

Decolonising English Teaching in India: Remarks on English as All-Indian Elite Language (EAEL)

OPEN ACCESS

E.Dileep

Professor, Department of English, Krishna University, Machilipatnam, Andhra Pradesh, India

Volume: 7

Issue: 4

Month: September

Year: 2019

P-ISSN: 2320-2645

Received: 19.07.2019

Accepted: 24.08.2019

Published: 01.09.2019

Citation:

Dileep, E. "Decolonising English Teaching in India: Remarks on English as All-Indian Elite Language (EAEL)." *Shanlax International Journal of English*, vol. 7, no. 4, 2019, pp. 43-50.

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.34293/english.v7i4.596>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

Abstract

This paper is a humble attempt to share some nagging thoughts in the mind of an English teacher. In consonance with the desire for sharing, the paper often resorts to a personal and intimate style. It argues for an interdisciplinary approach and indispensable interfacing between teaching language and literature. The paper proposes that decolonizing English teaching takes different forms in different social contexts. It contends that, in India, English language teaching should be oriented towards reaching the grassroots learners to fulfill the project of decolonizing at present. In literature, it is argued, that native literature should be given prominence, and the texts in English translations can be used to counteract colonial alienation. Offering a critique of double linguistic hegemony of English and Sanskrit, the paper argues that the teachers of English have a responsibility in rehabilitating native or regional literature. It is suggested that a paradigm shift in the importance given to translations is needed in carrying out the decolonizing project.

Keywords: ELT, factionalism, decolonising, EAEL, Pedagogy, academia

This paper presents some personal reflections of a teacher of English, which may not be altogether new or incontrovertible, but are proposed here only tentatively, presumably in line with the subjective style of essay-writing, represented by Charles Lamb in English, to provoke some debate among the valued colleagues and some honest introspection, if the ideas are taken as worthy of serious attention. I am sure that an egregious (intended in the etymological sense) attempt like this will betray more of my ignorance than expertise. Still, I am writing this with the belief that diplomatic silence about noteworthy issues is more dangerous than a childish display of ignorance.

To begin with, although I am addressing the English teaching community as if it is a single entity, there are certain academic factions among us, as most of us have inherited the unfortunate division between those that specialize in ELT and those that are devoted to literature. Among other things, this factionalism has its unproductive ramifications for English language teaching in India. To take an example that comes handy for me, the literature faction of us, I believe, will feel at home with the first part of my title, as the word "decolonizing" is familiar in literary theory, suggesting a conceptual affinity with postcolonialism. And usually, we are conventional and cautious enough not to cross the border (or is it an LoC?) and speak of something like the Postcolonial ELT.

For their part, the other faction, i.e., the ELT wing, so to speak, may think that the second part of the title is strangely familiar, containing a rather longish acronym, characterizing certain strange species of English. As they are familiar with acronyms like EFL, ESL, and ESP, etc., as the stock of their trade, if they can accept an additional fourth letter in EAEL, they may consider tolerating the new acronym, if not the person responsible for its grotesque coinage. Jokes aside, the problem with the title is that it tries to engage simultaneously, with both the worlds of English teaching (as language and literature), trespassing over the border, venturing into a zone of possible cross-firing.

The source of this perilous propensity may be sensed, to some extent, in the idiosyncrasies of the author of this paper (and also the acronym), who likes the memorable opening lines of Nabokov's famous (or rather notorious) novel, *Lolita*, "Lolita, light of my life, fire of my loins. My sin, my soul. Lo-lee-ta: the tip of the tongue taking a trip of three steps down the palate to tap, at three, on the teeth. Lo. Lee. Ta," because the lines combine both the linguistic and literary perspectives: the logic of a phonetician with the unmistakable alliteration of a verbal artist. As the protagonist of the novel is a professor of English, this has its narrative justification as well. But this personal side of the matter is only part of the reason.

The other part of the reason, which is objective and more serious for the same reason, is the fact that the familiar stocks of the trade, like EFL and ESL, take a completely formalist view of English language teaching, disregarding the social context in which the act of teaching takes place. The second part of the title is indeed an attempt at defining and formalizing English teaching concerning that underappreciated social context. The need for this can be properly appreciated when we keep in mind how rarely literature on ELT concerns itself with the social dimension.

In a relatively recent book, the well-known ELT experts, Diane Larsen-Freeman and Marti Anderson question: "What, then, can teachers do about the politics of language?" Responding to their question, they say: "A minimal answer to this question is that it is important for teachers to develop an awareness of political issues around the use of language. Language teachers are not merely teaching language as a neutral vehicle for the expression of meaning." Then they go on to speak about Critical Pedagogy as a theory that could address this concern. Although this mention of Critical Pedagogy in an ELT book is an honorable exception, Critical Pedagogy as an approach is mostly conspicuous by its absence, even in most of the present-day ELT manuals.

As is well-known, English has come to stay with us, inherited from the colonial past. And the project of decolonizing English is also not a new idea. NgũgĩwaThiong'o famously advocated the abolition of the English Department in his country as a part of this project. But the form this project

of decolonization takes in a society depends on the specificities of its socio-political context. The role and function of the English language in India cannot be confined to the colonial past. They should be estimated after a critical consideration of the passionate arguments and debates that emerged in the process of dealing with the linguistic issues in postcolonial India.

The issue of language has triggered one of the most vexing controversies, debated by no less a solemn body than the constituent assembly of India. It is interesting to see how the issue of language in India is intricately connected with politics. Austin's book cited above gives interesting details about how Hindustani is replaced by Hindi as the official language, in the aftermath of the partition of the country. Not only the matters of language but also the issue of translation of the Constitution was passionately discussed by the Constituent assembly.

When the Hindi translation was ready by the summer of 1948, Nehru saw a copy of that and wrote to Rajendra Prasad that he "did not understand a word of it," as Sanskritization had made the translation incomprehensible even for the Hindi speakers (qtd. in Austin 282). Finally, the English version came to be considered the only official version. I take this opportunity to mention another instance of the political implications of translation. As I am writing this, on 1-06-2019, the news is out, although not confirmed, that the North Korean leader, Kim Jong Un executed 4 or 5 high-level diplomatic officials and that a translator was also given severe punishment, on the charge of bad performance.

As Granville Austin explains in his classic work on the Indian constitution:

Language assumed such surprising importance in the Assembly because, like fundamental rights, it touched everyone. The Power of the Executive or the Judiciary would rarely affect most individuals. Federalism was a question for politicians. But in a nation composed of linguistic minorities, where even provinces were not linguistically homogeneous, and there were, for example, Tamil enclaves existing in Oriya-speaking areas, problems of language were an everyday affair (268).

The issue of language assumed such prominence because it was related to the unity of India, which

is a primary concern for the members of the constituent assembly. But India, with its numerous languages and multilingualism, has a unique status when it comes to the matters of language. To put it simply, in spite of the numerical strength of Hindi speaking people, its popularity never extended to the south of India considerably. On the other hand, English enjoyed a near all-Indian presence, but it is a foreign language. The debates of that time should be understood against this linguistic debacle.

Notwithstanding this, as some regional language should be assigned the status of “national” language, using “tactful euphemism,” to put it in Austin’s words, it is proposed that Hindi should be the “official language of the Union” (266). But there are differences in this. To listen to Austin again:

The Hindi-wallahs held that the use of English was incompatible with India’s independence, and therefore Hindi must become the national language. They preach that multilingualism was incompatible with Indian unity and that for this reason, also, the nation should adopt Hindi. While I was writing the paper, on 2-06-2019, newspapers reported that the recent proposal in the New Education Policy 2019, to make Hindi compulsory was revoked, after vehement protests, voiced mostly from the state of Tamilnadu. This shows how the project of making Hindi the national language is still a far cry from becoming a reality.

The moderates ... They believed that English and all the regional languages could be effectively utilized in their proper spheres, like liquids seeking their levels. Hindi—broadly defined—might be given a special place because it was spoken by a relatively larger number of persons, but the use of English, they believed, was a not incompatible with Indian nationalism” (268).

Even among visionaries like Nehru, there is a certain ambivalence that is inescapable due to the exigencies of the situation. He said, for instance, that “English will inevitably remain important language for us because of our past association and because of its present importance in the world.” But he also says that it was “axiomatic that the masses can only grow educationally and culturally through the medium of their languages” (qtd. in Austin 271). Thus, Nehru believed that although English plays a prominent

role in India, the nation cannot become great based on a foreign language. So, he felt that the language India chooses must be “a language of the people, not a language of a learned coterie” (qtd. in Austin 303).

The problem is that by and large, English has remained the language of that coterie until now. This paradoxical view of Nehru gives expression to a profound truth about the status and role of English in contemporary India. Although it is a foreign tongue, English has a crucial role to play because of some past and present exigencies of our country, but it has its undeniable limitation too, as it is the language of a particular section of our society—the educated elite. I am tempted to call it an elitist dialect, because when a language is limited to a social class, linguists usually describe it as a dialect, like the caste dialects in regional languages, but the imposing international presence of English as a language makes this description untenable.

Perhaps, some periodization is possible concerning the changing role of English in India. The initial stage during the colonial times can be characterized by the famous words of Caliban: “You taught me language and my profit on ‘t/Is I know how to curse.” A pattern is discernible in these times, in which people with expatriate experience like Gandhi, Nehru. Sri Aurobindo, Dr. B.R Ambedkar, and the Ghadar militants, etc. played leading roles in Indian nationalism, and when they returned home, they turned into national leaders. This was a period when English was a language of the political and cultural elite of India because in the person of people like Raja Ram Mohan Roy it has also inspired many cultural changes in the country. The prominence of the English elite in these spheres of social life is not so conspicuous now.

The second stage has come on to the scene in the late, post-independence period. In this period, the spread of English has grown a lot, and it is not just a few political and cultural elite who acquired the language. The status of English as a language has changed at the national and international levels in this period. At the international level, it has become a global language and the prominent language of internet and computers, thus turning into a passport to global professional opportunities. At the national level, as a subject taught in Indian schools, it has

reached a wider public now, following a demographic change in the composition of students in the recent decades, gradually transcending earlier elitism.

In this second stage, the significant difference is between the cosmopolitan English elite and the grass-root (mostly rural) people with regional languages as mother tongues who aspire to acquire English as a means for socio-economical upward mobility. This division is reflected in Indian writings in English today in the trends of cosmopolitanism and nativism. In English as a language in India, this is reflected as the difference between the accents of English. P. Sathyavathi, a well-known Telugu writer, herself a lecturer in English, wrote an interesting Telugu short story about how English accent acts a marker of prestige in the educational institutions.

At times, we can see these trends coming into a collision. For instance, Jnanpith awardee and a proponent of nativism, Bhalchandra Nemade's dismissive attitude towards the works of Salman Rushdie and V.S.Naipaul is well-known. He characterized their work, reportedly, as "pandering to the west," and Rushdie is reported to have tweeted in the acerbic language in response. The Hindu also quoted Nemade as saying "what is so great about English? There isn't a single epic in the language. We have ten epics in the Mahabharata itself. Don't make English compulsory, make its elimination compulsory."

Against this backdrop, the next phase in the propagation of English should be envisaged in India, as its downward propagation from the elite to the grassroots of the country. This should define the orientation of English teaching both as a language and literature. In the language teaching front, most of the ELT approaches take a formalist and linguistic approach to teaching, disregarding the socio-political realities. Given the demographic change mentioned above, I believe, this socio-political outlook is indispensable. This is the reason I hinted at the lacuna that we don't speak about something like the Postcolonial ELT.

The advantage of Postcolonial theory is it gives a framework to analyze and appreciate how the colonial cultural phenomena sustain imperceptibly even in the Postcolonial times. It is one of the contentions of this paper that this approach will be productive even

for the teachers in ELT, as it enables them to better appreciate the social context in which their work takes place. Postcolonial ELT (or Decolonised ELT) is not just a curious hybrid of disparate conceptual entities. It can provide the theoretical framework to address some key issues that remained mostly unaddressed until now. The fact of the matter is that English still enjoys the status of the Master's language. The master may not be a colonial master, but the glory and prestige of the colonial master's language sustain to this day, in the case of English.

A student's competence in English is not taken as a matter comparable in importance to the competence in any regional language. It is something that almost unilaterally decides the prestige and esteem of a student in the class room. It is a common experience, for the teachers who teach for the students from rural backdrops, that there is a socio-linguistic divide among the students. Generally, it is only a few students with an elitist backdrop of a convent education, who can develop a feel and felicity for English, which is more or less comparable to the native language, or the mother tongue.

This seems to be a common experience for many of the peoples colonized by the English. Thus, NgũgĩwaThiong'o says in his influential work, *Decolonising the Mind* that "the most coveted place in the pyramid and the system was only available to the holder of an English language credit card. English was the official vehicle and the magic formula to colonial elitedom (12)."

Every language teacher knows very well that without a free and fluent interaction in the classroom, which understandably involves quite several provisional mistakes, no foreign language can be acquired. But when it comes to English, students exhibit deep-rooted inhibitions. Many of them, especially those with a rural backdrop, are awestruck at the prospect of speaking English in the presence of the whole class. If the class consists of a good number of girl students, the plight of boys at a similar prospect is tormenting beyond description. This is understandable because young students develop self-esteem and identity at this age. But what is not usually paid critical attention is the enormous role played by English competence in the formation of this self-esteem and identity.

Although this is not systematically theorized in the field of English language teaching, many teachers sense this instinctively. Still, instead of demystifying and de-politicizing English, a majority of English teachers subscribe to, and even try to enhance its solemnity and superiority, as it vicariously reflects and informs their prestige in the academia. This should not be taken to determine that the English teachers are deliberately participating in a silent conspiracy to accrue the importance of their subject through devious means.

The intent is to say that it is time we become conscious of our social responsibility and take a perspective that locates the practice of English language teaching in line with the progressive developments and on-going democratization of our society. The social and psychological dimensions of this perspective can be explored in the light of theorists like Franz Fanon and NgũgĩwaThiong'o etc. It doesn't matter much whether it is going to be called Postcolonial ELT or something else. What matters the most is that this perspective should stand for de-glorifying and de-politicizing English, instead of accruing its hegemonic status. It should be a part of the democratization process that diffuses education and learning from the elite to the grassroots.

At the same time, one should be clear that a wholesale rejection of English is not an option now, given the obvious socio-economic advantages, and given its role as a lingua franca not only internationally, but in India itself. So, what is needed is its retention, even extension, without its hegemonic status vis-à-vis the other languages of India. As William Dalrymple says in the introduction to his *White Mughals*, India has a tradition of colonizing the colonizer, and we can add that the same should be the case with English in India.

Any language, including English, becomes our own when it is used to convey our lived reality. When Kamala Das declares in her eloquent poem, "Introduction" that whatever language she speaks becomes her own including its oddities and peculiarities, she could be taken as speaking for all Indians, especially for the people at grassroots, at this juncture. Here, Kushwant Singh's call for naturalizing English acts as a clarion call, when he says "[s]o, dear Bhashawallas, make peace with

Angrezi. Drape her in a Banaras brocade sari as you would if your son brought home a foreign daughter-in-law. But don't waste your energies fighting against her because she has come to stay 'till death do us part'" (39).

If we take the trouble of developing an alternative perspective to reach the unreached sections, the good news is that there is no dearth of creativity for the students at the grassroots level. Despite their disadvantages in acquiring English idiom, they created idioms with English in their mother tongue, Telugu, because they feel free in deviating from the standard, in their mother tongue. Among the youth, there is a Telugu expression, "hand ichchādu," which, quite counter-intuitively, denotes betrayal and not help.

Similarly, after a popular film, *Happy Days*, the expression "light thisko" has become popular although there is already an idiom with similar meaning in English: Take it easy. As we can see, what is intimidating for them is not English language per se, but the inordinate prestige attached to it and its correct use. Once this is removed, before long, they not only start appropriating it freely but also charge that language with their meanings and creativity.

Mikhail Bakhtin's sociological approach—which he developed with his colleagues like Volosinov and Medvedev, underscoring how language is not just a passive medium of communication but is informed by the social context, and by the intentions of the people who charge the words with their meanings—founded an alternative approach for doing linguistics, but unfortunately Bakhtin is appropriated exclusively by the literary theorists and applied linguists like the ELT professionals do not seem to have taken this approach with the seriousness it deserves.

To depart, the teacher should first have an irreverent orientation towards the language she or he is dealing with, which has been surrounded by the elitist aura so far. At first, this may seem sacrilegious for those who have been under the spell of this aura for long. It takes systematic theorization of the social and psychological aspects in the teaching-learning of English and developing new approaches and methods to meet the new objectives. For instance, the new approach may take mother tongue as scaffolding in the Vygotskian sense, rather than as an impediment

to being inhibited from acquiring a new language.

Let's turn to the literary aspect. In his provocative essay, "On the abolition of the English Department," NgūgĩwaThiong'o puts it thoughtfully that "the primary duty of any literature department is to illuminate the spirit animating the people, to show how it meets new challenges, and to investigate possible areas of development and involvement (439)." How many of us, the teachers of English literature can say for sure that the kind of literature we teach meets this criterion? I, for one, do not believe that it is possible to meet this criterion, to any considerable degree, using most of the English literary texts in the classroom.

On the contrary, vernacular literature, Telugu literature in my case, can richly meet this criterion. In another paper, from which the present paper draws some ideas, I have argued that English translations of Telugu (or other regional) literary works are to be preferred than English literary works per se, to meet this requirement in our classrooms, as the themes and concerns of Telugu literature are close to the lived experience of our rural students. This is important to counteract (post)colonial alienation, which, in the words of NgūgĩwaThiong'o "takes two interlinked forms: an active (or passive) distancing of oneself from the reality around; and an active (or passive) identification with that which is most external to one's environment" (28).

What about the interaction and exchanges between English and Telugu (or regional) languages and literature, once English is accepted and adopted as one of the Indian languages? This has been a very contentious issue, and popular opinion is overwhelmingly dominated by chronic prejudices. The unquestionable dogma here is that proficiency in English and proficiency in Telugu (or other vernaculars) are inversely proportional. It is common for the parents of convent-going pupils to say that their children do not know numbers or the names of weeks in Telugu, with a certain sense of irrepressible pride. The implication is that they are more proficient in and familiar with English than with their mother tongue. But if a teacher starts interacting with them, it is not difficult to find that in most of the cases the pupils involved are severely impaired not only in their verbal skills but in their cognitive skills as well.

On the other extremity of popular opinion, we find a similar endorsement to the inevitable dichotomy, but with a sense of resentment. This side is populated by those who decry the domination of English language and literature and see that as the root cause of the depreciation in the significance of regional languages and literature. Preference to the native tongue and regional languages is certainly good, but the people who advocate that are not always motivated by progressive and democratic objectives. This was the case even in our constitutional debates, so much so that Nehru said everybody knows "that Hindi is the most powerful language of India . . . But it is the misfortune of Hindi that it has collected round it some advocates who continually do tremendous injury to its cause by advocating it in a wrong way" (qtd. in Austin 285). Surprisingly, a similar charge can be made even today against many of the contemporary advocates of Telugu. Of course, there are some honorable exceptions like G. Umamaheswara Rao, who promotes the use of Telugu not for sentimental reasons but for highly realistic and practical reasons.

Paradoxically, at least in our case of Telugu, many of those who decry this linguistic domination of English, silently tolerate, or even advocate in some cases, the hegemony of a classical language like Sanskrit. This is because such people oppose the dominance of English not due to some realistic concerns but due to their conservative sentiments. It is consistently and conveniently ignored by such people that English and Sanskrit belong to the same linguistic family and the reason for their dominance has its source in similar historical hegemony these languages exercised at different periods. Kushwant Singh points out the similarity between the existence of English and Sanskrit in India when he questions "do you deny English the status of an Indian language? Is it because it was brought to India by foreign conquerors? So also were Arabic and Persian. So indeed was Sanskrit by our Aryan forefathers." Then he adds that both "Hindi and Urdu were born out of these once-foreign languages. English happens to be the last of these importations" (38-39).

This remarkable essay, titled "English Zindabad Vs. Angrezi Hata," from which the above two quotes of Kushwant Singh are taken, lacks awareness

or analysis of the linguistic hegemony of English or Sanskrit. But the fact is that most Indian regional languages face this double domination so much so that a great writer like Tagore takes an equally critical stance towards these twin hegemonies. He lamented that We have not been able to hit up on the true ideas and feelings or the true language of the Bengali. The Sanskrit scholar will cry, ‘How true! In what is being written today we find no Sanskrit compounds, no cherishing of your Sanskrit words. You call this Bengali?’ We say to them, ‘Your language is not Bengali, nor is that of the English-wallahs. Bengali is not to be found either in the Sanskrit or the English grammar: it is there in the Bengali heart. You are acting like somebody searches the town for his son while holding the child in his arms. You are moving heaven and earth in your search for Bengali, turning Sanskrit and English upside down, but you have never looked into your hearts’ (43).

This is not just a theoretical belief in the case of Tagore, through his *Gitanjali*, he has demonstrated the advantage of turning to the native tradition, rejecting the linguistic and literary hegemony. If one reads his translation of Kabir’s poems into English, one realizes how far Tagore’s magnum opus is influenced and inspired by that. But regrettably, the deplorable linguistic hegemony continued later on, and in an essay published as recently as in the 1980s, Bhalchandra Nemade writes that

Even today the development of Marathi seems difficult because of its twin enslavement to Sanskritized prose and to Anglicized vocabulary which is treated as a status symbol and has polluted the taste even of womenfolk. The children of the urban, service-minded elite class are forced to go to English medium schools at a tender age. They become intellectually invalid and incapable of shaping language creatively and independently. This class cannot help the Marathi language. We should note that the universities, particularly the universities of Pune and Bombay, have done nothing to develop the Marathi language” (199).

How far can we say that our universities did better than this to Telugu? What is remarkable about Nemade’s opinion is it suggests the root cause for the problem. It is not these languages by themselves that are at the crux of the problem, but their hegemonic

status and taking them as status symbols. In the history of India, it seems to be a recurrent pattern that a new language is introduced in its multilingual context by some advancing outsiders and the language retains its hegemonic status even after its introducers cease to be the ruling class. Although the hegemonic language enjoys wider proliferation in the context of multiple regional languages, it can become a living language only in so far as it can percolate to the grassroots and the rest of its use will be restricted to the elitist purposes like administration.

Sanskrit and Persian in the past and English at the present times have trodden the same path to varying degrees. In the past, Sanskrit also enjoyed the status of an all-Indian elite language, but as its percolation to the grassroots is greatly limited, its existence as a living language has become negligible. The importance of English as a living language and literature also depends on how far it could percolate to the lower rungs of the society, in the process of linguistic democratization.

The interaction between English and Telugu literature presents a more interesting case. In spite of the hue and cry raised by the conservatives about the influence of English literature, almost all the literary luminaries who inaugurated modern Telugu literature are remarkably familiar with English literature, and quite a few of the modern Telugu writers are faculty of English. Prof. Madhurantakam Narendra, whose superannuation provides the occasion for this paper, belongs to this group of luminaries.

Through the contributions of Telugu literary stalwarts like Gurazada Apparao, Sri and Chalam, etc., the influence of English literature helped in providing an international outlook and contemporary relevance for modern Telugu literature. It has greatly inspired a critical attitude to the moribund customs, contributing to the rejection of outworn ideas, so much so that Gurazada questions in his famous Telugu poem on the comet “Would they have taught us English/ Had they known beforehand all that had happened?” This is my translation of the lines from Telugu. But this productive interaction remained mostly one-way traffic. Although the influence of English literature enriched Telugu literature, the contributions to English literature or letters, by the writers whose roots are in Telugu literature and

culture are very few and far between. I have already mentioned the cosmopolitan and nativist strains in Indian writings in English. Among these, it is the cosmopolitan stream that reached the international readership to a considerable extent. Although a few nativist works like the writings of R. K. Narayan earned international recognition, this is still a subsidiary strain in Indian English writings.

Perhaps, this is where the contributions of English literati (this, of course, includes English faculty) whose sensibilities are rooted in native literature can come into the picture, to fill the gap. The lacuna is that although there are rich repertoires of native literatures, they lack representation in the writings in English, and the native literatures remain passive receivers of English literary influence. The best and readily available means to redress this is through translations of regional literatures into English.

The intellectual ethos in Indian academia is a stumbling block for this because, in its evaluation, translation is considered a secondary, marginal, and inferior activity. According to the central stage to translation may seem objectionable for the ones who subscribe to the original/translation binary, which is prominent in the western literary traditions that are predominantly monolingual, and link their single languages with national identities. But, in India, translations are typically the points of departure for many native kinds of literature and translations are never accorded secondary status. Reclaiming this productive tradition will empower us for filling this lacuna. Politically speaking, this project of translations should be reckoned as a postcolonial version of empire writing back, and this could make the cherished idea of world literature a reality in the true sense and not as a one-sided coin.

Author Details

Dr.E.Dileep, Professor, Department of English, Krishna University, Machilipatnam, Andhra Pradesh, India.

Email ID: englishdileep@gmail.com.

Works Cited

- Austin, Granville. *Indian Constitution: Cornerstone of a Nation*, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2000.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, translated by Caryl Emerson, University of Minnesota Press, New York, 1984.
- Dalrymple, William. *White Mughals*, Penguin, 2004.
- Kabir. *One Hundred Poems of Kabir*, translated by Rabindranath Tagore, assisted by Evelyn Underhill, Macmillan, London, 1915.
- Das, Kamala. *Kamala Das Selected Poems*, edited by Devindra Kohli, Penguin, Gurgaon, 2014.
- Larsen-Freeman, Diane and Marti Anderson. *Techniques & Principles in Language Teaching*. 3rd ed., Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Nemade, Bhalchandra. "The Marathi Novel: 1950-1975 (1981)." *Indian Literary Criticism: Theory and Interpretation*, edited by G.N. Devy, Orient Black Swan, Hyderabad, 2009, pp. 192-219.
- Nabokov, Vladimir. *Lolita*, Penguin Books, London, 1995.
- Singh, Kushwant. "English Zindabad Vs Angrezi Hatav." *Communication Skills in English*, Hyderabad, State Institute of Vocational Education, 2001
- Tagore, Rabindranath. "Baul Songs." *Selected Writings on Literature and Language*, edited by Sisir Kumar Das and Sukanta Chaudhuri, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2011.
- Thiong'o, Ngũgĩ wa. *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*, J. Currey, London, 2011.
- Thiong'o, Ngũgĩ wa. *Homecoming: Essays on African and Caribbean Literature, Culture and Politics*, Heinemann, London, 1972.