spread of English in its historical context, world language theory, a sociolinguistic perspective on the development of English as an International Language. This model connects the spread of English in the second and foreign language contexts within the historical time frame of the past two centuries and accounts for language evolution—the development of international varieties of English via second language acquisition processes. World language theory identifies four central features of the development of global language: (1) econocultural factors; (2) the coexistence of world language with other languages in a multilingual context with bilingual speakers; (3) the transcendence of the role of an elite lingua franca; and (4) language change via the processes of world language convergence and world language divergence.

The explanation of the last two processes form the subject of Chapter 7. World language divergence is described as the language change which accompanies the spread of English as it evolves into a world language: the formation of new varieties, or the world Englishes. In particular, this process centers around the creation of what have been called the indigenized varieties of English in postcolonial Asia and Africa (e.g., Indian English, Singaporean English, Nigerian English). The chapter puts forward the notion of social second language acquisition, SLA by populations, or what is referred to as the process of macroacquisition. At the same time, the mutual relations of the various world varieties of English owes to the process within world language development that is called world language convergence. World language convergence is a product of the sociohistorical development of the world econocultural system, which constitutes the center of gravity around which the
varieties of World Englishes revolve. In this way, it is argued, world Englishes maintain their Englishness.

Chapter 8 discusses the implications of the language spread and change framework for English language teaching (ELT). Given the process of world language convergence, the dissertation argues that despite the creation of different contexts and purposes in the development of EIL, there remains an essential unity across the contexts and purposes that constitute the substance of the field of TESOL. The chapter concludes the dissertation by developing the construct of cross-cultural pedagogy, which seeks the connection of ELT methodology at two levels: 1) the classroom level, and 2) the sociolinguistic implications of the spread and change of English in different contexts (ENL, ESL, EFL).
CHAPTER 2

THE POLITICS OF COLONIAL LANGUAGE POLICY AND THE THEORY OF LINGUISTIC IMPERIALISM

Scholars of the English language point out that the spread of English "has been the most striking example of 'language expansion' this century if not in all recorded history. It has far exceeded that other famous case, the spread of Latin during the Roman Empire" (Platt, et al. 1984, p. 1). Given both its immense spread and the peculiar circumstances in which it has taken place, explanation of its development has focused on historical processes of the modern world. The most prominent current theory of the development of English into an international language, known as linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992), focuses on the imperialist context in which much of the spread of English over the past centuries took place. This theory ascribes the development of English as a world language wholly or mainly to this alleged process of the language spread by virtue of linguistic imperialism. Any treatment of the development of EIL, therefore, must begin with testing empirically the thesis of linguistic imperialism. The study thus must focus on examining whether there was imperial language policy operating in the British empire and whether imperial British and American English language policy is responsible for the spread of English. If linguistic imperialism does not stand up to empirical verification as an explanation for the development of EIL, then the
development of EIL and varieties of world Englishes is probably attributed to other sociolinguistic and historical processes that this study attempts to identify.

Before developing an alternative explanatory framework, this chapter and the three that follow adduce and investigate the empirical evidence for the spread of English as a result of linguistic imperialism. In order to investigate whether linguistic imperialism existed as a separate historical process, this chapter first considers salient claims implied under the thesis of linguistic imperialism, and sets up parameters of what would represent a separate assertion of a conscious linguistic imperialist policy. Subsequently, these criteria are examined within that empirical evidence to determine whether a bonafide linguistic imperialist policy existed.

The Theory of Linguistic Imperialism

Phillipson's (1992) theory of linguistic imperialism is the first attempt at a comprehensive theoretical account of the development of English as an international language and so constitutes the starting point for any subsequent work. Moreover, the thesis is compelling on the surface, and has a historical basis. Imperialism is certainly one of the most important historical episodes, and coincides chronologically with the development of English as a World Language. To assign to it causal significance appears justified.

Phillipson aims to explain "the contemporary phenomenon of English as a world language," within the parameters of linguistic imperialism theory. He undertakes "to analyze how the language became so dominant and why." To account for the current state of English as a world language, Phillipson looks "at the spread of English historically, in order to ascertain whether the language has been actively promoted as an instrument of the foreign
policy of the major English-speaking states, and if so, in what way" (p. 1). He approaches
the explanation of the spread of English in the modern era from a historical standpoint.
Phillipson "looks at language policies that Third World countries inherited from colonial
times..." (p. 1). In his brief historical exposition, he claims that there was an active and
conscious policy on the part of the imperial Britain.

It is interesting that Phillipson, however, never directly addresses himself to what he
promises, viz., an explanation of how English became the world language. Indeed, he
remarks rather ambiguously that "English is now entrenched worldwide, as a result of British
colonialism, international interdependence, 'revolutions' in technology, transport,
communications and commerce, and because English is the language of the USA, a major
economic, political, and military force in the contemporary world" (pp. 23-24). Of these
factors, apparently only the first, however, is intended to refer to the pre-World War II
period, at least implying that British imperialism lies at the root of the question.

Phillipson's lack of specificity notwithstanding, it has become customary, perhaps, to
regard the explanatory framework that linguistic imperialism presents as an explanation of the
development of EIL (Pennycook, 1994; Widdowson, 1997; Alatis and Straehle, 1998). Such
an explanation involves the following salient features:

1) linguistic imperialism is a separate kind of imperialism that amounts to a conscious
language policy on the part of the imperial power to impose its language and, in the
case of Britain and the US, responsible for the spread of English;

2) this policy emanates from the Center;
3) the spread of English is not non-ideological; rather, there is an inherent purpose underlying it—language is spread for its own sake;

4) English is an imposed language in those parts of the world where it is not spoken natively.

Phillipson (1992) argues that linguistic imperialism is a separate policy (p. 53). It necessarily follows from this, therefore, that English is essentially foreign to all but a few contexts, namely those where it is spoken natively as a national language (e.g., the UK, US, etc.). Phillipson, therefore, carefully skirts the question of world Englishes, a notion which posits (as will be discussed in Chapter 6) that English has become *indigenized* in so-called "un-English" contexts. A corollary of this thesis is that English has the tendency to replace indigenous languages in these "un-English" contexts, that, as Phillipson says, it entrenches a form of "subtractive" rather than "additive" bilingualism (1992, p. 306).

Another tacit assumption of the theory of linguistic imperialism is that English is an imposed language, imposed by the English-speaking world as a deliberate linguistic policy. As an essentially foreign language, English appears as something foisted upon the world by means of imperialist domination, as colonial rule and European culture. If English were not both an essentially "foreign" language as well as an imposed language, it would make little, if any, sense to call those from the "periphery" who advocate the use of English their agents of a linguistic imperialist policy who have "internalized" its essence, as Phillipson does (1992, p. 57).

It might well be that Phillipson would not claim adherence to all of these presuppositions. But the question is not simply what Phillipson claims but what the theory
of linguistic imperialism as a coherent theoretical framework says about the development of EIL. If, on the other hand, linguistic imperialism is said not represent an explanatory framework for the development of EIL, the theory's explanatory power is then greatly weakened. To be sure, linguistic imperialism is generally taken as language imposition, as the alienness of English to "un-English" contexts, and, by linking it to both cultural imperialism and neo-colonialism as a phase of imperialism, Phillipson is also tacitly making such claims. As he comments elsewhere, "the work is avowedly historical" (1993, p. 366).

Implicit in the concept of linguistic imperialism is that it is a separate aspect of the sociohistorical system known as imperialism, and Phillipson describes it that way, writing, "it is necessary to establish linguistic imperialism as a distinct type of imperialism, in order to be able to assess its role within an imperialist structure as a whole" (p. 53). As such, it is necessary to the theory of linguistic imperialism that a tangible, traceable policy of linguistic imperialism lie at the root of the international spread of English. "It is linguistic imperialism if the English language is imposed (by sticks, carrots, or ideas) on the Welsh or the Ugandans, and linguicism is in operation. In the neo-colonial phase of imperialism inter-state actors from the Centre and representatives of the elite in the Periphery (their counterparts and collaborators) are the key agents of this linguistic imperialism." Since it represents a joint effort of the Center and the elite from the periphery, the obvious implication is the historical process of the imposition of English on the non-elite is contemplated under this theory as it pertains to English language spread. In other words, it is not sufficient to the hypothesis that English spread as a function of English linguistic imperialism that English should have spread
historically during the epoch of imperialism. It must be shown that it did so as a result of a linguistic-based imperialism, a distinctive language policy.

To sum up, linguistic imperialism is a theory that implicitly holds that English as a world language is the product of an imperial policy—one which goes beyond economic and political considerations; that seeks to spread English for ideological reasons. Critics of this framework have noted that this thesis so far lacks strict empirical verification in primary source materials. Phillipson (1993) has also endorsed calls "for further empirical verification" and acknowledged that "the utility and validity of the essential elements of the conceptual framework need to be put to the test" (p. 369).

Substantiating the Theory of Linguistic Imperialism

To substantiate his explanatory framework, Phillipson seeks to show that such conscious English language policies were in existence during the colonial time in the British empire. In directing his inquiry to the colonial period, he tacitly acknowledges that for linguistic imperialism to be a consistent explanatory framework, English as a World Language must have developed as the product of a conscious policy. Phillipson traces the antecedents of the post-World War II policies back to the 1920s, but this does not essentially alter the time frame; as the period of the development of English as a World Language extends much further back than this. The substantiation of the thesis of linguistic imperialism necessarily pertains to the colonial period, rather than the post-colonial period to which most of Phillipson's discussion is addressed. In particular, Phillipson is concerned to put the work of the British Council and other government institutions of Britain and the United States
connected with the teaching of English around the world within the parameters of linguistic imperialism. That is, for Phillipson, conscious ELT policies that he devotes so much attention to are a mainly post-World War II phenomenon.

The development of English as a World Language, however, cannot be explained by events that took place after its establishment as a world language--i.e., after World War II. Indeed, it can only be explained by processes that took place during the whole of its development. Since that development extends back at least until the early 19th century, and, as this work will show, into the 18th century; it is hardly possible to attribute English as a World Language to the conscious policies of ELT that took place after World War II. Already, then, the entire discussion of ELT, which focuses precisely on the post-war period, is irrelevant to the essential question. English as a World Language cannot date in its development from after World War II, hence we must find the evidence for that conscious policy in the pre-war period. So that the British Council does not actually pertain to the question of the development of English as a World Language.

It is not necessary to show that English as a World Language existed at any particular point, but that its process of formation was under way. One does not customarily attribute causality in history to processes that postdate a particular phenomenon to be explained. And that clearly means the period of the extension of the British Empire into Asia and Africa. Otherwise, cause postdates effect.

Testing Phillipson's theoretical framework empirically means asking the question of whether there was a uniform colonial policy, and whether it was ideological and imperial. To investigate this one needs to look more closely into the language policy during the colonial
period, as Phillipson glosses over it. Disconfirming the hypothesis of linguistic imperialism, on the other hand, involves demonstrating that there was no unified imperial policy, and thereby no distinctive ideology concerned with spreading English in the colonial dependencies for cultural or linguistic reasons.

Phillipson himself acknowledges this necessity. Thus, he writes, that he "looks at language policies that Third World countries inherited from colonial times..." In other words, for linguistic imperialism to be a consistent explanatory framework, English as a World Language must have developed as the product of a conscious policy developed and put into effect during the colonial epoch. Hence, by Phillipson's own admission, the evidence he presents pertaining to the British Council and other post-colonial agencies, while necessary to the substantiation of his thesis, does not provide sufficient demonstration of the role of linguistic imperialism in the development of English as a World Language.

Despite the overriding importance of the colonial period, Phillipson devotes only one chapter to this period of the development of English as an International Language, and much of it deals not with British but with French policy. Hence, the entire historical substantiation of linguistic imperialism comes down to the very brief chapter on "colonial inheritance," twenty four pages in length, of which only eight pages are devoted to the period before World War II vis-a-vis English--one page on India and Macaulay, and four on the post-World War I period, with only broad general statements to cover the period in between; while twelve pages are devoted to the post World War II period, four pages are devoted, paradoxically, to French colonial policy, and one page is given to a discussion of the fictional character Robinson Crusoe. One searches in vain for any specific discussion of language policy or
statistics on the number of English-learning students in the British colonies. The only statistics presented are for French colonies, with a passing reference to Tanganyika, a British colony inherited from Germany in 1920. What actually pertains to British policy for the period in question appears to contain factual inaccuracies, as will be discussed in Chapter 5. Where his discussion is accurate, it contradicts his thesis of the spread of English as a function of linguistic imperialism.

Phillipson's (1992) attempt to substantiate the thesis of English "linguistic imperialism" was not based on a sufficient investigation of the subject. He never asks, in a precise, coherent, and consistent way, just what would constitute a linguistic imperialist policy, and so any policy he finds he merely takes as confirmation of his theory. Therefore, some of the very evidence needed to refute the thesis of linguistic imperialism is haphazardly scattered throughout the book, especially the historical section. The fundamental question that proponents of "linguistic imperialism" have not asked is: Was English deliberately spread to the colonies, or was it a stowaway aboard the ship of British imperialism, carried along for the ride, without any intention to deliberately spread it?

Given the nature of his historical discussion, therefore, Phillipson never answers the question of whether the ELT profession is the cause or the effect of the development of English as a World Language, because he never undertakes a systematic historical examination of English as a World Language. In other words, Phillipson has not tested whether ELT has been the instrument of spreading English, or merely itself an outgrowth of that development. If the former, then English as a World Language would necessarily constitute a postwar development. Yet every characteristic of English as a World Language
already existed prior to the development of ELT in Phillipson's sense of the word. English was already spread to its present extent before the second world war. What has occurred since then has been a quantitative extension of the language to a degree, but not a qualitative alteration in its role, function, and dominance in the world. Hence, if linguistic imperialism is the cause of English as a World Language, it must be manifested before the middle of this century. The present investigation, therefore, will limit itself to that time frame.

The Development of the World Economy and the Spread of English from the 18th Century

With the development of industrial capitalism in the late 18th century, with England, and later also the United States, as its center, English more and more became the language of the world market. As commerce became a truly world phenomenon, and linked all parts of the world market, the need for a central language of commerce exerted itself, and that language was, by dint of England's commercial supremacy, naturally English. This circumstance is not attributable to any cultural aspirations of the English, but to the economic conditions that created the commercial supremacy. We must consider, moreover, that the very internal logic of economic imperialism dictated that production in the colonies—whether those of England, the United States, France, Germany, Holland, Denmark, Italy or Japan—was geared toward the world market, as was production in parts of the world not under colonial rule—Latin America, Central and Eastern Europe, and parts of Asia (Wallerstein, 1980). It must be noted that, while colonial rule fell to one imperialist nation or another, the commercial exploitation of the colonies was an international effort, with merchants and
commercial ventures representing all or most of the major economic powers. In such a
situation, one language had to develop as the commercial lingua franca. That language was
English. So much had English become the language of the world market that many of the
other colonial powers instituted English education in their colonies for the provision of a
commercial class suited to carry out the work entailed by the world market (e.g., League of
Nations, 1923, 1925b). England could hardly be expected to be an exception to this general
trend.

Commercial practice by its nature requires a tremendous amount of clerical work.
Correspondence must be conducted, orders placed, schedules ironed out and so forth. All
of this was no less true in the past than today. It arises, not out of any desire to spread the
language of a particular nation, but out of the economic basis of society. It is simply a
function of the development of the world market. And it implies a commercial class
conversant with the language of the world market to carry out these commercial functions.

British imperial officials were well aware of this pressing necessity of commerce. The
inspector of education for Hong Kong described the practical consequences for language
policy at the turn of this century:

[A] merchant who is solely alive to his own profits ... would ... require intelligent
clerks, and would therefore pay willingly for schools which turned out a good stock
of these ... with a thorough mercantile education. The Chinese clerks should also
have a working knowledge of their own written language. He would probably be
wise in his generation in objecting to pay for teaching a mere smattering of English,
as the necessary minimum of pidgin English can be easily picked up by shop-boys and
domestic servants out of school. In other words he would prefer to an even but low
standard, an education which aimed at advancing the more promising pupils. (Irving,
1905, p. 80)
The need for commercial clerks implies a tremendous variation in the number of English educated youths from colony to colony. The need would be heaviest in commercial colonies like Hong Kong and Singapore, through which much of the exported produce of an entire region would pass; on the other hand, demand would be light in colonies whose economy was based almost entirely on the production of raw materials transshipped through an external commercial center.

In addition to the provision of commercial clerks, there is the separate question of the necessity of the imparting of English to colonial subjects for the purposes of government. It seems highly significant to proponents of the theory of linguistic imperialism that English became, by and large, the language of colonial governments, but here one needs to note that this question comes up at all because of the existence of territorial imperialism. Even if English did become the language of government in the colonies this does not prove a separate intent to spread the language as such. Rather, it is simply a decision for the convenience of those British subjects in colonial service, who brought with them their language into that service. On the contrary, what is striking about British colonial rule throughout its history is the virtually universal requirement for employment in the colonial service of a knowledge of the local languages of the colonies (e.g., Lugard, 1923).

As the empire developed, however, the colonial service became more and more dominated, at least at the lower levels, by nationals of the colonial nations, and not by Europeans. There was one overriding motivation for such a substitution: money. It was quite expensive to maintain a European colonial service. In addition to the higher wages, there was the question of transport, including dependents. Further, in tropical areas British
administrators often would spend half a year back in England recuperating for every year of service in the colony; this was particularly the case with the climatic conditions and adjustments that the Englishmen had to undergo in West Africa. In these areas, effective service was thus reduced by one third (Orr, 1905). Finally, England was too small a country to spare enough of its civil servant in an empire that numbered hundreds of millions and reached far flung lands. Employing local civil servants became thus a matter of practical economics for the colonial government.

The efficiency and the economy of the British administration in its empire necessitated the training of a well qualified group of civil servants from among the colonized nations, those who worked in the colonial administration as well as of commercial clerks, those who worked in private enterprise. Such civil servants had to be conversant with English, and so an additional need for English-speaking subjects of the British empire necessarily arose without any separate language policy goals.

The demand for civil servants developed in three main phases. First, there was a period after the colony was first founded but before it began to develop economically in which there was no demand for civil servants, and therefore, education was generally discouraged, or the question was not addressed. The second stage commenced when the colony began to develop economically and the demand for English speaking educated members of the subjugated peoples arose and the emphasis on teaching English coincided with this. The third stage involved the supply of English speaking nationals outstripping the demand and the consequent desire to limit English and higher education. The transition form one stage to another was not uniform across all colonies, but rather dependent upon the internal economic
development of a colony. The economic level of advancement also played a crucial role in determining the educational structure and the teaching of English.

It was not alone a question of economics that prompted the training of the colonial population for the purpose of British colonial administration. The British understood that in many colonies there already existed a fairly well established social structure within the community and that local leaders carried much social prestige among their people. The existence of the indigenous power structure of the community of the subjugated people was perhaps an equally important factor in the use of colonial subjects in building its administration in the empire. For the British, it was significant that the members of the indigenous power structure carried prestige in the community and were familiar with the sociocultural aspects of the life of the community. To take advantage of this fact, the policy of indirect rule— or the incorporation of the existing indigenous power structures in British rule— in colonies such as Nigeria, for example, was to make imperial ruling more expedient and economical (Lugard, 1923, see also Chapter 3).

For this reason, special attention was given to the education of the sons of the prominent colonial born leaders. For instance, in 1908, a British official in Southern Africa recommended that the Governments in all the larger areas ought to "establish a boarding-school, primarily for the sons of chiefs, but also open to a limited number of the sons of the wealthier natives who are commoners ... A Government school, largely on an aristocratic basis, for the Bechuana natives, would much diminish in the future the difficulties of the British administration, and lead to greater harmony between those tribes" (Sargant, 1908, p. 52).
Administering the colony through members of the indigenous power structure became a significant part of the British colonial administration. And it necessarily meant educating some of the local population for the purpose of Government Service in English.

Thus both economic and the sociopolitical factors in the colonies had a bearing upon the spread of English, they dictated the need for training of a group of native civil servants who would be able to maintain communication with the subjugated community as well as the imperial side. Colonial administrators were aware of the dependence of the colonial administration upon the civil servants drawn from the local community and consistently in the early period of empire building reported the shortage of well qualified civil servants with a sufficient knowledge of English and their native language. As one of the foremost British colonial administrators of the first decades of the 20th century wrote: "The progress made in the development of Africa would have been impossible were it not for the enormous number of Africans who fill posts in which a knowledge of English, of reading, writing, and arithmetic, and, to a lesser degree, of book-keeping and accountancy, is required" (Lugard, 1923, p. 443).

The teaching of English for administrative purposes became primary in English education. It was not to make a pupil, as one of the colonial inspectors put it "a potential missionary of the empire" (Irving, 1905, p. 81), but rather to produce "to-morrow's officials" and clerks for the mercantile class (Irving, 1905, p. 82).

The decision to employ colonial-born subjects dated back at least to 1833 (see below). And it grew greatly with time. In some colonies, e.g., Gold Coast by 1920, people indigenous to the country held all post in the subordinate clerical services and in numerous technical
departments: by the same year, in Nigeria, 4500 posts in administration and 2500 posts in the technical departments were held by Nigerians (Lugard, 1923, p. 87)

Employment in the British administration meant more lucrative posts and an opportunity for promotion. It is not surprising, therefore, that the colonized population desired to study English and knew the economic value of the language. In his report for 1866, an inspector of the Government Schools and a headmaster at the Central School in Hong Kong linked the success of the Central School, where English was taught with "English being convertible into dollars" (quoted in Irving, 1905, p. 118); more regular attendance at the schools where English was taught carried the connotation that "the education given is a special one having a distinct money value" (quoted in Irving, 1905, p. 118).

Educating civil servants, a relatively small group of students, did not mean the exclusion of the teaching of their native language. In fact, the knowledge of both was to be expected. The practical policy stipulated the necessity of teaching the native language alongside English. In the case of Hong Kong, for example, the educational system in the colony was to give the mercantile class, the most well to do class, the "to-morrow's officials" who besides knowing English, the "ability to read and write a plain letter in his own language, whether he is in a lawyer’s office, or is a compradore, or court interpreter, needs no showing" (Irving, 1905, p. 82).

Hence for reasons of expediency, an English speaking elite would necessarily have come into existence without any goal of spreading the language as such. What proves this all the more is that such an English speaking elite sprang up in a non-English colonies just as a French speaking elite existed in Europe in the 19th century (in Germany, Poland, Russia
etc.). The real test of linguistic imperialism as such as a separate policy would be the attempt to impose English on the masses, on the non-elite of the society.

Defining a Linguistic Imperialist Policy

A separate and specifically linguistic imperialism thereby implies something beyond the bare needs of empire on a purely pragmatic basis. It requires a concerted effort to spread the language on its own basis, apart from the dictates of expediency alone. If English did not merely traverse a part of the globe in company with British rule and British and American commercial dominance, then we should find more than simply a trend toward a certain spread of the language among the elite of the country—a trend that was also evident in parts of the world over which neither Great Britain nor the United States exerted no imperial control. English, as noted, was already becoming the language of commerce throughout the world, and so spread in all parts of the world on the force of economic motives. But if linguistic imperialism is an explanatory framework in its own right, and accounts for the development of English as a World Language, then there should, in addition, be evidence of the conscious attempt to spread the language. Since we do not have in question merely the parameters and shape of language policy in general, but the testing of a hypothesis which asserts that the goal of the British was to systematically promote English language spread, it is clear that such a policy must be manifested above all in the educational setting in which by far the greater number of English users in the colonial context acquired English (Platt et al, 1984).

Such a linguistic imperialist policy should display to at least some extent the following features:
1) universal and exclusive education in English

2) replacement of the indigenous languages with English, as was the case in Ireland.

A purely linguistic imperialist standpoint is not one of expediency but insists that everyone should be educated in English as subjects of Greater England. It assumes that the people in the colonies would change their customs, thinking, etc. to that of the English mode-and become denationalized. In practical terms, such an imperial policy would necessitate universal and exclusive teaching of English to every speaker in all of the empire's dependencies. As the inspector of schools in Hong Kong observed, "[A]n imperial policy ... may regard the Chinese boys and girls who leave the Hong Kong schools every year as so many pro-English missionaries" (Irving, 1905, pp. 80-81). The problem inherent in such a policy, as the inspector went on to indicate, is that such universal education as this policy envisioned would require substantial government funding to supply well qualified teachers or training of the local teachers, provision of materials, and the existence of facilities or buildings. This represented a financial burden that England itself was unwilling to bear. Instead, it made the colonies themselves fund their own educational systems out of the taxes they collected. Since as a general matter, little tax revenue could be gotten out of the indigenous population, especially in the early period of colonial rule--certainly not enough to fund such an ambitious educational project, even if all tax revenue were diverted to this purpose--the burden of such a project would fall upon the taxation of British commercial enterprise in the colonies. But as the inspector pointed out, the commercial class did not find such schemes in its interest and vigorously resisted paying for them, putting, as we shall see, its local interests above imperial interests.
In sum, an imperial language policy is conscious and systematic language planning on the part of the governing bodies situated in the Center; it is primarily ideologically driven and leads to a replacement of the existing language(s), and its societal functions in a given community. Most important, imperial language policy is the imposition of another language on all peoples, not only on a small fraction of a given society that may participate and benefit from the acquisition of the imperial language.

Historical Cases of Linguistic Imperialist Policy Advocacy

Sentiments were occasionally expressed by Englishmen who had no direct connection to colonial policy. For example, as an imperialistically-minded English schoolmaster declared: "The future has few certainties or none; but if there be any, one is that, if ever there is a universal language-a language spoken or understood among all members of the human family-it will be English (Welldon, 1895, p. 889, emphasis added).

An example of something resembling such a policy in the British empire is found in British Papua New Guinea. During its very brief tenure as a British colony (1890 to the turn of the century when the colony became the property of Australia), the colonial government made known its intention to establish English as a common language in the dependency. In the view of the government the large number of indigenous languages made any other policy than the implementation of English as a common language impossible. "It is tolerably clear that the trading and working language of the west end, of the east end, and of the islands, will be English" (Colonial Office, Papua New Guinea, 1896, p. 189-191). To this end, the local government supported the use of English by instructing all government officers to use English.
when interacting with native employees, prisoners, etc. It was the belief that such close contact in conjunction with the spread of English among miners and traders "would probably eventually make English the common language" (*ibid.*). The local colonial government also appealed to missions, e.g., the Wesleyen mission, to receive assistance in teaching English: all native teachers were instructed to teach the language and in the future use it as a medium of instruction (p. 33). Colonial officials believed that English education was necessary if the people of New Guinea were to be fit to work for European employers. Hence, they regarded education without the imparting of English to be of little value (p. 33). The projected policy to spread English and establish it as a common language involved teaching it to all inhabitants in the colony. It is important to realize, however, that it was the local government's policy and not one developed in London.

**Barriers to a British Linguistic Policy**

In fact, a significant barrier in the way of such an imperial policy was the fact that *decentralization* rather than a centralized empire-wide official policy existed as to language and educational policy in the British empire. Great Britain did not develop an empire-wide language policy of any kind, and did not even coordinate policy throughout the empire on relevant questions until the late 1920s. As historian Donald Schilling writes, "From the imperial point of view the situation ... had obvious disadvantages. There was, for example, no effort to coordinate the educational policies of Britain's African possessions or, for that matter, to make the experience of one colony readily available to any of the others. Thus, while the *laissez faire* approach of the Colonial Office to African education allowed for
relative flexibility, spontaneity, and individuality on the local level, it also allowed for
collision, inaction, and a degree of variation in the educational policies and programs of the
African colonies" (1972, p. 282). In the case of Kenya, for example, Schilling writes,
"Seldom, especially prior to 1923, did the Colonial Office initiate educational policy; rather
it chose to exercise its prerogatives by responding to the specific proposals of the Kenya
government" (1972).

With the lack of a uniform imperial policy, local conditions and events shaped
attitudes towards the significance of the spread of English and English education in the
dependencies. So long as the burden of formulating policy fell on the colonial administrators,
the chances could only be much greater that a "local policy" would be followed. For one
thing, the colonial administrators felt the pressure exerted by the English merchants and
manufacturers, who, as noted above, looked to their immediate interests. As Ronald Hyam
comments, an overriding goal of British imperial rule was "to avoid spending the British
taxpayer's money. Britain's empire was ever an empire on the cheap'' (quoted in Schilling,
1972, pp. 26-27). Whereas, as noted, an imperial policy of spreading English would have
meant significant outlays. In fact, far from striving to encourage large-scale undertakings on
the part of colonial administrations, the British Colonial Office generally confined itself to
making significant cuts in the proposed expenditures by the various colonial administrations.

And then, again, the administrators themselves were not necessarily in a position to
chart such an imperial course on their own. They were often people who rose through the
army and civil service who knew as little of the colony next to them as remote parts of the
world. They were not always products of the universities; they were overwhelmed by the
task of governing colonies that were seldom stable for long periods. The imperial viewpoint, while occasionally found among colonial administrators either in England or abroad, was more likely to be found among schoolmasters who specialized in creating castles in the air. Imperial administrators seemed to be driven more by practice than by imperial ideology. Primarily, then, it would be local demands and expediency that determined the spread of English, rather than a coherent empire-wide policy, and that certainly did not favor the development of the type of policy contemplated by linguistic imperialism.

The Case of Philippines and Imperial Language Policy

History affords proof, however, that such an imperial policy was nevertheless possible, local interests notwithstanding, where the imperial power executed it with sufficient vigor. But it is the United States, and not Great Britain, that would institute the closest thing to the model of the imperial policy. The case of the Philippines is instructive in this respect, for however much it differs from the "pure" imperial policy envisioned by some, it differs even more from the policy that Great Britain would settle upon. The case of Philippines serves as an excellent example of a conscious policy of the imposition of English on a colony by an imperial power.

U.S. rule in Philippines, dating from its seizing of the islands from Spain in 1898, was marked by a conscious language policy aimed at making English the official and common language of the colony, a policy which, among other results, would, according to the American colonial government, "build up national solidarity" (Annual Report of Governor General of Philippine Islands, 1926, p.5).
The Philippines, a Spanish colony for about three centuries, upon the American annexation had a wide range of indigenous languages; records indicate as many as 87 languages were spoken in the archipelago (Annual Report of Governor General of Philippine Islands, 1926, p. 5). Under Spanish rule, although Spanish was supposed to be the language of instruction, in reality education, such as it was, was carried out in the local languages (Report of the Philippine Commission, 1900, p. 31). In fact, the Spanish left the impression that they were more concerned with limiting access to knowledge of Spanish than spreading it (Gonzales, 1987).

Educational language policy on the part of the United States differed considerably. At the very outset, the goal was clearly specified: "Common schools must be established everywhere, and as a minimum standard every child must be taught arithmetic and to read and write the English language" (Reports of the Taft Philippine Commission, 1901, p. 108). Further, primary instruction was made "compulsory for all children between the ages of 6 and 12 years" (p. 110). The state was to carefully monitor a centralized public-school system. Two principal features of this system stand out: 1) a provision of education to every child, 2) the teaching of English to every child. At the root of the American plan was to use the English language as the sole means of instruction in the archipelago. The bureau of education justified this decision on the grounds that it would be impracticable to translate textbooks, even into the principal indigenous languages, and that none of these languages could serve as the common medium of communication.

Further justifying the American policy of instituting English as the only means of instruction was the ideological notion of the superiority of the English language and its
cultural heritage compared to the indigenous languages: "The few newspapers that are printed in the native language do not furnish all the intellectual guidance or stimulus needed by the inhabitants of the islands in their aspirations to be counted among civilized peoples ... Elementary books might have been prepared and printed in the various dialects and made the basis of primary instruction. Pupils having passed over this stage of their cultivation by this means would have found only a barren waste before them" (Third Annual Report of the Philippine Commission, 1903, p. 880). The English language was regarded as the "language of a civilized nation" and the local languages as lacking the means to facilitate the student in "increasing his knowledge" (p. 881). Therefore, it was a convenient ideological argument for promoting English to the detriment of other indigenous languages. The American bureau of education also claimed that the majority of the population was "ignorant" of Spanish, and that the Filipino people welcomed with enthusiasm the American effort to teach English (Third Annual Report of the Philippine Commission, 1903, p. 881). In short, the American plan was to provide education to every child but in a foreign language, which was supposed to open a path to a more advanced civilization.

English served as the means of instruction in the public school system from the moment of its establishment. The colonial government provided financial support thereby providing "universal free education for all the children of the islands" with the goal of making "this country ... one of the several nations of the world scattered in every portion of the globe where the English language will be spoken" (Report of Governor General of Philippine Islands, 1919, p. 110). To further promote the teaching and the spread of English in the
Philippines, pressure was put on private schools to give instruction in English, with the recommendation of making all instruction in private schools in English as well.

After almost twenty five years of American rule in the Philippines, and with the government's financial support as well as with the effort on the part of American teachers, it was reported that "English has made remarkable progress and will, by the use of proper methods in the hands of efficient teachers, become, in the near future, the common language" (Report of the Governor General of the Philippine Islands, 1926, p. 5) The official reports of the bureau of education consistently emphasized the success of the inauguration of the teaching of English: it was stated that "already one-half of the people of the Islands under the age of from 30 to 35 years are daily communicating with each other in business and social intercourse through the medium of the English language" (Report of the Governor General of the Philippine Islands, 1919, p. 110). The optimistic prediction was that in 15 years, English would be not only common unifying language in the Islands but also would substitute the use of Spanish in the Government and legislature. The encroachment of English painted a bleak future for other languages spoken in the colony; the opinion among experts was that they would be confined to use at home, possibly for one or two generations (Report of the Governor General of the Philippine Islands, 1919).

Although at the root of the American imperial policy lay the political and ideological concern of building up "national solidarity" through the spread of English as a common language (Report of the Governor General of the Philippine Islands, 1926), the length of primary education when English was taught was fixed at three years only (Report of the Philippine Commission, 1905); thus in practice, leaving a great majority of the population
using their local languages; by late 1920s, 97 percent received education; on average, however, they spent less than three years in school (Report of the Governor General of the Philippine Islands, 1927, p. 206). Thus, as reports state "the mass of Filipinos do not now stay in school long enough to develop for permanent use even the rudiments of an education" (p. 206). The majority of the students even out of those who were enrolled in the public system only began learning English, thus, in practice still making use of their mother languages.

Furthermore, as reports point out, even to American educators it was shocking that very early there was such a concern and emphasis given to the practical or one could call industrial education in the Islands as opposed to the classical (Report of the Philippine Commission, 1905, p. 823); that learning was apparently to diminish the tendency on the part of the Filipino people to idealize and to deal with the increasing numbers of educated students seeking "white-collar" employment.

The American policy in the Philippines approximates what Phillipson (1992) calls linguistic imperialism. The United States, however, was not an important colonial power in Asia or Africa; it had no colonies in Africa, and only one major colony in Asia--the Philippines. Although this policy was promulgated by a minor player on the world colonial scale--and so does not of itself substantiate the thesis of EIL as the result of linguistic imperialism--it can serve as a useful point of comparison in considering British policy in its vast colonial empire in Asia and Africa.
The Macaulay Doctrine: The Case of India

In answering the question "Was the British language policy imperialistic?," it has become commonplace to turn to what is known as the Macaulay doctrine allegedly lying at the foundation of British colonial language policy, with the implication that it was applied everywhere. Before examining policy in Asia and Africa, there is the need to reexamine the context and content of that doctrine.

The substantiation of the thesis of English linguistic imperialism commences with the Macaulay doctrine, a language policy developed in British India in the 1830s. According to Phillipson (1992), this policy (1) aimed at the imposition of English on India, and (2) determined British language policy throughout the British empire. As to the first goal, Phillipson does admit in his brief discussion that the policy is aimed only "for a limited proportion of the subjects of the empire" (p. 111)--a point at odds with his theoretical framework. But this admission is easily overlooked in light of the statements which accompany it. First it is explicitly stated, "The job of education was to produce people with mastery of English" (1992, p. 111). In addition, he cites as an authority a scholar writing about the spread of Hindi in India the bewildering statement that "English became the sole medium of education...." (1992, p. 111). And finally, Phillipson (1992) mixes in two selected quotations from the Macaulay doctrine of 1830. He first cites Macaulay as desiring creation of "a class of persons Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals. and in intellect" (1992, p. 110). Second, he cites the Resolution of March 7, 1835 as proclaiming that "the great object of the British Government ought to be the promotion of European literature and science among the natives of India; and that all the funds appropriated
for the purpose of education would be best employed on English education alone" (1992, p. 111).

From this account, one would hardly expect to find that not only was the replacement of the mother languages of the Indian people with English never contemplated but that the vast majority of the Indian people who received education did so in their mother language at the behest of the British Indian Government.

To better understand British colonial language policy in India and the development of English education therein, it is necessary to examine the Macaulay Minute of 1835. In his doctrine, Macaulay, chairman of the Governor-General's Committee on Public Instruction, argues for the implementation of English education as a means for "intellectual improvement of those classes of people who have the means of pursuing higher studies" (quoted in Cameron, 1853, p. 68). Macaulay, thus, is concerned here with 1) the usage of English in higher education, and 2) providing instruction in English for a selected group of people, those who are endowed with the means to procure higher education--the local elite. His philosophy for English education stemmed from his belief that "the dialects commonly spoken among the natives of this part of India contain neither the literary nor scientific information" (quoted in Cameron, 1853, p. 68). For Macaulay, that constituted a compelling reason to advocate English education in India. Further he believed that the local languages need to be "enriched" by other languages to make them suitable for the purposes of higher education.

What is important to point out is that Macaulay had no intention of "Anglicizing" all of India, but only imparting the knowledge of English to the ruling class more for political reasons rather than for purely linguistic reasons. In his Minute, Macaulay states: "It is
impossible for us, with our limited means, to attempt to educate the body of the people. We must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern" (quoted in Cameron, 1853, p. 78). Thus, here it is the political motivation that guides Macaulay's thinking regarding teaching English. Further in his Minute, Macaulay states his desire to create "a class of persons Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, and in intellect. To that class we may leave it to refine the vernacular dialects of the country, to enrich those dialects with terms of science borrowed from the Western nomenclature, and to render them by degrees fit vehicles for conveying knowledge to the great mass of the population" (quoted in Cameron, 1853, p. 78). This statement on Macaulay's part contextualizes more precisely the intentions of teaching English in India. It is clear, however, that unlike Phillipson's decontextualized excerpts indicating Macaulay's desire to Anglicize the whole of India, Macaulay's English language policy could be that of "linguistic imperialism" if one only pays attention to the education of the elite of that day.

Furthermore, it would be wrong to assume that Macaulay's philosophy of converting the indigenous people to imbibe English taste, opinions, and intellect were shared by other imperial administrators in British dependencies. Not only did Macaulay's standpoint not become the policy throughout the empire, but most prominent colonial officials came to opposite conclusions. For example, Lord Cromer, governor of Egypt, would criticize at the end of the 19th century "the superficial, and in my opinion, generally erroneous view, that the study of French or English necessarily connotes the creation of French or English political proclivities" (Irving, 1905, p. 96). Sir Valentine Chirol (1921), an influential figure in Indian
politics, and Lord Richard Lugard (1923), the most influential British colonial administrator in Africa, both concurred with Cromer.

Most important to the adoption of Macaulay's policy, the British Parliament in 1833 issued a directive to the government of India that Indian people were to be employed in ever-growing numbers in the administration of the colony—a policy actuated not by ideological motives but for reasons of economy in the cost of governance (Mayhew, 1926, p. 19). Prior to this desire to lower the costs of empire—an outgrowth of the general political tenor of the times—Parliament had shown little interest in matters of policy in India that touched even indirectly on language policy. In fact, Parliament never took any direct interest in language policy in India. Rather, it confined itself to vague pronouncements and left it to the colonial administration in India to decide how such directives were to be implemented. Parliament first decreed in 1813 that the colonial administration of India was to allocate money for "reviving literature in India" and "for the introduction and promotion of a knowledge of the sciences among the inhabitants of the British territories" (quoted in Cameron, 1853, p. 65). This ambiguous wording was met by the colonial administrators in India by funding of the study of Arabic and Sanskrit. The 1833 Parliamentary act said no more about the question of language, and did not even consider the question. But as a British administrator in India remarked, "to give the natives a complete English education was the surest way of putting them in real and practical possession of the privilege of eligibility to all offices in their own country..." (Cameron, 1853, p. 63)—i.e., so long as that country was to fall under British rule. As discussed earlier in the chapter, such use of the subjugated peoples in the civil service necessitated their conversance with English. Hence, as Mayhew (1926) observes, Indian
governor "Bentinck found in the claims of the Anglicists the solution of the problem immediately confronting him, the supply of competent and trustworthy native servants of the Company" (p. 18). In addition, the British were resolved to prosecute vigorously the economic development of the colony, another factor dictating English education for the elite. Hence, if ideological considerations weighed heavily in Macaulay's thinking, they played a far less significant role--if any--in the forces motivating his superiors in the colonial administration and in London.

This fact has not been lost on scholars of British educational policy in India. Shelvankar (1940) notes: "The neglect of mass education merely showed that the new rulers of India had not come to the country to indulge in 'Social Uplift,' and the excessive importance attached to English was the natural consequence of their desire to economize in administration by creating on the spot a class of minor officials instead of importing every clerk and civil servant from England" (p. 103). Singh (1979) concurs: "There is no disputing the fact that Indian education grew to meet the requirements of local bureaucracy" (p. 111). Lord Chirol, himself an important figure in the history of British educational policy in India, concluded the same thing: "The main original object of the introduction of Western education into India was the training of a sufficient number of young Indians to fill the subordinate posts in the public offices with English-speaking natives" (1910, p. 34).

Those, therefore, who, as Phillipson (1992), evince the Indian government's Resolution of March 7, 1835 referred to above, as proof that an intention existed to impose English as the language of all education in India are fundamentally mistaken. The latter act was the expression of the policy of providing English education to create a civil service
staffed by Indians. Phillipson says of that decision: "This decision on funding firmly slammed the door on indigenous traditions of learning" (1992, p. 110). One is left to wonder what is the source for this conclusion, since none is given. But if one reads further in Resolution of March 7, 1835, one finds: "But it is not the intention of his Lordship in council to abolish any college or school of native learning, while the native population shall appear to be inclined to avail themselves of the advantages which it affords; and his Lordship in council directs that all existing professors and students at all the institutions under the superintendence of the committee shall continue to receive their stipends" (Cameron, 1853, p. 81). The question only related to what the British government intended to promote on its own, and not at all what was to be permitted to exist. Hence, not only was the door not slammed, it was purposely left open. So much so that, as Mayhew records, "By 1839 Lord Auckland [governor of India] was allowing grants for oriental publications and refusing to starve existing oriental institution" (1926, p. 25). And, even more pointedly, "In 1853 the Government N.W. Provinces, in noting with regret how few Anglo-vernacular students had secured public employment, expressed a determination to give preference to men 'proficient in a sound and enlarged education added to a knowledge of the Sanskrit language and familiarity with the Hindi language'" (Mayhew, 1926, p. 26). By the 1880s, the Colonial and Indian Exhibition ceremoniously displayed books published by the Indian colonial administration in both local languages (Marathi, Gujarati, Bengali, Kanarese, Tamil, Hindi, Urdu, and other) and the classical languages of India, Sanskrit, Arabic, and Persian (J. Russell, 1887, p. 207).
Even, then, if that document had been the colonial government's last word on the subject, the import is quite different from that given by Phillipson. But, as a matter of fact, the contrary is the case. The policy continued to evolve, and far from a last word, we have here only a phase in the development of the policy.

Indeed, the Committee of Public Instruction soon issued a clarification to offset what a prominent colonial official later called in a speech to Parliament on education in India the "erroneous interpretation" of the Resolution of March 7, 1835 that "government had intended that education in English should be given in its colleges to the exclusion of education in the vernacular languages of the country" (Cameron, 1853, p. 88).

The statement of the Committee of Public Instruction, because it clears up so many misconceptions, is worth quoting at length:

We are deeply sensible of the importance of encouraging the cultivation of the vernacular languages. We do not conceive that the order of the 7th of March precludes us from doing this, and we have constantly acted on this construction. In the discussions which preceded that order, the claims of the vernacular languages were broadly and prominently admitted by all parties, and the question submitted for the decision of Government only concerned the relative advantage of teaching English on the one side, and the learned Eastern languages on the other. We therefore conceive that the phrases 'European literature and science,' 'English education alone,' and 'imparting to the native population a knowledge of English literature and science through the medium of the English language,' are intended merely to secure the preference to European learning taught through the medium of the English language, over Oriental learning taught through the medium of the Sanskrit and Arabic languages, as regards the instruction of those natives who receive a learned education at our seminaries. These expressions have, as we understand them, no reference to the question through what ulterior medium such instruction as the mass of the people is capable of receiving, is to be conveyed. If English had been rejected, and the learned Eastern tongues adopted, the people would equally have received their knowledge through the vernacular dialects. It was therefore quite unnecessary for the Government, in deciding the question between the rival languages, to take any notice of the vernacular tongues, and consequently we have thought that nothing could reasonably be inferred from its omission to take such notice.
We conceive the formation of a vernacular literature to be the ultimate object
to which all our efforts must be directed.... We trust that the number of such
translations will now multiply every year.... A teacher of the vernacular language of
the province is already attached to several of our institutions, and we look to this plan
soon becoming general (quoted in Cameron, 1853, p. 89).

In fact, what has generally been lost sight of is that the Resolution of March 7, 1835
did not touch vernacular elementary education at all, and that the Indian government
continued to pursue that objective. The village school that was the mainstay of education in
a country in which 90% of the population lived in rural areas was left as it was--an institution
of wholly vernacular education--by the policy that became synonymous with Macaulay's
name. Indeed, by 1859 the colonial administration was declaring that promoting elementary
vernacular education for the "masses" was an educational priority of the colonial
administration. Hence, as will be shown in Chapter 3, far from education in British India
being entirely in English, it was rather overwhelmingly dominated by mother languages.
CHAPTER 3

THE CONTAINMENT POLICY: CONTROLLED ACCESS TO ENGLISH IN BRITISH COLONIAL ASIA

This chapter traces British colonial educational language policy in British-controlled Asia from the foundation of the rudiments of an educational system in the early 19th century to World War II. The focus of the data presented is England's principal Asian colonial possessions, India, Ceylon (present-day Sri Lanka), and British Malaya (present-day Malaysia and Singapore), since (1) these colonies together contained the overwhelming numerical majority of the population of British Asia; (2) the policies laid out in these principal colonies set the agenda for educational policy in other Asian possessions; and (3) documentation is more systematic for these colonies.

Great Britain's colonial empire in Asia dates from the 17th century and reached its final extent by the end of the 19th century. In all, it encompassed India (including Burma), Ceylon, the Straits Settlements (including Singapore), the Federated Malay States, the Unfederated Malay States, Brunei, Labuan, Hong Kong, Weihaiwei, and a number of Pacific Islands, including Fiji, British New Guinea, British Solomon Islands, Cocos-Keeling and Christmas Islands, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, New Hebrides, and Tongan Islands. Throughout the British Asian possessions, agriculture constituted the dominant factor in the economy and the majority of the population was engaged in agriculture during the colonial
period. In Ceylon, for example, the percentage was 88 per cent (Ormsby Gore, 1928; Cull, 1901). Production for this segment of the population was highly labor-intensive. Alongside the rural-based production, there was significant urban development in such colonies as the Straits Settlements, India, and Ceylon (De Silva, 1987). In parts of British Asia, then, economic development depended upon a bifurcated labor force; but in particular, it entailed the necessity of keeping the rural population "on the land," in both those colonies that were exclusively agricultural, such as the Unfederated Malay States, and those in which some urbanization had taken place by the early 20th century. This overall socioeconomic structure of British Asia served as the fundamental basis for the development and implementation of educational language policy in that portion of the British empire.

Formation of Local Language Policies: The Fear of English Spread to the Working Class

The British colonial authorities throughout Asia struggled throughout the 19th and early 20th century to design an educational policy that would meet the demands of empire, both in terms of British rule and the economic purpose of the colonies. The colonial authorities discovered that this required a flexible approach, rather than an ideologically driven policy such as the imperial policy discussed in Chapter 2. In the absence of a unified British imperial policy, each colonial administration had to more or less work out for itself an educational system adapted to its needs. Despite the lack of coordination, the resemblance of the various educational systems is remarkable. The similarity stems, however, not from the desire to follow a preconceived imperial policy, but, rather, to pursue a course dictated by expediency and the political and economic imperatives of colonial rule.
First and foremost, therefore, the colonial administrators adopted an attitude of practical caution. What concerned them most was not disrupting colonial production. They found, to their dismay, that, in the words of an American missionary report of 1901, there existed "the tendency among all classes to consider any kind of manual labor as beneath the man who has received an education equal to matriculation for college. Those who pass beyond this point feel themselves farther and farther removed from every calling in life except the so-called learned professions or a position under the Government of India" ("Report of the Deputation sent by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to India and Ceylon in 1901," 1905, p. 328). A government commission in India warned of what it called the "dangerous problem of the educated proletariat" (Indian Statutory Commission, 1930, vol. VIII, p. 38). In Ceylon, a turn of the century colonial education commission for Ceylon asserted that general education, while appropriate in a European country, would in rural Ceylon "unfit the population for a life of labour...if it is imparted on unsuitable lines and by unsuitable methods" (Ceylon, Commission on Elementary Education, 1906, p. 8). More specifically, the commission warned that to prepare the children of Ceylon for the occupation of a clerk in rural schools would be "bad for the community" (p. 8). As has been shown in Chapter 2, education for government or clerical employment meant English education. And so "unsuitable education" for rural children in British Asia came to mean English education, while "an education suited to the after life of the cultivator" (p. 8) entailed education in a local language.

Colonial administrators and education officials in Ceylon were particularly vocal on the subject of the opposition to the widespread teaching of English held throughout British
Asia. In a report to the Colonial Office, the governor of Ceylon in 1889 castigated the "evil effects upon the country of a generation of half-educated idlers who deem that a little pidgin-English places them above honest work" (Colonial Office, Ceylon, 1892, p. 17). Missionaries and colonial administrators shared one view, put succinctly by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Colombo: "In small towns ... the teaching of English has the effect of unsettling the population. Boys who are able to converse in English have a repugnance for their paternal trade" (quoted in Casterelli, 1905, 308). Colonial administrators complained that English education led youth in the countryside in Ceylon to regard "industrial work as a social disgrace" and "beneath their dignity" (quoted in Burrows, 1905, p. 345; see also, Ceylon, Commission on Elementary Education, 1906; Cull, 1901; Colonial Office, Ceylon, 1904). In the minds of these officials, even rudimentary English education given to the rural youth of Ceylon had undesirable results: the English educated youth, according to the colonial administrators, recognized the economic value of the knowledge of English and expected other means of employment than manual labor.

This ubiquitous notion was well-grounded in fact. To work anywhere other than in agriculture some competence in English was a must (Cull, 1901). As the Director of Public Instruction in Ceylon noted in 1899, "No Sinhalese lad can now do anything for himself out the agricultural walk of life without some knowledge of English" (quoted in Cull, p. 800). The Archbishop of Colombo echoed this view, "In large towns...knowledge of English is a necessity for almost every child" (quoted in Casterelli, 1905, p. 308). He added, "The effect

---

1K.M. De Silva (1981) notes that the "traditional elite" in Ceylon shared this fear of English education for the working classes, and that its "opposition" to education "was much more comprehensive in scope" (p. 332).
is most valuable for the education of the best classes amongst our people" (p. 308). But if imparted to the agricultural classes, English education, in the minds of the authorities, would mean the loss of the subjugated labor in the colony (cf. Pennycook, 1994).

These fears were realized in India, at least in the view of the British colonial authorities, by the early years of the 20th century. The Montagu-Chelmsford Report to the House of Commons of 1918, as summarized by Montgomery (1919), stated:

"Results which have been economically disastrous have been manifest in the fact that the exclusively literary system of higher education has produced a growing native intelligentsia, which can not find employment and becomes humiliated and soured, affording the best possible soil for discontented and anarchistic teachings. Education is directly responsible for this political and governmental ulcer on the body of the country. Only of late years has any complaint arisen against the real element which is wrong in the situation, namely, the inadequacy of facilities for training in manufactures, commerce, and the application of science to active industrial life (pp. 65-66)."

The Architecture of Language Policy: "Vernacular" Education for the Majority

This economic concern was reflected in the design of education for the majority of pupils, the future generation of laborers in British Asia. As an educational commission for India put it in 1882: "[P]rimary education [should] be regarded as the instruction of the masses through the vernacular in such subjects as will best fit them for their position in life, and be not necessarily regarded as a portion of instruction leading up to the university" (J. Russell, 1887, p. 200). Similarly, elementary education for rural children in Ceylon was said to be intended to keep the child in his proper "environment" (Ormsby Gore, 1928, p. 99). Language played a central role in the determination of that environment. A knowledge of English constituted "practically the only avenue to remunerative employment of any kind"
In the Straits Settlements, it was reported that "English education...is necessary if [a student] is to aspire to well-paid business or Government" (Colonial Office, Straits Settlements, 1922, p. 49). "English being convertible into dollars" in the colonial context, as an education official in Hong Kong put it (quoted in Irving, 1905), there existed an additional motive to limit its acquisition. In the words of the Educational Commission of 1901 in Ceylon: "a knowledge of English should be looked on in this country much in the same light as that in which a University education is regarded at home" (quoted in Ceylon, Commission on Elementary Education, 1906, p. 45). That is, as the privilege of the few, or "an important hallmark of elite status" (De Silva, 1981, p. 332).

The socioeconomic implications of a knowledge of English played a defining role in educational language policy in British Asia (cf. Pennycook, 1994). A principal goal of colonial administration was to maintain the status quo in the colony, the socioeconomic stratification of the population. Educational language policy was directed toward this end. Traditional categories made way for those expressing the specific purposes of education. In colonial Ceylon, for example, the administration commented: "[T]he distinction between primary and secondary education is replaced by the distinction between vernacular and English schools" (Colonial Office, Ceylon, 1904, p. 40). The curricula for "English Schools" and "Vernacular Schools" differed primarily in point of language (Colonial Office, Ceylon, 1929). On this foundation, a two-tiered educational system was set up, in which "really good English" was taught to the few in "English Schools", while "Vernacular Schools", which
taught in local languages, were established for the majority (Colonial Office, Ceylon, 1892, p. 17).

In India, "vernacular education" constituted the pillar of education. Unlike in other Asian colonies, virtually all primary education for children from age 5 to 11 was given in local languages. At the level of middle schools, the division between Anglo-vernacular and English schools commenced (Montgomery, 1919). That a very small percentage of Indian students went beyond the primary vernacular level will be discussed subsequently.

The "Vernacular Schools" of British Asia were explicitly connected particularly to education of the agricultural population. The colonial government of the Federated Malay States summed up the point succinctly: "The aim of these schools is to give a general education to those boys who have no need for an education in English, and who will find employment either in agriculture or in appointments in which a knowledge of the vernacular is all that is required...." (Colonial Office, Federated Malay States, 1934, p. 52). A report of the Unfederated Malay state of Kelantan was more detailed:

Kelantan is an agricultural State and...its future economic prosperity and happiness of its people will turn largely on the maintenance of the State as an agricultural unit and of its people as an agricultural people.... The majority of the people will remain workers on the land and will not therefore require a knowledge of the English language. An English education for the majority of the inhabitants will not be conducive to the happiness of the people or the welfare of the State. The State does not want its people to gravitate to the towns and to acquire a smattering of English such as is represented by the winning of a Junior Cambridge Certificate and with it a contempt for manual labour. Rather is it to be desired that the peasant be equipped mentally and physically to carry out the work of his forefathers more efficiently and with better results. The schools of Kelantan must not be dominated by a course of
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3In addition to "English Schools" and "Vernacular Schools", there were a very small number of "Anglo-Vernacular Schools" or bilingual establishments, in which the local language gave way to English in the upper standards (Colonial Office, 1892).
instruction designed for urban classes; and the removal of illiteracy and the teaching of elementary agriculture must the aim and object of all vernacular schools" (Colonial Office, Unfederated Malay States, Kelantan. 1932, pp. 30-31).

One principal goal dominated the design of "vernacular education" in British Asia--to maintain the agricultural basis of production. A Brunei colonial administrator expressed the common sentiment: "Nothing is taught which will tend to drive Malays from their agricultural pursuits" (Colonial Office, Brunei. 1929, p. 22). And, of course, the very name "vernacular education" indicated what was to avoided above all, the teaching of English.

Hence, the linguistic division of education ran alongside socioeconomic lines. This was the case not only as between rural and urban persons, but also within the urban population. As government reports detail, the fees charged for attendance at government English schools made them inaccessible to the less affluent classes, while vernacular schools were free throughout British Asia (Colonial Office, Ceylon, 1938). It is expressly stated in a Kedah (Unfederated Malay State) report that relatively high school fees are instituted in English schools (and periodically raised) "to discourage boys of promise insufficient to secure the limited number of appointments open to those with English qualification from continuing their education beyond the age when they are pliable enough to turn to other than sedentary occupations" (Colonial Office, Unfederated Malay States, Kedah, 1936, p. 32). Thus we find, as in Ceylon, that the "purely vernacular schools" in the large towns were "for the poor and lower classes" only (Cull, 1901, p. 772). The same held true in British Malaya: it is the "better class of Malay boys who are able to attend an 'English' school. These are confined to the towns" (Federal Education Office, Federated Malay States, 1905, p. 16).
The economic basis of vernacular education was reflected in the curriculum, which a Federated Malay States official called "very elementary, but...sufficient for the ordinary requirements of Malay boys, who will become bullock-waggon drivers, padi-growers, fishermen, etc...." (Federal Education Office, Federated Malay States, 1905, p. 9). Above all, vernacular education aimed "to inculcate the dignity of manual labour" (Colonial Office, Straits Settlements, 1921, p. 49) and to combat "the erroneous idea that it is better and more dignified to do clerical than manual work, that generally obtains with native boys" (Federal Education Office, Federated Malay States, 1905, p. 17). As time passed, the purpose became more specific: to boost "the raayat's agricultural and industrial productivity" (Colonial Office, Kedah, 1937, p. 40), and so the well-being of the colony.

The Origins of "Vernacular" Education in British Asia

The policy of instituting vernacular education for the lower socioeconomic classes is evident from the very beginning of British colonial rule in Asia. The decision implementing the Macaulay policy in India in 1835 noted that it was not to have any affect on "vernacular education" for the "mass of the people," as is often wrongly thought (Cameron, 1853; Indian Statutory Commission, 1930, Part VI). In the 1850s, decisions were taken by the colonial administration of India to begin the expansion of vernacular education. These resolutions were strengthened by the educational commission of the early 1880s, which, as noted above, staunchly supported "instruction of the masses through the vernacular" (J. Russell, 1887, p. 194). Such was the level of acceptance of this policy that by World War I, a commentator was able to write: "The question of the medium of instruction has never been a troublesome
one, primary education being almost always synonymous with vernacular education even in
the primary standards attached to the secondary schools" (Montgomery, 1919, p. 74).

The situation was similar in the other major British colonial Asian possessions. In the
case of Ceylon, local language schools had already been established under its former Dutch
colonial rulers (Cull, 1901). When Great Britain inherited the colony, these were left in place,
and, with time, greatly extended. By the last decades of the 19th century, the policy of
drawing a clear line between local language education for the majority and English education
for the few was already in place.

The same process was very much in evidence in British Malaya (cf. Pennycook, 1994).
Upon becoming a Crown Colony, the Straits Settlements appointed a Select Committee of
the Legislative Council in 1870, which recommended "a large extension of Vernacular
Schools, by which it means, not such schools as are now established, where Malay children
are taught a few verses of the Koran, but schools where children will be educated in their
mother tongue" (Eleum, 1905, p. 139) Upon the appointment in 1872 of an Inspector of
Schools, he "devoted his energies chiefly at first to establishing and bringing into order a
system of vernacular education in Malay. The policy of the Government from then up to the
present time has, roughly stated, been to afford under direct Government control a free
education to Malays in their own language, while the provision of English education is left
chiefly to the enterprise of various educational committees and missionary and religious
bodies, Government assisting by the payment of grants-in aid..." (p. 140).
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In the Federated Malay States, English and vernacular schools were established as early as the 1880s in the main towns of Perak and Selangor (Federal Education Office, Federated Malay States, 1905, p. 5).

The Containment Policy of the Spread of English and the Growth of "Vernacular" Education

While British Asian colonial governments emphasized vernacular education, they placed various limits on English education. In the Unfederated Malay States, for example, English school enrollments were fixed "in accordance with the number of posts, available for boys with an English Education, in Government or private employment" (Colonial Office, Unfederated Malay States, Johore, 1930, p. 16). In Kelantan it was said that "Except for vacancies in Government service...for which there are already an overwhelming number of candidates, there are few openings locally for candidates whose only qualification is a moderate knowledge of English and it has been decided to concentrate for the present on improving the standard of Vernacular education" (Colonial Office, Unfederated Malay States, Kelantan, 1929, p. 20). A report for Trengganu captured the spirit that undergirded the policy:

In the present stage of the State's development no great expansion of facilities for English education is needed. Of the Government clerical and subordinate staff the majority have no knowledge of English whatsoever and are by no means happy with Romanised Malay, yet they are quite capable of carrying out with a reasonable degree of efficiency the work entrusted to them, and so far as local administration is concerned, there is no obvious reason why ability to read and write English should be demanded of these officers for many years to come. For the supply of comparatively few English-speaking clerks whom the Government requires of is likely to require in the near future, the existing schools are adequate, and there is little commercial
demand for English in a State which still looks to the padi-field and the fishing boat for its livelihood.

Admittedly the supply of free English education at Trengganu does not equal to the demand, to the disappointment of Malay parents who wish to give their children a better education than they received themselves and think that better education necessarily connotes English education. But possibly they forget their own proverb which says that however high the padi-bird may soar, he ends by settling on the buffalo's back: and many a Trengganu youth who struggles up to Standard IV in an English school will find that he has after all to make his living by work in which his English (such as it is) will not help him (Colonial Office, Unfederated Malay States, Trengganu, 1932, p. 17).

Hence, as the Secretary of State for the colonies noted in 1928, "vernacular education...is the only type of education within reach of the vast majority" (Ormsby Gore, 1928, p. 53).

The point emerges very prominently from an examination of the numbers of "Vernacular Schools" versus "English Schools" in British Asia. As shown in Appendix A, there were some 4,000 "Vernacular Schools" in Ceylon from the last decades of the 19th century through the end of colonial period in the 1930s. In contrast, the number of "English Schools," which numbered 124 in 1889, reached only 255 by 1927. In the latter year there were sixteen times more "Vernacular Schools" than "English Schools." Moreover, the growing emphasis upon mother language education is shown even more clearly by the effort of the government to directly support local language education. As shown in Appendix B, while the total number of "Vernacular Schools" remained almost constant over the period considered, the number of such schools that were government-supported increased from 1254
in 1889 to 3117, a rate faster than that of the expansion of government-supported "English
Schools."^3

In India, the growing emphasis placed upon vernacular education in 1870s is evident
in the five-fold growth of the number of primary vernacular schools, from 16,473 to 82,916
(Russell, 1887). The rate of growth dramatically declined over the next three decades, but
as in Ceylon, the number of vernacular schools dwarfed the number of English schools. Exact
figures on the number of English schools are not available, but it is interesting to consider the
number of schools operated by England's Church Missionary Society in India. At the turn of
the 20th century, that body operated 21 High Schools and Colleges in English, 89 "Anglo-
Vernacular Schools." and 1137 "Vernacular Schools" (Maconachie, 1905).

The picture is much the same in British Malaya.4 But there, due to a later
commencement of British rule and the institution of an educational system, the growth in the
number of "Vernacular Schools" is far more dramatic: over the period of 1900 to 1936, the
number of "Vernacular Schools" increased from 174 to 1332, while the number of English

^3While "English Schools" received government support from the beginning, "Vernacular Schools" were divided between those receiving government support and those independent of the colonial administration. However, as shown by a comparison of Appendixes A and B, the latter category had become relatively insignificant by the late period of British colonial rule.

4 There is a complicating factor in calculating the number of "Vernacular Schools" in that the number of such schools for Chinese or Indian children is sometimes specified and sometimes not. On the other hand, "English Schools" were mostly open to all children. But the general picture is not altered. The question of the education of Chinese and Indian children in British Malaya and the Pacific Islands and Indian children in Ceylon is taken up separately in a subsequent section of this chapter.

For the Federated Malay States, the number of "Vernacular Schools" includes Chinese and Indian in addition to Malay.
schools grew from 24 to 48 (see Appendix C), so that in 1936 "Vernacular Schools" outnumbered "English Schools" by a ratio of 28:1. The development of an educational system lagged even further behind in the Unfederated Malay States, but by the year 1928, for which full figures are obtainable, there were 294 "Vernacular Schools" to only 9 "English Schools" (a ratio of 33:1) (see Appendix D).5 Thereafter the proportion appears to have remained fairly constant, although comprehensive statistics are not available.

In the Straits Settlements, exact numbers of "English Schools" are more difficult to come by, because there were small private English schools in Singapore that came and went. But if we take government schools and government-aided schools, the picture is as follows:
in 1900, there were 171 "Vernacular" versus 39 "English" (4.4:1) (Eleum, 1905); in 1928, 567 "Vernacular" as against 84 "English" (6.75:1) (Ormsby Gore, 1928); in 1938, 297 "Vernacular" and 58 "English" (5.1:1) (Colonial Office, Straits Settlements, 1939). There was in the Straits Settlements a further division between Singapore and Malacca which will be discussed subsequently. In Brunei during the same period, there were only "Vernacular Schools" and no "English Schools" (Colonial Office, Brunei, 1929).

With respect to British Pacific Island territories, it appears from Colonial Office records that, for most of the colonies, almost all the schools were "vernacular" (Colonial Office, Fiji, 1923, 1926, 1933; Colonial Office, Tongan Islands Protectorate, 1916, 1926). In early years some of them taught English as a subject, but later abolished it. In later years, a few secondary English schools were established.

5 This total refers only to Malay "Vernacular Schools." There were, in addition, at least 3 Chinese schools and 14 Tamil schools in Kelantan; other colonies do not give such figures for that year.
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The Solomon Islands represented something of an exception. English was taught as a subject in that territory. But education was entirely in the hands of missions with some support from the government for technical education in early 1930s. There were no government schools in the pre-World War II period (Colonial Office, Solomon Islands, 1932, p.11). The official reason given for this was as follows: "There is no universal language in the Solomon Islands. Numerous dialects are spoken, and it frequently happens that natives living in villages a few miles apart are unable to understand one another. There are many parts of the Protectorate where a form of broken English is spoken and understood by the natives, especially in the eastern parts of the Group" (Colonial Office, Solomon Islands, 1930, p. 3). The small size of the British Island possessions—in which student populations were sometimes a mere handful of thousands or fewer—sometimes influenced educational policy. Unlike in the colonies of larger population, local authorities sometimes did not think it worthy of instituting the expense for vernacular education.

Taking British Asia as a whole, the large number of vernacular schools shows that they were scattered throughout the countryside, and were therefore the only kind of school available to the vast majority of the population. as Secretary for the Colonies William Ormsby Gore (1928) noted. The vast number of vernacular schools, therefore, signified a policy of limiting the educational, and thereby the economic, opportunities of the rural population, and thereby serving the goal of maintaining a labor force on the land. For this reason, English schools were for the most part only located in towns, where they served the purpose of educating a small section of the population to carry out the necessary functions of empire outlined in Chapter 2 and necessary for colonial rule.
Moreover, the small enrollments of the vernacular schools are strong evidence, confirmed by the descriptive sources, that these schools were in their vast majority village vernacular schools. The educational statistics from British Asia, therefore, provide strong evidence that the policy of opposition to English education for the rural population was implemented by colonial authorities throughout British possessions in Asia. Such a policy contrasts starkly with the American policy in the Philippines, detailed in Chapter 2, for the same period where English education was made the basis of the educational system, even in the villages.

In analyzing the data, it should be noted that the ratio of "Vernacular" to English schools, therefore, correlates strongly with the degree of urban development in the colony. The more agricultural the colony, the greater the ratio of vernacular to English schools. Hence, the ratio is highest in the Unfederated Malay States, and lowest in the Straits Settlement (where, however, the same ratio is manifested as among the different constituent colonies according to their level of urbanization) (Eleum, 1905). In the purely agricultural colonies, such as Perlis, Brunei and some of the Pacific Island colonies, there were no English schools at all.

Students Learning English versus Local Languages

As is implied by the figures on the number of "Vernacular" versus "English" schools, the vast majority of children in British colonial Asia received education in local languages exclusively. Only a small minority received education in English. In India, in 1882 92.4 percent of all students enrolled in schools at all levels learned the vernacular only, while 7.6
percent learned English. By 1919, the percentage of students learning vernacular languages only had dropped slightly to 84%. If instead of taking the students learning English as a percentage of students, it is taken as a percentage of the total school-age population of India, the figures are 1.3% for 1882, and 3.3% for 1919 (Russell, 1887; Montgomery, 1919). If the tremendous commercial development of the nation in those years, together with the "Indianization of the civil services" are taken into account (Indian Statutory Commission, Vol 1, 1930), this rise in the number of Indian youths learning English is easily accounted for. But it should be noted that total English literacy in India was still a substantial amount less than these figures imply. In 1901, a bare 0.68% of all males and 0.07% of all females in India were recorded as literate in English by the census (Census of the British Empire, 1906).

As shown in Appendix E, from the late 19th century on, the overwhelming majority of students in Ceylon received their schooling in the so-called "vernacular schools" in which local languages, primarily Sinhala or Tamil, were taught exclusively. The percentage of children who attended "Vernacular Schools" remained between 80% and 90% from the last decades of the 19th century to the end of the colonial period. However, even this statistic over-represents the actual number of youth who were learning English, since a large proportion of the children of Ceylon received no schooling at all. In 1904, less than 40% of children of school age (as defined by the colonial administration as children between the ages of 6 and 12) were enrolled in schools (Ceylon, Commission on Elementary Education, 1906).

*This number is actually the percentage of students attending all post-primary schools. But since not all secondary schools were conducted in English, the figure overstates the percentage of students actually learning English.*
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and in 1927 this figure had reached no more than 50 percent (Ormbsy Gore, 1928).⁷ The division between those students receiving education and those not tended to reflect the division between urban and rural Ceylon. As a government report commented around the turn of the century, "The children who are receiving no education at all are mainly those living in outlying country districts" (Colonial Office, 1901, p. 27). Thus, in 1904, while 63.8 percent of students in the Western province were under instruction, under 11.5 percent of those in the province of Uva were so classified (Ceylon, Commission on Elementary Education, 1906, pp. 6-7).

The percentage of children attending "Vernacular Schools" was very similar in the Federated Malay States, as shown in Appendix F.⁸ The percentage educated in local languages, primarily Malay, remained between 77.3% and 85.3% over the period of 1900 to 1936 even while the total number of students under instruction increased almost twenty-fold (Appendix G). For the Federated Malay States, however, more exact figures on the number of children receiving local language versus English education exist. As shown in Appendix H, among Malay boys in 1928, 6.6% received English education, while 75% attended Malay-language schools only. For Malay girls, virtually no English education existed, and a mere 9% attended Malay-language schools.

Local language education dominated in the Unfederated Malay States to an even greater degree. In 1927-8, by which time education has been established on some basis, fully

⁷ The classification of school age had been slightly extended evidently.

⁸ The total for students at "Vernacular Schools" includes Malay, Chinese and Indian students.
93% of school-going children attended the primarily Malay "vernacular schools" (Colonial Office, Unfederated Malay States, 1928; Johore, 1928; Kedah and Perlis, 1929; Kelantan, 1929; Perlis, 1928; Trengganu, 1928; Ormsby Gore, 1928). Subsequent to that point, statistics for the whole of the Unfederated States are not available, but in the most populous of the states, Johore, 91.8% of the students attended "vernacular schools" in 1938 (Colonial Office, Unfederated Malay States, Johore, 1939), and this despite the fact that English education was the most developed in this state. Although statistics on the number of children of school-going age who were not able to attend school are not available, anecdotal evidence suggests that they still constituted a sizeable number in the late 1930s.

Only in the comparatively small Straits Settlements were students educated in English and local languages is roughly equal numbers from about 1900 through the 1930s (Eleum, 1905; Colonial Office, Straits Settlements, 1923; 1933). However, there was a great discrepancy as between the different settlements. Whereas, for example, in Singapore in 1900 students at "English Schools" outnumbered those at "Vernacular Schools" by a ratio of 4:1, in Malacca those the ratio was about the same proportion in favor of "Vernacular School" students. In Penang, the ratio was approximately 1:1 (Eleum, 1905). This situation is explained, however, by the fact that Singapore served primarily as a commercial center for

---

9This figure includes only Malay "vernacular" students. The actual figure must have been somewhat higher when Chinese and Indian "vernacular" students are added in. It should be noted that Chinese and Indian students are included in the totals for "English schools."

10This includes Chinese and Indian students in "Vernacular Schools."

11This includes, for the most part, Chinese and Indian "vernacular schools." in the latter of which some English instruction was provided. However, there were few such schools in comparison to the "purely vernacular schools" (Eleum, 1905).
all of British Malaya, and to some extent for Southeast Asia in general. Hence, the demand for English-educated commercial clerks outstripped the supply for virtually the entire colonial period in Singapore, which was reflected in the educational system. On the other hand, Malacca like other parts of British Malaya, was primarily agricultural. And, as has been shown, the outlook of the British colonial authorities in the Straits Settlements was in substance no different from that in the other Asian colonies; the high incidence of English education, therefore, stemmed from commercial need alone.

In Brunei, local language education only existed during the pre-World War II period (Colonial Office, Brunei, 1931).

The difference in quality of education was reflected in the length of education as well. While English schools included standards all the way through high school, the vernacular schools extended only to the fifth standard. And the average pupil probably did not complete even these. In Ceylon, statistics for the year 1898 show that the number of students "presented for examination" for the fourth standard was less than 40 percent of that for the first standard. By 1928, officials still reported that the "vast majority" of students in Ceylon did not advance beyond the "elementary stage" (Colonial Office, Ceylon, 1929). In India as late in the history of British rule as 1923, only 19% of boys and 10% of girls who attended school reached even the fourth class (Indian Statutory Commission, 1930, vol. 1, pp. 392-3). Therefore, a large percentage of school children, as many as 40%, relapsed in illiteracy as adults (Montgomery, 1919). Moreover, most Indian children did not attend school at all. As late as 1921, only one third of male and one thirteenth of female children of school age were
enrolled in schools. As many as three out of four rural villages still had no educational facilities at all (Mayhew, 1926).

With the reservation of English education for the wealthier classes, the majority of the population could not change their occupation. In Ceylon, the colonial administration was reluctant from the first to allow the inhabitants of rural areas "the means of attaining [even a] modicum of" English, reported the Director of Public Instruction, a refusal the colonial authorities justified "With the cry that this little knowledge of English has an unsettling effect on the mind of the native goiya..." (quoted in Cull, 1901, p. 800). In short, the colonial administration institutionally limited access to English for the socioeconomic classes that they considered the "useful class" (Ceylon, Commission on Elementary Education, 1906, p. 19) -- that which was to carry out the manual labor in Ceylon.

The situation was just as apparent in India. A colonial official reported in 1907 that fewer than 15% of the money spent on Indian peoples in the civil service in his district (the Punjab) went to the rural-born Indian population. He commented, "the sons of agriculturalists are almost excluded from clerical posts worth more than a shilling a day" (Thorburn, 1907-1908, p. 140). Just as revealing of the socioeconomic basis of education were statistics collected with respect to caste -- or what the British called the "depressed classes." The colonial authorities acknowledged in 1930 that "It is only in rare cases where members of these class have through education raised themselves in the economic scale..." (Indian Statutory Commission, 1930, p. 395). For example, only one female in 30,000 among the "depressed classes" attended school beyond the primary level.
Estate Schools

An account of the educational system in British Asia remains incomplete without an examination of the system of estate schools. The system of estate schools further exemplifies the close link between industrial/agricultural education and mother language education in the colonial context.

Within the British colonial empire, indentured labor was not at all uncommon (Buell, 1928). In the case of Ceylon, a significant number Southern Indian peoples migrated to Ceylon as a labour force for the large colonial plantations (K.M. de Silva, 1981), or what the British called estates. In 1901, Tamil workers employed on estates were 42 per cent of the entire Tamil population in Ceylon (Ceylon, Commission on Elementary Education, 1906, p. 58). They were predominantly employed on large farms as "indentured" workers to provide cheap labor. In addition to men and women, who worked in about equal numbers, children were extensively employed as "tea pluckers," so soon as they were old enough "to reach over the top of a tea bush" (quoted in Ceylon, Commission on Elementary Education, p. 55). On top of the other hardships that life as an indentured laborer entailed, it meant the necessity of frequent migration from one estate to another. On the other hand, the majority of those who came to Ceylon as indentured laborers settled there permanently (Ceylon, Commission on Elementary Education).

According to the Inspector of Education of Ceylon in the early years of this century, when pressed by members of Parliament in London to address the question of education on the estates, the children of Tamil indentured laborers had not "yet reached a stage of civilization which makes it necessary to treat them as English children are treated" (quoted
in Ceylon, 1906, p. 55). He added, "Indeed, it must be refreshing to the philanthropist to
know that their present condition is far healthier and happier (if less intellectually forcing)
than that of a large majority of the children in England" (p. 55). Intellect was supposed to be
reserved for others.

This educational official knew firsthand, however, that the indentured Tamil workers
themselves were not at all satisfied with such conditions. For he detailed in his report that
much of the education accessible to the children of indentured workers was organized and
financed by the efforts of the indentured workers themselves (Ceylon, Commission on
Elementary Education, 1906), a circumstance that was found still to be the case two decades
later (Ormsby Gore, 1928).

These Tamil efforts notwithstanding, colonial education officials deemed the "question
of intellectual aspirations" of Tamil children "irrelevant" (Ceylon, Commission on Elementary
Education, p. 55). Indeed, they concluded most cynically that "every cooly who comes to live
and work on a tea estate is subjected to educational influences of a disciplinary kind" (p. 55).
More than this, the educational experts of Ceylon did not deem wise: "It is not a matter of
urgency to the interests of the state that they should spend several years in an organised
school" (p. 19). Indeed, should such a requirement be introduced, it might only amount to
a "mistake that has been the cause of a great deal of mischief already" (p. 56). The
government of Ceylon, then, was decidedly against "direct Government interference" in the
matter (p. 57). Government policy more or less left education on estates to the discretion of
the planters. Nor did they attempt to hide their reasons: "There is an undefined but very real
feeling that education will prevent the children from following the vocation of their parents."
Such a philosophy tacitly justifies the status quo: education is defined as that which encourages the estate worker to go on being an estate worker and does not interfere with production.

As such, instruction was of the most rudimentary nature. It was confined to two hours daily of basic mother language literacy and hygiene (Ormsby Gore, 1928, p. 103). For the vast majority of the children, "education" did not go beyond the second standard (Ceylon, Commission on Elementary Education, 1906, p. 55). In "Line schools," i.e., more or less organised instruction given in the fields, the rudiments of literacy in Tamil and arithmetic constituted the whole of the curriculum. The report on estate education asserted quite straightforwardly, "There is no question of the teaching of English" (p. 55). The children of the estate worker were to learn, above all, the "habits of industry" (p. 19), and it was made clear that school should not be allowed to interfere with the day's labor of children on estates (Colonial Office, Ceylon, 1904; Ceylon, Commission on Elementary Education). Education of the children of estate workers was not made compulsory; rather, the planter was left "free to organise this instruction in the way which he finds most suitable" (p. 19). Such instruction was not required to exceed two hours in the day.

Even this most rudimentary education was not available to the majority of the children living on the estates of Ceylon. In 1904, only 16 percent of the 46,200 children aged 6 to 12 were in any sort of schools (Ceylon, Commission on Elementary Education, 1906). By 1928, the proportion had grown substantially, to 46 percent of the 81,858 children (Ormsby Gore, 1928); still, the majority of children remained outside the estate schools such as they were.
In conclusion, an examination of the history of educational policy in British Asia, therefore, does not show any concerted, consistent attempt to institute a linguistic imperialist policy. On the contrary, it indicates a concern to limit the spread of English as much as was consonant with the purposes of a colonial empire. The result of this policy, Pennycook (1994) has written, was that “the demand for English education by local people was frequently far stronger than the colonizers’ desire to teach it” (p. 93).
CHAPTER 4

EDUCATIONAL LANGUAGE POLICY IN BRITISH AFRICA

This chapter traces the development of British educational language policy in Africa from its earliest years in Southern Africa in the mid-19th century to its full development throughout British Africa by the time of World War II. The chapter is organized in approximate order of the historical development of education in British Africa, commencing with Southern Africa, moving on to a consideration of Egypt, and then tracing developments in East and West Africa. The chapter also integrates into the text significant events and agencies shaping educational policy in Africa, principally the League of Nations Mandate Commission, the Phelps-Stokes Study of African education, and the development of a British Colonial Office commission on the education in Africa. Examined in this way, a comprehensive picture of British educational policy in Africa emerges, showing a general continuity despite the differences in time, place, and circumstances: As in British Asia, educational policy was formulated locally for reasons of expediency to serve economic aims consonant with colonial domination, and colonial administrators throughout most of Africa opted for vernacular education as the cornerstone of British educational language policy.

British colonization in Africa began in the southernmost portion of the continent in the last years of the 18th century and made its way north on the continent as the century
progressed, reaching its fullest extent by the turn of the 20th century. The British African
dominions were divided into four regions.

1) Southern Africa, consisting of the large colony of South Africa (until its
independence in 1913), its small satellite colonies of Basutoland and Swaziland,
Bechuanaland, and Southern Rhodesia;

2) North Africa, where Great Britain controlled Egypt, the Egyptian Sudan, and
British Somaliland;

3) West Africa, consisting of British Cameroon, Gold Coast and Northern Territories
of the Gold Coast, Gambia, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, and Togoland;

4) East Africa, which included Kenya, Nyasaland, Northern Rhodesia, Tanganyika,
Uganda, Zanzibar, and the Indian Ocean islands of Mauritius and Seychelles.

Southern Africa

British colonization of Africa commenced with the cession of the Cape Colony on the
southern tip of Africa from Holland to Britain in 1803 (Sargant, 1905, p. 575). From there,
British control extended over nearly the whole of Southern Africa over the next century. By
that time, colonial production had come to be geared toward to the South African mines that
provided the economic mainstay of British Southern Africa and determined colonial policy
throughout the region. Even the circumstances of the other colonies can only be fully
understood if one understands the context in which they were set in relation to the economy
in South Africa--specifically in relation to the mining industry. In South Africa, labor-
intensive extractive industries formed the basis of colonial production (Crush, Jeeves, and
Yudelman, 1991). The mining industry that was concentrated around Johannesburg necessarily needed not only the managers to run it—generally Europeans—but also those who would do the manual labor. The latter task fell to Africans from all over southern Africa. One of the ways to recruit workers for the mines "voluntarily" was to limit the already existing economic support of the local population, e.g., by taking away the land. The various African peoples were then crowded onto what were called by the colonial administrators "native reserves," conditions which in no way allowed of even the most meager subsistence (Crush et al; Harries, 1994; Buell, 1928). Basutoland, for example, was one of the many such "reserves" in British South Africa. Since the peoples inhabiting these lands were forced to search for work to support themselves and pay taxes levied by the colonial administration, these territories constituted in reality "labor reserves," and they were administered accordingly. The colonial government of Basutoland pointedly declared that "the vast majority...will remain laborers on the soil or in the lower ranks of industry" (Sloley, 1905, p. 132).

For all but administrative purposes, then, all of colonial Southern Africa was a part of the larger South African context. In 1921, it was estimated for Basutoland, for example, that 40 percent of the adult male population and at least 10 percent of the adult female population were away at "labor centers" in South Africa (Buell, 1928, p. 170). A report by the International Labor Office (1936, p. 484) in 1935 found the proportion for the same colony to be above 50 percent.¹ Since, however, these migrant laborers returned home

¹How much this remains the case is shown by the fact that "At the beginning of the 1990s, over half of Lesotho's national income derived from migrant miners working in South Africa" (Crush, Jeeves and Yudelman, 1991).
periodically, the proportion of the total population which migrated to South Africa periodically was in reality much higher. Given this de facto integration into the South African economy, the people of Southern Africa, wherever they lived, found themselves forced to live in the multilingual environment constituted by South Africa. Nor did this situation change when South Africa became an independent country in 1913, as the statistics cited above demonstrate.

These economic concerns guided the overall educational philosophy of the colonial administrators of Southern Africa. As the goal of the colonial administration was to secure labor for industry in South Africa, an effort was made to keep education within highly restricted bounds. Indeed, there was a fear of educated Africans among colonial employers, as colonial officials unanimously reported. As one expressed the general feeling, "book learning...lowered [Africans'] usefulness for work", and made them "uppish" and "conceited"—by which was meant that they became "disinclined" to work for the European (Clarke, 1905, p. 333; see also on this point, Sloley, 1905; Sargant, 1908; Muir, 1901; R. Russell, 1901; Stewart, 1905; Casartelli, 1905). Another colonial administrator succinctly summed up the widespread conviction: the education of all Africans in South Africa "would mean ruin to South Africa" (quoted in Muir, 1905, p. 85).

So prominent a figure in the history of British imperialism in southern Africa as Cecil Rhodes weighed in with a viewpoint reminiscent of those expressed in British Asia. Rhodes declared in 1892, when Premier of the Cape Colony:

I have, in my tours through the Transkeian districts, found some excellent institutions, where natives are being taught Latin and Greek. These schools are turning out native parsons by the score; but the thing is, in my opinion, being overdone. I do not
hesitate to say that native parsons are becoming more plentiful than congregations. Thus a dangerous class is being evolved. The native preachers are excellent so long as their number is limited, but the supply is out of all proportion to the demand. These preachers and other native Latin and Greek scholars, after the education they have received, feel it undignified to return to manual labor, consequently the country is becoming gradually infested with unemployed men, who will in the end develop into agitators of the most pernicious type (quoted in Casartelli, 1905, p. 290).

In such a context, the formation of educational policy had above all to address the fear that education would unfit the people of the labor reserves like Basutoland for manual labor. As a missionary in South Africa put it, education was above all charged with combating "the erroneous idea that manual work is servile toil, and mental work is supposed to elevate a man to a higher class" (Stewart, 1905, p. 338). According to this missionary, "This is the old native idea of social rank" (p. 338). If so, it did not differ from the "old idea" of social rank of the colonial government, which in 1889 had decreed that the education of European colonists must "fit them to maintain their unquestioned superiority and supremacy in this land" (quoted in Muir, 1901, p. 71). On the other hand, wrote the Education Adviser to the High Commissioner of South Africa, education for the people of Basutoland was intended to make them "far more useful to their white employers than they have ever been before" (Sargant, 1908, p. 30). Education, then, had to be different for the European settler and the African worker. The education of each was, in the language of the colonial authorities, to suit each for his or her "environment."

The concern not to alter the conditions of the African worker undergirded the educational philosophy prevalent in South Africa. If the purpose of education for the peoples of Southern Africa was to limit their chances of leaving their "environment"—that is, their role as manual laborers—then it followed that they should "receive and profit by [the education]
of the hands rather than that of the mind" (quoted in Casartelli, 1905, p. 289). The education suited to this purpose was elementary industrial education, taken in its broadest sense as education designed for the afterlife of a manual worker in either industry or agriculture (Casartelli 1905; Stewart, 1905; Sargant, 1908; Muir, 1901; Sloley, 1905). According to the inspector of education for southern African colonies, industrial training in the primary schools established for Africans would "predispose" the young to "serious manual activities, and to see nothing in an industrial livelihood incompatible with the worthy exercise of all of his faculties" (Sargant, 1908, pp. 23-24).

In fact, this movement toward industrial education extended back as far as the mid-19th century in South Africa. The governor of the Cape Colony, the early center of British South Africa, expressed his desire to avoid "bookish" education and confine Africans to practical training (quoted in Muir, 1901, p. 29). An 1879 commission in that colony recommended that "manual training" should form an "essential part" of the education of Africans (quoted in Muir, p. 86). In the educational code of Southern Rhodesia of the year 1899, it was specified of the four hour period of instruction, at least 2 of those hours "shall be devoted to industrial training" (Hammond, 1905, p. 172).

In this context, it is hardly surprising that the Resident Commissioner of colonial Basutoland, for example, should weigh in by the 1890s with his opinion that education must follow a similar course in that part of British South Africa (Colonial Office, Basutoland, 1896, 1898, 1899, 1901, 1903). As he put it in a report to the Board of Education of Great Britain, the people of Basutoland were to be manual laborers in industry or agriculture, in which "spheres they are happy, contented, and useful, and for them their best friends can desire
nothing better than the most elementary education, sound moral training and encouragement in the habits of steady industry" (Sloley, 1905, p. 132). Given that most Sotho men and women would leave Basutoland in the course of their lives in the search for work, industrial education would provide a powerful means of ensuring that they had no alternative but to head for the mines of South Africa.

This purpose also dictated educational language policy. For the economic language of South Africa—particularly of the mines to which most migrants from other parts of Southern Africa headed—was not English, but a variety of Zulu "mixed with a little Dutch and English" in which the African miners communicated with one another and with their European employers (Johnston, 1904). The education of Africans in English, on the other hand, served entirely different ends (Lugard, 1923; Schilling, 1972). In the context of colonial economic life, a knowledge of English brought with it the possibility of working in the colonial administration or other clerical employment; it constituted a means of more lucrative work not limited to manual labor. Further, education in English meant that the student would go beyond the rudiments of education, i.e., the second or third standard. Thus, from the sociological point of view, education, and particularly competence in English, placed the individual in a higher social strata. However, since most Southern African colonies were intended to serve primarily as labor reserves, no such educated class was therefore needed. For this reason, at least at the early period of its existence, no two-tiered system of education developed, as in other African colonies (Lugard, 1923; Schilling, 1972). Instead, the educational policy for the lower classes stands forth in its classic form, as it were. Industrial training for Southern Africa went hand in hand with mother language education.
In much of British Southern Africa, mother language education was held to be of the "greatest benefit" (Sloley, 1905, p. 135). Educators, colonial officials and missionaries were all in agreement that elementary education—which alone was developed at all in most of Southern Africa during the first decades of this century—should be in the mother language, for example, Sesotho in Basutoland (Colonial Office, Basutoland, 1910, p. 26). That a significant number of people in Basutoland would speak English was said to be "out of the question" (Colonial Office, Basutoland, 1909, p. 44). Colonial education officials praised missionaries for promoting the teaching of Sesotho, thus keeping education "in touch with the people" (Colonial Office, Basutoland, 1909, p. 42). English was said by them to be the language of advanced civilization and unsuited for the masses, who did not have the cultivated concepts and ideas present in the English language (Sargant, 1908). Thus in reality, the teaching of English was practically nonexistent. It was "the accomplishment of the few" (Colonial Office, Basutoland, 1910, p. 25); the "only language known by the majority of the students is Sesotho" (Colonial Office, Basutoland, 1910, p. 26).

Given the prevalent attitude toward education among colonial authorities, it is not surprising that educational officials should report that "the bulk of the young people are growing up without education as we understand it" (Colonial Office, Basutoland, 1905, p. 7). Even the largely industrial education mixed in with mother language literacy reached only a small proportion of children. Relatively few children attended school. Although only the most rudimentary statistics were gathered as to the number of children in school, these suggest that at the turn of the century the number of children between 6 and 15 years of age attending school may have been as few as one in ten (Colonial Office, Basutoland, 1905).
This number increased dramatically over the succeeding decades, reaching two in three by the mid-1930s, which Basutoland administrators called "a very remarkable phenomenon for Africa" (Colonial Office, Basutoland, 1936, p. 16). The emphasis of the education, however, had not changed. The vast majority of the students were confined to the "purely vernacular [Sesotho] classes", while the higher classes, in which English was taught, were reserved for the "comparatively few" (Colonial Office, Basutoland, 1928, p. 14). Thus, while there were by 1930 over 760 "elementary vernacular schools" in which education was confined almost entirely to mother language literacy, there were only 28 intermediate schools in which the teaching of English was emphasized (Colonial Office, Basutoland, 1928, p. 14; 1931, p. 19). In Southern Africa, then, mother language education developed as the natural concomitant to industrial education.

British Policy in Egypt

Egypt came under British control in 1883, making it the second oldest British colonial area in Africa--complicated by the longstanding French interest and influence in the area. Its longtime governor, Lord Cromer, would become not only the most influential figure in the history of British Egypt, but also a prominent and much-cited figure throughout the British empire. As discussed in Chapter 2, Lord Cromer did not concur with Macaulay that pro-British political proclivities and sentiments necessarily followed the spread of English within the British empire. Nor were Egyptian politics a simple matter. The British had to consider the French in the establishment of policy in this formerly French colony. Thus, as a later imperial official, Lord Lloyd, noted. "The general policy of His Majesty's Government
precluded any attempt to establish the influence of British culture" (1933, p. 159). The attempt at any wide dissemination of English, therefore, would not figure in British plans in Egypt, not even to the extent that it did in Southern Africa in the 19th century. Instead, circumscribed by budgetary constraints, Cromer concentrated educational efforts to his goal of promoting the employment of Egyptians within the civil service.

In the eyes of Lord Cromer, good government in Egypt, like in other parts of the empire, meant inexpensive government. Hence, he favored a plan designed to "employ Egyptians in the great majority of the subordinate and in a large number of the superior administrative posts." His administration, therefore, had in its employ by 1906 12,027 Egyptians and 1252 Europeans. Cromer devoted the resources at his disposal for education virtually entirely to fulfilling this goal (Montgomery, 1919). As an educational expert familiar with the Egyptian system commented, "Education in Egypt is now clearly crystallizing into two systems: The Europeanized, which aims at providing education chiefly for the wealthier circles of society, and the vernacular, which aims at a practical education for the rest of the population" (Montgomery, 1919, p. 94).

Since, as Cromer pointed out, "a large section of the upper and middle classes of [Egyptian] society depends on Government employment" (1909, p. 531), education of the elite naturally turned on the practical ends of government. This consisted of primary and secondary schools in which English and French were taught, although Arabic was the medium of instruction, due in large part to Egyptian preferences. Only in the "higher colleges" did Arabic give way to English as the medium of instruction (Montgomery, 1919). However, it should be noted that Lord Cromer not only wanted Arabic to be made the medium of
instruction at these higher colleges, but also advocated restricting the number of "foreign languages" taught (Cromer). Although government controlled, these schools charged substantial fees.

For the vast majority of the population, vernacular (Arabic) education alone was possible. These consisted of the traditional village schools attached to mosques, called Kuttabs, which were left in place by the British, although in 1897 a uniform curriculum was given, consisting of rudimentary vernacular literacy alongside the religious training. Among the significant provisions of the curriculum mentioned by Cromer was that "The teaching of any foreign language was rigorously excluded" (1909, p. 533). Far inferior to the primary schools also offering a four year course, the vernacular schools, according to the colonial administration, were "designed merely to equip the pupil with sufficient knowledge to take care of his own interests in his own station of life" (quoted in Lloyd, 1933, p. 14). There were "higher elementary schools," also entirely "vernacular," and stressing mainly manual training. But only 1 in every 292 students proceeded to this higher course (ibid.).

It was not until 1918 that the colonial administration collected comprehensive statistics on education. They show that there were 134 primary schools (in which English was taught) versus 4265 "vernacular elementary schools." Of primary school aged children, fully 92.5 per cent attended the vernacular schools. However, no more than 1 in 5 Egyptian children attended school. As of the 1907 census, 96 per cent of the people were returned as illiterate (Montgomery, 1919, p. 93).
Opposition to British Rule and its Effect on the Development of Education in West Africa

By the turn of the century, the anticolonial movements in both Egypt and India had become so prominent—and so effective—that they began to occupy the attention of the British authorities to an ever-increasing extent. Large-scale national movements emerged in each nation, well-organized, popularly-based, and increasingly taking the offensive. As British rule rested, or appeared to rest, on an increasingly tenuous basis, the British colonial authorities searched for ways and means to quell the opposition. And educational language policy quickly entered their purview.

The British colonial authorities found it particularly vexing that the English educated segment of the population of India and Egypt should have taken such a prominent role in the anticolonial movement (Chirol, 1910). From this they concluded that one of the important contributing factors to the opposition to British rule was English education. In particular, they believed that Indian and Egyptian people looked upon English education primarily as a means to relatively well-paying government employment, and that when the "factories of government officials" (Lloyd, 1933, p. 166) turned out a supply of the English-educated that outstripped the "market" for government employees, many of those making up the residual supply became "discontented" and thereby more likely to take part in the opposition movement (Chirol, 1910). For instance, a prominent British figure in India, Lord Chirol, deprecated what he called the creation of a "a semi-educated proletariat which is not only unemployed, but in many cases almost unemployable" and proclaimed that the "bitterness engendered" by this circumstance can only "vent itself...on the alien rulers who have imported the alien system of education by which many of those who fail believe themselves to have
been cruelly duped" (Chirol, 1910, pp. 225-226). An educational adviser in Egypt expressed the same sentiment in decrying those students who received English education seeking government jobs which were not available. "Large numbers of youths were thus diverted from their natural career in agriculture or industry...without any prospect of obtaining the kind of employment they hoped for, and estranged from their surroundings and parental influences" (quoted in Chirol, 1921, p. 227).

In the words of a prominent British missionary in India: the question that British rule faced there was "how to prevent the production of this disappointed man who is a student only in name" (Chirol, 1910, p. 217). That is, the British colonial administrators sought the seeds of the threat to their rule in both India and Egypt in their introduction of "Western" (English) education at the higher educational level.

British perceptions of the role of English education in the anticolonial movements came to play a significant factor in the formulation of educational language policy by the colonial governments of both Egypt and India. British colonial officials tended to translate this view of the connection of English education and anti-colonial movements into a general opposition to English and often "literary" education in general. If the British had wanted only to spread English, they might reasonably have been expected to press ahead with a policy of imposing English on the entire populations of their colonies no matter what the cost (similar to the US policy in Philippines). However, the British wanted above all to retain their empire: hence, when even the small extent of English education showed signs of awakening political opposition to British rule (or at least when the British interpreted the matter this way), the
British colonial administration's response was to curtail English education in both India and Egypt.

In both colonies the decision was made to give greater weight to primary vernacular education rather than higher English education. British authorities chastised themselves for having "sacrificed popular to higher education...for the production...of Government officials" (Chirol, 1921, p. 223). But the emphasis was clearly upon limiting the higher rather than extending the "popular." Colonial authorities opted for a policy of higher education "carefully limited in quantity, and directed chiefly to supplying the technical and professional needs of the country" (Lloyd, 1933, p. 160). In practice, little was done to promote mass education, despite repeated declarations by the governments of India and Egypt of the desirability of such a policy.

Under Lord Curzon's administration in India in the early years of this century, an attempt was made to deal with the perceived "evils" of the educational system in the form of a policy decision to emphasize the vernacular as the "proper medium of instruction" for primary education, and limiting English to higher education. In addition, it deemphasized "literary education" in high schools and limited the number of students in universities. This policy met with "a violent outburst of indignation" among educated Indians, who considered it an attempt to "throttle higher education in India" (Chirol, 1910, pp. 229-230).

In Egypt, where previously the primary (English) school certificate had served as a qualification for employment in government service, this certificate was abolished and primary education subordinated to the position of feeder into the secondary schools in the hope of limiting the number of students.
Such a policy—which amounted in practice only to an attempt at the further limitation on the spread of English—was not fundamentally new in either British Asia or in Egypt, and it was, moreover, consonant with the developing position in Southern Africa at this time (c. 1905-1914). The most important effect, ironically, would be that it served to shift policy elsewhere in the empire, particularly in West Africa.

British West Africa

At the turn of the 20th century, it was generally professed by the British colonial administrators and educationalists that the educational systems in India and Egypt had proved disastrous. In the opinion of the British colonial authorities, education in those colonies had produced a so-called "discontented class" as a result of overproducing English-educated youths with slight prospect of government employment. From the standpoint of the British colonial authorities, the result was youth with "bookish" knowledge, or literary knowledge, who learned English and expected good employment.

In the early years of British rule in Africa, from the 1890s through the World War I period, particularly in tropical colonies, there was still "unlimited demand" for qualified members of the indigenous population to fill in governmental and technical posts. The demand was so great that often pupils who did not finish their education left to assume governmental posts that called for higher qualifications, which led to some discontent on the part of the British (Lugard, 1923, pp. 442-443). In these circumstances, English education tended to be emphasized in some British West and East Africa possessions even while it was being curtailed in other parts of the empire.
Already, however, British colonial administrators in Africa were beginning to take notice of the events in other parts of the empire, and they proved quite willing to heed the warnings they derived from the Indian and Egyptian examples. The most prominent of these British officials was Sir Frederick Lugard (later Lord Lugard). Lugard, born in India, spent his entire career in the colonial service. After decades spent securing Britain's military hold over Africa, Lugard became High Commissioner in Northern Nigeria from 1900-1907, his first high-ranking civilian post. Lugard already distinguished himself at this stage of his career by developing the colonial governmental policy that was to become known as "indirect rule." Lugard's policy of indirect rule involved the incorporation of the existing indigenous power structures in British rule in colonies such as Nigeria in order to make imperial rule more feasible in tropical areas, where large importations of English officials was deemed out of the question, as well as to make it more economical elsewhere. In addition, the British believed that in many colonies there already existed a fairly well established social structure within the community and that local leaders carried much social prestige among their people. Lugard's idea was to take advantage of the established social structure within the community and the social prestige of the local elite among their people. As part of this policy, great attention was paid to the education of the sons of the indigenous elite. Administering the colony through some of the members of the indigenous power structure became a significant part of the British colonial administration throughout Africa. The impact of the policy of indirect rule on language policy would be significant. It meant that the efficiency of the British rule in the colonies was in large part dependent upon the close collaboration and mutual communication with the colonial population, both in social and linguistic terms.
After establishing the basis of British rule in Nigeria, Lugard was appointed governor of Hong Kong, a post he held through 1913. It was during these years that educational policy first came to his attention. Lugard played the key role in founding the University of Hong Kong "in the teeth of opposition and even derision, local and metropolitan, in the hope that it would be a meeting-place for Chinese and western culture" (Lugard, 1923, pp. xxxvi-xxxvii). In taking such an active interest in education, Lugard became aware of the controversy swirling in India in these years. In particular, an influential series of articles in *The Times* by Sir Valentine Chirol caught his attention. In a paper delivered at the 1911 Imperial Education Conference, Lugard showed that he has learned the main "lessons" of the "Indian Unrest" as put forth by Chirol. These are, according to Lugard, 1) the necessity of "direct government control over educational institutions"; 2) avoidance of any "concentration on higher education to the neglect of the schools which will train for the University"; 3) the danger of the "sole use of English as the medium of instruction" in education (Lugard, 1911, p. 241). Lugard first applied these lessons to the creation of the University of Hong Kong, but when he returned to Nigeria in 1913 to take the post of governor of the newly united colony, he gave them much broader consideration, the results of which he put forth in the formulation of a new educational policy for Nigeria, which he recorded in his influential book, *Dual Mandate*, which Lugard wrote upon retiring from the colonial service in 1919 and which appeared in 1921.

Lugard charted recommendations for educational policy that in effect limited the spread of English to the majority of the indigenous population. Lugard’s notion of education in Africa, particularly in tropical Africa, took into account the lesson from the "failure" of the
system in India. He characterized this failure in familiar terms, as the creation of a class of
educated but "unemployable" English-educated youths, who lacked "self-control, discipline,"
respect for authority and exhibited "contempt for manual work" (Lugard, 1923, p. 428). Lugard writes, "Education has brought to such men only discontent, suspicion of others, and
bitterness, which masquerades as racial patriotism, and the vindication of rights unjustly
withheld" (Lugard, 1923, p. 429). In this, he claims, "They have lost touch with their own
people" (p. 429). Lugard attributes such results to a failure on the part of the colonial
governments to supervise education (and not to some imperial policy). It is to be remedied
by greater government control over education.

Since the main problem of the Indian system was the overproduction of English
educated youth, Lugard proposed a dual system of schools in Africa: the "literary" schools
modeled after the public schools in England that would produce a well disciplined and
qualified clerical service for government and commercial purposes, and the "village" (rural)
schools that would produce the industrial class. This system should be controlled by the
colonial government, the failure of which in India that contributed to the "failure" of the
educational system there in Lugard's mind. In the former, a minority would be trained, in the
latter the great majority, thus, Lugard believed, in the long run avoiding the problem faced
by the British in India. Lugard's notion of this structure of education in African dependencies
was linked to indirect rule. It is the pupil from the "literary" school that will share
governmental and municipal responsibilities in the colony (Lugard, 1923).

Lugard's system of education also specified the role, and the scope of the spread of
the English language. In the "literary" schools, English was to be the medium of instruction
in the upper standards; local languages were the medium of instruction in lower standards where "promising" pupils from village were taught as teachers for village schools or clerks for local courts. In the "village" school which train the craftsmen and agriculturists, the local language should be the medium of instruction, although colloquial English might be introduced (1923, pp. 444-445). The "village" school "would not be intended to qualify a boy for Government employment, or to develop into literary schools" (p. 445). In the higher standards in the "village" school, English or a local lingua franca (Arabic, Swahili, or Hausa) should be used. Lugard also suggested that in the dependencies where languages such as Hausa or Swahili are widely used they should be promoted as lingua franca, elsewhere the usage of English for intercommunication should be encouraged (p. 454).

The recommendations made by Lugard concerning the structure of education in African dependencies and the teaching of English show 1) that English was limited to a small minority of population that reaches upper standards in the "literary" school and who subsequently may in some form participate in the government or commerce, 2) that vernacular education with the industrial focus is promoted to the great majority of the indigenous population.

The advocacy of this policy in Lugard's Dual Mandate, which an official of the British African service noted "became almost a textbook for British administrators in Africa" (Mason, 1959, p. 38), ensured its acceptance throughout Africa. All the more so, as at the same time a number of events took place, with Lugard at their center, that resulted in the adoption of this policy as official British Empire policy, thus bringing all parts of the Empire into line with the policy already in place in British Asia, Egypt, and British Southern Africa.
Language Policy in the International Political Arena: The League of Nations Mandates Commission and the Phelps-Stokes Fund in Africa

**The League of Nations Mandates Commission**

After World War I, international politics would, for the first time, enter as a prominent factor in determining educational language policy in the British empire—exerting its first effects on the colonies taken over by the victorious Allies from the defeated Germany. England constituted the preeminent power in the post-World War I League of Nations formed out of the peace treaty ending the war, and as such, the most powerful voice on questions of colonial policy. Within the League Mandates Commission, the body charged with distributing and overseeing former German territories, such as Tanganyika and Cameroon, British representatives wielded the power to ensure adequate representation of their views on colonial rule in Africa. Nevertheless, the process of oversight of those new British possessions by the international imperial body helped institute a process of formation of empire-wide policy-making on the part of the British for the first time in the history of British colonialism. Despite its complete lack of authority over the vast dominions of Great Britain, from the foundation of the League Mandates Commission in 1921, then, a new chapter began in the history of the British empire—one which, for reasons to be made clear, made its impact felt first in British Africa.

The League of Nations Mandates Commission constitutes a neglected chapter in the history of British colonial language and education policy, and also shows Britain's attempt to influence other colonial powers. The existence of the League Mandates Commission, which
interested itself in all aspects of colonial administration, created a forum in which British language policy in various colonial settings would be considered together. Already this was, therefore, a step toward the conscious coordination of British colonial policy, which had hitherto developed in each colony more or less independently.

But since the League of Nations was something more—a meeting ground for the imperial powers—the Mandates Commission was itself also a forum for each of the colonial powers to promote its own policy. Indeed, what is perhaps most interesting about the history of the Mandates Commission is how each power represented its own policy, and the clashes over approach to language policy in the colonies, particularly between the British and their allies on one side, and the French and the Belgians (both of whom advocated the use of French), on the other.

As the two largest colonial powers, who together held the majority of the League Mandates, the Mandates Commission had necessarily to concentrate its attention on the policy pursued by these two powers. It did not take long for the essential difference in their approaches to emerge.

The British, represented by Frederick Lugard from the third session onward, advocated a policy of "vernacular education at the base and English at the top," as had become the popular means of expressing this idea. In this they were joined by the Portuguese representative (League of Nations, 1923, 1924b), and eventually by the representative from Sweden, not itself a colonial power. In the Swedish representative, who interested herself particularly in educational matters, the British made an invaluable ally. She became a Lugard convert, commenting that "Sir Frederick Lugard's The Dual Mandate [was] the most helpful
book I have ever read about colonial administration" (League of Nations, 1924a, p. 183). She adopted the British view of the purpose of education being "character-training" *(ibid.*, p. 184) and she sniped at the opposite camp continually in the course of the back and forth exchanges on educational policy in the early and mid-1920s (League of Nations, 1924a, 1924b, 1925a).

The French made clear very early that they regarded the imparting of the French language in all educational institutions, including village elementary schools, to be "indispensable" (League of Nations, 1923, p. 29). This included, they insisted, the use of French as the language of instruction. The French variously justified their policy, at one time complaining that too many different "dialects" (League of Nations, 1923, p. 245) existed in a particular country, other times that "the knowledge which [the government] wishes to impart can only be given in French" (League of Nations, 1923, p. 285). It might, of course, seem more "logical" to use the mother language, the Belgian representative allowed, but that would involve the use of "debased languages," popular jargons with "small vocabularies...inadequate for the expression of general ideas" (League of Nations, 1925a, p. 35).

The British were undeterred by these objections. To the first, they countered that a lingua franca would answer the problem, e.g., Swahili in East Africa. The Belgian representative observed that in this way Swahili must become the lingua franca of the nation. Nothing was more objectionable to proponents of French than making a "native language" into the lingua franca. The British were unmoved by this objection. The Belgian representative tried another tack, were they not concerned that the spread of Swahili would
mean the spread of Islam? The British countered that they had not noticed any such tendency (League of Nations, 1925a).

As to the second objection, the British made it clear that they had no intention of imparting "general ideas" by means of the educational system under their control. To Lugard, education had one overriding objective, to ensure "that natives should work" (League of Nations, 1925b, p. 206). If education—"using that term in its broadest sense" (ibid.)—were properly structured, it should bring about that goal, he argued. Lugard for his part objected to the system of education in the territories under Belgian mandate: it was too "literary" (p. 70). Lugard made it clear that from his standpoint—that of training for labor—what counted was the imperative that the "language of the country" must serve as the language of instruction in the schools. It was only a secondary question whether the European language were taught as a subject (League of Nations, 1923). However, as the Swedish representative noted, teaching a European language in the "village schools properly so-called" involved "a great waster of time." While she "quite realised that the elite of the population must be acquainted with French," for the elementary schools it was necessary to concentrate on the "usual branches of knowledge," which she listed as "agriculture, hygiene and manual and agricultural work." She lamented that in a French mandate, as many as 21 hours out of 30 per week were given over to the study of French in elementary schools, leaving no time for the "really essential part of teaching" (League of Nations, 1925b, pp. 34-5).

So little could the advocates of French and the British and their allies agree on these questions, that the Belgian representative found himself defending the right of each colonial power to "decide...on the spot whether it was in the native's interest that he should be taught
his own or a European language" (League of Nations, 1925b, p. 36). "The matter must be
left to the local administration" (ibid.) and not the Mandates Commission, he concluded,
ironically vindicating the British policy in their own colonies against the British as the
dominant power in the League of Nations.

Hence, as the reports of the individual mandated colonies attested, the French
instituted French education in their mandated territories; while the British followed a policy
of "vernacular education" as the basis of educational policy.

*The Phelps-Stokes Commission*

The British position on educational policy in the League of Nations found support
from an unexpected source, the Phelps-Stokes Fund, an American philanthropic society
directing its resources towards African Americans and heavily interested in education. The
Phelps-Stokes Fund had previously concentrated its efforts on the education of African
Americans in the southern states of the US, vigorously supporting the policy of industrial
education for southern African Americans of educationalist Booker T. Washington. The
attention of the philanthropic society was first turned to Africa by American missionaries
there, who feared that political developments in British Africa would lead to the loss of their
influence over education. As the colonial governments increasingly asserted their control
over the education system in Africa, missionaries sought leverage to ensure their
representation in the evolution of educational policy (Jones, 1921; Schilling, 1972). Having

---

2The only major class of exceptions were the Arab countries under French mandate, where instruction in Arabic was permitted, but French was made compulsory alongside it.
determined to take up the question, the Phelps-Stokes Fund appointed a commission of
enquiry to look into the current state of education in certain parts of Africa. The commission
was set up under the leadership of Dr. Thomas Jesse Jones, a Welsh-born sociologist from
Columbia University and education director of the Phelps-Stokes Fund.

Prior to their departure for Africa, Jones and other members traveled to Europe,
where they consulted with officials in the colonial departments of the European powers with
African possessions, as well as with leaders of missionary groups (Phelps Stokes, 1921, p.
xiii). The Committee left for Africa on August 25, 1920 and within one year visited the
British possessions of Sierra Leone, Gold Coast, Nigeria, Cameroon, southern Africa; French
Cameroons, Portuguese Angola, Belgian Congo; and the independent states of Liberia and
South Africa. The primary means of collecting data was field trips and interviews with
Africans (women, men, school age children, teachers, missionaries, farmers, etc.). The
commission also visited schools and held conferences with chambers of commerce and
European merchants (Phelps Stokes, 1921, p. xix).

The recommendations made by the Commission did not depart significantly in content
from the then existing practice; they were not a new departure in education in the colonies,
but rather they were a continuation of the existing practice of the colonial governments in
Asia and Africa. The detailed recommendations that the Commission made regarding
education in the colonies were subsumed under the so called policy of "adaptation." The goal
of education in the colony was to "adapt education to the needs of the people... as the first
requisite" (Jones, 1921, p. 11) and "adapt school work to African conditions" (p. 11). The
policy of adaptation, thus, relied upon the identification of the supposed needs of the people.
According to Jones, "the bulk of the African population lived in small, rural villages and engaged in agricultural pursuits; therefore, African education should be permeated with a strong agricultural bias. with hygiene, health, child care, housekeeping, and handicrafts as other basic subjects" (Schilling, 1972, p. 245). As such, the Commission made detailed recommendations on incorporating education to teach the African to use the soil effectively:

The school program should provide such instruction in gardening as is necessary to develop skill in the cultivation of the soil and appreciation for the soil as one of the great resources of the world. In the classroom the study of the soil should rank with the most important subjects of the curriculum. The practical work should be regarded as a part of the educational system and not demanded as the necessary drudgery of the institution (Jones, 1921, p. 18).

Other tenets of the policy of adaptation were education in health and sanitation, home life, and character development and religious education as "the most vital features of education" (Jones, 1921, p. 18).

The Commission also considered the question of language as a very critical element of the policy of adaptation. It made recommendations hoping that they would guide governments in most African colonies. However, the recommendations hardly departed in kind from the previous language practice in the colonies. The Commission emphasized vernacular education (mother tongue education) for the majority of people: "The local school must make all possible provision for instruction in the vernacular" (Jones, 1921, p. 61); the Commission also recommended the teaching of a lingua franca of African origin in the middle classes in the areas "occupied by large Native groups speaking diverse languages" (Jones, 1921, p. 26). Finally, in the upper standards, the language of the European colonial power "should be taught" (Jones, 1921, p. 26). This language policy statement does not depart in
essence from that of earlier British practice in the majority of Asian or African colonies, and the policy statement of Lord Lugard, both of which in the majority of cases limited the teaching of English and the spread thereof to the upper standards which only a very small percentage of the subjugated population ever reached.

It is not surprising that the work of the Commission and its recommendations met with much approval on the part of white settlers, colonial officers, and missionaries. As the Commission's "educational program was geared to village life and did not contain more than a small dose of that 'evil medicine'--literary education, the settlers claimed that the Phelps-Stokes Commission had done no more than echo many of their most basic tenets of African education" (Schilling, 1972, p. 247).

Despite the coached and allegedly progressive philosophy of shaping education to the needs of the African people, in essence it resembles the earlier educational policy of the British in Asia and Africa. More than two and a half decades later, the philanthropic society recommended a similar policy aiming at keeping the local population in "its environment." These goals were entirely in accordance with those motivating the design of education and language policy in Asia, as shown in Chapter 3. In short, the entire thrust of the Phelps-Stokes Commission, like that of British policy, was bound up with the economic and political goals of imperialism. As historian Donald Schilling has summed up the Phelps-Stokes Commission's recommendations with respect to Kenya:

The advocates of adaptation were fully conscious of the colonial situation and were using this policy to insure its perpetuation. Practically, the policy of adaptation served to undermine the development of an African challenge to British rule in Kenya. Adaptationists held that education should meet the needs of the African people, yet
they did not allow Africans themselves to determine what their needs were (Schilling, 1972, p. 373).

Given the common goals and outlook of the Phelps-Stokes Commission and British imperial administrators and missionaries, their cooperation in the sphere of education in the British empire is not surprising. Officials like Lugard saw in the Phelps-Stokes report the embodiment of their own program, and eagerly seized upon it to spur the Colonial Office, hitherto more or less silent on these questions, into action. The result was the formation of the Advisory Committee on Native Education in British Tropical Africa (Schilling, 1972, p. 252), later expanded into the Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies. This Committee, founded in 1923, was under the direction of Lugard and Ormsby Gore, both of whom had served as British representatives on the League of Nations Mandates Commission, and both of whom were already advocates of the British policy as it had developed in Asia and most of Africa to that point. Although the Advisory Committee issued a number of policy statements of a fairly detailed nature, it never violated in spirit or substance the educational language policies already in place, nor did it add much in point of detail. Its main function was thus to provide guidance along these lines to those parts of the British empire, mainly those colonies in Africa then in the process of developing education policy, still in the process of administrative and policy development, and to bring those colonial administrations whose policies differed substantially into line with the bulk of the empire.

This orientation of the Committee was made clear from the first meeting by Ormsby Gore:

There are few subjects on which greater uneasiness is being felt at the present time than education, not only in Europe but in other parts of the world, such as India,
where it is now admitted that mistakes have been made in the past. The object of the present Committee is to avoid a repetition of such mistakes in Africa and by collecting the truth of experience from all over the world, to build up a sounder system of education, which should be less productive of causes of legitimate discontent (quoted in Schilling, 1972, p. 298).

As Schilling (1972) observes, "Ormsby-Gore was advocating a policy which would derail the beginnings of nationalism in Africa and facilitate the continued exercise of British rule. Thus from its very inception the Advisory Committee had an overtly political object" (p. 298).

The Committee's policy recommendations were outlined in its report on Education Policy in British Tropical Africa of 1925. The Memorandum contained 14 broad educational principles that were presented to (and approved by) the Secretary of State for the Colonies and which were to constitute the basis of educational policy for local governments in African colonies. The Committee made use of the philosophy and discourse of the Phelps-Stokes study. But its policy more closely demonstrates, perhaps, the influence of the thinking of Lord Lugard, one of its principal authors. Stressing a favorite Lugard theme, the importance of assuming greater control and supervision on the part of the governments, the report couched its conclusions in the catchphrase of the Phelps-Stokes commission, the principle of "adaptation" of education to "native life": "Education should be adapted to the mentality, aptitude, occupation and traditions of the various people, conserving as far as possible all sound and healthy elements in the fabric of their social life" (Advisory Committee on Native Education in the British Tropical African Dependencies, 1925, p. 4). In making this conclusion more specific, the report sounded the theme so familiar in British imperial education history, declaring that education must "counteract the tendency to look down on manual labour" (p. 7) that education directed toward producing clerks was thought to
produce. On the question of language policy, the Committee followed the longstanding policy of placing "primary importance" on "the educational use of the vernaculars" (6). A supplementary report specifically addressing this question, drawn up a few months later, made explicit what was envisioned thereby: "The aim of education in Tropical Africa should be to preserve and develop a vernacular as a medium of expression and of communication in adult life and as the vehicle of native thought and culture. Therefore the mother tongue should be the basis and medium of all elementary education in Tropical Africa" (quoted in Schilling, 1972, p. 310).

That the Advisory Committee's policy should be in line with that of the main portions of the British empire is already shown by the analysis of the Phelps-Stokes Commission, which provided the direct impetus for its creation. The close connection of the two, however, has been misunderstood to indicate the adoption by the British of an "alien" policy. That such an interpretation is misdirected not only follows from the account of British policy provided above but also from two salient circumstances: (1) That Lord Lugard was a prime mover within the Advisory Committee, and, as shown, he had already formulated precisely the policy it adopted before the Phelps-Stokes Commission performed its work in Africa--as shown, he formulated it, in fact, while in British Asia, where it was already the long-standing policy. (2) That in the American colonies, the policies advocated by the Phelps-Stokes Commission were never put into place, but English education constituted the basis from the first throughout American rule. These crucial facts have been overlooked.

\[\text{Schilling comments that "it was natural for the memorandum to reflect what had become established practice in African education" (p. 307). And, as is shown in the previous chapter, this policy was also that followed in Asia.}\]
Educational Language Policy in Africa from the Founding of the Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies to World War II

It is important to note that the role of the Phelps-Stokes Commission and the subsequent founding of the Advisory Committee brought perhaps a more articulated and unified stand regarding language policy in British dependencies. It did not, however, in essence alter the longstanding British colonial practice and view on education in general, and language policy in particular. To illustrate this point, it is necessary to examine the policy in these areas prior to the Phelps-Stokes visit and compare it to the recommendations of the Commission and the Advisory Committee and further developments until World War II.

West Africa

Sierra Leone and Gold Coast, two small west coastal colonies, could be considered the colonies with the most "English-based educational" system in West Africa. In 1910 in Sierra Leone, the medium of instruction in the majority of schools was "'pidgin' English, resulting in rapid initial progress and stagnation later, for the dialect is an actual hindrance to the acquiring of pure English afterwards." (Colonial Office, Sierra Leone, 1911, p. 31). Emphasis was placed on teaching simpler English but "good English" during this period. Sierra Leone, however, represented something of an unusual colony, inhabited as it was by the British descendants of freed African slaves mainly from the West Coast, who did not share a common language (Report of the Imperial Conference of 1911, p. 229). That it was no different in other respects is attested by the following: "The majority of native children have no education from the European point of view" (p. 231 Imperial Conference); what the
majority of children were given as education was a few month's training in basic life functions, e.g., cleanliness, periods for recuperation after child-birth, farm work, etc. The youth who resided in the capital, Freetown, had a chance to acquire 'pidgin' English, in the eyes of the British director of education (p. 228, Imperial Conference, 1911).

A change to mother language education came. nevertheless, in 1928 when government schools switched to using the mother language at least during the "first stages" in schools (Colonial Office, Sierra Leone, 1929, p. 24). If the change of the language policy might be attributed to the confluence of the Phelps-Stokes Commission and the Advisory Committee, the familiar calls for industrial training in the British colonies in general existed as far back as the 1890s in Sierra Leone; by 1910, agricultural and industrial training was introduced in the school curricula (Colonial Office, Sierra Leone, 1911, p. 27).

Of all the colonies in Africa, English education was perhaps most extensive in Gold Coast (Colonial Office, Gold Coast, 1897b, p. 25). English was taught as early as the 1890s, often alongside the vernacular; by 1896 there were 200 government elementary schools where instruction was given mainly in English. However, only a small percentage of children attended schools and the majority stayed in so called "infant classes" (Colonial Office, Gold Coast, 1896, p. 12). By 1906, only 20% of all school age children attended school (Colonial Office, Gold Coast, 1907, p. 29).

A change of language policy took place by 1919 when it was reported that "the vernacular is used almost entirely in the infant classes, and English and the Vernacular in the lower standards. In the higher classes. English is the language mainly used" (Colonial Office, Gold Coast, 1921, p. 40). By the late 1930s, the 10 year primary course featured 6 years of
mother language education followed by English in the highest standards as the medium of
instruction; English was taught as a subject earlier. However, a report from a commission in
1948 stated that even "at present only a small proportion of the boys and girls who enter
school at six years pass into the senior primary schools from Standard III" (Colonial Office,
Gold Coast, 1948, p. 64), that is into the class when instruction is given in English.

The familiar call for industrial education in schools in Gold Coast was heard as early
as the 1890s; and it was "regretted that industrial training is not made the principal aim of the
educational system" (Colonial Office, Gold Coast, 1899, p. 19); it was believed that literary
education "for Gold Coast children would be of little value, and the Government is therefore,
encouraging the missionary agencies to include in the training of the children one of more of
many branches of useful industrial work" (Colonial Office, Gold Coast, 1897a, p. 9). The
complaint continued to be sounded after World War II: "It is creating a false sense of values
in which the dignity of labour is lost sight of" (Colonial Office, Gold Coast, 1948, p. 64).

The case of Gold Coast shows that the Phelps-Stokes Commission's recommendations
merely reinforced the earlier policy and practice of the British colonial government and did
not represent a new departure for Gold Coast. The same was true for Nigeria, also visited
by the Phelps-Stokes Commission in December of 1920. In Northern Nigeria, in the years
of 1910-1911, a proposal was issued to establish "vernacular schools" and in the following
year the concern was to have "liberal education [given] in a manner that will enable them to
preserve, maintain, and develop their national character" (Colonial Office, Northern Nigeria,
1914, p. 13). This goal is later echoed by the Phelps-Stokes Commission. Further, English
was taught in secondary schools as an optional subject and "only at the request of the parents" (p. 13).

Similar developments took place with regard to language education in Southern Nigeria during this period. The New Education Code of 1908 provided for "liberal literary education combined with a useful and practical education." The government provided grants to vernacular schools in which instruction was "solely in vernacular." Vernacular schools were primarily village schools. If instruction was given in English, it was given in "colloquial English" (Colonial Office, Southern Nigeria, 1909, p. 23). Further, it is important to note that missionaries taught mother language literacy from the beginning of the colonization of Southern Nigeria in the 1880s, but fewer than 0.1% of population attended schools (Gordon, 1905). In short, with the government financial aid, purely "vernacular" education in the villages was established by 1910.

The language situation in Lagos closely resembled the general picture of Southern Nigeria. In the view of the Inspector of Schools in 1901 writes:

It is unlikely that English will ever generally supplant the every-day speech of the people. But for a more advanced education ability to read English with ease will, of course, be necessary, and provision should be made for a course of instruction in English for the few who will rise above the average, and are destined to be the future leaders of their people (Carr, 1905, p. 53).

In light of language education in the above British colonies, even Lugard's recommendations on language education seem to only add caution that the English education provided to those being prepared for government employment should not "get out of control." as in India and Egypt as viewed by the colonial administrations.
East Africa

Like in many of the West African colonies, the overall language education in East Africa hardly changed after the visit of the Phelps-Stokes Commission. If it did, it is primarily with respect to the number of schools and further development of industrial education.

In Kenya, during the first decade of the 20th century, education was entirely in the hands of missionary societies and the schools were well attended. "In lower classes the instruction is carried on solely through the mother-tongue, Swahili being learnt only in the higher classes. At a few missions English is taught" (Colonial Office, Kenya, 1913, pp. 57-58). The question of language education was often debated in the subsequent decades, but in practice "various combinations of the local vernacular, Swahili, and English continued to be used in the schools" (Schilling, 1972, p. 153). Thus, in essence the Phelps-Stokes Commission's recommendation seemed not to alter the course of the earlier practice.

Similarly, the emphasis on industrial education by the Commission was not a new aspect in Kenya's education. In fact, government gave grants-in aid to missions to develop industrial education (Colonial Office, Kenya, 1912, p. 52). The visit of the Phelps-Stokes Commission and the establishment of the Central Advisory Committee in Kenya gave greater impetus to improve the village education system via grants. Yet still in the early 1920s, "pupils are being taught the elements of education" (Colonial Office, Kenya, 1925, p. 19). If the goal of education were to implement the policy of adaptation, then the following statistics in the case of this colony seem to show its "success": "In 1938, when approximately 130,000 Africans were in school, 96.2% attended elementary and sub-elementary schools (Standards I-III).
Only 2.9% were receiving a primary education (Standards IV-VI), while a meager .9% attended secondary schools" (Schilling, 1972, p. 503).

The statistics also help to understand the spread of English in the colony. The vast majority of children who received instruction were taught in their mother tongue or Swahili, with only a very small percentage studying English. In short, the policy of adaptation facilitated the confinement of teaching of English to very few children.

The case of language education in Uganda shows similar features. By 1909, vernacular schools were established in the colony (Colonial Office, Uganda, 1909, p. 16). However, a special school was set up for the sons of local leaders in which they would profit from "a little higher education than that given in the ordinary schools" and in which English was taught (Colonial Office, Uganda, 1909, p. 21). In general, vernacular education predominated the system. There might have been, however, some bigger schools here and there that provided some instruction in Latin and English during this period (Colonial Office, Uganda, 1905, p. 19). In the post Phelps-Stokes period and late 1930s, English was made the medium of instruction in "all middle and junior secondary schools" (Colonial Office, Uganda, 1932, p. 33). In the elementary schools "in all areas" vernacular languages served as the medium of instruction and in some districts Swahili was introduced in the last stages of the course (Colonial Office, Uganda, 1932, p. 33). As far as language policy, it did not change dramatically, however, education was more supervised and carefully administered.

The later emphasis upon industrial education, was not a new phenomenon in Uganda either. By 1908, in Primary Schools, "the chief point is that directions have been given so that in vernacular schools, in addition to the usual course of instruction in the three R’s, there shall,
as far as possible, be a certain amount of manual work—mat-making, basket-making, pottery work, an so forth, will be encouraged and taught" (Colonial Office, Uganda, 1910, p. 18). In fact, Board of Education reports show that missions' educational system was in large part manual training. "The foundation of new mission stations has implied the foundation of new schools for manual training" (p. 19). This educational orientation was emphasized on numerous occasions prior to the visit of the Phelps-Stokes Commission and it was due to the conviction on the part of the colonial officials that there exist "a tendency to despise manual work" (Colonial Office, Uganda, 1910, p. 19). In 1929, this educational pursuit was channeled officially to give "the education in the village schools a definite agricultural bias, and agricultural training schools for teachers are being established" (Colonial Office, Uganda, 1930, p. 31). The post Phelps-Stokes period also brought greater attention to the teaching of Swahili in village schools. In 1929 it was reported that "the teaching of Swahili is now definitely established in the Eastern Province and good progress has been made. This language will be taught in all training institutions for village school teachers except in Buganda" (Colonial Office, Uganda, 1930, p. 31).

In Zanzibar, government vernacular schools were established by 1913 and no substantial change took place regarding language education or the emphasis upon industrial education. In the Government schools, the first three years of instruction was given in Swahili; this course was "intended to provide a convenient opportunity to divert to industrial pursuits the energies of those boys whose abilities are not such as to warrant their continuing their studies with a view to obtaining the Government Schools Certificate" (Colonial Office, Zanzibar, 1914, p. 16). For those who would continue their studies instruction was given
either in English or Arabic. By 1926, only 3.8% of Arab and African school going children attended Government schools (Colonial Office, Zanzibar, 1927, p. 9). In the subsequent years, the syllabus in Government schools was more and more adapted to "village needs" (Colonial Office, Zanzibar, 1932, p. 16). By 1936, the 20 elementary schools provided a four-year vernacular course in which Swahili was the medium of instruction (Colonial Office, Zanzibar, 1937). Thus, the foundation of the language education and the overall objectives thereof remained essentially the same.

Education in Nyasaland, although almost entirely in the hands of missionaries until 1925, was of a very "elementary character" and practical (Colonial Office, Nyasaland, 1921, p. 9). Of 2,030 schools by the early 1920s, most of them were in the charge of "native teachers" (ibid.). With the formation of an Education Department in 1925, the government took over control of education and instituted a vernacular code, which stated that village schools should teach in the vernacular the elements of industry. It is crucial to note that the government considered that "the foundation of primary education is the vernacular village school" (Colonial Office, Nyasaland, 1932, p. 42). Primary education remained the only type of education well into the late 1930s when no secondary schools were available (Colonial Office, Nyasaland, 1937, p. 39). Elementary education, for more than 80% of children in the Protectorate, was four to five years of school; all instruction was given in the vernacular, although English was introduced as a subject during the third year. However, the wastage due to "economic pressure to leave school as soon as the elements of vernacular reading and writing have been mastered" (Colonial Office, Nyasaland, 1934, p. 34) was such that less than
"5% of the original pupils" ever reach the upper levels (Colonial Office, Nyasaland, 1932, p. 43). In all, less than 6% of the population claimed some knowledge of English (ibid.).

The majority of the British colonies in West and East Africa did not experience significant changes with respect to the overall language policy and the general emphasis given in education in the colony that could be attributed to the influence of the Phelps-Stokes Commission. As shown in the above discussion, what the Commission recommended had been to some extent already implemented with various degree of success. In other words, the Commission did not advocate fundamentally new phenomena that the British colonial administration had not already found to be beneficial prior to the visit of the Commission. The British colonial governments with greater or lesser success attempted to limit the teaching of English in the colonies and prepare the subjugated peoples to "use its environment" with no challenge to the colonial authority. It is perhaps because of the congruity between the goals of the British colonial governments and the recommendations of the Commission that its work found unchallenged acceptance by the colonial administration. It was nothing more than a unified articulation of the local British policies that to various degree had been implemented in various colonies of the British empire.
The aim of this chapter is twofold: 1) to synthesize the findings of Chapter 2, 3, and 4; 2) to present a more in-depth sociolinguistically based discussion of the spread of English during the period considered in this study. What has been important in the foregoing chapters was not merely the examination of the language policy, but an analysis of its basis, or sociolinguistic and economic context. By this detailed analysis of the colonial empire as a whole the thesis of a linguistic imperialist policy can be tested. It has been the aim of the foregoing chapters to test that hypothesis. In Chapter 2, four underlying assumptions of the theory of linguistic imperialism are identified:

1) linguistic imperialism is a separate kind of imperialism that amounts to a conscious language policy on the part of the imperial power to impose its language and, in the case of Britain and the US, responsible for the spread of English;

2) that this policy emanates from the Center;

3) that the spread of English is not non-ideological; rather, there is an inherent purpose underlying it;

4) that English is an imposed language in those parts of the world where it is not spoken natively.
Was There a Policy of Linguistic Imperialism in the British Empire?

In Chapter 2, it was argued that the claim that "linguistic imperialism" constitutes a separate form of imperialism requires the substantiation of a conscious, ideologically driven policy to implement the language in question beyond the economic and political dictates of imperialism as such. In particular, the hallmarks of a such a policy should include, at a minimum, the following two conditions:

1) universal and exclusive education in English;

2) replacement of the indigenous languages with English, as was the case in Ireland.

So much is this self-evident that Phillipson (1992), despite the evidence he himself provides, quotes as substantiation of England's linguistic imperialist policy in India the statement that "English became the sole medium of education" and comments subsequently that "The job of education was to produce people with a mastery of English" (p. 111). In addition, seemingly echoing the sort of fervor for the spread of English that Phillipson leads one to suppose the British entertained, he proclaims that "English was the master language of the empire" (p. 111). That such a policy could be implemented was shown by the case of American educational language policy in Philippines.

That such a policy at no time characterized Britain's imperial practice has been amply demonstrated in Chapters 2, 3, and 4. Rather than a separate policy designed to serve its own (cultural and linguistic) ends, language policy and the teaching of English in British Asia and Africa during the period examined in this study was intrinsically intertwined with the socioeconomic concerns of the colonial empire. It served as a basic means to preserve
sociological stratification and the status quo for the disempowered classes within different language groups. The history of educational language policy in the British empire shows that the absence of bilingual education became a form of socioeconomic education. The socioeconomic purpose of mother language education is shown by its intimate connection to industrial education. Indeed, mother language education came to have, throughout British-controlled Asia and Africa, the content of industrial education, and "industrial education" came to mean little more than mother language education.

It is important, first of all, that the sociohistorical study of language policy in the British empire extend beyond the restricted scope in which the substantiation of the policy of linguistic imperialism has placed it. As Mazrui and Mazrui (1998) observe, "Colonial authorities tend to be regarded as having pursued a monolithic language policy aimed at destroying African languages and establishing the supremacy of European languages for the explicit purpose of controlling the world view of the colonized" (p. 55). The thinly documented assertion that education in the colonies was the vehicle for the imposition of English is based almost entirely on the examination of the education of the elite. Macaulay's call for the "Anglicization" of the Indian upper classes is a case in point, taken as the starting point for the historical substantiation of linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992). But it is equally important, if not more important, to examine how educational policy affected the lives of the vast majority of the people.

Since "linguistic imperialism" implies that the mother language is replaced and not supplemented by the imperial language (English), the teaching of English by itself, even where it did take place, is not sufficient grounds to identify the policy of the British empire with
linguistic imperialism. Moreover, it is certainly clear that no such replacement of the local languages took place. In India, for example, the number of English speakers at the turn of the century, or after 65 years—more than two generations—of the Macaulay policy, was, at 0.68% of males and 0.07% of the females (Census of the British Empire, 1906, p. lvi) a much smaller proportion of the total population than at present.¹

The Containment Policy and the Purpose of British Colonial Educational Policy

This study has focused on educational language policy as the lynchpin of language policy because this aspect of overall language policy shows how the British colonial administrations controlled access to English. British administrators tended to believe that the teaching of English and English education had what they called an "unsettling" influence upon the people of the colonies under their control. To a large extent, they came, like Lord Cromer in Egypt, to equate the teaching of English with the spread of ideas of the development of a Western state and democracy—and as colonial rulers they feared this result. They considered that English had a negative influence upon the development of the respect for authority—their authority. Lugard (1923), for example, considered that the safest way of teaching English to those who had to have it was at boarding schools where the pupil would be completely under the supervision of the carefully selected staff.Unchecked, they claimed, English education was a recipe for revolt. In the early part of the 20th century, when political opposition to

¹"One million is a liberal estimate of the number of Indians who have acquired and retained some knowledge of English; whilst at the last census, out of a total population of 294 millions, less than sixteen millions could read and write in any language...and this modest amount of literacy is mainly confined to a few privileged castes" (Chirol. 1910, p. 246).
British rule mounted, particularly in India and Egypt, influential British figures like Sir Valentine Chirol (1910, 1921) pointed the finger squarely at English education—and administrators like Lugard took careful note. Half a century later, administrators in the Gold Coast reached the same conclusion (Colonial Office, Gold Coast, 1948). Given not only that the vast majority of education consisted of "vernacular education," by design, and that, in addition, the British colonial administrations came to fear the results of English education, what are we to make of Phillipson's (1992) statement that "instruction through a local language was invariably seen as a transition phase prior to instruction in English" (112)? Not only was this not invariably the case, it was only so in a very small minority of cases.

Rather, local language education was the cornerstone of the British "colonial vision of education." Far from forming part of "enlightened education" (Phillipson, 1992, p. 120), it had the very opposite purpose, viz., to cut off the disadvantaged socioeconomic classes from virtually all enlightenment—and the benefits that accrue therefrom.

It is not only in retrospect that such a conclusion is possible. The question was actually addressed in just these terms by the American Philippine commission. That body, quite aware of how different its own policy recommendations were from those in practice in British territories, analyzed the question very acutely:

If the government were to make the local dialects the media of school instruction, a limited number of the more or less wealthy and influential persons would use the facilities which they can command to learn English for the sake of the additional power or other advantages it would give them in the communities to which they

---

2"The effort of the Americans to give the Filipinos a knowledge of English is in marked contrast to the policy carried out by some of the European nations in their oriental possessions" (Report of the Philippine Commission, 1903, p. 881).
belong, and these advantages or this additional power would tend to perpetuate the prestige and domination of the present oligarchic element in Filipino society. The knowledge of English which the public schools offer to the youth of the islands will contribute materially to the emancipation of the dependent classes (Philippine Commission, 1903, p. 881)

Thus, the American Philippine commission accurately captured, as it were, the spirit and purpose of limiting English on the part of the British, the essence of Lugard's policy of "indirect rule" through the perpetuation of the local elite. Indeed, it was not a mere accident that British policy promoted this social stratification through language policy as a function of their explicit aim, as shown in Chapter 4.

Bilingual Education for the Elite

Even when Phillipson concerns himself solely with those obtaining an "English education," he overstates the case substantially. Thus he says that "The British policy of 'indirect rule' was to be effectuated by educating the elite exclusively through the medium of English" (111). The context seems to imply that Phillipson is referring to India, through the reference to the policy of "indirect rule" is therefore misplaced. But in either case, it is important to understand that even English education for the elite was in its substance bilingual education. For both political and educational reasons, bilingualism and multilingualism developed. On the political side, it represented an attempt to ensure that the ruling elite was "kept in touch with the masses," in pursuance of the policy of "indirect rule." It was not desirable, as the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies expressed it, that "in the education of the 10 per cent. there should be an absolute divergence from or break with the education of the 90 per cent" (Ormsby Gore, 1928, p. 99). Toward this end, a sound
knowledge of the "vernacular" was considered essential. Imperial administrators were
decidedly against the replacement of the "vernacular" wholly with English even for the
English-educated.

This political agenda accorded with the view of education officials in British colonies
charged with designing and executing the education systems. These officials frequently
complained that students could not learn adequately in English, especially in the lower
standards. Their solution was to insist upon a "sound education" in the "vernacular" even for
those destined to go on to English education at the top levels.

At the Imperial Education Conference of 1911, an inspector of Normal Schools in
Burma. reported that even oral instruction of English, given because of the parents' insistence,
was found "exceedingly difficult" to implement because of the lack of bilingual teachers and,
therefore, it was abandoned entirely in the lower levels. Only in Standard V was the pupil
allowed to begin any study of English. Furthermore, the transition from Burmese to English
medium took at least two years during which the content courses were still often taught in
Burmese in order not to "retard the progress of children" (Report of the Imperial Education
Conference. 1911. p. 262). In Bombay. pupils had to pass satisfactorily through five
standards in the "vernacular" before they could study English or continue their education in
vernacular (p. 263). In Malta where three languages (Maltese. Italian. and English) were in
use. the Government introduced a system called "the principle of choice" in 1898 which
specified that until the 3rd Standard the child was to be instructed in Maltese. subsequently.
the parent chose either Italian or English as the language of instruction for the child; still the
child learnt the other language in the upper classes, which in practice meant that the pupil was leaving the school as a multilingual speaker (p. 265).

Even in India, the oldest British colony where an early provision for the spread of English was made, Lord Curzon's Government issued a resolution in 1904 which insisted on education in the mother language: "As a general rule a child should not be allowed to learn English as a language until he has received a thorough grounding in his mother tongue" (quoted in Report of the Imperial Education Conference, 1911, p. 260). The resolution added, "No scholar in a secondary school should even then be allowed to abandon the study of his vernacular which should be kept up until the end of the school course. If the educated classes neglect the cultivation of their own languages, these will assuredly sink to the level of mere colloquial dialects, possessing no literature worthy of the name" (p. 260). In Bombay, secondary students were given the opportunity to decide between the use of English and the "vernacular" in their studies (Report of the Imperial Education Conference, 1911). In the same way, "English education" in Ceylon was of two kinds: "a full course of instruction in the vernacular languages plus a working knowledge of English"; and schools in which the language of instruction was English, but in "the majority" of which the local languages continued to be taught even in the upper classes (Colonial Office, Ceylon, 1938, pp. 101-102).

It is equally important to note that the government also saw a danger in introducing English instruction too early. The introduction of English too early in education was deprecated because it was said to raise the expectation of English education for all, which was not a British goal (Report of the Imperial Education Conference, 1911, p. 262).
Educational officials were satisfied that the result of their policy was the development of bilingualism among the elite in the colonies. As an official from India remarked, "there is an increasing number of those who employ a vernacular and English simultaneously. But, of course, these are confined to the great towns, and particularly to the town of Bombay. I once asked a Chief Justice in Bombay what language he spoke as an infant, and he told me that he practically spoke the vernacular and English from the beginning. He began to speak in those simultaneously" (Report of the Imperial Education Conference, 1911, p. 263).

Nor were these purely 20th century notions. A Select Committee on education in the Straits Settlements declared in 1870 that the "Committee is of the opinion that a boy, whether he be Chinese or Malay, can make no real progress in education until well grounded in his own language" (Eleum, 1901, p. 139).

Even where some English was taught in the colonies to elementary school aged children, there was no attempt to ensure that English was learned. Despite the continual insistence by experts that only years of concerted effort would result in a child proficient in English, only a rudimentary education was given at best.

British Attitudes Toward Local Languages and the Question of Lingua Francas

As the concern of the Curzon government over the fate of the "vernaculars" in India suggests, the attitude of British imperial administrators toward local languages is more complex than proponents of linguistic imperialism describe it. According to Phillipson (1992), "Local languages were never accorded high status" (p. 112). Indeed, it has already been shown that a principal goal of Macaulay's policy was the "enrichment of the
vernaculars," to use his words. But however we are to take such statements, there can be no
doubt that British administrators emphasized the important place of the local languages. For
example, the Calcutta University Commission of 1917 commented as follows:

The mother tongue is of primary importance. The mother tongue is the true vehicle
of mother wit.... It is through the vernacular (refined, though not weakened, by
scholarship and taste) that the new conceptions of the mind should press their way to
birth in speech.... A man's native speech is almost like his shadow, inseparable from
his personality. In our way of speech we must each, as the old saying runs, drink
water out of our own cistern, for each one of us is a member of a community. We
share its energy and its instincts; its memories, however dim, of old and far-off things.
And it is through our vernacular, through our folk-speech, whether actually uttered
or harboured in our unspoken thoughts, that most of us attain to the characteristic
expression of our nature and what our nature allows us to be or to discern.... Hence
in all education, the primary place should be given to training in the exact and free use
of the mother tongue (Calcutta University Commission, 1917, pp. 197-8).

The same commission, it might be noted, recommended that the "vernacular" be substituted
for English as the language of instruction and examination at Calcutta University. Similarly.
in 1919 Sinhala and Tamil were added to the London Matriculation and Cambridge
examinations (Colonial Office, Ceylon, 1920). As Mazrui and Mazrui (1998) have pointed
out, British colonial "policies of indirect rule allowed for considerable cultural and linguistic
relativism" (p. 8).

While the British imperial authorities were not openly hostile to local languages,
neither were they actively interested in them. The motivation behind language policy was
here, as elsewhere, not linguistic, but practical, as shown by a closer examination of
"vernacular education."

There was, for example, a difference between the local language policy of the
"vernacular schools" of Ceylon and true "mother language education." The "vernacular
schools" of colonial Ceylon, although they employed one of the community languages, did not always use the pupil's mother tongue. Tamil children while in vernacular schools often had to study in Sinhala and not in Tamil (Ceylon, Commission on Elementary Education, 1906). To say, then, that the principle operating was essentially one of mother language education is not entirely correct. It is more accurately described as a policy of an avoidance of English education. It is important to realize that, as in the case of a portion of the Tamil population in colonial Ceylon, "vernacular education" in the colonial context did not always mean the right to choose one's mother language. "Vernacular education"--or the avoidance of teaching English--could in and of itself represent a case of language imposition.

The same policies held true in those colonies where the medium of instruction in the schools was not the mother language but the local lingual franca, e.g., Malay in Brunei and Swahili in East Africa. Similarly, in South Africa (Junod, 1905) selected "vernacular languages" were to serve as the medium of instruction for schooling, irrespective of the "mother language" of the pupil, although these languages were not colony-wide lingua francas. Such a policy existed in other African colonies as well.

When England claimed its share of the former German colonies after World War I, with minor exceptions, English was not imposed on those territories (League of Nations, 1923, 1924a, 1924b, 1925a, 1925b). Indeed, as shown in the previous chapter, England strenuously opposed the French policy of education in a European language. Yet Phillipson (1992) maintains that in Tanganyika, "English was established as the dominant language" (p. 129), seemingly unaware that England, in fact, promoted Swahili as a lingua franca above English. For, as Lugard (1923) declared flatly, "Where a widely-spoken language easily
acquired by Europeans exists—such as Hausa in the west and Swahili in the east— it would appear desirable to promote its use as a lingua franca, for natives easily acquire an African tongue” (p. 454). Mazrui and Mazrui (1998) comment, “Both the Germans until 1918 and the British afterwards contributed significantly to the triumph of Kiswahili as a region-wide lingua franca” (p. 171).

In several colonies, official languages other than English were proclaimed, e.g., Nyanja in Nyasaland which, the colonial administration noted, “all civil servants are expected to learn” (Colonial Office, Nyasaland, 1928, p. 5). And just as importantly, local languages were promoted in the judiciary. For example, contrary to what Phillipson (1992) says. Persian was replaced by English in India only in the higher courts, but by the vernacular in the lower courts, which alone touched the lives of most Indians (Cameron, 1853). Once again, then, the English were actually pursuing the opposite of a linguistic imperialist policy in India. Namely, they were promoting the mother languages above certain languages of elite status. Phillipson ignores this, but the point is crucial for the question of linguistic imperialism. It is the same as the replacement of Latin as the language of religion, education, science, law and so forth, in Europe. Phillipson would be opposed to the use of, say, French, as a "European" language of law in, say, Denmark. How then can he fail not to hail the British policy of instituting the mother language in the lower courts as a step in the right direction?

This attitude toward the vernacular—surprising if we accept the claims of a deliberate policy of "linguistic imperialism"—is reflected in the use of local lingua francas in a number of multilingual colonies. Particularly striking examples are provided by the British territories in East Africa, where Swahili was made the lingua franca, and of the Malay peninsula and
surrounding islands, where the Malay language was used. In fact, upon returning from a trip to visit England's Malaysian possessions in 1928, Undersecretary for the Colonies, William Ormsby Gore was moved to record that "Malay is becoming increasingly the lingua franca of the peninsula for people of all races, not least the Chinese" (Ormsby Gore, 1928, p. 53). Ormsby Gore noted that the Chinese were more likely to learn Malay than English. Such a development was the product of deliberate policy, both in Malay-speaking colonies and in East Africa. For example, in multilingual Brunei, Malay was made the medium of instruction in the schools, as was Swahili in much of East Africa (League of Nations, 1924a, 1924b, 1925a, 1925b). This contributed not a little to the present status of the latter as a "language of the masses" (Mazrui and Mazrui, 1998, p. 187).

The policy of tolerating, let alone encouraging, a lingua franca other than English—a notion abhorrent, for example, to the French (see Chapter IV)—particularly undermines the thesis of a linguistic imperialist policy on the part of the British. For the last thing an imperialist policy would permit would be a potential rival to the supremacy of English. And yet the British were unfazed by this result.

Nor is it a question of preventing the arising of a rival to the supremacy of English. For, in the first place, the "vernacular" is always the strongest such rival. And in the second place, the British precisely fostered such rivals in British Malaya, other Asian colonies, and parts of Africa.

3"[A]t least a quarter of the indigenous population of the State is composed of races whose mother tongue is not Malay.... The provision of education in their several languages is obviously impracticable, and it is inevitable that, linguistically at any rate, the other races must be assimilated to Malay" (Colonial Office, Brunei, 1938, pp. 32-3).
Moreover, the use of the "vernaculars" in education occasioned no small effort and expense. Where the American imperial authorities in Philippines said that the necessity of so much translation made vernacular education impossible there, the British undertook the immense work, and this should not be lost sight of with respect to claims of linguistic imperialism. At the same time, the American authorities in Philippines said that the diversity of languages there meant that English was the logical lingua franca; whereas the British made a local language the basis of education, even if it was not the "mother language" of the students. Moreover, it has already been documented in Chapter II that the British required their colonial administrators to learn at least one local language as a condition of service. The British were determined that language should not be a barrier to maintaining a tight hold on their colonies. Hence, Mazrui and Mazrui (1998) observe, "Throughout the colonial era, European languages served the ends of colonialism, but they did not necessarily do so as the consequence of their imposition on Africans. Sometimes Europeans languages were deemed to serve colonial interests best by being made inaccessible to the African" (p. 56).

Did the "Center" Determine Colonial Language Policy?

English language education in the British empire was left to be determined and solved by the local needs of a colony as opposed to the specifications of one overall imperial policy. Colonial reports -from the earlier period of imperial rule show that 1) there was no overriding imperial policy conceived in London that to which each colony had to adhere, 2) each colony was left to its own devices to shape its language policy that would meet the local demands. The study has covered both Asian and African colonies in order to show that similar
responses were made to the similar colonial conditions in both Asia and Africa, albeit independently; and that the policy was in place before an actual official imperial policy was formed in the 1920s. Colonial administrators in British Asia and Africa charged with the task of implementing imperial rule in the colonies, focused on meeting the demands arising locally and running the colony efficiently. Thus, in practice supposed "imperial" concerns were overshadowed by local immediate interests. While an "imperial" policy would dictate the teaching of English on ideological grounds, local interests shaped language policy on a wholly different basis—expediency. This state of language policy in the British empire is borne out by the imperial education conference of 1911 (Report of the Imperial Education Conference, 1911) during which the question of language teaching in the colonies was discussed, but no official and consistent policy was designed.

Such policy made on the local level was subject to diverse opinion, as the preceding chapters have shown. Cromer's policy that English was not for the majority differs significantly from that of Macaulay, although even his interest in the spread of English has been greatly exaggerated. Thus, in the British empire there was no one policy; the policy of Macaulay in India, such as it took shape, was confined to India. Where there is no central policy and where there is such a diversity of opinion, an imperial policy cannot develop, thus greatly hampering the potential for the development of a linguistic imperialist policy.

Decentralization rather than a centralized empire-wide official policy constituted the structure of language policy in the British empire—militating against a linguistic imperialist policy from the first. This central feature stands in contrast to the language policy pursued in the Philippines by the United States. The United States set its language policy very early
by an imperial commission in the 1900, when the colony was taken over, and it adhered to this policy during its rule in the Philippines. In contrast, the early period of British colonial rule can be viewed as having no consistent uniform policy regarding the teaching of the English language.

The dictates of the local conditions made the spread of English in the colonies uneven. If imperial policy insisted on teaching English to every student, local policy limited the number of the students exposed to the formal teaching of English to meet the local demands for English-educated subjects of the empire, it leaves the bulk of the population to be educated in the local language or, at most, to acquire the most rudimentary elements of the English language. Thus, in the main, economic interests within the colony and the state of the economy in each colony controlled the spread of English. As a result, it created an uneven spread of English among different colonies within the British empire, and within a single colony. In the commercial centers of the colonies alone was there significant demand for English; hence, in the more rural districts of the colony, a vernacular education was thought sufficient. The local policy, unlike the imperial policy, created a division in the educational system in the colonies and rendered the spread of English varied. Moreover, the level of acquisition of English was left to the local specifications, monitored in the main, if at all, by local inspectors of education who provided general accounts and some guidelines for the system.

Hence, as shown in the previous chapter, the results of the opposition movements to British rule in Egypt and India do not mark a sharp break in language policy in India or Egypt--but slight adjustments more along the lines of a refinement of policy. The influence
was felt, instead, in a shift in West Africa, where colonial administrators were determined not to repeat the "mistakes" they believed to have been committed elsewhere. The result is that language policy developed in the same manner in those parts of Africa as in Asia.

With respect to the history of education in the British empire, the investigation of the entire history of British empire with respect to educational language policy counteracts the notion that mother language industrial education was a later development, brought about specifically by the intervention of an American educational commission in the 1920s (Phillipson, 1992; Berman, 1982; Clatworthy, 1971; King, 1971). When in 1923, the Secretary of State appointed an "Advisory Committee on Native Education in British Tropical Africa" (and later extended to all of the colonies) chaired by Ormsby-Gore, Parliamentary Under-Secretary, the committee adopted a policy based on ostensibly the recommendations of the Phelps-Stokes commission under Jones, yet in reality, reflecting the local policies that had evolved in most of the colonies from Malaya to Ceylon, from Southern Africa to Egypt. These policies were, in addition, already expounded by the British representatives to the League of Nations Mandates Commission and enunciated by British educationalists in the colonies since before the turn of the century, and the policies had already been implemented on more or less completely in the various colonies.

Thus when the Advisory Committee expanded its scope to include the entire British empire, it was not so much to establish an imperial policy as to stamp with the name of imperial policy what had already developed throughout the colonies as local policy. When, therefore, Great Britain finally developed an "imperial" policy it was not what advocates of imperial policy had understood by its term, nor what is today called the policy of linguistic
imperialism, but rather precisely the opposite. It was a policy of limiting the spread of English to what was minimally necessary to running a colonial empire.

Was British Colonial Language Policy Part of a Cultural Imperialist Agenda?

As the preceding chapters have shown, there was not on the part of the British imperial authorities a concerted "linguistic imperialist policy," although in the course of development of the British empire conflicting views arose of the role of language and educational policy. The analysis in Chapter 2 has shown that proponents of an "imperial" policy would necessarily have argued that the goal of the British empire was to ensure its utmost influence in its dependencies and make the language of England that of the subjugated people. Linguistic unity would promote the interests of the British empire, not only vis a vis the colonies but also the other imperial powers, which at the end of the 19th century--the period of which this ideology reached its peak--were competing in the division of Africa and Asia. The imposition of English on the colonies already acquired would cement the stability of the empire assuring that British imperialism would be more than a fleeting moment in history. In this view, the interests of mother England were paramount.

One of the weaknesses underlying the theory of linguistic imperialism is its facile assumptions about the connection of the attitude of imperialist nations and the type of language policy that necessarily follows from that. In particular, it is tacitly assumed that the belief in the superior culture of the center leads of itself to a desire to want to impose its language, together with its culture, on the subjugated nation. An imperialism in which
economic interests are paramount, however, need not adhere to such strictures. The desire
to spread the language and culture need not follow from the quest to exploit.

In that vein, proponents of linguistic imperialism have concluded that the progression
from Macaulay to the later policy makers such as Lord Lugard and the American Phelps-
Stokes Commission can be characterized as the movement toward a language policy actuated
by more enlightened views (see Phillipson, 1992). Many of those approaching this question
have almost entirely overlooked the racist assumptions behind limiting English that lay behind
the "vernacular education" policies, including the fear of the spread of British culture.

Lugard's thinking is particularly revealing in this respect. This major architect of
language policy in British Africa, in explaining how British policy differed from that of most
other colonial powers, particularly the French, explained the matter as follows. He quotes
"a high official" in the French colonial administration as telling him that "We bring French
culture to the Africans and they must learn French, and will become Frenchmen. We believe
in French Evolution, and not in the Evolution of the African" (Lugard, 1933, p. 6). Lugard
says that a Governor-General declared that the mission of French education in the colonies
was to impart a "French soul" (p. 6). Of course, such "privileges of complete assimilation are
necessarily confined to a few. For the bulk of the population the ideal is universal instruction
in the language of the European Suzerein, which must be taught in every village to the
exclusion of the vernacular" (p. 6). Although Lugard notes that this attitude had begun to

---

4It has already been shown in the discussion of the League of Nations Mandate
Commission that Phillipson's assertion that French and British policy were identical finds little
support in their mutual dealings as colonial powers.
change by the 1930s, the irony that the British, through their role in the League of Nations Mandate Commission, helped bring about this result cannot be overlooked.

It is significant not only that Lugard rejects such notions, but also his reasons for doing so. He criticizes the French policy not only on practical grounds, but because it would lead to "complete social equality" and "where this policy is carried out to the fullest extent, miscegenation may not only be tolerated, but encouraged" (Lugard, 1933, p. 6). Similarly, what is often lost in the consideration of the debate between the "Orientalists" and Macaulay's faction is that one of the pillars of the "Orientalist" case was that Indians were incapable of learning English well, a charge which Macaulay refuted. In fact, Macaulay criticized the "Orientalists" in the British administration for their racist assumption of intellectual inferiority of non-Europeans, a prejudice he did not share (Cameron, 1853).

The same theme emerges in the 20th century. Thomas Jesse Jones, the main author of the Phelps-Stokes report, not only worked from racist assumptions, but also sought to impose the method of racial oppression from the American South to Africa, for which the founder of the Pan Africanist movement, W.E.B. Du Bois, excoriated him (Schilling, 1972), exposing the racist elements in the recommendations made by the Phelps-Stokes Commission:

It is... absolutely clear that he [Thomas Jesse Jones] means that Africans should not be trained as white Europeans are trained; that on the contrary—and this is the meat of Jones' thesis,—Africans should be trained to be content with their present condition, to be submissive, peaceful, and industrious; and work in such ways and under such circumstances that their labour will be most profitable for the countries that are exploiting Africa (quoted in Schilling, 1972, p. 376).

Indeed, the notion of the "superiority" of English led to results entirely different from those suggested by advocates of the "linguistic imperialism" thesis. For example, an
educational official in British southern Africa argued that English and the materials used to teach were out of reach for the colonial born child and that, therefore, the teaching of English had no value (Sargant, 1908). This standpoint actually became an ideological pillar of the policy of limiting English education. Unlike Phillipson (1992) who points out that the British used this notion to impose English on the subjugated peoples because they saw English as an "intrinsically" superior language than those used by the colonial born in the British empire, the notion of the superiority of English served as a justification for "vernacular education" for the majority of the population. In the words of Mazrui and Mazrui (1998), "Sometimes for purely racist reasons ... Germanic Europeans insisted on the greater use of indigenous languages in education and a greater recognition of African cultures" (p. 14).

Lugard reflects all of these attitudes. He says that one of the thrusts of the policy behind indirect rule is that "instead of seeking a fancied equality with the white man by participation in debates in the Legislative Council, he will prefer to exert a genuine influence in his own Native Councils and Native Courts, and in the development of his own people" (Lugard, 1933, p. 7).

Lugard emphasizes that rural education is crucial, but that it must not consist of a "mere kindergarten, where a half-educated mission-school boy teaches pidgin English to children in a classroom" (Lugard, 1933, p. 9). It was almost possible to say, said Lugard, "that the classroom would be the least important sphere of work" (p. 9). The real point was to train workers who would remain in their sphere, and, of course, language would be confined to the "vernacular" (p. 9).
Nothing is more illustrative of this point than the opposition to purely "literary" education, which formed the basis of Lugard's thinking, and policy in Africa. But this is merely a new form given to an old complaint, as the evidence given in Chapter 2 shows. It is interesting that the British should have connected the speaking of English to political unrest. Were they really Macauleyists through and through, the thought would not have occurred to them. But they were pragmatists, and language policy was only an aspect of imperial policy, not a goal in and of itself. As Mazrui and Mazrui (1998) have concluded, "The English ... were less preoccupied [than the French] with the imperative of spreading their language as such. On the contrary there were sometimes arrogantly possessive about it, particularly in their colonies" (p. 21). The men like Frederick Lugard who set the language policy of the empire were not imbued with ideas straight out of the boarding schools of England. They were mainly ex-soldiers who, like Lugard, were born and spent their lives in the colonies and were educated not at Oxford, but in the military conquest of Asia and Africa. They made policy not as a schoolmaster would have it, but as a soldier and colonial administrator would have it. It was policy arising out of political and economic concerns, and not "linguistic imperialist" concerns.

Is English an Imposed Language in the "Periphery"?

Given that the first three assumptions of linguistic imperialism have been found not to hold, it follows also that we cannot automatically accept the fourth, that English is an imposed language in nations other than those where it is spoken "natively." For the consequence of the notion that EIL has arisen as the result of linguistic imposition is that
English spread represents the sort of cultural hegemony of the most powerful English-speaking nations that Phillipson sees it to be. The development of EIL then constitutes a more complex linguistic process, and English in the postcolonial nations of the former English-speaking colonial powers represents not an imposed language, but an indigenized language. These questions will be explored in the following two chapters.
Explanatory frameworks (Phillipson, 1992; Quirk, 1988; Brosnahan, 1973) account for the spread of English within the context of the 19th and 20th centuries, and perspectives appropriate to this historical time frame are put forward. But the spread of English extends much further back in history, and exhibits complexities that have yet to be brought under a unifying theoretical perspective. Most important, why did English have the tendency to replace local languages in the British Isles, North America, and Australasia, while only becoming established alongside them in much of Asia and Africa? Explanatory frameworks put forward to this point either cannot, as linguistic imperialism, explain the peculiarities of English's spread, or, as with Quirk's (1988) framework, make no attempt to do so, but only describe different modes of language spread. To overcome the limitations of existing theoretical perspectives, and to attempt to subsume the various strands in the development of English in the world under one unifying theoretical framework, the broader construct of language spread must be analyzed and the development of English as a World Language distinguished within it.

This chapter examines the origins of English as an International Language, putting forward World Language Theory as an explanatory framework. World Language Theory
distinguishes language spread within a national or regional context from the growth of world language.

World Language Theory: Premises

Three essential conceptual bases underlie world language theory:

1. the premise that language spread must be understood in the context of language change, in a unified conception of language spread and change;
2. the context of the understanding of the development of EIL requires a theoretical approach employing a world scope;
3. a paradigm shift from monolingualism to bilingualism reflecting a historical shift in language use.

Premise 1

Conceptions of language spread have hitherto for the most part been separated from those of language change. A framework is needed which takes language spread in the context of language change, as one integrated form of language development. This type of approach, which is language spread and change, rather than language spread by itself, provides the grounding for the present account.

Thus, in this conception, the complex interrelationship of the spread of English with its linguistic change is taken in the context of the development of English into what I call a world language. The world language theory framework sets out to explain the development of English into a world language, not only in terms of its spread, but also in the changes in the language itself that this brought about. Thus language spread and change provides the
grounding for a comprehensive theoretical model for the development of EIL and international varieties of English.

Premise 2

World language development cannot be accounted for conceptually by an approach that has reference to the national level. The primarily national standpoint that dominates considerations of language spread, it could be argued, is left over from the dominance of language development as a national phenomenon. It is a central contention of this study that an explanation of the development of EIL requires a framework employing tools of world systems analysis (cf. Frank and Gills, 1993)

Premise 3

Contrary to assumptions often made in linguistics, monolingualism and monolinguals represent neither the typical cases from which linguistic theory must generalize nor the normal modus vivendi of language users and speech communities (Romaine, 1996). In fact, as Romaine observes, "It is ... monolingualism that represents a special case" (p. 573). World language theory is a conceptualization making use of the shift from monolingual to bilingual/multilingual paradigms that Kachru (1997a) has recently called for. As such, it takes bilingualism/multilingualism as central to processes in language evolution.

Differentiating Features of World Language

World language theory identifies four central features of the development of global language. These are:

1. econocultural features of the language;
2. the coexistence of world language with other languages in a multilingual context with bilingual speakers;
3. the transcendence of the role of an elite lingua franca;
4. language change via the processes of world language convergence and world language divergence.

The Econocultural Features of the Language

World language theory is a sociolinguistic perspective on the development of English as an International Language. It connects the spread of English in the second and foreign language contexts within the historical time frame and accounts for language evolution—the development of international varieties of English via second language acquisition processes.

From the historical vantage point, the sociolinguistic development of English has moved through two essential phases. First, via the formation of the domestic market and the evolution of a national language and culture, English developed into the national language of England. Second, by virtue of the creation of the world economy and culture together with accompanying sociohistorical circumstances, English evolved into a world language.

The distinguishing feature of a world language is encapsulated in what Randolph Quirk (1988) has called the econocultural features of a language, that is, its combination of economic or commercial centrality and its cultural/intellectual role in the world community. World language is a product of the sociohistorical development of the world econocultural system, which includes the world market, business community, technology, science and
cultural and intellectual life on the global scale. World language evolution runs parallel to the development of the world econocultural system.

Since the world economy develops so as to more and more unify both trade and the production process, there must naturally be felt a need for unifying language of the world market. And as the world economy increases in complexity, and in particular as it becomes a market not only for the supplying of consumer wants, but also the needs of production, world language arises. For purposes of world language theory, to Quirk's conception of the econocultural functions must be added a conceptual distinction between internal and external functions, that is, those that have reference to the domestic economy and those that pertain to the world economy. By distinguishing between the national and world realms of econocultural functions, world language theory defines the basis on which world language arises.

But the world econocultural system includes more than the world economy in the strict sense. To the extent that science and technology becomes international, so does a world language tend to emerge to fulfill world intellectual and scientific functions. And the world econocultural system has its cultural component as well.

A central contention of this dissertation is that the spread of English, which coincides with British imperialism and colonialism, is nevertheless the result of a more fundamental development. Imperialism is only the unwitting instrument of the spread of English, and even the unwilling instrument. The spread of English is as much a product of the struggle against imperialism, as the British themselves learned by experience (cf. Mazrui, 1973; Mazrui and Mazrui, 1998). Frantz Fanon described such a process with respect to French in Algeria:
“Paradoxically as it may appear, it is the Algerian Revolution, it is the struggle of the Algerian people, that is facilitating the spreading of the French language in the nation” (quoted in Mazrui and Mazrui, 1998, p. 63). Mazrui and Mazrui (1998) point out that English also emerged as such an “instrument of liberation,” to use Fanon’s term, in the British colonial empire, both in Africa and Asia.

Imperialism only works toward the development of world language by creating a language of trade (although this is not solely a question of imperialism, either). But it also holds up the development of world language by confining the language to the elite and commercial classes, by subordinating the spread of language to its own political and economic ends through the containment policy of limited access demonstrated in Chapters 3 and 4. World language is not essentially an offspring of imperialism. As Pennycook (1994) cautions, “it is important not to assume a deterministic relationship of imperialism” and English spread (p. 225).

This other side of the relation of imperialism to world language—the extent to which it retards as well as promotes the spread of English—is overlooked by linguistic imperialism, as shown in detail in the preceding chapters. On the other hand, the notion of postcolonialism in language (Pennycook, 1994; Kachru, 1997a; Mazrui and Mazrui, 1998) has served to call attention to this point. Here we see clearly that world language is not purely a development of imperialism. The phase of the development of the world economy known as imperialism both creates the conditions of world language, but simultaneously attempts to undo those conditions. Imperialism plays a role in creating the world economocultural system which lies at
the basis of world language. But this system is the expression of the world economic system (Wallerstein, 1980), and not only its imperialist phase.

The evolution of world language tends to coincide with at least the incipient decline of political hegemony of the nation of origin rather than its rise. The classical period of Latin, for example, comes after the fall of Roman political supremacy, although that was its basis. In the same way, English has progressed greatly as a world language since the fall of territorial imperialism, and especially since the decline of British and American hegemony on the world market. That world market is now less dominated by the US and England than in the past, certainly in the case of England, which has fallen back to a second rate world power (Wallerstein, 1980). The current period, for example, has featured the growing importance of Asia in world commerce. Not coincidentally, the same period has witnessed the development of English as an Asian Language (Kachru, 1997). World language, then, takes a more definite shape when the hegemony of the major "old" English-speaking nations is challenged by a number of emerging powers.

Also, the spread of English as an intellectual and scientific language coincides with the rise to prominence of the non-Western world, or nations outside North America and Europe. The last half century has seen the tremendous growth of the middle and professional classes in Asia, Africa, and Latin America and Eastern Europe. Indeed, these sections of society, and with them science and technological innovation, are growing fastest in those areas (Widdowson, 1997). At the same time, Western (European and American) hegemony has been effectively challenged and recedes with every passing year. Interestingly, the coherent theoretical standpoint of "cultural imperialism" (Phillipson, 1992) has emerged just at the
historical moment that old modes of imperial control have been successfully challenged. That perspective, however, reflects that in a declining period of imperial rule, the conditions that characterized it are of recent memory and still exert their effects in the interpretation of contemporary sociopolitical processes. A more persuasive and nuanced argument has been put forward by such scholars as Mazrui and Mazrui (1998) and B. Kachru (1981; 1997) that indigenized languages are not carriers of imperialist cultural hegemony. In this respect, it is easy to confuse the development of English in the global arena with one of those lingering effects, or even to see it as the last bastion of imperialist hegemony.

To better understand econocultural language spread and the context in which it occurs, the history of the spread of English will be briefly considered and econocultural language spread contrasted to the other means by which English has spread.

*The Spread of English in the British Isles.*

The spread of English began in the British Isles themselves. Its progress there was slow, its expansion to its present state of supremacy commencing no later than the 8th century and lasting throughout the millennium following (Wakelin, 1975; Hindley, 1990).

This period of the spread of English is often today overlooked. Its vital importance lies in the fact that, first, it took place in the context of the establishment of English economic and political hegemony over the British Isles. and, second, that English almost entirely displaced the Celtic languages that had existed there (Baugh and Cable, 1993). It is quite true that many of these languages have in the last century experienced a revival, particularly Irish (O Riagain, 1997). But it is also indisputable that the vast majority of the population
throughout the British Isles speak English as their mother language, and that, even in the case of Irish, it remains a language spoken by a small, if increasing, minority of the population, while English is spoken by a larger proportion of the population (97%) than in all but one other nation in the world (Fishman, 1977). In this essential respect, therefore, the spread of English in the British Isles, though a function of English hegemony, differs significantly from the later spread of English in the British empire. This first phase of the spread of English, however, did not spread the language beyond the confined geographical area surrounding the home nation. Such a spread of the language, therefore, does not involve the creation of a world language, or even the origins thereof. It is no different from other similar examples throughout the world of the regional spread of a language. Nevertheless, it shows that what has been called the "imperial" model of language spread (Quirk, 1988) dates back very far in history, and is a model that, as will be shown, actually includes kinds of language spread that are quite different in nature.

The Spread of English to North America and Australasia.

The second phase of the spread of English commenced around the beginning of the 17th century, with the founding of British colonies in North America, and lasted until near the end of the 18th century, with the establishment of a British colony in Australasia. Here, for the first time, English spread beyond the confines of the British Isles in an extensive and permanent diaspora (Baugh and Cable, 1993). There were many ramifications of this spread of English, including in the Caribbean, but underlying the complex result is the basis of this spread of English to America, and later Australasia, in the migrations of English-speaking
peoples from the British Isles. This basis has led Quirk (1988) to refer to this kind of language spread under the "demographic" model. It should be noted, as well, that this model is not peculiar to English. At the same time English was spread to North America by these means, so were Spanish, French, and Portuguese. What is less often noted is that this episode in the spread of English was confined to a relatively well-defined period, and virtually ceased thereafter. It resulted, moreover, not in the creation of English as a world language, anymore than the simultaneous spread of Spanish, French, and Portuguese made those the language of the entire world; rather, its essential result was the establishment of English as the national language of a number of new nations, including the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, but others as well (see Fishman, 1977). These nations adopted English as a direct result of not simply the political control of England, but also the large numbers of English colonists who brought their language with them in their movements. Nevertheless, taking this kind of spread of English alone, we cannot account for the development of English into the world language it has become. It does not tell us why English rather than French, Spanish, or Portuguese (let alone Arabic, Chinese, Turkish, and other languages that had attained a perhaps greater world presence, especially Arabic, when measured both in terms of geographical spread and number of speakers) should attain that position (Brosnahan, 1973; Fishman, 1977).

*The Spread of English to the Rest of the World.*

To answer that question we must examine what has been put forward as yet a third model of language spread and contextualize it within two crucial political and economic
developments of the 18th century. That model is what Quirk (1988) calls the econocultural model, in which English spreads for the economic and cultural/intellectual reasons I discussed earlier.

For such an econocultural development to take place, two historical processes had to converge: first, the transition from colonies as a refuge for Europe's surplus population to the establishment of economic and political hegemony over entire peoples; and second, England's attainment of domination over the world market. European colonization in the Americas and Australasia differed essentially from its dominant form in Asia and Africa in the form of colonial control (Hilferding, 1980; Hobson, 1895). In the Americas and Australasia, political and economic hegemony was established mainly by means of the migration of European peoples, who over a period of time established themselves as the majority populations in those parts of the world. But a world-scale political and economic hegemony required an extension of control or at least influence into Asia and Africa, and this required a different form of colonialism. There were necessary limits to the scale of migration-based colonialism. Hence, a world-embracing economy and a world market required the establishment of economic and political hegemony on the world scale by conquest of peoples. It was, therefore, the newer form of colonial control that took root in Asia and Africa in the 18th century which established the essential conditions of world language—the evolution of econocultural functions of language on a decidedly global scale, and populations who retained their mother languages.

Yet, had this merely produced a series of largely unconnected national dominions, competing empires in a state of equilibrium, no one language could have come to embody
econocultural functions. Hence, just as important as the transition to the new type of colonial hegemony of the 18th century was the establishment of domination over the world market which England wrested from France during the 18th century in a series of colonial and European wars (Wallerstein, 1980). The more England gained control of the world market (in part a function of the industrial revolution there), the more the international extension of trade and production relations inevitably transmitted English, rather than French, Spanish, Portuguese, Arabic, Chinese, or Turkish. Europe subjugated the world, and England subjugated the other European powers. Hence, while French, Spanish, Portuguese, Arabic, Chinese and Turkish remained imperial languages, none of them became a world language, because none of them acquired world econocultural functions. This result was something that no one nation, culture, or people willed. Noting the British opposition to the "'reckless' spreading of the English language" in contrast to French efforts to promulgate their language, Mazrui and Mazrui comment that "English gathered its own momentum and rapidly outstripped French both in the number of countries in the world that adopted it as a major national medium, and in the number of speakers. The British who did not want their language to become a universal were landed with precisely that fate, while the French had to embark on a determined attempt to stop French from receding in importance" (p. 21). Such an outcome was the result of historical processes of development, rather than a conscious policy of linguistic or cultural imperialism, however much we may find elements of the latter within it. Neither linguistic imperialism nor the econocultural model of language spread by themselves can explain how English came to take on the econocultural functions that made its transition to a world language possible.
To fully understand this process, we must consider more closely how the conditions in South Asia, and later other parts of Asia and Africa, differed from those of other places to which English spread. One of the chief questions that has yet to be explained is why English replaced the languages of such nations as Ireland as well as in North America and Australasia while in India, Nigeria, and so forth, English functions alongside other languages.

If we examine the three periods of the spread of English I referred to earlier—first within the British Isles, second to America and Australasia, and finally to Asia, Africa, and the rest of the world— we find that three quite different processes were at work, and in this we find the explanation for the replacement of the indigenous languages in the earliest episodes as opposed to the establishment of bilingualism/multilingualism in the most recent. In the first period of the spread of English within the British Isles, the spread of English was in part accompanied by and in part carried out by means of a migration of English-speaking peoples as part of the establishment of English political and economic hegemony in Great Britain (Hindley, 1990; Wakelin, 1975). A direct and substantial English presence existed in the form of English enclaves or English-speaking communities. The same took place in the migration of English-speaking peoples to the Americas and to Australasia: but in the latter case, the transition to English as the dominant language was immediate, as the English-speaking community formed itself into the dominant political force through displacement of the indigenous population. This was possible because the people who formed the laboring population were imported to the New World, including from Africa (Blassingame, 1979). Since these forced migrants came from numerous different language groups, English was the only possible medium for them to adopt, however much they adapted it to their own use.
The basis of the language spread within the British Isles and the English diaspora in the Americas and Australasia aside, the cases are really quite different. For the colonization of America and Australasia was a spread of the language by means of population movement, whereas in the British Isles English was spread primarily by its supplanting of the mother languages of the indigenous populations. Hence, the more interesting question is why English supplanted the languages of the British Isles and not the languages of Asia and Africa. The proximity of England to its neighbors played a crucial role, and we must keep the substantial migration of English-speaking peoples in mind. The result of this migration, as mentioned, was the establishment of English-speaking communities, e.g., in Ireland in the 16th-18th centuries (Hindley, 1990). Given English economic hegemony, these communities, or English enclaves were necessarily the most economically, including industrially, advanced regions in Ireland. As the Irish population was drawn to these centers from the countryside, English spread to the working classes; it first became the language of the migrant workers from the countryside. But by these means, it began to spread even throughout the countryside, until by the mid-19th century Irish had become a minority language, and very nearly an extinct language (Hindley; O Riagain, 1997).

In English colonies in Africa and Asia, on the other hand, the great distance and the vastness of the empire compared to the metropolis made only a small, insignificant migration of English-speaking peoples possible (Lugard, 1923). The English language spread to Africa and Asia by political and economic means, not demographic (Quirk, 1988). There was, consequently, no establishment of large-scale English-speaking communities in such nations as India. Hence, English-language dominated areas did not emerge. In short, English never
became the language of industry and of the major agricultural districts; instead, it was the language primarily of the colonial administration.

This brings us to the crucial factor in the establishment of English as the dominant language of a nation, versus its spread as what I call the functional world language. To replace the indigenous languages, it is not enough that English should become the language of external commerce or world trade, but it must also become, as in the British Isles, the language of the domestic economy (at least, to begin with, its essential centers). That is, a monolingual English context is formed when the language is necessarily transmitted to the working classes by economic life itself. Otherwise, the indigenous languages are not supplanted. And it is this distinction between purely internal and external economic functions which, as stated above, must be attached to Quirk's (1988) econocultural model to make it serviceable for world language theory. For that reason, the roots of English as a World Language lie in the 18th century, rather than in earlier episodes of English spread, or in the policies of the British empire beginning in the 19th century.

As Figure 1 illustrates, English has spread into three distinct functional settings: that of a national language, that of a second language, and that of a foreign language. World language theory explains these linguistic outcomes by means of the context in which English has spread. In the context of the migration of mother tongue English speakers (North America, Australasia), English functions as a national language. Where English spread by imperial and econocultural processes to a multilingual environment, Indigenized Varieties of English evolved as second languages (West Africa, South Asia, etc.) via a process taken up in Chapter 7. Finally, where the econocultural spread of English has occurred in the context
Figure 1. A model of English language spread and change
of an existing dominant national language (Western Europe, East Asia, Latin America, etc.),
the outcome is English as a "Foreign" Language.

*The Coexistence of World Language with Other Languages in a Multilingual Context with Bilingual Speakers*

Just as important, world language tends to establish itself alongside local languages rather than replacing them. This mode of development distinguishes world language from national language development, in which a dominant political language suppresses all rivals over time within a limited territory. Unlike with the development of national language, the development of world language seems not to displace other languages. Instead, a crucial component of world language is that the majority of its speakers are bilingual or multilingual.

For the reasons shown, the development of English as a World language commences with the establishment of English alongside other local or national languages in the context of stable bilingual/multilingual speech communities (Y. Kachru, 1993). Its origins, then, lie in the changeover to colonial rule as extended over Asia and Africa, a process which commenced in South Asia in the 18th century, particularly with the extension of English rule in India. A concomitant of this process was that the English language established itself alongside of other languages.

It is interesting to note that the principal non-English speaking areas of the British Isles went through a transitional period of bilingualism before English supplanted the indigenous languages almost entirely (Hindley, 1990). This might suggest to those who
adhere to the framework of linguistic imperialism that the encroachment of English in many parts of the world will continue until the same process takes place. At this point at least, those (e.g., Y. Kachru, 1993; B. Kachru, 1986) who describe these nations as stable bilingual/multilingual communities would appear to be correct. After three centuries, English tends not to show signs of displacing the many languages of Asia and Africa. No more than 3% of the population of South Asia, for instance, is English-speaking, and their context remains rooted in stable bilingualism and multilingualism (Kachru, 1986). Whether this takes place is a crucial point of contention between different accounts of EIL.

The Transcendence of the Role of an Elite Lingua Franca

Unlike an international lingua franca, such as Latin represented in Europe at one time, a world language is more than an exclusive language of a socioeconomic and intellectual elite. It has an economic role in the world which induces its spread independently of the political and cultural hegemony of any one nation or nations, although this too plays a role in the development of world language. World language combines economic and cultural/intellectual roles.

A world language is, unlike an elite lingua franca, not confined to the socioeconomic elite, but encompasses (in its tendency) all of society. World language theory suggests only that there is a tendency toward the world language breaking out of the confines of the elite, and that has already occurred throughout the world. When it is estimated that the world's English-using population has reached nearly 2 billion (Crystal, 1997), it must be remembered that there are not 2 billion members of the elite in the world. The very surge of demographics
that has taken place in the postcolonial world shows that it is no longer a language of the elite exclusively; and that, very importantly, is a postcolonial phenomenon. The basis of English as a World Language already existed, however. It is merely the further growth that has occurred, and as many scholars have pointed out, it is far too simplistic to attribute this to the British council and similar agencies. What this account shows is the language acquired its econocultural functions far back in history, long before the British Council, etc., came into being. In fact, the origins lie in the 18th century, as this chapter shows.

Why does world language not replace other languages?

If English as a world language is not limited to the elite, it may be asked why world language does not replace the languages of the nations to which it spreads. Once it reaches lower socioeconomic classes, it might be thought that, as in Ireland, it should supplant the languages of the given nation to which it spreads. But this does not occur so long as the world language does not become the language of the internal (domestic) economy (market).

Unlike the case with the spread of English to such British Isles as Ireland, world language is established in multilingual conditions, and is spoken by bilinguals. The situation of the Irish type occurs in the immediate vicinity of a hegemonic power, and only where a large migration takes place as well, as distinct from the spread of English to colonies of the newer type. Hence, even where the language serves certain functions of national language (as in the macroacquisition context described in the following chapter) its spread to the working classes is also as a "second language." World language, therefore, does not replace other languages, but serves as integral part of what S.N. Sridhar (1994) has called "the
composite pragmatic model of bilingualism, one that recognizes that a bilingual acquires as much competence in the two (or more) languages as is needed and that all of the languages together serve the full range of communicative needs" (p. 802). This model of bilingualism, thus, allows English to assume certain important functions without usurping the domain of other languages. To that degree, English in these "second language contexts" fulfills certain intellectual/cultural functions in the world—which it develops alongside the purely political and economic), but without thereby establishing itself as the basis of the local economy (the internal market). Hence, even in its spread to classes outside the elite, it does not do so as the language of the domestic economy, but in the econocultural functional realm of world language. Throughout Africa, for example, as Mazrui and Mazrui (1998) note, "More and more now learn it simply because it is the most important language globally" (p. 78). Its role has already been established by its means of spread in the establishment of world language, and so it does not replace the local languages.

The exaggerated fears of adherents to the linguistic imperialism framework, therefore, are unfounded. What Bisong (1995) has written about English in Nigeria seems to capture the essence of the spread of world language. Bisong claims that in Nigeria, the "linguistic and cultural picture is one of multilingualism and multiculturalism" (p. 123). Directly taking on the thesis of linguistic imperialism, he remarks:

There is no way three or four hours of exposure to English in a formal school situation could possibly compete with, let alone threaten to supplant, the non-stop process of acquiring competence in the mother tongue.... The parent sends the child to the English-medium school precisely because she wants her child to grow up multilingual. She is also not unmindful of the advantages that might accrue from the acquisition of competence in English. Why settle for monolingualism in a society that is constantly in a state of flux, when you can be multilingual and more at ease with a
richer linguistic repertoire and expanding consciousness? To interpret such actions as emanating from people who are victims of Centre linguistic imperialism is to bend sociolinguistic evidence to suit a preconceived thesis (Bisong, 1995, p. 125).

The socioeconomics of language policy and world language.

In this respect, the policy goals of linguistic imperialism must be examined from a class standpoint. The ascendance of the English language to a dominant linguistic position in the modern era (Kachru and Nelson, 1996) creates something of a threat to language rights advocates, a subject of study for scholars, and a practical concern to language policy planners and educationalists within the multicultural/multilingual international community. That the teaching of English in the present era stands out as one of the major issues being debated by scholars, policy-makers, and educational practitioners is not a surprise. The historical uniqueness of the spread and development of English around the world during the colonial era, and the subsequent postcolonial establishment of the new independent nations prepared the ground for making the English language an inseparable part of the sociocultural and economic reality of many nations (Kachru and Nelson, 1996). And others feel the seemingly irresistible force of the world market, within which English plays such a dominant role (Kachru, 1985).

The question which has more and more begun to dominate discussion is how the teaching of English should be regarded given this rapid spread of the language (Ricento and Hornberger, 1996). According to an increasingly prevalent view, English teaching constitutes a part of a "linguistic imperialism" which as effectively terminates the linguistic and cultural development of other languages as territorial imperialism once stamped out national political
development (Phillipson, 1992). From this standpoint, the teaching of English represents the imposition of language, just as colonialism was the imposition of foreign rule.

The concern of the language rights advocates regarding the necessity of teaching mother languages and not replacing them with the teaching of English is incontestible (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981; Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson, 1990). But does the entire understanding put forth under the framework of linguistic imperialism follow inevitably from this democratic principle? Is it thereby the case that the development of an international language represents a threat to the peoples of the world analogous to that of territorial imperialism? The linguistic imperialism perspective examines the question almost exclusively from the national or ethnic standpoint, which lies at the root of linguistic imperialism theory. To put it another way, according to that standpoint, nations, peoples, or ethnic groups—or even languages themselves—are the fundamental unit of analysis. But such a basis is far from exhausting the full range of complexity of human society. Indeed, perhaps the most serious flaw of a standpoint that aims at the empowerment of the disempowered is that it entirely neglects the socioeconomic stratifications within language communities, divisions that other scholars have shown to be crucial to any understanding of sociolinguistic relations (Tollefson, 1991; Fairclough, 1989). Ignoring all other such units of analysis, the conceptual apparatus of linguistic imperialism assumes, at root, that the individual interest is in all cases effectively subsumed by the national or ethnic. Such a perspective seems to be gaining ground in the world once again; nevertheless, this assumption is not one that should be accepted without rigorous examination.
The complexity of language education in multilingual societies and the implementation of democratic language policy cannot be properly conceived in isolation from the sociological fabric of a speech community (Tollefson, 1991). The question must be asked: in societies in which English serves as a second language, can the absence of bilingual education become a form of socioeconomic education? Sociohistorical empirical studies of the spread of English and English education in the colonial era are needed to provide a basis for a more enlightened discussion of the role of English in present-day multicultural/multilingual contexts, and to provide insight into the practical and theoretical concerns of the modern educator. The history of the spread of English provides crucial empirical data of importance for comprehending the dynamics of language planning within a broader historical and sociological framework. The empirical data is of importance to understand and act upon in the design of educational language policies.

As the data in this study suggest, educational language policy was intrinsically intertwined with the socioeconomic fabric of the societies of British colonies. It served as a basic means to preserve sociological stratification and the status quo for the disempowered classes. The implications of this circumstance cannot be ignored when considering language policy in education in the world today. The cases of British colonies suggest that in societies in which English serves as a second language the absence of bilingual education can become a form of socioeconomic education. The socioeconomic purpose of mother language education is shown by its intimate connection to industrial education. Indeed, mother language education came to have, in British colonies, the content of industrial education, and "industrial education" came to mean nothing more than mother language education.
Furthermore, an examination of England's African and Asian colonial empire shows that educational policy in multilingual societies cannot ever be taken separately from educational language policy. We cannot conclude, as Phillipson has, that the emphasis on mother language education in such places as South Africa is "sound", while its application, or specific purpose, is flawed (1992, p. 120). Such a conclusion misses the essential point that mother language education was the cornerstone of the "colonial vision of education." Far from forming part of an "enlightened education," it had the very opposite purpose, viz., to cut off the disadvantaged socioeconomic classes from virtually all enlightenment—and the benefits that accrue therefrom.

It might be time to abandon the notion that educational purposes can ever be served by safeguarding abstract national rights—or even the rights of languages (Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson, 1990)—as do those who make "linguistic imperialism" the fulcrum around which language policy turns, and the main criterion by which it must be assessed. This conception reduces, at root, all questions of language to national or ethnic questions alone, and ignores the complex array of factors that must also be figured in (cf. Tollefson, 1991). Language policy that takes its impetus from the framework of linguistic imperialism tends to view the socioeconomically disadvantaged as mere carriers of national rights, which viewed socioeconomically have the potential to be transformed into national burdens. A consideration of policy in the British empire points to the possibility of disempowerment of socioeconomic groups by means of the limitation of educational language policy to the mother language, whether done in the name of the "state's interests" or of preserving linguistic rights. It is ironic that those who are most disempowered in the world should have such a role foisted
on them. And that is how the matter necessarily appears so soon as we take not an abstract case, but the educational practice. In most of British Asia, for example, since education for the socioeconomically privileged was in reality bilingual education, mother language educational policy amounted only to an educational and socioeconomic disadvantage for the less affluent, not to the maintenance of mother languages.

Moreover, as soon as the question of language policy is placed within the domain of education, another dimension must be recognized. It is an undeniable fact of the modern world that the language of world intellectual culture is English. Indeed, the proponents of linguistic rights have been among those to point to this reality most forcefully. But they have not considered the implications of this circumstance, or only from a narrowly ethnic or national political standpoint (Phillipson, 1992). The role of English must not be addressed merely from the ethnic or national standpoint of linguistic imperialism, but from the educational standpoint of those who do not have the privilege to engage in an international debate conducted in a language they do not know. That is, the question must be addressed above all from the standpoint of the disempowered. And disempowerment surely has its intellectual component.

The intellectual aspirations of the disempowered can no longer be dismissed as "irrelevant", as by the colonial educational administrators. For, as Mazrui and Mazrui (1998) write, "Colonial governments in Anglophone Africa were often more guilty of violating the right to language(s) than of violating the right of languages" (p. 115). And yet this intellectual disempowerment must remain the case so long as knowledge of English is confined to those who can afford the intellectual privileges that it bestows. And not the least of these is the
ability to participate in the construction of knowledge—and policy—on the international plane. The exclusion of the disempowered from the linguistic tools of power can hardly be considered democratic. Not to recognize the right of all to the language of world intellectual life is to leave in place existent limitations and exclusions. To do so in the name of nationality or ethnicity renders the majority who cannot afford education outside of that provided by the state mere repositories of the rights of peoples and not the rights of persons.

If the term "human rights"—and therefore the term "linguistic human rights"—is to have any meaning, then it must certainly include rights based on that most characteristically human of faculties, the intellect. And this is all the more true when the conception is meant to form the basis of educational policy. The recognition of the right to speak one's mother language—an unquestionable fundamental democratic right—is clearly too restricted. Nor is it adequate to recognise a right to speak a language such as English only where it has been designated as an official language (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1981). Such a notion of rights once again places limitations solely on those who depend entirely on educational language policy, and subjects their intellectual rights to narrow political considerations—which are gaining rather than losing ground in the world today. An integral part of any tenable notion of "linguistic human rights" must be the right to speak the language of world intellectual life. And such a right only becomes actual when bilingual educational policy is made available to all. This aim may be called impractical, but it should at least be recognized as a goal not only worth striving for, but necessary for the creation of meaningful democracy for all members of the world community.
Language Change via the Processes of World Language Convergence and World Language Divergence

Within the process of the evolution of world language, the factors that led to the establishment of English as a World Language gain local expression as varieties of New Englishes or World Englishes via the emergence of political and economic independent nations as outgrowths of the collapse of colonialism. The development of English as a World language commences with the establishment of English alongside other languages, hence the creation of stable bilingual/multilingual communities. As such, English establishes itself alongside other languages, and as B. Kachru (1986) and others (S. Sridhar and K. Sridhar, 1986) have pointed out underwent a process of acculturation or indigenization in the "un-English" context, a process, which I call macroacquisition, that is discussed in detail in Chapter VII. This spread of English is simultaneous with its change, both in the creation of World Englishes and in the establishment of English as a World Language, or through the processes of world language convergence and world language divergence, which Chapter VII takes up.

This change of English is a necessary concomitant of its spread. The spread of English has been a decentralized process, as shown in this study. Kachru (1996) observes that "visible' language planning is less important than 'invisible' language learning and teaching" (p. 248). English has spread and continues to spread as a second or foreign language. In

\[1\]

\[1\]After three centuries, English has shown no signs of displacing the many languages of Asia and Africa. No more than 3% of the population of South Asia, for instance, is English-speaking (Kachru, 1990), and their context remains rooted in stable bilingualism and multilingualism.
particular, it is learned by its "non-native speakers" in an educational setting (cf. Platt et al., 1984). The implications of the spread of a language through its teaching are far reaching. It implies that the most active agents of the spread of English are actually "non-native" users, the teachers of the language. Some interesting consequences follow from this circumstance. It means that the logic of the spread of English has invested these "non-native speakers" with "authority"—or what is more adequately called agency in language change. Consider the real circumstances in which this teaching takes place in the vast majority of cases. No textbook, assuming even its Inner Circle "authenticity," can possibly cover the entire range of social and functional needs of learning/teaching context. No Inner Circle "authorities" are readily available to adjudicate every question of use that arises and must arise as part and parcel of the classroom experience. Hence, these agents of spread are thrown back on their own judgment, on their reasoning, on their creativity; in short, on their own "authority" as users and teachers of the language. To that degree agents of spread become the often unwitting agents of language change. They give both shape and substance to the language which they spread. Through their agency, they influence how the language is learned by its nascent users. And, however, imperceptibly, teachers and learners contribute to its change. Thus they play an active role in the decentralized creation of the world language.

For this reason, the decentralized creation of the world language is also language change. Language spread, viewed from this perspective, can no longer be held to be separate from language change. Rather, by investing its users with agency in language change, Halliday (1970) has argued that "the particular form taken by the grammatical system of the language is closely related to the social and personal needs that language is required to serve" (p. 142).
language spread is by its very nature language change. For it is the language that is spread, and not something else. Such a dichotomous conceptualization of language represents the attempt to uphold "the language" against its change by the "other." But the logic of language does not allow this. To use language is to take part in its change. More than that, to use a language is to become an agent of language change. Hence, so soon as a language becomes international in scope, it ceases to be the preserve of a nation. Its ownership in use extends to the world that uses it. Its purely national character disappears in its international use.

The "New Englishes" that have emerged, while to some extent taking on the function of national languages, are not national languages in the sense of dominant languages in a monolingual context but manifestations of world language—hence, World Englishes. They do not replace the various languages of the nation, as, e.g., English replaced Cornish and other Celtic languages as part of the establishment of its linguistic hegemony in England (Hindley, 1990; Bailey, 1991) These World Englishes exist in multilingual contexts, and their speakers are, for the most part, bilinguals. English does not replace other languages, as would be the case if its spread were a manifestation of linguistic imperialism. It undergoes linguistic change (Weinreich, 1953; Thomason and Kaufman, 1988), and, thereby, it yields a cline of Englishness (Kachru, 1981, 1990).

In this conception, the development of both the standard indigenized variety and cline of Englishness appear as part of the process of world language development, in which World Englishes arise in definite circumstances in the process of development of world language. Specifically, indigenized varieties emerge in contexts in which no one indigenous language dominates the postcolonial national entity. The new language variety thereby fulfills the role
of a national second language, developing a formal and contextual standardization of register and style (Kachru, 1981, 1992). On the other hand, in the case that a second language is not needed as the expression of the national identity of a people, no special standard language variety tends to develop from the performance variety. The context of World Englishes, therefore, is that of stable multilingualism in a nation and stable bilingualism (or multilingualism) among the English-using population.

Conclusion: World Language Theory as a Model of Language Spread and Change

World language theory connects language spread as a sociopolitical process to linguistic change, an element of the question generally overlooked. It contends that the development of English as a World language is part of the transition from language spread as a function of national language development to language spread as the expression of world language development.

As such, there can be said to be two historical processes of politico-linguistic development: national language and world language. Language spread in the modern era, therefore, takes on a political determination, national and world, which are political and economic categories rather than linguistic ones. Hence, neither national nor world language develop for linguistic reasons, but for sociohistorical reasons. They are manifestations of, respectively, the development of the nation-state and the development of the world economy (Wallerstein, 1980).

National language implies the development of one language for a nation-state, although, as Quirk (1988) points out, this ideal case has seldom been realized in practice.
Nevertheless, national language has historically exhibited something of this tendency, and has for that reason, become the basis for monolingualism or the destruction of various and competing languages. World Language, on the other hand, implies the existence of a language in addition to national languages, hence bilingualism. World language, then, is a process of the superseding of national languages as the hegemonic sociopolitical language form. This process has coincided with the continuous growth of the world economy over the last few centuries, and is tied, in particular, to England’s and the US’s dominance of the world market. In this respect, English as a world language is not the product of a policy, but a world historical process, similar to, in a different era, the development of national languages.

World language thereby becomes a meaningful unit of analysis as much as national language. It allows an understanding of how English has changed as a result of its becoming a world language, and how language change can now be as much driven by processes outside the Inner Circle as within it. Such an integrated conception of language spread and change also allows an understanding of the development of the world Englishes as varieties, not of inner circle English, but English as a World Language (EWL). EWL already contains the notion of world Englishes, national varieties of a world language, just as national language does not exclude, and even implies, regional variation. The varieties of world language stand in roughly the same relationship to the world language as regional varieties to a national language.
CHAPTER 7

WORLD LANGUAGE DIVERGENCE AND WORLD LANGUAGE CONVERGENCE

This chapter develops a central construct within world language theory—\textit{macroacquisition}. It also provides a new vantage point to account for the development of international varieties of English in the context of world language theory. In the conception of world language theory presented in the previous chapter, what separates world language evolution from other types of language spread such as the development of national language and language imposition on the international scale is that a world language becomes established alongside other languages rather than replacing them. Rather than producing monolingual contexts, therefore, world language produces bilingual and multilingual contexts wherein we find the point of intersection of language spread and language change. That results in the development of variety within world language, a process that I call \textit{world language divergence}. This occurs in the context of linguistically diverse populations acquiring the world language.

Applying this insight to conceptions of second language acquisition (SLA) and language spread and change, this study puts forward a sociolinguistic model of the post-colonial development of the indigenized varieties of English (IVEs). A component of world language theory, the study develops a conception of social SLA, \textit{macroacquisition}, as a
central theoretical construct in accounting for the process of indigenization or acculturation (Kachru, 1981) that English underwent in postcolonial Asia and Africa. In this conception, I situate indigenization in its larger linguistic context as the intersection of SLA and language spread and change—or SLA taking place in the process of language spread and change—thus providing a new vantage point for our understanding of the emergence of the IVEs.

However, the emergence of the varieties of world Englishes leads to the essential question: why do they remain varieties of one language, and not become separate languages as in the case of the emergence of the Romance languages out of Latin. The answer to this question lies in the second main process within world language development: world language convergence. World language convergence is a product of the sociohistorical development of the world econocultural system. The world econocultural system constitutes the center of gravity for world Englishes around which they revolve.

The Development of the IVEs: World Language Divergence

Linguistic Models of IVEs

Hitherto attention in SLA has focused on the development of language within the individual learner, but just as important to a comprehensive understanding of SLA processes is the development that languages undergo by virtue of being second languages. Much empirical evidence of the existence of this process exists in the form of the study of the IVEs. But there is as yet no theoretical apparatus to explain this development. We cannot simply look at the process of acquiring an L2 one-sidedly, from the individual learner's perspective
alone, but must look at the relationship of learner populations and language in the process of the development of second languages, e.g., World Englishes.

One attempt at an explanation has been put forward by Selinker (1992), who sees the creation of IVEs as a case of Interlanguage (IL) development. As Y. Kachru (1993) points out, however, that IL theory is not applicable to the Outer Circle as the ideal target language (TL) proposed by IL theory is not the goal of learners and speakers of IVEs. Moreover, she argues that to label the language of Outer Circle speakers as "fossilized" speech ignores the sociohistorical development of the IVEs and the sociocultural context of the Outer Circle. It may be added that the inadequacy of the IL standpoint for the explanation of the New Englishes is particularly evident in the fact that IVEs have developed their own standard varieties, while the idea of a standard interlanguage contradicts the notion of the IL continuum.

IL theory attempts to explain the development of IVEs at the microlevel, as a process taking as its unit of analysis the individual. It is generally acknowledged, however, that a comprehensive theory of SLA has to account for both internal and external (societal) factors (Ellis, 1994). The same conditions apply to the explanation of indigenization as a process within SLA. External factors have to be taken into account and analyzed to derive a better understanding of why a particular linguistic form develops. Since the context is one of the development of a new language variety, with its own systems, standards and norms, it is not enough to study the learner and assume that the core language remains the same. One must study also the results of its being learned. Nor are these changes to be found simply within the speech of the learner, or in the so-called interlanguage, but in the language itself.
The IVE context differs from the classical SLA setting as defined by Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991): "A second language is one being acquired in an environment in which the language is spoken natively" (p. 7). The IVE context is one in which the SLA process takes place in a non-native setting, with limited input from native speakers. Moreover, in the process of indigenization there is no fixed TL, but the language variety rather develops from the SLA process itself. As S.N. Sridhar (1994) has put it, the indigenization context is one not of "transplanted learners" but transplanted languages. In the case of the "transplanted learner," research in SLA has shown that education does not play a significant role in the outcome of the process (Ritchie and Bhatia, 1996), although it plays a role in the rate of acquisition (Ellis, 1994). But with SLA involving a "transplanted" language where there is no native speaker context, SLA does not follow the "natural route," but the educational route.

What makes the process of development of the IVEs difficult to account for under the existing theories of language change is that the IVEs develop explicitly as second languages. Since the target language only develops as the result of the SLA process, rather than preceding it. The theory of pidginization/creolization, to some extent, implies the same thing, but the IVEs do not develop as either pidgins or creoles (Sridhar and Sridhar, 1994). The term pidgin refers to a minimal L2 "which barely resembled the masters' language as they spoke it" (Anderson and Shirai, 1996, p. 527). A creole is the "new natural native language" arising of a pidgin by second generation native speakers (p. 528).

The context of IVEs differs from that of pidginization/creolization in the following ways:
(1) Acquisition of the IVE does not take place in a "natural" setting of first language acquisition, but in an educational setting after the L1 has been acquired. This finding is confirmed by the historical data presented in previous chapters of this work.

(2) The IVE does not develop as a native but as a "non-native" variety.

(3) The IVE is not a restricted language, or a minimal language, but a language showing full linguistic range (Sridhar and Sridhar, 1994. Kachru, 1997) and develops as a variety of the language.

Social SLA: Macroacquisition

The debate over the role of English in the postcolonial world, begun in the 1960s, has gained momentum in recent years (cf. Y. Kachru, 1993; Phillipson, 1992; Pennycook, 1994; Tollefson, 1991; Bhatt, 1995). Scholars such as B. Kachru (1997a) have called for a "rethinking" of many theoretical and methodological constructs in the area of English studies to reflect the changing landscape of global English. In particular, Kachru argues for the need to abandon monolingual paradigms in favor of those more appropriate to the multilingual and multicultural contexts that increasingly constitute the setting of English-using communities. This contrasts with the situation described by Romaine (1996), "Modern linguistic theory generally takes the monolingual individual as its starting point in dealing with basic analytical problems such as the construction of grammars and the nature of competence" (p. 571).

Given that the context of the development of world language is that of bilingualism of English users, rather than language spread as the imposition of a usurping language, it also follows that the development of the New Englishes takes place in a second language.
acquisition (SLA) context. This process of development can be understood as a process within second language acquisition, but not second language acquisition as traditionally conceived. Instead of second language acquisition by individuals, the indigenization of a world language is a social process, second language acquisition among populations.

Central to this discussion is the notion of social SLA. By social SLA here I mean

1) second language acquisition by populations (cf. Strevens, 1980); rather than by individual learners;

2) SLA in which there is no fixed TL present as the goal of SLA;

3) SLA taking place in a multilingual context;

4) SLA in which input is not that coming from a native speaker.

Taking second language acquisition as a social process requires requisite conceptual changes in the relation of language and learner. SLA becomes a dynamic process, in which the language no longer appears as a static category, a fixed target, but alters as a result of its acquisition by the learning population. The speech community not only acquires the language but makes the language its own (cf. Widdowson, 1996). The process is two-sided. Individuals learn the language; and there is the creation of an independent variety with its own linguistic norms and standard usage (cf. Kachru, 1990; Bokamba, 1992; Bhatt, 1997). The two essential results are carried out each through the other, via reciprocal determination.

In contrast, what Tollefson (1991) has called neo-classical SLA theory sees the acquisition one-sidedly. Individual learners progress along an interlanguage continuum (Selinker, 1972) toward a static target language (TL). In this way, we cannot explain the development of a standard indigenized variety. For the conception demands that we treat
one of the variables, either the learner or the language, as static. In the usual case, the language is held to be constant (unchanging), while the learner's knowledge of it varies. On the other hand, so soon as the language is to be taken as variable, then we assume constant speakers whose performance in the language registers the change. But the situation of the development of a new standard in an SLA context demands a conception which permits both constituent elements to vary simultaneously.

Drawing on this notion of social SLA, *macroacquisition* is a theory of indigenization which places it in the domain of world language development. In this conception, indigenization represents just such a process of social SLA in a multilingual context, taking the evolution of a world language in a sociohistorical context as its premise. It is, therefore, the nexus of language spread and change and SLA. It thereby poses its own demands upon our conception of both SLA and language spread and change.

This process of macroacquisition poses theoretical problems that neither second language acquisition nor language spread and language change have yet to grapple with. On the one hand, SLA is a social process. On the other, indigenized varieties of English develop explicitly as second languages, which does not permit the application of standard linguistic theory. SLA theory, therefore, may no longer be confined to the individual learner. And linguistic theory can no longer ignore the dynamics of the second language acquisition context in language change.
As Bhatt (1995) points out, "There are two questions in the understanding of variation of English across cultures. First, What is the structure of 'non-native' Englishes?; and second. How did they come to be the way they are?" The first of these questions has received extensive treatment by linguists (e.g., Bhatt, 1997; Sridhar, 1992). This section takes up the second of these questions. Macroacquisition accounts for indigenization under the process of world language divergence, the creation of variety in the world language, or the origin of world Englishes.

Sociolinguistics has long accepted that, as Michael Halliday (1970) says, "the particular form taken by the grammatical [and other] systems of the language is closely related to the social and personal needs that language is required to serve" (p. 142). This conception lends itself to the study of language change in the context of its spread. In considering the process of indigenization as the intersection of SLA and language spread and change, I draw upon the conceptions of that process put forward by Kachru (1981) and Bokamba (1992). In his discussion of an African indigenized variety of English, Bokamba identifies three principal "sources and raison d'etre of this variety of English," and by implication, other IVEs representing part of the "more general phenomenon": linguistic interference, analogical derivation, and "the deliberate attempts by Africans to preserve and transmit African cultural thought in English" (p. 142). Following Bokamba, I identify these three elements as the central processes within macroacquisition.
Under the first, linguistic influence from the first language(s), Bokamba includes a wide range of cross-linguistic syntactico-semantic deviations that are resultant of such linguistic processes as semantic extension, semantic shift, syntactico-semantic transfer, and coinage (Kirk-Greene, 1971; Sey 1973). Interestingly, these deviations are observed in all levels of language competence, including formal and educated discourse in African Englishes (cf. Sey, 1973; Kirk-Greene, 1971; Chinebuah, 1976; Angogo and Hancock, 1980). Analogical derivation, another source of "Africanisms" in African English described by Bokamba, comes from alterations of the rules of Standard English itself. According to Bokamba, idiomatic expressions such as "going to hospital/church/school" are particularly linguistically productive and are subject to analogical derivation.

Bokamba trenchantly observes that these two linguistic processes by themselves do not constitute an explanation of the process of indigenization. Linguistic interference and analogical derivation "might adequately account for the phenomena observed here, [but] fail to explain why interference and analogical derivations of the type noted here occur at all" (p. 139). This is all the more true when the last of Bokamba's elements, which I will call conscious acculturation¹ of the language, is taken into account. Bokamba considers conscious attempts to convey African culture via English means as the third main source of "Africanisms" in African English. The principal agents here are African writers, particularly, novelists. This phenomenon of deliberate usage of culturebound constructs in the English

¹I use this term to differentiate the phenomenon that Bokamba has in mind here, and which is described, e.g., by Peter Lowenberg (1986) from the general phenomenon of acculturation as described by Kachru (1981) and others as the process of indigenization in general. This slight alteration in terminology is not intended to connote any difference in the processes described.
medium is often linked with establishing one's unique sociocultural identity (Y. Kachru, 1986; Chishimba, 1982; B. Kachru, 1982, 1983, 1985, 1986; Lowenberg, 1984; Magura, 1984; Nelson, 1984; and Smith, 1981). These linguistic processes, which I take to be central in macroacquisition, are also cited in Kachru (1981), whose description of the processes of indigenization is in essential agreement with Bokamba's. Kachru adds the process hybridization, which is noted by Lowenberg (1986) as well.

To explain why these processes "occur at all," as Bokamba puts it, we must look beyond the processes themselves to the context in which they take place. As noted above, this context is the intersection of SLA as a social process with language spread and change. Specifically, it is the macroacquisition of English in the process of its development as a world language. Macroacquisition takes place in the development of English as a world language in a multilingual environment, as discussed above, in which a political and social identity of a community has either emerged or is emerging in the complex interplay of forces in postcolonial nation-building. The indigenization of the language is the reflection of the shared social and political (national or supranational) identity as the institutionalized language variety resulting from the social SLA process, with linguistic interference, analogical derivation, and conscious acculturation as its constituent elements. Indigenization, therefore, is grounded in a social SLA process and within the development of world language. In such a context indigenization gains a general linguistic significance as a central process in language spread and change in the modern world.
Language spread and change is a more comprehensive theoretical framework than language contact. Language contact is a theory of language change, but it does not say how the languages came into contact. It does not contain a conception of language spread. It addresses only one side of the macroacquisition context; by itself it cannot distinguish between the site of macroacquisition in the Outer Circle and world language in the Expanding Circle. World language theory, in contrast, contains both of these elements and combines an explanation of processes of language spread with language change. It is language contact as a necessary and historical process. Where language contact understands the process as discrete and particularistic, macroacquisition places indigenization within the context of a larger process of language development. Because macroacquisition is a social process, processes take place that could not in an individual case. The acquiring community in the process of indigenizing the language does not merely transfer L1 elements, but transforms the language. The linguistic processes by means of which this takes place must be viewed as constituent parts of the transformation of the language. Moreover, since we have a process of creation of a language variety from a multilingual learning population, the study of transfer processes can only identify sources of language forms and structures, but can never explain the process of indigenization as such. That the process not only occurs, but creates institutionalized and standardized language varieties that serve multilingual communities, has

Suzanne Romaine (1996) has observed that "Linguists are giving increasing attention to the systematic study of language contact, and some have used the term contact linguistics in a wide sense to refer to both the process and outcome of any situation in which languages are in contact. Linguists who study language contact often seek to describe changes at the level of linguistic systems in isolation and abstraction from speakers. Sometimes they tend to treat the outcome of linguistic interaction in static rather than dynamic terms, and lose sight of the fact that the bilingual individual is the ultimate locus of contact" (p. 572).
been demonstrated very clearly (Platt et al, 1980; Bokamba, 1992; Kachru, 1990, 1992, 1997). Since these varieties are spoken by members of linguistically diverse first language backgrounds, the differentiating elements of the language variety must achieve a status within the collective identity, must express a social idea. They are neither mistakes nor merely systematic deviations that can be catalogued. They are the reflections of the social context that has produced them, produced by a social process. Hence macroacquisition, social SLA, cannot be regarded as merely the sum total of individual SLA processes such as language transfer. Agency is not invested only in languages in contact, but in peoples creating languages as the expression of their self-determination and construction of shared group identity.

The melding of various linguistic groups into a second language speech community, or a macroacquisition speech community, is necessarily a multicultural phenomenon. The indigenized variety fuses the various cultural elements into a language variety expressing, in a meaningful sense, all of them. It is important to note that indigenized varieties would not emerge at all if languages were inalterably the expression of one culture only (cf. Mazrui and Mazrui, 1998). Indeed, world language itself would be impossible. By virtue of becoming a vehicle for the expression of an emerging world culture (cf. Mazrui and Mazrui, 1998), the world language must transcend its culturebound parameters (Kachru, 1981; Smith, 1987). This element already exists, within a national or supranational context, in the IVEs, which have taken shape from the forging of a social and political identity by different cultural groups. James Baldwin has captured this process with respect to African American English: "[A]n immense experience has forged this language, it had been (and remains) one of the tools
of a people’s survival” (quoted in Mazrui and Mazrui, 1998, p. 24). The macroacquisition process is necessarily one of the acculturation of the language becoming indigenized because the language is learned in the process of creation of a common social and political identity—an identity in a multicultural setting. This dynamic expresses itself in the language variety, which is thereby acquired in the double sense alluded to earlier.

English as a World Language and the World Englishes: World Language Convergence

A theory of the development of the World Englishes must answer an additional question, one that hitherto has perhaps not been posed: Why have not the linguistic processes that created the World Englishes as separate language varieties proceeded to the point that they should become separate languages as in the case of the emergence of the Romance languages out of Latin? While linguistic imperialism finds the root in the sociohistorical development, by subsuming the process under language imposition, it loses sight of the variety that develops. In contrast, the New Englishes perspective is correct to see the process of development of English as an International Language as a process in its own right. So the question remains what is the basis of development of English as an International language, and not merely as a number of separate languages. It is empirically evident that these languages are intrinsically connected, therefore if the connection is not simply English as the language of England and its spread, then what is the connection? And here it is not enough to theoretically substantiate the differences (as in Pennycook, 1994, for example), but also to substantiate theoretically the fundamental unity of the language.
Virtually all scholars of the World Englishes agree that while they exhibit the characteristics of language varieties, they remain identifiably English (Bokamba, 1992; Kachru, 1981). A model of the emergence of the World Englishes must account for this linguistic maintenance as much as the linguistic change. But if we confine ourselves to a consideration of languages in contact, we have no means of doing so, since it does not address the sociolinguistic context in which the contact takes place.

In the context of world language theory, on the other hand, such an explanation becomes possible. As illustrated in Figure 2, the mutual relations of the various world Englishes owes to the process within world language development that I call world language convergence.

The world language, rather than an actual variety or true standard, constitutes a sort of center of gravity around which the various varieties revolve. Their functional relation in the arena of world econocultural relations serves to ensure their continuous mutual interaction. Hence, unlike the various Romance languages, which evolved into wholly separate languages in the wake of the death of Latin, the varieties of World Englishes retain their essential linguistic unity.

In this respect, there may be a central difference between the indigenization of Englishes and the linguistic change in other cases of what Kachru (1976) calls transplanted languages. Bokamba (1992) notes that similar processes seem to occur with all such transplanted languages. But an important difference must be noted with reference to the emergent language varieties and their source language, as a consideration of the process of development of world language suggests.
At the same time, the world econocultural system, discussed in Chapter 6, constitutes the center of gravity around which the varieties of World Englishes revolve. In
Figure 2: World Language Convergence within English as a World Language
this way, World Englishes maintain their Englishness. The functional relations of the world Englishes in the arena of world econocultural relations serves to ensure their continuous mutual interaction, ensuring that the varieties of World Englishes retain their essential linguistic unity.

The process by which English has become a world language has exerted important effects on the language itself. One of the processes within the internationalization of English is what I call transculturation: the process by which world Englishes increasing become multicultural media within pluralistic cultural communities. This process contrasts to a degree with national language development which can be looked at partly as the tendency towards the formation of a national culture. Transculturation is the process of transcending monoculturalism in language both within the world econocultural system and also within the varieties of world Englishes. There is an interplay of forces in which the World Englishes influence one another and so each variety becomes itself more and more multicultural.

Examples of such processes include, perhaps, the task of what Mazrui and Mazrui (1998) call the "deracialization of the English language," or "the process by which the language would be tamed and domesticated in the direction of greater compatibility with the dignity and experience of people of African descent" (p. 45) as an aspect of what they call "linguistic counter-penetration"(p. 42). In this sense, the creation of English as a world language involves, in a fundamental sense, the linguistic counter-penetration of the IVEs upon inner circle English. Such a project, for them, constitutes "a first step towards a healthier universalism built on a multicultural heritage"(p. 52).
It is not the development of English as a world language as such that represents the legacy of anglophone nation imperial domination, as shown in Chapter 6. It is rather the tendency to view both English as a World Language and the IVEs with reference to the "transplanted" language. Mazrui and Mazrui (1998) criticize the "ahistorical and artificial contrast that associates European languages with oppression and non-European languages with liberation" which tacitly "accept[s] the racist and undialectical terms of reference imposed by European imperialism itself" (p. 64). Herein, then, lies the main legacy of the inequality of power relations of the colonizing nations and the nations they dominated. Hence, the colonial origins of the IVEs are reflected not in the true relations of the languages, but in their perceived relations. As Kachru (1997) points out, we must "realize the limitations of...colonial constructs...in terms of our multilingual and multicultural societies." This discourse of colonialism takes many forms, including the endowing of the speakers of core Englishes with the status-laden and norm based honorific of native speaker, which in this sense could be taken as a "colonial construct." Hence, postcolonial linguistic relations are referenced to the colonial context. In this way, they may be denigrated, or their status as standard varieties of English may be denied altogether (Quirk, 1988, 1990; Prator, 1968.)

Acculturation, therefore, must be taken in light of the development of English as a world language, rather than from an Inner Circle English standpoint. In this sense, we have a sociohistorical context of acculturation of the developing language, or indigenization, and not centrally acculturation in a foreign language, a static target language (cf. Smith. 1983). A theory of English as an International Language must take up this point.
English as a national language is only the source of world language, not the world language itself. And it must more and more be reduced to merely one World English among many, losing its privileged status. The "New Englishes," at the same time, become nationalized as a result of their indigenization. But World English as such has as much reference to the "foreign-language" context; indeed world language is just the domain in which all of these national distinctions dissolve. Within that process, indigenized varieties are the manifestation of the growth of world language in definite conditions. Viewing the development of the postcolonial New Englishes in this way constitutes a means of shifting from a monocultural paradigm with its accompanying constructs to the complex hybridity that affirms the new sociocultural and linguistic identity of a multilingual community.

A postcolonial vantage point also suggests that where English plants itself in the life of a nation for purposes of world trade and world culture, there is no reason to fear that it will replace the language or languages of national life. Where English serves these purely external economic and world cultural functions, bilingualism/multilingualism becomes stabilized; and that appears to remain true no matter how important a role English comes to play in national life, as in the nations with indigenized varieties of the World Englishes (Y. Kachru, 1993). Given this dynamic, the assertions that the spread of English as the expression of linguistic imperialism, if unchecked, will tend toward monolingualism and monoculturalism appear unfounded. Rather, a more fruitful line of inquiry would appear to be how the spread of English in conjunction with its change has promoted cultural pluralism in the world and blurred the lines of national existence.
CHAPTER 8
ENGLISH AS A WORLD LANGUAGE, ELT, AND CROSS-CULTURAL PEDAGOGY

This dissertation has argued that English has developed into a world language through a process of sociohistorical evolution. Within this development, the process of world language convergence assures the essential unity of the language despite the variety that arises through world language divergence. Thus, the spread of English in the international context has led to the creation of a wide diversity of contexts and purposes for English learning and teaching. Nevertheless, it is a central contention of this dissertation that despite the diversity of contexts and purposes in which English is learned around the world, there remains a unifying world context that gives shape to the discipline of TESOL, preventing it from fragmenting into a number of separate, if related, fields. At the same time, the variety that expresses itself within English as a World Language finds expression in the cross-cultural basis present within the field of TESOL. This chapter concludes the dissertation by (1) revisiting the research questions and providing succinct summaries of findings; (2) considering the implications of the framework of language spread and change for TESOL; and (3) developing the concept of cross-cultural pedagogy for TESOL methodologists.
Research Questions

Main Research Questions

1. *Is imperial British and American English language policy responsible for the spread of English?*

   The findings presented in Chapters 2, 3, and 4 have shown that the spread of English to become an international language is a complex process that cannot be attributed to a single factor. In the explanation of the spread of English, it is also necessary to take into account the complex dynamic of the conflicting wills of the imperial powers and the peoples subjected to their rule (cf. Pennycook, 1994).

2. *Is language policy at the root of the emergence of English as an International Language?*

   This study has shown that language policy does not lie at the root of the emergence of English as an International Language, but the larger sociohistorical processes involved in the development of the world econocultural system. Rather than the kind of linguistic imperialist policy that sought to promote the spread of English as an end in its own right, the primary English-language colonial power, Great Britain, employed a containment policy that sought to control access to the language. This was dictated by the economic and political needs of running the colonial administration, established at the local level in the colonies from the foundation of the British empire in Asia and Africa until the 1920s.

3. *Is the sociohistorical process of development of EIL a product of language imposition alone?*

   As shown in Chapter 6, a complex array of factors have produced the phenomenon of EIL, including migration, imperial rule, and econocultural language spread.
4. What is the relationship between the development of the world market and EIL?

With the changeover from colonies of the old type (migration-based) to those of the new type (economic and political subjugation of nations and peoples), the process of establishment of the world market and the world economy was accompanied by the parallel development of EIL. This study has sought to explain this connection within the framework of world language theory, which postulates the connection of language and politico-economic development in the form of the world econocultural system.

Secondary Research Questions

1. Was there imperial language policy operating in the British empire?

As demonstrated in Chapters 2, 3, 4, and 5, the British language policy was local in nature rather than imperial (or empire-wide) until long after its essential shape was established.

2. Was there an imperial American English language policy? What is its relation to the British policy? Was there an "Anglo-American" language policy?

It was shown in Chapter 2 that the American language policy in Philippines could be characterized as both imperial and linguistically imperialistic. In this sense, however, it was in stark contrast to that pursued by the British. As such, it is not possible to speak of an "Anglo-American" language policy.
3. *Did the language policies of the British and Americans tend towards the replacement of the indigenous languages?*

In the case of British language policy, the replacement of indigenous languages was neither contemplated nor promoted by the policies put in place. Even where English was taught, it was almost universally done in the context of an emphasis on bilingual education, thus preserving the place of the mother tongue. In the case of the American language policy in the Philippines, such a result was considered, although American rule in Philippines did not last long enough to effect such a goal.

4. *Was there an attempt to make the English language the language of the whole population of the colonies of the British and American empires?*

In the case of the Americans in the Philippines, such was the explicit intention. In the British empire, on the other hand, this result was steadfastly avoided and universally deplored.

5. *Was there “invisible” ideology in language policy?*

"Invisible" ideology in language policy as defined by Tollefson (1991) is "the policy of requiring everyone to learn a single dominant language...as a common-sense solution to the communication problems" (p. 10). The British never put forward a policy of using English for these purposes in their colonies. They did, however, use local language lingua francas (e.g., Swahili in East Africa and Malay in British Malaya) in this way. The Americans in the Philippines, on the other hand, sought to implement English in the manner described by Tollefson.

6. *Was language policy by the British seen as a solution to the communication problems of multilingual societies?*
In general, language policy was not implemented in order to serve the ends of communication in multilingual contexts. Rather, the purpose of language policy in British colonial possessions was to promote economic and political goals by promoting socioeconomic stratification of the population of the colonies. English was, for the most part, not viewed as a language for internal purposes by diverse linguistic communities. To further make this practice possible, the British generally insisted that their colonial administrators be conversant with local languages.

7. Who were the language policy agents? Were they located in the Center or in the colonies?

Given the absence of an imperial language policy for the greater part of British colonial rule in Asia and Africa, the agents of language policy were located almost entirely in the colonies themselves. Even after the establishment of empire-wide institutions for dealing with these questions in the latter 1920s, the shaping of the contours of policy continued to be the predominant realm of the local administration. Moreover, as argued in Chapters 6 and 7, Asians and Africans took upon the roles of the agents of language spread and change very early in the process of the development of EIL, and could therefore also be considered language policy agents in the sense used by Kachru (1996).

Language Spread and Change and TESOL

The framework of language spread and change developed here brings a perspective to the study of English as an International Language that resonates with recent directions in TESOL methodology. Bilingualism/multilingualism form a central conceptual component of
the framework of language spread and change, and it can therefore serve as a tool in moving towards bilingual paradigms as the basis of TESOL and SLA, a direction that scholars such as Kachru (1997), Ferguson (1984), and Sridhar and Sridhar (1994) have called for. This paradigm shift also holds great potential for negating the hegemonic implications of English spread in the global context; perhaps more so than linguistic imperialism frameworks, which by making the spread of English a function of the political and cultural will of English-speaking nations ignore the larger forces driving the spread of English in the world.

Other implications also follow from the explanatory framework put forward in this dissertation. Given its process of development, a world language no more needs explicit regulation than a national language. The very sociohistorical processes, the econocultural functions, that called it into being serve to ensure the mutual intelligibility of the language, just as national languages have managed to exist whether consciously regulated by language academies or not, and despite their "actualization" as diverse dialects and registers. In this respect, Bailey (1986) has remarked sententiously, "It is not without its own interest to observe how much English has moved and is now moving toward a common syntax, punctuation, and international idiom without anyone's lifting a finger to promote this goal in any authoritative way" (p. 81). Even if this strong case is questioned, it seems that, in Kachru's (1990) words, there exists, at least "at one level," "an internationally understood English, in spite of its local characteristics" (p. 123).

A theory of world language not only provides a means of explaining the development of the IVEs as varieties of English, as opposed to "something else," but also simultaneously debunks the myth that there is such a thing as core and periphery in world Englishes--
linguistically, rather than politically. This recognition is crucial to the task of moving beyond the colonial constructs present in much linguistic analysis that Kachru (1997a) has criticized. On this basis, we preserve the meaningfulness of the term "English-using communities" (Kachru, 1997b), rather than positing users of "something else." And we also take cognizance of the implications of English in the world, with its far greater proportion of users in the Outer and Expanding Circles than in the Inner Circle.

Neither the meaningfulness of English-using communities nor the changes in the distribution of its speakers can be ignored in the teaching of the language. According to Strevens (1980), TEFL has shifted "away from the assumption--usually unstated and often not realized--that 'English should always be interpreted as 'The English of native speakers of the language', and in the direction of the assumption--already justified by the enormous expansion of English used in communication between non-native speakers--that 'English' also means 'The English of non-native speakers' treated in its own right and accepted on a footing of equality" (pp. 91-92).

I have argued that intelligibility exists to a far greater degree than is sometimes suggested (Widdowson, 1997). B. Kachru and Nelson (1996) have noted that "Standard British and American users, on the whole, are expected to be rather tolerant of each others' English..." (p. 81). This tolerance suggests that intelligibility across Inner Circle world Englishes is not only accepted as possible but perhaps even as quite natural among Inner Circle speakers. Most, if not all, Inner Circle English speakers appear willing to meet on a common linguistic plane and accept the diversity of their Englishes despite the considerable differences in the varieties of English they speak and the cross-communication problems.
entailed thereby (cf. Smith, 1983b). It is not only theory, then, but practice that proves intelligibility across international varieties to be perfectly possible. Hence, to carry out Strevens' vision of TEFL, this situation must be extended to all English-using communities.

It is not at all obvious why the possibility of unrestricted international communication by Inner Circle speakers is not questioned, while it is held (e.g., Widdowson, 1997) that Outer and Expanding Circle speakers, at least those outside of Europe, must confine themselves to specific purposes in communication with other Outer and Expanding Circle English-users and with Inner Circle English-users. When we say that people in the Outer and Expanding Circle are English-using, we must admit at least the possibility that they may use English for all the purposes to which a language may be put. Kachru (1997a) has shown, for example, that the functional range of use of English in the Outer and (and with one exception) the Expanding Circle are just as varied as in the Inner Circle. EIL as ESP, therefore, seems to be an unjustified restriction on English use, one which also flies in the face of global practice. Such a view is, as I have argued, only necessary if the premise is accepted that conceiving EIL as ESPs is the only means of separating the international use of English from the international use of Inner Circle English.

I would suggest that the concerns of cross-cultural miscommunication stem more from problems of interpretability than intelligibility, a distinction to which Candlin (1982) has called attention. Candlin points out that interpretability is "a richer (and inherently more complex) problem than intelligibility" (95), involving such questions as "culture/society/context" (p. 98). Here is the realm, I would argue, in which the acculturation of English (Kachru, 1990) to its different global contexts introduces complexity to
international communication in English (cf. Smith, 1987). But, then, this problem is far from unique to a world language. The potential for difficulty in interpretability necessarily arises in any multicultural language; indeed, it also exists in the interactions of "native speakers" of the same language, who are from different generations, backgrounds, classes, that is, from different cultures or subcultures (cf. Smith, 1983b). Even if we did not have a world language in question, but rather a national one, it hardly seems possible to argue anymore that there exists such a mythological construct as a monocultural nation. Furthermore, the issue of interpretability would exist as much in the ESP "registers" of EIL, for even within a particular specialist setting, language users bring different cultures with them.

Such obstacles are not insurmountable. If they were, language would not extend beyond the barriers of a particular culture. We would not only lack an international means of communication. Rather than concluding that international communication must be limited to specific purposes (Widdowson, 1997), and so rendered a fragmented rather than truly global form of communication, we may conceive of world language as the realm of intelligibility, not interpretability (cf. Smith, 1983b). But interpretability can also be achieved, albeit not without effort.

The solution lies not in approaching EIL as ESPs, but in putting into practice the program for international communication in English outlined by Smith (1983b). Smith (1987) asserts that "all English speakers need training for effective international communication" (p. xi). Cross-cultural communication requires--on the part of Inner, Outer, and Expanding Circle English-users--not only "learn[ing] tolerance for different pronunciation patterns." but "know[ing] how other people structure information and argument when using English";
gaining familiarity with other cultures, especially through reading "new literatures' written in English by non-native speakers and intended for a world audience" (1983b, p. 9). Effective international communication presupposes that all of the parties transcend culture-bound parameters.

At the same time, such an approach serves to justify Widdowson's call (1994) for the abandonment of the notion that the "native speaker" is the best teacher of English. The diverse cultural identities of ELT professionals serve to enrich the language, and reflect the actual determination of change in the language that is constituted by its spread.

Cross-Cultural Pedagogy and ELT

In becoming a world language, English has at the same time cast off the culture-bound parameters of a national language and assumed the role of communication medium of a multicultural global community. In this sense, it subsumes different contexts and purposes that call forth different methodologies.

I view methodology at two levels. There is, first, methodology in the classroom (Nunan, 1991; Richard-Amato, 1996), that is, how we promote SLA via the usage of appropriate methods, techniques and so forth. Second, methodology pertains to the sociolinguistic level (cf. Brown, 1993, 1997; Holliday, 1994; Smith, 1983), insofar as we need to understand the implications stemming from the development of English into an international language and the demands of particular contexts and the purposes for learning/teaching English. As Brown (1993; 1997) has argued, an awareness of the development of variety within English on the international level is important for the design
of the TESOL curriculum. The framework developed in this dissertation has implications for both.

On the sociolinguistic level, language spread and change emphasizes that the spread of English is not by itself a conduit for the spread of a particular culture. TESOL methodology must take cognizance of the fluidity of English speaking cultures. Because English has spread and changed into English as an International Language, its multiple contexts express themselves in multiple identities. There is an implicit contradiction entailed by basing an international language on national identity (cf. Smith, 1983). An international language that remains national is a contradiction in terms. As such, local identity in English remains necessary in addition to other identities that may be acquired in the language, both within the ESL and EFL contexts. TESOL methodology must, therefore, stress additive rather than replacive models of acculturation in English. This principle is important in both International Teaching Associates training in a particular national context and teacher education internationally.

The idea of the additive rather than replacive model of acculturation in English provides one pillar of cross-cultural pedagogy for TESOL. It speaks to a concern that has been reflected in research in TESOL (Pennycook, 1994; Holliday, 1994; McKay and Hornberger, 1996).

Language spread and change provides a means to understand English as a multicultural global language in which such concepts as authenticity and cultural knowledge have become more fluid. Such constructs as autonomy and authenticity, as well as the model of communicative competence need to include cross-cultural awareness on the part of the
language interlocutors--their norms and expectations. Authenticity, for example, has come
to be viewed recently as context-specific (Widdowson, 1998). Similarly, Kachru (1997a)
calls attention to the hybridity of cultural identity for an increasing number of English-users.
These kinds of questions must be increasingly addressed both in the education of American
and international teachers in TESOL programs, especially as the university has become more
representative of the multicultural context in which we operate. At the same time,
experimentation with methods arising out of the standpoint of critical language pedagogy
(Shor, 1995) may prove fruitful in the implementation of the goals outlined here. The need
for a cross-cultural pedagogical agenda for TESOL constitutes one of the implications arising
out of the study of the development of English as an International Language.
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APPENDIX A

Number of "vernacular schools" vs. "English schools" in Ceylon, 1889-1927.

Sources: Colonial Office, Ceylon, 1892; 1899; 1912; Ormsby-Gore, 1928.

Note: The few dozen or so "Anglo-vernacular schools" or bilingual schools are classed with "English schools" for the years 1889, 1898, 1910 and with "vernacular schools" in 1928.

Figure 3. Number of "vernacular schools" versus "English schools" in Ceylon, 1889-1927.
APPENDIX B

Number of government-supported "vernacular schools" versus government-supported "English schools" in Ceylon, 1889-1927

Source: Colonial Office, Ceylon 1892, 1899, 1910, 1920; Ceylon, Commission on Elementary Education, 1906.

Note: The few dozen or so "Anglo-vernacular schools" or bilingual schools are classed with "English schools" for 1889, 1909 and 1919; for the year 1927 they are classed with "vernacular schools." They are not included in the data for 1898.

Figure 4. Number of government-supported "vernacular schools" versus government-supported "English schools" in Ceylon, 1889-1927.
APPENDIX C

Number of "vernacular schools" versus "English schools" in the Federated Malay States, 1900-1936.

Figure 5. Number of "vernacular schools" versus "English schools" in the Federated Malay States, 1900-1936.

Sources: Federal Education Office, Federated Malay States, 1905; Colonial Office, Federated Malay States, 1923; 1937.
APPENDIX D

Number of 'vernacular schools' versus 'English schools' in the Unfederated Malay States, 1927-8.

Sources: Colonial Office, Unfederated Malay States, 1928; Johore, 1928; Kedah and Perlis, 1929; Kelantan, 1929; Perlis, 1928; Trengganu, 1928; Ormsby Gore, 1928.

Figure 8: Number of "English Schools" versus "Vernacular Schools" in the Unfederated Malay States, 1927-8.
APPENDIX E

Number of students in "vernacular schools" versus government-supported "English schools" in Ceylon, 1889-1927.

Sources: Colonial Office, Ceylon, 1892, 1920, 1925, 1932, 1938; Ceylon, Commission on Elementary Education, 1906.

Figure 7. Number of students in "vernacular schools" versus "English" and "Anglo-vernacular schools" as percentage of total students in Ceylon, 1889-1936.
APPENDIX F

Number of students in "vernacular schools" versus "English schools" in the Federated Malay States, 1927-1928.

Sources: Federal Education Office, Federated Malay States, 1905; Colonial Office, Federated Malay States, 1923; 1937.

Figure 8: Number of students in "vernacular schools" versus "English schools" in the Federated Malay States, 1900-1936.
APPENDIX G

Percentage of total students enrolled in "vernacular schools" versus "English schools" in the Federated Malay States, 1900-1936.

Sources: Federal Education Office, Federated Malay States, 1905; Colonial Office, Federated Malay States, 1923; 1937.

Figure 6: Percentage of total students enrolled in "vernacular schools" versus "English schools" in the Federated Malay States, 1900-1936.
APPENDIX H

Percentage of Malay children receiving "vernacular" or "English" educations, Federated Malay States, 1928

![Bar chart showing percentage of Malay boys and girls receiving vernacular and English education.]

Source: Ormsby Gore, 1928.

Figure 7: Percentage of Malay children receiving "vernacular" or "English" educations, Federated Malay States, 1928.