



Politics of Language in Colonial India and in Post-Partition Pakistan, 1947–1970s

*¹Gulawar Khan & ²Arif Khan Masood

*¹Professor in the Faculty of Management and Social Sciences, Lasbela University of Agriculture, Water and Marine Sciences (LUAWMS), Uthal, Balochistan. Email: khan_aw@hotmail.co.uk.

²Arif Khan Masood, Senior Lecturer in Humanities and Social Sciences, Bahria University, Karachi Campus, Email: arifkhanmaseed08@gmail.com.

Citation: Khan, G. & Masood, A.K. (2023). Politics of Language in Colonial India and in Post-Partition Pakistan, 1947–1970s. *Journal of Law and Social Sciences*.1(2), 31-45.

Received: June 4, 2023

Revised: September 21, 2023

Accepted: November 22, 2023

Published: December 31, 2023



Copyright: © 2023 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).



Abstract

This study aims to explore the impact of colonialism on language in India, with a particular focus on Pakistan until 1970. It will examine how language policies were used as a tool for control and dominance, as well as how they shaped the linguistic landscape of the region. To begin, the paper investigates the role of language and politics in United India since the introduction of English language by Thomas Babington, popularly known as Lord Macaulay, in 1834, arguing that the imperialist rulers and ruling elites were preoccupied with their languages and were protecting their political status using language as a political tool, both in colonial India and post-colonial Pakistan. Second, this study also asserts that after the partition of unified India, the Pakistani elite exploited language(s) as a political tool to defend their self-centered ambitions, contributing to the dismemberment of Pakistan in the 1970s. The discontent does not end there; certain elites continue to use language to mobilize their ethnic supporters to acquire maximum benefits and political powers within Pakistan.

Keywords: Colonialism, language, politics, elite, united India, and Pakistan.

Introduction

The politics of language is not a new phenomenon. It has continued to be in force in the present-day South Asia since the arrival of different dynasties in the united India. The present-day Bhutan, Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Pakistan, and the Maldives are the seven independent nations that make up the united India, popularly known as Indian subcontinent (hereafter India). From a linguistic standpoint, however, these political divisions conceal the extensive underlying histories of language politics in India. Since ages, language is used as a political tool to address language and linguistic differences among peoples. It can take the form of government appreciation or how language is treated in official dimensions. Language policy is one of the ways to place language in the context of social structure so that language determines who has access to political influence and financial resources. In fact, language policy is a process through which dominant groups achieve linguistic primacy in state apparatus (Paulston,1992).

While going through the literature of language politics or politics of language in India, it is observed that that every powerful dynastic ruler(s) prefers to expand their own language(s) instead of the languages of their subjects. It is because, as we can see it around the globe, language is an effective tool of power and control not only in totalitarian dynasties but also in the modern-day democracies. Linguistic identity is primarily a political issue where languages are serving as signs of loyalty (Rajagopalan, 2007). The external forces, such as Mahmud Chaznavi and the Mughal emperors, who invaded India, always exploited language to their advantage. In the 11th century, Sultan Mahmud Ghaznavid introduced Persian to India, and the Mughal emperor Babur designated it as the



court language, while his grandson Akbar declared it an official language of India (Banoo, 2017).

Thomas Babington, well known as Lord Macaulay, was the one who first popularized the English language in 1834. He introduced British education to India as well. His highly contested use of the English language as a first language and approach to minimizing the use of conventional languages make for an interesting read.

As mentioned above, language politics existed in one form or another for the purpose where rulers extract more powers for shaping society and social discourse in their favor (see for example, Kachru, 2008 and Ziauddin, 2007). It happens not only in India but after the Partition of India, the same happened and still happening in post-colonial Pakistan. The politics of language presents a very insightful lesson for the students and researchers associated with subject matter of this study.

Therefore, this paper is planned to examine the politics of language in colonial India and post-colonial India with special reference to Pakistan. The paper is divided into three sections. To begin, it investigates the politics of language from the arrival of the Mughals in the subcontinent until the arrival of the British in India. In this section, the authors briefly examine the politics being practiced by the rulers in relation to Persian, Urdu, and Hindi, followed by the English language. The third section focuses on the politics of language in Pakistan from 1947 to the 1970s. In this section, the author analyzes how Pakistan's founders, as well as regional and ethnic elites and politicians, use language as a political tool to maximize their interests. The authors concluded this study in the fourth section by arguing that language is an easy prey for political leaders and the ethnic elite to use it for personal gains, while ordinary people are constantly at a loss.

Politics of Language During Mughal Period

The language of pre-historic India is said to be unknown, but it was the Aryans invasion which brought Vedic language along with them. The Vedic language was composed of various dialect such as Sanskrit, Sauraseni Prakrit, and Sauraseni Apabhramsa. The Sauraseni dialect served as the language of interregional communication (Nayar, 1969). India was divided into several regional polities at the start of the 16th century, and each state or principality spoke a different language at the time. According to the comprehensive collection of languages used by the British Empire known as the Linguistic Survey of India (LIS), there were 364 languages with varied dialects spoken throughout undivided India (Grierson, (Ed.)1921). However, with the advent of the Muslim in India, especially the Mughal, Persian came to the scene and was declared as a language of Mughal court by the first Mughal emperor, Zahir Ud Din Muhammad Babur



(1834 - 1530).¹ Later, Abu'l-Fath Jalal Ud Din Muhammad Akbar, Babur's grandson (1556 - 1605) declared it an official's language at all levels (Ali, 1975, Ali, n.d). Here, it is significant to note that Persian had become the language of the Muslim aristocracy in India long well before Mughals arrived. During Ghaznavi's reign, Northern India produced numerous poets and prose authors in Punjab, including Masud Sad Salman, Amir Khusru, and Hassan Sijiz (Alam, 1998).

It may be noted that nobles and high officers from other states, most notably Persia and the Uzbek khanates, were raised to the Mughal nobility. In the seventeenth century, the Persian diaspora was more important to the Mughal empire than the Turkic diaspora. It is all because the Persian fought for the Mughal ruler, Akbar, to reestablished Mughal rule in part of Afghanistan and India (Ali, n.d). It may be noted that the Mughal did not replace other languages but supersede them to be official or court languages by Persian. Though, the Mughals worked hard to popularize Persian language; eventually, in the 18th century, a literary language based on a synthesis of Hindi and Persian emerged in the form of Urdu, whose very name announced its connection with the Mughal court (Ali, n.d). According to Nayar (1969), during the 17th and 18th centuries, however, Urdu (written in Arabic script) and Hindi (written in Devanagari script) also developed into widely used interregional languages. The reason behind declaring Persian as court language seems to be political. It is because the Mughal rulers were deeply influenced by the Persian language and culture owing to their roots in Persia. In addition to this, many Persian artists, craftsmen, and scholars came to India and settled during the Mughal period out of which many of them were appointed on some key position in the Mughal court. Furthermore, during the reign of Moghul emperor, Jalal Ud Din Muhammad Akbar (1556 – 1606), Persian, besides court language, was also chosen as the official language of India. As time went on, it gained prestige to the point where it was still spoken in North India after Muslim rule ended (Nayar, 1969). So, with the passage of time, the Persian language was now to remain as a reminder of the past glories, along with a portion of the crumbling Mughal aristocracy (Alam, 1998: p.331).

With the advent of East India Company into India in 1600s, the company brought along with them a new language, the English language. However, they did not implement it as official or court language at once owing to the fear that the local Indians would resist it. The East India Company and its associates failed to establish English as the language of instruction and governmental institutions because company officials were divided into two groups for more than 200 years: the Orientalists and the Anglicists. The Orientalists were active in their attempts to protect the "glory past" of the Indian classical tradition. The Orientalists believed that instruction should be given in regional dialects to aid locals in better assimilating Western moral and philosophical ideas. While the Anglicists thought

¹ It may be noted that the Persian language, which Mehmood Ghaznavi brought to Northern India with him, flourished during the Mughals' rule, particularly under Akbar.



that English was the only language that could accurately reflect the complex ideas required to communicate Western thought (Ramamurthy, 2015, Evans, 2002, and Ghosh, 1995). However, many people within the East India Company were persuaded by Lord Macaulay's (1835) influential Minute that English was the only language that mattered. It was Lord Macaulay's rhetorical minute for Lord Bentinck. written on February 2, 1835, and with this, English officially began to take Persian's place as India's official language (see Kausar et al, 2015 and Ghosh, 1995: 21).

The British aimed to bring modern western education to India because they thought it would help their economy by convincing Indians of the superiority of British manufactured goods and the benefits of trade and commerce. To teach the language to the people of India, English-language schools were established in cities like Delhi and Banaras. English was declared as a language of all kinds of competitive exams in India. Thus, it (English) became a requirement for people who wanted to advance in their careers and positions. The middle-class Indians enrolled their children in English-language schools in order for them to succeed in British-run competitive exams and obtain desirable jobs under the British East India Company.

To sum up this section, the official language and the vehicle of culture remained as Persian during the Mughal period. However, with passage of time, with a mixture of Hindi and Arabic languages, Persian has replaced by Urdu, because the idiom used at the Mughal Court called "Urdu-i-Mu'alla" got widespread recognition. As Urdu retains a large portion of Persian's vocabulary as well as the content and idioms of its poetic thought, it eventually replaced Persian almost entirely as the language of polite conversation and poetry (Ziauddin, 2005). It was the time of last Mughal emperors where Urdu language became so popular that it become the symbol of Muslims and Islam in India. Even the last Mughal Emperor, Bahadur Shah Zafar himself become a great poet of Urdu language but by that time the East India Company has established its control over most of the Indian sub-continent and Bahadur Shah Zafar's rule was confined to Delhi only. However, after the British put down the uprising in 1857, he was captured and exiled to Burma (Myanmar) with his family (Husian, 2006).

Politics of Language in Colonial India

During the 17th and 18th centuries, however, Urdu (written in Perso-Arabic script) and Hindi (written in Devanagari script) also developed into widely used interregional languages (Nayar, 1969). The old myth that Urdu language emerged because of having different people in the war camp during Mughal period, speaking different languages, where a common language emerged known as Urdu, which means *lashkari zaban* (camp language). Still, it is widely assumed that Urdu was developed in Delhi military camps in order for soldiers from various locations to easily communicate with one another. However, this myth is only partially true; the Mughals certainly contributed to the Urdu language, but it had been developing for centuries before their arrival of the Mughals. For



instance, the Mughal era began in 1526 with Babar's victory at Panipat, so those who think Urdu only appeared during Shah Jahan's reign ignore the fact that poets like Ameer Khusrau, who died in 1325, had been producing Urdu poetry for a very long time before that (see Parekh, 2017 and Kausar et al, 2015).

Prior to the arrival of the British, Persian, as opposed to Urdu, was the official language of administration, and Muslims and even well-educated Hindus learned it. However, middle- and upper-class residents of northern India spoke Urdu at home, and since it was using the Persia-Arabic script, learning Persian in school automatically prepared one to learn Urdu. In addition, beginning with Aurangzeb's reign, a serious and organized effort was made to persuade the Mughal élite to learn the regional language and script to accommodate the regional challenges to the central élite identity (Rahman, 2000). Thus, in order to bridge the cultural gaps and accommodate regional challenges, Aurangzeb mandated that the élite of the Mughal court learn Urdu as a part of their formal Persian education.

The Mughal rulers adored poetry and frequently summoned Urdu poets to their Darbars (courts) to perform it. While performing poetry in Mughal courts, the poets express their appreciation for the Mughals in their work. The Urdu language was used to represent politeness and beauty. Urdu was used by the Mughal rulers and nobles of the time to communicate with the native Indians. It became much more popular in India, not only among Indians but also among the East India Company, which began learning Urdu and Persian to deal with Indians on daily basis for day-to-day affairs and for business purposes (see Rahman, 2000 and Minault, 1999).

However, long before the popularity of Urdu, the East India Company brought along with them a new language, the English language. The company did not implement it as official or court language at once owing to the fear that the local Indians would resist it and secondly the Company officials were divided into two groups for more than 200 years: the Orientalists and the Anglicists. The Orientalists were active in their attempts to protect the "glory past" of the Indian classical tradition. The Orientalists believed that instruction should be given in regional dialects to aid locals in better assimilating Western moral and philosophical ideas. While the Anglicists thought that English was the only language that could accurately reflect the complex ideas required to communicate Western thought (Ramamurthy, 2015 and Ghosh, 1995). However, many people within the East India Company were persuaded by Lord Macaulay's (1835) influential Minute that English was the only language that mattered. It was Lord Macaulay's rhetorical minute for Lord Bentinck. written on February 2, 1835, and with this, English officially began to take Persian's place as India's official language (Ghosh, 1995: 21). Lord Macaulay stated in his rhetorical minute:

"The empire is the imperishable empire of our arts and our morals, our literature and our laws. The question before us is simply whether, when it is



in our power to teach this language,-English-we shall teach languages in which, by universal confession, there are no books on any subjects which deserve to be compared to our own; whether, when we can teach European science, we shall teach systems which, by universal confession, where ever they differ from those of Europe, differ for the worse: where we patronize sound philosophy and true history, we shall countenance, at the public expense, medical doctrines which would disgrace any English farrier, astronomy which would move laughter in the girls at an English boarding school, history abounding with kings thirty feet high and reigns thirty thousand years long, and geography made up to seas of treacle and seas of butter” (cited in Ramamurthy, 2015:7).

It is important to note that in the 1850s, the Indians banded together to rebel against Company rule, ignoring all linguistic, religious, and ethnic divisions. When they banded together to rebel against the company's cruel and inhumane rule in 1857, the former (Indians) lost because they lacked effective organization, charismatic leadership, and modern weapons. The Indian soldiers fought bravely and gallantly with their lathes, swords, and axes, but they were no match for the Britishers, who had modern weapons like rifles, cannons, and muskets. As a result, after the War of Independence in 1857, the East India Company's rule was abolished, and India came under direct British rule. This period saw a great deal of upheaval in India, as many Indians, especially Muslims, feared that their rights and freedoms would be oppressed by the new British rulers. The British introduced many western-style schools and colleges in India to promote the English language and culture. Muslims were reluctant to send their children to get an English education, as they were concerned this would erode the values of their religion. Hindus welcomed English education and prepared for competitive examinations to secure good and high-ranking jobs.

On the question of language, the differences between the Muslims and Hindus reached to a point where the Muslim start thinking that Urdu is a language of Muslims and Islam in India while at the same time Hindus consider Hindi as the language superior to all other languages spoken in India. But in fact, both the languages have same origin and there is not much difference between the two except of written script. As is well known, both languages share a common ancestor and share many characteristics on various structural levels, as well as some indisputable differences. Regarding the historical development of Hindi and Urdu, various academics have made varying claims. According to some academics, these two languages are just two different styles of the same language. Some people draw the conclusion that Hindi emerged from Urdu, while others claim that Urdu emerged from Hindi.² Whatever the case may be, a controversy arose between Muslims

² The name of the author and date of publication of this source is not known. The title of the source is “The Hindi and Urdu Controversy: A Linguistic Assessment.” Available online from:



and Hindus in the late nineteenth century, culminating in Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, a supporter of Hindu-Muslim unity, becoming the first person to assert that Hindus and Muslims are two distinct nations.³ The Hindi-Urdu controversy emerged in 1837 when the East India Company replaced Persian as official and language of courts in various parts of India by regional languages. However, in Northern India, Urdu was picked to be used as official language with Persian script instead of Hindi in Devanagari script. The most immediate cause of controversy is thought to be North India's contradictory language policy in the 1860s. Though, the government promoted both Hindi and Urdu as school languages, it discouraged the use of Hindi or Nagari script for official purposes. As a result of this policy, students who were educated in Hindi or Urdu competed more passionately for government jobs, resulting in a more communal favor (Anonymous, n.d). It may be noted that the Hindi and Urdu controversy erupted in 1867 at Banaras when a movement was started to replace Urdu and Persian script entirely by Hindi in Devanagari script at the courts of Banaras city (Dar, 2018).

Keeping in view the above discussion, it is argued that the idea of two distinct nations gained widespread acceptance in the Indian public sphere, especially among Muslims, leading to increased religious and political tensions between Muslims and Hindus. Urdu was used by the Muslim leadership in united India as one of the causes of the demand for Pakistan. And it was this tension vis-à-vis politics, economy, language, culture, sense of deprivation, western democracy and federal vis unitary systems of governance that ultimately compel the British India to divide India into two sovereign and independent states, Pakistan, and India. However, the politics of language did not stop after partition of India but rather emerged more forcefully even in an independent Pakistan.

Politics of Language in Pakistan 1947-1970s

As mentioned in the preceding sections that language plays an important role for the rulers and the elite groups of the society. In many instances, the rulers and the elite often opted for such languages that give them more strength and high position in a society. The rulers often patronaged a particular language to be used as official and the language of education and examination for jobs. As Paulston (1992) noted, language policy is used as

https://www.academia.edu/39342451/The_Hindi_and_Urdu_Controversy_A_Linguistic_Assessment, accessed on 15/12/2022.

³ In one of his famous statements, Sir Sayyid Ahmed Khan said that "India is like a beautiful bride blessed by two attractive eyes - the Hindus and the Muslims. If they maintain enmity or hypocritical relations with each other, then this beautiful bride will look cross-eyed, and if one destroys the other, [the bride] will look one-eyed. So! Inhabitants of India, do as you will - make this bride cross-eyed or one-eyed [or preserve both her eyes]" (Cited in Dar, 2018: 12).



a tool of power, whereby dominant groups maintain control over minority groups through their control over language and state apparatus including state resources.

After the partition of India, the major languages that were in use in Pakistan were Bengali, Punjabi, Sindhi, Pashtu, Balochi, and Urdu. It may be noted that these languages (including others such as Brahui, Saraiki, Potohari, Hindko etc.) were the mother tongues of the people living in eastern and western Pakistan. The percentage of major languages that were in use after the creation of Pakistan were as follows: Bengali 56.6 %, Punjabi including Saraiki 28.4 %, Pashtu 6.6 %, Sindhi 5.3 %, and Balochi 3.04 % (Bangash, 2018: 212) while the speakers of Urdu language were only 7.5 % who mostly migrated from India (Khan, 2014). Thus, the beginning of the language politics emerged in Pakistan. According to Khan (2014) all the other regional languages were disregarded when Urdu was declared the national language of Pakistan. In fact, Urdu was the language of only 7.5% of Pakistan's total population, those who had migrated from various parts of India to Pakistan, particularly Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Bombay, Rajasthan, Delhi, and Orissa.

Earlier than the establishment of Pakistan, Muslim Bengali representatives refuted the Muslim League's stance of asserting Urdu as the national language of all Muslims in India (Rahman, 1997). Soon after the divide, Pakistan saw the emergence of language politics and ethnonationalist ideas after the speech of Muhammad Ali Jinnah regarding the national language of Pakistan in 1948 at Dacca. During his speech, though not in Urdu, Jinnah stated:

...Whether Bengali shall be the official language of this Province is a matter for the elected representatives of the people of this Province to decide. I have no doubt that this question shall be decided solely in accordance with the wishes of the inhabitants of this Province at the appropriate time...But let me make it very clear to you that the State Language of Pakistan is going to be Urdu and no other language. Anyone who tries to mislead you is really the enemy of Pakistan. Without one State language, no nation can remain tied up solidly together and function...Therefore, so far as the State Language is concerned, Pakistan's language shall be Urdu. (Zaidi, 2002, cited in Bangash, 2018: 208).

This speech of Muhammad Ali Jinnah sparked angry responses from the students, and Tajuddin Ahmad, an observer, claimed that Jinnah's remarks regarding Urdu language were hurtful to everyone in the province (Bengal). People expected that Jinnah would be above party politics. Others asserted that individuals tore down a gate, destroyed a portrait of M. Ali Jinnah, and demonstrated against the Quaid's remarks (Rahman, 1996 and Zaidi, 2002, cited in Bangash, 2018: 208). The 'vernacular proto elite' opposed the Muslim League decision itself as well as the aristocratic traditional Bengali leadership that shared power with the West Pakistani elite by using Bengali as a symbol of identity (Rahman, 1997: 181).



The argument that was dictated by the founders of Pakistan and the Muslim elite who came from those parts of India where Urdu was their lingua franca that Urdu is the language of Islam while the Bengali language is not that rich with Islamic thoughts to be called as an Islamic language. They also consider that Urdu played a major role towards Pakistan movement and the creation of Pakistan (Rahman,).⁴ However, such mesh of religious and national identity failed to take roots in Pakistan. It is because Urdu was an alien language not only for the Bengalis but for the people of West Pakistan too (Bangash, 2018:199).

Therefore, the Bengali Language Movement that started in 1948 was the first to oppose Urdu as national language. It was the Bengali Language Movement, couple with other grievances, which resulted in the disintegration of Pakistan and the emergence of Bangladesh as in independent country. Even though M. A. Jinnah announced that in Bengal the people can use any language they wish. They can use Bangla for official purpose (Bangash, 2018). Not only has this but later the Bengali language was also given the status of national language besides Urdu in the first constitution of Pakistan of 1956.

Thus, it can be argued that the Bengali language became a representation and symbol of political and cultural assertiveness even after the dismemberment of Pakistan. It is also argued that it was not only the ruling elite and the vanguards of the Pakistani state, but the ethno-regional and ethno-linguistic nationalist also played an important role in politicizing the language issue for their personal and regional gains after the creation of Bangladesh. For instance, as pointed out by Rahman (1996), the leadership of smaller provinces of Pakistan have all exploited their different languages (Sindhi, Balochi, Pashtu, and Saraiki) as ethnic identity markers to gain influence and achieve greater share of power and resources within the state. They considered Urdu language as a tool of dominance over the lesser ethnic groups and their languages. Urdu became known in Pakistan as the language of the ruling élite. Furthermore, the politics of language also played a role in the rise of regional or ethnic nationalist movements. The language problem first developed in Sindh in 1970s when Sindhis' hostility to Urdu became violent. The then prime Minister of Pakistan, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto through Sindh Language Act imposed Sindhi as an official language Alon with Urdu in the province of Sindh (2019: 4-3). Nonetheless, the Urdu-Sindhi clashes of January 1970 and July 1972 were a reaction by Urdu supporters to what they saw as an attempt to destabilize them and make Sindhis dominant. Other ethno-nationalist leaders disagreed with the Center's uniting principles and objected to the use of Urdu as a symbol (Rahman, 1997: 178).

In later years, the language issue is used and still using by the ethno-nationalists of Balochistan and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The central government was pressurized by Saraiki

⁴ For the argument that Urdu is an Islamic language of the people of South Asia see Rahman, Tariq's paper "Urdu as an Islamic Language,



language movement and 1981, it was separated from Punjabi and recognized a separate language. Since then, there is a movement of Saraikistan, and the people of upper Punjab is demanding a province based on their linguistic identity (Faiz, 2022). Similarly, after changing the name of former North-West Frontier Province (NWFP) under the 18th constitutional amendment as Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, the Hazara division also made an argument based on their language (Hindko language) to separate Hazara division from Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and named it as Hazara Province. In this name game the Pakistan Muslim League – Nawaz (PML-N) played an important role, and it gave favor to the Hazarwals (residents of Hazara division) because it has bank vote in this division.

Likewise, the province of Balochistan is home to multilingual and multicultural people. They have lived side by side for centuries. There is no direct clash on political issues. However, the Pakhtun occasionally allege that the Baloch treat them unfairly. Pakhtuns in Balochistan do not like the name of the province. The majority of Pakhtuns in the province believe that the name Balochistan does not accurately reflect their own cultural identity and historical background.

In short, it is argued that in the long term, Pakistan must fight the challenges of ethnic nationalism. According to Baloch (2010) the founding father of Pakistan, Mohammad Ali Jinnah once stated that if we start thinking of ourselves as Bengalis, Punjabis, Sindhis, Pashtuns, Baloch, and so on first, and Muslims and Pakistanis secondarily, Pakistan will undoubtedly fall apart. The founder of the nation was/is hardly known for his prophetic statements, but there is much truth to his assertion.

Conclusion

While going through the literature of language politics or politics of language in India, it is observed that that every powerful dynastic ruler(s) prefers to expand their own language(s) instead of the languages of their subjects. It is because, as we can see it around the globe, language is an effective tool of power and control not only in totalitarian dynasties but also in the modern-day democracies. Persian was declared a language of the Mughal court by Babur (1519–1530) and Akbar (1556–1605). The Mughals did not replace other languages but considered Persian to be the official or court language. During Ghaznavi's reign, Northern India produced numerous poets and prose authors in Punjab. Persian was chosen as the official language of India during the reign of Jalal ud Din Muhammad Akbar (1556–1606). Persian was still spoken in North India after Muslim rule ended. The East India Company failed to establish English as the language of instruction and governmental institutions because company officials were divided into two groups for more than 200 years. The British aimed to bring modern western education to India because they thought it would help their economy. The Orientalists believed that instruction should be given in regional dialects to aid locals in better assimilating Western moral and philosophical ideas. English was declared the language of all kinds of competitive exams in India.



The old myth is that Urdu emerged because different people speaking different languages lived in the war camps during the Mughal period. The Mughals certainly contributed to the Urdu language, but it had been developing for centuries before their arrival. In addition, beginning with Aurangzeb's reign, Mughal élite were taught Urdu as part of their formal Persian education. Before Urdu, the East India Company brought along with them a new language, the English language. The company officials were divided into two groups for more than 200 years: the Orientalists and the Anglicists. The Orientalists believed that instruction should be given in regional dialects to aid locals in better assimilating Western moral and philosophical ideas. In 1837, the East India Company replaced Persian as the official language and language of courts in various parts of India with regional languages. Hindus welcomed English education and prepared for competitive examinations to secure high-ranking jobs. Muslims began thinking that Urdu was the language of Muslims and Islam in India. The idea of two distinct nations gained widespread acceptance in the Indian public sphere, especially among Muslims, leading to increased religious and political tensions between Muslims and Hindus. It was this tension vis-à-vis politics, economy, language, culture, sense of deprivation, and federalism that ultimately compelled the British to divide India into two.

Here it may be noted that after the creation of Pakistan then in the year 1948 Urdu was chosen as Pakistan's official language only because of the Muhajirs, who were originally from north India, who controlled state institutions and spoke it. It reflected the Muhajirs' broader sense of superiority, which was deeply resented by other ethnolinguistic communities. This resentment fueled a sense of injustice and exclusion for many Pakistanis who felt their own cultures and languages were being ignored in favor of Urdu. It was the language movement of the Bengalis who that make it possible for them to get separated their province from the dominance of Punjabi-Muhajir political dominance.

References

- Alam, M. (1998). The pursuit of Persian: Language in Mughal politics. *Modern Asian Studies*, 32(2), 317-349. Available online from: [jstor.org/stable/313001](https://www.jstor.org/stable/313001), re-accessed on 07/05/2023.
- Ali, M. A. (1975). The passing of empire: the Mughal case. *Modern Asian Studies*, 9(3), 385-396. Available online from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/311728>, re-accessed 07/05/2023.
- Ali, M. A. (n.d). The Mughal Empire and its successors. Available online from: chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgiclfefindmkaj/https://en.unesco.org/silkroad/site/default/files/knowledge-bank-article/vol_V%20silk%20road_the%20mughal%20empire%20and%20its%20successors.pdf, accessed on 3/12/2022.



- Anonymous (n.d). The Hindi and Urdu Controversy: A Linguistic Assessment. Available online from:
https://www.academia.edu/39342451/The_Hindi_and_Urdu_Controversy_A_Linguistic_Assessment, accessed on 15/12/2022.
- Baloch, B. (2010). What's in a name? in the South Asian Channel, April 2. Available online from: <https://foreignpolicy.com/2010/04/26/whats-in-a-name-2/>, accessed on 21/12/2022.
- Bangash, Y. K. (2018). Language, Identity and the State in Pakistan, 1947-48. *Journal of Political Studies*, 25(1). Available online from:
http://pu.edu.pk/images/journal/pols/pdf-files/14_25_1_18.pdf, accessed on 05/05/2023.
- Banoo, Tota. (2017). Influence of Persian in India. *International Journal of Creative Research Thoughts*, Vol. 5, issue no. 1, 707-708. Available online from:
<https://ijcrt.org/papers/IJCRT1133405.pdf>, accessed on 01/05/2023.
- Dar, F. A. (2018). Sayyid Ahmad Khan and Hindu-Muslim Question in India. *Journal of the Research Society of Pakistan*, 55(2). Available online from:
http://pu.edu.pk/images/journal/history/PDF-FILES/1-2_55_2_18.pdf, re-accessed on 07/05/2023.
- Evans, S. (2002). Macaulay's minute revisited: Colonial language policy in nineteenth-century India. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 23(4), 260-281. Available online from:
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01434630208666469?journalCode=rmmm20>, re-accessed on 07/05/2023.
- Faiz, Asma. (2022). Language, Nation and State in federal Pakistan. Forum of Federation, Ottawa, Canda, Available online from:
<https://forumfed.org/document/language-nation-and-state-in-federal-pakistan/>, re-accessed on 07/06/2023.
- Ghosh, S. C. (1995). Bentinck, Macaulay and the introduction of English education in India. *History of Education*, 24(1), 17-24. Available online from:
[doi:10.1080/0046760950240102](https://doi.org/10.1080/0046760950240102), accessed on 14/12/2022.
- Grierson, G. A. (Ed.). (1921). Linguistic survey of India (Vol. 10). Office of the superintendent of government printing, India. Available online from:
https://books.google.com.pk/books?hl=en&lr=&id=bz1BAQAAMAAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR21&ots=72c2eB1G1P&sig=yc1iGBKCuDBgX0_TdIUCTm_ZqTE&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false, accessed on 03/12/2022.
-



Kachru, B. B., Kachru, Y., & Sridhar, S. N. (Eds.). (2008). *Language in South Asia*. Cambridge University Press.

Kausar, R., Sarwar, M., & Shabbir, M. (2015). The History of the Urdu Language Together with Its Origin and Geographic Distribution. *International Journal of Innovation and Research in Educational Sciences*, 2, 5-9. Available online from: https://www.ijires.org/administrator/components/com_jresearch/files/publications/IJIRES-154_final.pdf, re-accessed on 01/05/2023.

Khan, G. (2014). *Politics of nationalism, federalism, and separatism: The case of Balochistan in Pakistan* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Westminster).

Minault, G. (1999). Delhi College and Urdu. Available online from: https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Delhi+College+and+Urdu&btnG=, accessed on 16/12/2022.

Nayar, B. R. (1969). *National communication and language policy in India* (Vol. 3). New York: FA Praeger.

Parekh, Rauf. (2017). Urdu's origin: it's not a 'camp language'. In Daily Dawn, December 17. Available online from: <https://www.dawn.com/news/681263/urdus-origin-its-not-a-camp-language>, accessed on 12/12/2022.

Paulston, C. B. (1992). Planning language, planning inequality: language policy in the community. W. Tollefson James. London: Longman, 1991. Pp. xi+ 234. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 14(2), 221-223.

Rahman, T. (1997). The Urdu—English Controversy in Pakistan. *Modern Asian Studies*, 31(1), 177-207. Available online from: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/312861>, re-accessed on 03/05/2023.

Rahman, T. (2000). The Teaching of Urdu in British India. Available online from: https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=the+teaching+of+urdu+in+british+india&btnG=, accessed on 15/12/2022.

Rajagopalan, K. (2001). The politics of language and the concept of linguistic identity. *CAUCE, Revista de Filología y su Didáctica*, 24, 17-28. Available online from: https://idus.us.es/bitstream/handle/11441/21938/file_1.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, re-accessed on 02/05/2023.

Ramamurthy, K. (2015). *Teacher professional development for English language education in India*. Rutgers The State University of New Jersey-New Brunswick.



Journal of Law and Social Sciences

University of Turbat

Ziauddin, M. (2007). Role Of Persians at The Mughal Court: A Historical Study, During 1526 A.d. To 1707 A.d.