Chapter Three: Rejecting Reform?: Gandhi, Gujarat Vidyapith and the Question of English Studies

Chapter Two discussed how the university reforms of 1904 that grew out of Lord Curzon's policy received an unfavourable response in the native society. While one reason for this was the increased centralisation and government control over institutions, another reason identified by Sanjay Seth was that the reforms diminished "Indian access to western education" (160). He identifies two strands of criticism of the existing system of western education that prevailed in the twentieth century: its inability to deliver the 'modernisation' it promised, and the disjunction it effected between the learner and his/her culture (Seth 161-2). This discontent impelled the establishment of institutions for national education—education that represented its socio-cultural roots, and that empowered the (people of the) nation, from the late nineteenth century onwards.

Further, the last two chapter discussed how institutionalisation played a central role in governing the effects of English education and disseminating a reformist perception. This chapter engages with the trajectory of an institution—the Gujarat Vidyapith, specifically the Gujarat Mahavidyalaya, that proposed to offer an alternative to the bulwarks of the pedagogic project of western modernity—governmental education, English, and the 'modernity' of the west, originating in direct political defiance of British rule. It explores whether standing outside these positions, constitutes a rejection of reform. It focuses on the first phase of the Gujarat Vidyapith that is roughly from its inception in 1920 to 1929-30, when the higher education institution—Gujarat Mahavidyalaya—functioned largely in an uninterrupted manner. This period overlaps with the demand for an independent university in Baroda. Thus, the discussion compares the nature of these two institutions attempting to challenge colonial control over education. It locates this discussion in the deployment of the terminology of reform in the vocabulary of colonial policy towards India.

The Persistence of Reform

From the beginning of the twentieth century to the third decade of the twentieth century, the term 'reform' was employed in the political vocabulary of the colonial government to identify two significant policy changes—the Morley-Minto reforms of 1909 (officially, the Indian Councils Act) and the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms of 1918 (which formed the basis of the Government of India Act 1919).

The use of the term ‘reform’ to identify these changes could be considered to be merely a conventional linguistic usage to designate any changes brought about by the colonial government to improve the existing system. This may be argued on two counts:

(a) Firstly, that by the end of the second, and beginning of the third decade of the twentieth century, India was entering its high nationalist phase, with the movement for swaraj or self-rule gaining momentum. Thus, the position of collusion with the colonial masters that the age of reform represented was only a faint memory by then.

(b) Secondly, that the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms appears to constitute a significant departure from the Morley-Minto reforms in terms of the radical changes that were introduced by them.

However, a closer scrutiny reveals that this was not so.

The Morley-Minto reforms followed close on the heels of the split between the moderate and extremist factions of the Congress party at the Surat session in 1907. They were undertaken “to act as a bulwark against the rising tide of extremism that was threatening the stability of the British raj” (Khan 10). The Montagu-Chelmsford reforms were the consequence of a long brewing demand for clear definition of the policy of Britain towards India. However, it was galvanized by India’s participation in the First World War in support of the British which significantly shifted British opinion in favour of India and its position in the empire by mid-1917. Ramsay MacDonald averred that Indians must be perceived “as partners in the Empire governing themselves more and more with what assistance from us is necessary, and becoming more and more responsible for working out their own destiny” (qtd. in Khan 32). However, there was a long delay between the generation of a pro-India attitude and the formalisation of the desired reforms. During this gap, the “moderates” began to lose patience, and “extremists” like Annie Besant and Bal Gangadhar Tilak initiated the Home Rule movement. The correspondence between Chelmsford and the India Office “[f]rom December 1916 up to 20 August 1917” (Khan 51) expressed that the “growing popularity of the extremist faction and of the Home Rulers was causing anxiety in Government circles” (Khan 50). Thus, both the set of reforms were responses to the threat of revolt, when viewed within the paradigm of the conceptual binary of reform and revolt.

The Morley-Minto reforms represented the grounding of the imperial position towards political reform in India within the conceptual paradigm of reform, that is to say, as politically conservatist and sceptical of transfer of radical decision-making power to the natives. The Montagu-Chelmsford reforms, on the other hand, were considered radical for promoting decentralisation, even by those sections of the conservatives in the home

government: “even Pentland, who favoured the retention of the Morley-Minto reforms as the basis of Indian advance, favoured provincial decentralization” (Danzig 58-59). However, Richard Danzig argues that although there was agreement between diverse, and often opposing, quarters on the question of decentralisation, none of these sections had the same motivations or expectations with respect to this proposed change (58). Fundamentally, while for the colonial government decentralisation was a form of administrative reform, for the nationalist leaders of India, it was anticipated as a form of political reform. In other words, following the experience of many colonial officials and the devastating defeat in Mesopotamia during the war that was attributed to “the overcentralized system of military command in India”, which projected the reforms in terms of “administrative devolution in India” (Danzig 62). However, for the Indians, decentralization was expected “to wrest administration from the administrators” leading to the demand for provincial autonomy which was “common to all three of the major reform schemes proposed by the Indians themselves: Gokhale's memorandum, submitted two days before his death, the Memorandum of the nineteen members of Chelmsford's legislative council, and the Congress-League Scheme” (Danzig 63).

As a result, the home government in London and the nationalists expected the reforms to safeguard the Provincial Governments against the control of the Government of India, while the Government of India expected the reforms to lead to the power heretofore held by the Secretary of State and the Parliament to the Government of India (Danzig 66-67). Montagu sided with the Government of India on this question as a strategy to secure its support in favour of decentralisation which would inevitably lead to “popularization” (Danzig 68). Curzon provided a third point-of-view by rallying for the proposed reforms in order to make some concessions to the nationalist leaders. That is, the reforms would appear a victory for the Home Rule movement in the short term, at the same time “assuring ‘for any future that can reasonably be predicted’ a continued British presence and dominance *at the Centre* in the Indian sub-continent” (Danzig 70). Danzig observes that Indian nationalists failed to take into account two factors while supporting the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms:

(a) They failed to question “why people often hostile to Indian aspirations were pushing forward the bandwagon of provincial decentralization” and thus failed to anticipate the policy of “divide and rule” between states that it brought in its wake (Danzig 64).
(b) They failed to reason that “[r]eforms can be regressive as well as progressive” and “are designed to strengthen the government defensively by making some concessions to its critics” (Danzig 64-5).

This demonstrates two things: one, that co-operation and collusion (even if not consciously) with the colonial masters by a section of the 'nationalists' continued even with the growing momentum of the movement for political independence; and two, that the implementation of the reform scheme was destined for a problematic dispute.

Thirdly, in practice, both sets of reforms were shaped primarily as pedagogic projects. "[T]he appointment of Indians to the executive councils of Whitehall and Simla" was considered to be "the most revolutionary measure" proposed by the Morley-Minto reforms (Khan 8). However, it was defended for its "*didactic* value for *training Indians* "in habits of political *responsibility*"" (Khan 10; emphasis added).

Thus, position of the coloniser as a benevolent 'master' persisted in the enunciative act of reform. Danzig observes a similar strain drawn from "English liberal political philosophy that can be traced back at least as far as Burke" in the objectives of the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms, which was the perception of "local self-government and provincial government as *arenas for training responsible Indian politicians*" (65; emphasis added).

When Edwin Montagu was appointed Secretary of State for India in 1917, he insisted on the insertion of the term 'self-government' in the reform scheme to meet the long-standing expectations of Indians (Khan 57); "[h]owever, in the final draft of the announcement prepared by Curzon, and made public on 20 August 1917 the Cabinet preferred to use the word "*responsible government*" instead of "self-government"" (Khan 58; emphasis added). Thus, representative government refracted to become responsible government in the context of the colony. The question of responsible to whom, and what, was spelt out in the fine print, so to say. According to Farzana Khan, "the principle of responsibility" was introduced through "the system of dyarchy or double government" (65). Under this system, the administration of the provinces was divided into ""reserved" subjects…administered by the Governor in Council, responsible…to the Secretary of State and Parliament" and "transferred" subjects, also popularly known as the "nation-building" subjects…administered by the ministers" (Khan 65). In case of the latter subjects which apparently represented a genuine transfer of power to the local ministers, the Governor reserved the right to veto bills as well as forbid introduction of bills considered a threat to the safety of one or the other province (Khan 66). Further, it was "clearly indicated that the declared goal of responsible government would be achieved by *successive stages*. The British Government, along with the Government of India, and not the Indians, were to be the judges of the time and extent of each advance, being guided in their judgements by the co-operation received from those upon whom new opportunities of service would thus be *conferred* and by *the extent to which it was*

found that confidence could be reposed in the Indian sense of responsibility" (Khan 66-67; emphasis added). The echoes of Aurobindo's view of English reform as a 'glacial' phenomenon, as well as the 'test' that Arthur's knights had to undergo to prove themselves worthy of the quest of the Grail are not far.

The Question of Language and the Struggle for Power

Finally, what the gap between the promised and the offered indicates in the case of both sets of reforms is an anxiety over language. The first instance of this anxiety is found in Curzon's replacement of 'self-government' with 'responsible government'. Basing his argument on the vast diversity of race, religion, and "state of development" across various parts of India, he argues that the idea of Indian as a self-governing domain "in the *present phase of Indian evolution*, is the wildest of dreams" (qtd. in Danzig 69). He avers that even if India were to attain self-government, it could not apply to the entire territory as "it is idle to suppose that the same measure can be conceded to hill tribes in a primitive state of civilization, or to turbulent frontier clans, as it might be to *advanced and educated communities*" (qtd. in Danzig 69; emphasis added).

Thus, Curzon not only makes a case for 'evolution' as a precondition for self-government but makes 'education' and 'progress' the parameters against which the stage attained in such evolution would be adjudged. Elsewhere, "Curzon expressed astonishment and dismay", "when the Montagu-Chelmsford scheme, devised in accordance with the formula drawn up by Curzon himself, was seen to amount to the introduction of parliamentary government" (Khan 59). The root of his dismay was echoed in the words of Balfour—the only member of the Coalition Cabinet that debated the question of the reform scheme in India on 29 June 1917 and 5 July 1917, to disagree on "self-government within the Empire" as a "desirable" goal (Khan 55). Balfour's concern was linguistic, "because he feared that in the mouths of Englishmen the word self-government had acquired a definite but technical meaning—a parliamentary system of government on a democratic basis"; thus "[t]o graft such a system upon the ancient and unchanging social system of the East in his opinion, would be to produce a hybrid which would not only be worthless but probably dangerous" (Khan 55-6).

Curzon effectively reflected the perception held by Minto roughly two decades earlier that, owing to its "racial, communal and linguistic divisions", India "lacked the essentials of nationhood" (Khan 5). Morley seconded him in not wishing for "a "grand revolution" in his period of responsibility" (Khan 5), but only changes that were "to be towards improvement" and "not to be effected by adapting English political institutions to the nations which

inhabited India" (Khan 6). The change of term for Curzon, thus, was a "safer" option (Khan 58), as the alternative term "would, if accepted, involve a complete and irrevocable change in the political and administrative relations of England and India" (Khan 59). One finds a similar difference in opinion in interpretation of decentralisation and what type of institutional reform it would entail. Further, with respect to decentralisation, it is equally noteworthy how institutional reform refracts into two categories—political and administrative—in the context of the empire.

Curzon's anxiety over language reveals a sensitivity to language in the context of empire. When language enunciates a policy, interpretation becomes a site where the struggle for power and the authoritative version becomes pertinent, for it has material consequences for the empire.

While some struggles are conscious, others tend to be subterranean. Curzon's rejection of 'self-government' marks his struggle to resist the radicalism that the administrative changes were likely to admit. However, I argue that it was the evident similarities in the spirit, motivations, and objectives of the two set of reforms in spite of the significantly different political circumstances within which they were formed, reveals the subterranean function of language.

I further argue that this similarity is brought about by the location of the identification of both the proposed changes by the term 'reform'—which set discursive limits on the ideological-political direction that the policy would take.

Nationalist Resistance and Higher Education in the Gandhian Scheme

John Gallagher observes that between 1919 and 1922, the British empire reached from its "apogee" to a series of crises primarily represented in India, Egypt, and Ireland (364-5). He attributes it to the precarious balance of pressures and counter-pressures created by the parallel escalation against the British regime in these regions. However, he equally attributes it to the leaders of the resistance movements in these regions, such as "Zaghlul and Gandhi, Sun Yat Sen and Reza Shah" (J. Gallagher 368).

Two questions that emerge in this context are: firstly, if Mohanlal Karamchand Gandhi (1869-1948) posed a significant challenge to the stability of the British rule, how did he negotiate reform—the structuring principle of its policy towards India; and secondly, how did this impinge upon the question of English studies and colonial education.

National education was a critical part of Gandhi's non-cooperation movement initiated around 1919-1920: "People should have control over the education

system…education of the people lies in this very control. Only if control is in their hands, people will have greater faith in education of their children, and become responsible towards it. And when education will have this position in the society, swaraj will fall in our laps as soon as we ask for it" (Gandhiji, *Khari Kelavni* 62). One of the mottos of the non-governmental education institution established by Gandhi—Gujarat Vidyapith—was "*Sā vidyā yā vimuktayé*" meaning "Knowledge is that which grants freedom" (Kothari, *Gujarat Vidyapith* 1).

Early Views on Education

Yagnik and Sheth trace the origin of "Gandhi's experiments with education and pedagogy" to the shifting of his two children to South Africa in 1897, coincident with a "primacy…accorded to the mother tongue" which, in his case, was Gujarati (161).

In *Hind Swaraj* (1909), the tract he wrote on his way from London to South Africa, Gandhi argues that Indians seem to run with the idea of the need to educate under the crushing influence of the West, however, they fail to critically think about the same (*Khari Kelavni* 17). Clearly, Gandhi's use of the term 'education', here, is a reference to modern colonial education.

It is significant that the discussion on education in the eponymous chapter in *Hind Swaraj* begins with a reference to education initiatives undertaken by Maharaja Sayajirao Gaekwad III (136). It not only underlines the impact and wide reputation of Sayajirao's education policies in contemporary British India, but also endorses an analysis that views the contribution(s) of Sayajirao Gaekwad III and Gandhi as counterpoints in non-British interventions in native education.

Underlying Gandhi's critical stance towards colonial education is his equation of education with literacy (*Hind Swaraj* 137). He believed that the ordinary men and women of the country, such as peasants, did not need literacy to lead fulfilling lives and conduct their day-to-day activities with ease (*Hind Swaraj* 137-8). Speaking of "higher education", Gandhi enumerates how various sciences such as "Geography, Astronomy, Algebra, Geometry, etc." do not "enable us to do our duty" (*Hind Swaraj* 138-9). He draws on "Professor Huxley"[78] to bolster his views on "true education" which, in Huxley's words, must ensure the management of passions by "a tender *conscience*" (*Hind Swaraj* 138-9). Development of a strong moral conscience repeatedly emerges as the central goal of a 'true education' for Gandhi.

[78] Thomas Henry Huxley (1825-1895), English biologist and anthropologist.

Thus, the persistence of moral reform as the goal of education marks a continuity between late nineteenth century discourse on education/reform and Gandhi's views on education. However, where the crucial disjunction occurs is Gandhi's rejection of Western/modern culture as the repository of the desired morality.[79] Rather, he finds the former to be counterproductive in generating the latter.

There is a certain slippage in signification with regard to Gandhi's ideas on education. When he speaks of higher education, the implied reference is to the system of education established in India by the British. However, when he exhorts that this education need not be made compulsory and—referring to this education as "English education"—when the "Reader" asks Gandhi whether he finds it unnecessary for "obtaining Home Rule", Gandhi, through the figure of the "Editor" presents his views not on the system of colonial education but on education through the medium of the English language: "To give millions a knowledge of English is to enslave them" (*Hind Swaraj* 141). Listing the ill-effects of dependence on the English language, however, he refers to the moral corruption of those trained in the colonial system of education (*Hind Swaraj* 143). Yet, he identifies this group as the "English-knowing Indians" (*Hind Swaraj* 143). Thus, for Gandhi, language is the chief instrument of colonial ideology and the negative aspects of Western culture that it both instantiates and promotes. He, thus, seems to take issue not with the content of education but its medium, believing the latter to be the vehicle of Western ideas and ideology.

He concedes the need to receive some amount of English education but ascribes this persisting requirement to being "beset by the disease of civilization" (Gandhi, *Hind Swaraj* 144). Thus, one can observe a constant slippage and a persistent ambivalence in the referent of Gandhi's views on education. Colonial education is denounced for propagating a flawed idea of education as literacy and/or knowledge that is incompatible with practical life, and the remedy for this is identified as the adoption of Indian languages and/or the mother tongue. Thus, the fault is relocated from the ideas or tendencies disseminated through the education to the medium of education. A certain overlap is found in the use of the English language (by Indians, primarily) and moral corruption. Thus, moral corruption is traced to Western civilization that is responsible for creating a need for English education, as noted in the beginning of this paragraph. Yet, in this constant deference of the referent, what remains unanswered is the link between the introduction to Western civilisation, and the perceived need generated for English education. In other words, the ambivalence is generated by

[79] See Gandhi's recommendation: "Those who have studied English will have to teach morality to their progeny through their mother-tongue" (*Hind Swaraj* 144).

Gandhi's inability to address why or how the contact with a civilisation turned into a 'disease'.

I argue that this missing or silent link is/was reform. As noted in Chapters One and Two, by impinging upon not only material practices but structuring fundamental perceptions of valid/invalid change and legitimising a range of differentials over the course of the nineteenth century, reform functioned as a central discourse legitimising colonial modernity. Its trajectory depicts how it played a key role in building a perception that structured a necessity/desire for English and the West. However, Gandhi's refusal to address or name this link is indicative of a further development which shall be taken up at the end of this chapter, after considering further evidence.

Gandhi and Language

The previous section discussed Gandhi's tendency to collapse Western education into the Western/English language and observed that Gandhi viewed language as the chief carrier of ideas. Conversely, Gandhi's views on Indian languages aid in bolstering this observation. He identifies originality of ideas, primarily, with the use of the mother-tongue as a medium of thought and thereby expression.[80] In the presidential address delivered at the second Gujarat Educational Conference in 1917, he remarks that his only qualification was his unconditional love for the Gujarati language (Gandhiji, *Khari Kelavni* 19).

Translation as an Enabling Mechanism

A crucial component of Gandhi's conception of language was the idea of its rootedness in culture, and the acknowledgment of conceptual asymmetry between languages, especially between Western and Eastern languages. This insight is drawn from Gandhi's approach to translations. The 1904 translation of John Ruskin's *Unto this Last* into Gujarati titled *Sarvodaya* represented both Gandhi's "first major translation" as well as his insistence on grounding the ideas from English within the "Indian cultural idiom" leading to neologism (Yagnik and Sheth 162). His search for "Gujarati equivalents" of significant terms of the political struggle such as "Passive Resistance; Passive Resister; Cartoon; Civil Disobedience" through a competition announced in the *Indian Opinion* in 1907 reveal the distinction he drew between denotation and connotation in the process of translation (qtd. in Yagnik and Sheth 162), as well as his sensitivity to the transition in "connotations of words as the concept or idea moved from one language to another" (Yagnik and Sheth 163). This sensitivity

[80] It must be noted that he does not saturate the idea of originality with the mother-tongue usage. He states that fifty years of education via the mother-tongue could have produced several Roys and Boses in India, thereby implying that certain exceptions like Roy and Bose existed to the idea that only mother-tongue use and/or education could produce originality in thinking (Gandhi, *Khari Kelavni* 27).

extended to the etymology of words used in the target language as Gandhi clarified his equal openness to words "derived from Sanskrit or Urdu" (qtd. in Yagnik and Sheth 162).
It remains to be determined whether Gandhi's acute sensitivity to language arose from his insights into the use of language as a tool of political symbolism (whether in terms of his insistence on the mother tongue, which conversely symbolised rejection of the 'foreign' tongue; or in terms of his striving to find a "suitable Hindi or Urdu word" to describe his programme of non-cooperation to an audience in North India in 1919, or vexation regarding naming the community living project in Phoenix through "a common word over which the question of Hindu or Mussalman will not arise" (qtd. in Yagnik and Sheth 163) or arose from an epistemic awareness of the cognitive impact of language.

Initial reading suggests that Gandhi, in fact, employed language as one of his chief political tools, ascribing a primacy to it from amongst other symbols of cultural/communitarian representation. The repertoire of culture extends to symbols such as dress, accessories, to architecture, rituals, or even practices of food and drink. Gandhi does not seem to find his choice of dress or the physical structure or practices of his *ashrama* saturated with his religious-cultural identity. However, when it comes to language, he displays a constant concern with the etymological connotations of a term deriving from religion, and thus seems to single out/ saturate language with political symbolism/representation. An example is his recommendation in *Hind Swaraj* in the chapter dedicated to education that every "'cultured Indian'" should know a classical language besides his/her own language (qtd. in Isaka 108). However, he forms an identity between the speakers' religious-cultural background and the classical language he/she should learn; accordingly, a Hindu should know Sanskrit, "'…a Mahomedan, Arabic; …a Parsee, Persian; and all, Hindi'" (qtd. in Isaka 108).

Isaka also leans towards a reading of Gandhi's ideas on language and literature within the context of the political movement he initiated. She notes that the satyagraha—the chief political tool employed by Gandhi—allowed the Gujaratis to yoke their regional identity with the national, at a time as the region became active in politics on "an unprecedented scale" (Isaka 105).

Translation became an important tool for Gandhi in the process of regional and national consolidation. Javed Majeed argues that Gandhi viewed "…translation as a mode'" illustrated in his comparison of using Gita as a reference for conduct, with his use of the English dictionary (qtd. in Isaka 106). For Gandhi, it was a mode which allowed the flow of ideas and communication across different linguistic communities through both an interlingual

and intralingual process, as for a non-native speaker, the intralingual process of referring to a dictionary would also involve interlingual translation (Isaka 106). These two processes could be employed in successfully building a common (national) language for communication which would involve the use of simplified "form and vocabulary" for easy access, understanding and use across communities (Isaka 107). Thus, on one hand, he believed that the "borders" and "identity" of language could not be defined rigidly, but on the other, he wished to alter language as per the exigencies of communication needs (Isaka 106).

Isaka finds Gandhi's changing attitude towards Gujarati paradoxical. When encouraging the use of Gujarati language over English by the people of Gujarat, he underlines the richness and variety of the Gujarati language in the contributions made to it by illustrious poets and writers as well as its use by speakers from Hindu, Muslim, and Parsi communities (Isaka 107). Yet, the appreciation of the variety of usage in Gujarati did not stop Gandhi from advocating standardisation of the language. However, the paradox that Isaka notes finds a straightforward resolution when Gandhi's views on Gujarati (and/or Hindi) are contextualised within his use of language as a crucial political tool. In the speech delivered to a gathering in Bombay for Gandhi's reception in India in 1915, we find his use of Gujarati alongside his choice of clothing and diet as a distinct tool to relocate politics outside the purview of elite English-speaking intellectuals and generating accessibility for the common men and women of the country (Isaka 109). In light of these observations, the awareness of the political potential of language decidedly dominates a cognitive epistemic awareness about language in the context of Gandhi's heightened sensitiveness towards language use in communication and in translation.

Translation as Semantic Selection

Apposite to the act of translation is the act of editing. Translation is, in many ways, an act of selecting one meaning or set of meanings out of the cluster of connotations attached to any term, while eliminating others. Thus, when he chose to translate "civil disobedience" as "*savinay kanoon bhang*", "'civil' was rendered not in the sense of 'civic' or 'citizen' but in the sense of 'respectful' or 'compassionate' and inclusive of the idea of non-violence" (Yagnik and Sheth 162). While Yagnik and Sheth view this as rendition of "new concepts" by Gandhi which represented "his synthesis of ideas from East and West", I view it as, additionally, an exercise in editing, in curating what connotation or interpretation of a/the Western concept he intended his native-language audience to grasp, rather than allowing a Western idea to remain open to multiple interpretation(s).

Regionalism, Nationalism, and Language

Isaka argues that the context of Gandhi's political movements with Gujarat as their base facilitated "the Gujarati elite to overlap their identity with Indian nationalism" and that Gandhi's "ideas on language and literature" were based in this context (105). However, the growing divergence in Gandhi's ideas on Gujarati and Hindi (which he later termed Hindustani) reveal that the cohesion between the region and the nation that he was able to forge in the arena of politics could not be replicated in the domain of language. Rather, Gandhi's ideas in the latter domain were marked by inconsistencies. I argue that this divergence can be explained by the thesis that language and education, for Gandhi, were primarily political tools. Thereby his ideas on the same were subservient to the political purpose he intended them to serve. Thus, as the political role or function of native language(s) differed when viewed in terms of the region versus the nation, fissures in his views on Gujarati as opposed to Hindi/Hindustani emerged. Often, Gandhi's political ends also contrasted with his personal aspirations he called on Gujarati to fulfil.

It is significant that Gandhi's so-described experiments that anticipated the structure and characteristics of his political movement in India were incubated in a foreign country—South Africa. Much has been written about how the community in South Africa came from different states and regions of India, possessed different 'mother-tongues', and belonged to different religions as well as class backgrounds, followed by Gandhi's contribution in consolidating their identity as one.[81] Yagnik and Sheth view this as "backed by conviction developed from his personal spiritual search" (160). Yet, at the same time, the identity of this population in the foreign land was differentiated from other inhabitants by the larger rubrics of race and nationality, attested to by the description of the 1902 legislation against which Gandhi conducted his first satyagraha as "anti-Asiatic" (Yagnik and Sheth 164). For the South African authorities, legislation was aimed at Indians as a racial and national group, and not aimed at communities defined by class, caste, region, or religion, which must be examined as a crucial factor contributing to the assumption/consolidation of a collective identity. The development of Gandhi's insistence on use of the mother tongue after his children arrive in South Africa becomes a fact not unrelated to this argument. Thus, it was a national identity formed negatively out of its difference from other nationalities and races. On the other hand, in India, it was the European who was the 'outsider', caste, class, religious, and regional identities continued to jostle for precedence within the larger rubric of nationality in the self-perception of various native communities.

[81] See Yagnik and Sheth 160.

Gandhi and National Education

Education had been a concern of the institution-building processes of Gandhi in Gujarat right from the beginning.[82] However, the establishment of the Gujarat Vidyapith and Gujarat Mahavidyalaya followed Gandhi's "call for non-cooperation" (Yagnik and Sheth 174). Gandhi identified several flaws in the colonial system of education including the divisions of educated-uneducated (in English) that it generated, the psychological distance from the traditions of the East it generated, the burden of an alien language, the utilitarian approach to education it generated, and the absence of subjects of practical utility. In brief, it had two major drawbacks—an inability to account for the needs of majority of the population, and the erosion of all aspects that could contribute to a strong sense of native identity built on its own roots and traditions. Thus, offering an alternative to such education was crucial for the success of his political programme.

Gujarat Vidyapith

Vitthaldas Maganlal Kothari traces the origin of Gujarat Vidyapith to the fourth Gujarat Political Conference convened at Ahmedabad in August 1920.[83] With regard to national education, the Conference resolved the need to found Gujarat Vidyapith to establish and coordinate/correlate various educational institutions begun with a view to fulfil the central purpose of national education (Kothari, *Kelavni vade Kranti* 5). This purpose, as resolved by the Conference, was to address the need to establish national education institutions independent of the government, designed to train students into becoming self-dependent *Hindis*[84] possessing national pride and a good/high moral character to remedy the education policy introduced by the British government which had proven contrary to the culture and circumstances of our country, as well as was impractical (Kothari, *Kelavni vade Kranti* 4-5).

Kothari also identifies three phases of national education institutions in India from 1835 to 1920 and locates Gujarat Vidyapith in the third phase that began from 1920 with the commencement of the era of non-cooperation (*Kelavni vade Kranti* 3-4). He distinguishes it from the previous phases by stating that the objective of national education institutions in this phase was obtaining independence and self-rule, besides continuing the reform initiatives led by previous institutions (Kothari, *Kelavni vade Kranti* 4). To sum up, he considers the question of self-rule or *swaraj* and independence (from state control) as inextricably linked to

[82] See Yagnik and Sheth 173.
[83] *Gujarat Rajkiya Parishad*.
[84] This term may be translated as 'Indians' in the context of the sentence. However, I have transliterated the original to retain the collation of national identity with a linguistic identity in the given discourse.

the question of education facing Gujarat wherein the seed of Gujarat Vidyapith lie (Kothari, *Kelavni vade Kranti* 6).

A National Education Committee was formed to design an action plan based on the resolutions at the Conference. The committee identified an initial fourfold plan: to mobilise the managers of schools, teachers, and parents to cease co-operation in (government) education, to consolidate funds from the wealthy to aid establishment of the Vidyapith, to formulate a plan for the establishment of a *mahavidyalaya* (college), and formulate the constitution of the Vidyapith (Kothari, *Kelavni vade Kranti* 6-7). The committee formed the constitution following which the Gujarat Vidyapith was established on 18 October 1920, with Mahatma Gandhi as the chancellor and Asudamal Tekchand Gidwani as the vice-chancellor (Kothari, *Kelavni vade Kranti* 7). This temporary constitution was further updated to make a permanent one on 15 October 1922 which remained in force till 29 January 1928 (Kothari, *Kelavni vade Kranti* 7-8).

The four major contributions of the Vidyapith project identified by Yagnik and Sheth include primacy given to the Gujarati language, "compilation of the first authoritative Gujarati dictionary with standardized spellings in 1929", centre for research in archaeological-historical knowledge, and contribution to Gandhi's socio-political movements (174-5). They aver that "[t[he institutions and the movements had a symbiotic relationship: the ashram and Vidyapith, along with their residents and students, became the base and organizational structure through which the movements were conducted…" (Yagnik and Sheth 175-6).

Further, Yagnik and Sheth observe that Gandhi's increasing participation in and leadership of varied ongoing "[s]ocial, political and cultural" initiatives in Gujarat signified "not only that did Gandhi begin to dominate public organizations but that he began to integrate political and social reform activities which were, till then, separate and unconnected" (170, 172). Thus, one can observe how the process of institutionalization and the domain of education continued to serve as the loci for reform as well as synthesis of different domains of reform.

Post the Salt Satyagraha, Gandhi moved outside Gujarat to Wardha: "[w]ith this, the locus of the movement shifted outside Gujarat. The repression of the British intensified; they closed down the Satyagraha Ashram in 1933. The Vidyapith was closed down around the same time and its students dispersed. Even before its final closure, student numbers were steadily falling" (Yagnik and Sheth 190).

Kothari divides the changes in the first twenty-five years of the Vidyapith into six phases:

(a) 1920-27 October, fluctuation in the strength of the school and high-school owing to the waxing and waning of the non-cooperation movement, representative organizing committee, and special attention to the study of culture.
(b) 1928-30 March, establishment of permanent Vidyapith committee, equal importance to intellectual and vocational education, and special emphasis on rural education.
(c) 1930-34 ongoing educational work suspended owing to the freedom movement, and Vidyapith under government control from 1932 to '34.
(d) 1935-42 August, recommencement of work, high-school, and chief activity of publication.
(e) 1942-45 ongoing educational work suspended owing to the freedom movement.
(f) Activity post 1945. (*Kelavni vade Kranti* 11)

Kothari's chronology allows the identification of the most productive phase (from the point of view of educational activities) at the Gujarat Mahavidyalaya before it was interrupted by the movements outside the classroom.

Gujarat Mahavidyalaya

Kothari considers establishment of the Gujarat Mahavidyalaya to be the first important task undertaken during the first historical phase of the Gujarat Vidyapith (*Kelavni vade Kranti* 13). This institution was unique and the first of its kind in the region of Gujarat, and also within India,[85] as it emerged directly out of the call for non-cooperation. During the movement, there were several primary and middle schools that had entirely embraced non-cooperation; thereby, students studying at the primary or secondary level of education who boycotted government institutions had the alternative of such national schools (Kothari, *Kelavni vade Kranti* 38). However, no such alternative was available for tertiary or higher education. As a result, "the first task of the Vidyapith was the establishment of the Mahavidyalaya at the hands of Mahatma Gandhiji on 15-11-1920 at a rented house across the river in Ahmedabad" (Kothari, *Kelavni vade Kranti* 38).

[85] See Seth 166.

On the first day, 59 students were admitted to the Mahavidyalaya, besides professors, who had left their colleges and institutions mid-session (Kothari, *Kelavni vade Kranti* 13, 38). In the inaugural lecture, Gandhi argued that what set the Mahavidyalaya apart from other well-established colleges of the region was not its infrastructure but the national spirit animating it (Kothari, *Kelavni vade Kranti* 38-39).

In the period under study in this chapter, the Vidyalaya had three principals:

1. Mr. Asudamal Tekchand Gidwani 15-11-1920 to 15-11-1922
2. Mr. Jivatram Bhagwandas Kripalani 16-11-1922 to 6-2-1928
3. Mr. Dattatrey Balkrishna Kalelkar 10-2-1928 to 12-3-1930
   (Kothari, *Kelavni vade Kranti* 136)

Seth observes that in the diverse and parallel versions and experiments in national education undertaken in India in the second decade of the twentieth century, "there was one element held in common: whatever else made this education national, it had to be in the "vernaculars," that is, in the languages of India" (178).

Gujarati—the vernacular of the region of Gujarat was, thus, central and fundamental to Gandhi's scheme of national education. Education through mother-tongue was the first fundamental shift effected in all the institutions under the Gujarat Vidyapith right from its inception. As noted in the last chapter, the change in the policy concerning modern knowledge through English altered the content and scope of classical languages, and almost entirely eclipsed the study of the vernacular in formal education institutions, in the late nineteenth century.[86] Thus, the renewed and sharp emphasis on the vernacular was bound to have implications on the nature and scope of studies of English and in English.

In many ways, Gandhi's search for an authentic national political-cultural identity (dep)ended on language. He repeatedly connects "the use of the mother-tongue" with an ability to be "original" (qtd. in Isaka 111). However, it is debatable whether the native languages so transformed and shaped into their 'modern' versions by following the structures and processes of the European, specifically, English, language(s) could be a source of originality or authenticity purged of all English influence any longer. In that sense, his awareness of the linguistic shifts caused by the colonial contact seems only skin-deep.

Across various writings and speeches, Gandhi focuses on two chief goals of national education, in his view:

[86] See Seth 170-6, for an elaboration of this argument.

(a) National education should build the character and strength of the student. Here, strength is defined in both moral and physical terms. In an excerpt from a letter to M. H. Desai published in *Navjivan* in 1921, Gandhi writes: "Our education has two major flaws. The framers of the scheme of education have disregarded education of the body and the soul" (Gandhiji, *Kelavnino Koydo* 33). He reasons that it would take lesser number of years to study a given set of subjects in the mother-tongue rather than English, as learning English is an additional mental burden on the students (Gandhiji, *Khari Kelavni* 26). For him, this burden makes "our graduates mostly lacklustre, weak, unenthusiastic, diseased, and simply unoriginal. Qualities like the ability to research, ability to think, courage, patience, bravery, fearlessness, etc., deteriorate" (Gandhiji, *Khari Kelavni* 27).

(b) National education should not alienate the student from his society and his surroundings, which is the root of lack of originality in Indian students. In an article published in *Navjivan* in 1928, he writes: "to retain the sense of *prajātva*[87] in the youth of any populace, they must receive their lower or higher education through their own language…until then, they cannot form a live connection with the people, nor can they retain such a connection…a foreign language and its idioms…in learning which they have to disregard their mother-tongue and its literature, in developing a command over which thousands of students lose valuable years of their life…" (Gandhiji, *Khari Kelavni* 137).

Conversely, the function of the mother-tongue, for Gandhi, was to keep the student connected to the values of his/her society and culture. Thus, language and cultural-moral values were inextricably linked. Besides, Gandhi's criticism of the west in Hind Swaraj--hind swaraj—thoughts on modernity, hinges on the values represented by the western civilisation, not simply the language that bore them. Thus, Gandhi's critique was that of modernity itself.

Evidently, simply changing the medium without changing the content of study would not lead to the radical results Gandhi desired from education. Under the Principles listed in the constitution of the Gujarat Vidyapith, point number four relating to examinations states that there should be no changes made in the curriculum solely to make it examination-oriented (Kothari, *Kelavni vade Kranti* 118). Initially, for three to four months, to allow the students who had boycotted government institutions mid-session to appear for examinations, the curriculum taught at the Mahavidyalaya was as per that offered in the government

[87] Refers to the sense of belonging to a populace.

institutions (Kothari, *Kelavni vade Kranti* 40). However, later the curriculum was reshaped as per the objectives and principles of the Vidyapith, notably to also include commitment to khadi and spinning (Kothari, *Kelavni vade Kranti* 40).

The year 1924-5 is significant in the history of the Mahavidyalaya as post 1925 it witnesses a sharp fall, followed by steady decline in the student numbers in the institution. While the number of students is 225 in 1922-23which declines marginally to 205 in 1923-24 and 182 in 1924-5, it sharply drops to 102 in 1925-26 followed by 47 in 1926-27 (Kothari, *Kelavni vade Kranti* 168). Thus, it also represents the transitional moment in the popularity of the Mahavidyalaya.

In the subsequent section, I shall analyse the modified curriculum of the Gujarat Mahavidyalaya introduced in the prospectus of 1924-5.[88] I study whether the content of the curriculum reflected the radical political role that Gandhi attributed to education in the movement for non-cooperation and later, freedom, and the implications it had for the dovetailing of reform and English studies in higher education.

As observed earlier, the domains of English, the classical, and the vernacular languages were inextricably linked to each other so that expansion of the scope and dominance of one had implications for others, since the days of the Orientalist-Anglicist-Vernacularist debate[89] which framed the initial policy of English education in India. Thus, I take up the curricula of both English and Gujarati for consideration in the ensuing discussion.

The English Curriculum

In the language examinations in the Previous Examination (*prathamā parikshā*) for B.A. at the Mahavidyalaya, two papers in the mother-tongue (Gujarati for Gujarat Mahavidyalaya), one paper in the national language (Hindi or Urdu, though this is only a difference of script for Gandhi), and one paper in a modern language (Bengali, Marathi, English, or French), were prescribed (Kothari, *Gujarat Vidyapith* 98). Classical languages like Sanskrit, Arabic, and Farsi, were subsumed under optional subject (Kothari, *Gujarat Vidyapith* 98). For the graduate examination, specialisation in languages was undertaken under the "*Vagvidya Mandir*" or "*Bhasha Mandir*" (Kothari, *Gujarat Vidyapith* 101).

Table 1 presents a comparison of the curricular texts for English of the Gujarat Mahavidyalaya with the curriculum of the Bombay University.

Table 1

[88] A note under the prescribed subjects for Gujarati in the *Vagvidya Mandir* refers to the "changes" to be enforced from the summer examinations of 1925 (Kothari, *Gujarat Vidyapith* 107).

[89] See Seth, and Dash, *English Education and the Question of Indian Nationalism*, for a detailed discussion on this point.

Comparison of English Curriculum of the Gujarat Mahavidyalaya and the Bombay University

English – Recommended Reading/ Prescribed Textbooks		
	Curriculum of the Gujarat Mahavidyalaya 1924 *(English is one of several options under modern languages)*	**Curriculum of the Bombay University 1924** *(English is a compulsory subject for First and Intermediate examinations, and has compulsory and voluntary components for the B.A. Examination)*
Previous Examination	1. Readings in English Prose (published by Vidyapith) 2. Poetical Selections (published by Vidyapith) 3. Rime of the Ancient Mariner—Coleridge (Kothari, *Gujarat Vidyapith* 124)	*The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*—Coleridge [Prescribed for Intermediate Examination, 1924 and B.A. Examination 1925] (*Bombay University Calendar* (1924-5) 785, 787).
Graduate Examination (Kothari, *Gujarat Vidyapith* 137-8)	English Essays: Lobban	English Essays by J. H. Lobban [Prescribed for B.A. Examination, 1924] (*Bombay University Calendar* (1924-5) 786).
	Speeches on Taxation and Representation; and on Conciliation with America: Burke	Burke.—Selections. (Oxford, Clarendon Press.) [Prescribed for Intermediate Examination, 1925] (*Bombay University Calendar* (1924-5) 785).
	Spanish Military Nun: De Quincey The English Mail Coach: De Quincey	De Quincey.—Confessions of an Opium Eater [Prescribed for B.A. Examination, 1924] (*Bombay University Calendar* (1924-5) 785)

	Heroes and Hero Worship: Carlyle	Carlyle.—Heroes, Hero Worship and the Heroic in History. [Prescribed for B.A. Examination, 1924] (*Bombay University Calendar* (1924-5) 785).
	Essays in Criticism-2nd Series: M. Arnold	Matthew Arnold.—Selections by G. C. Macaulay. [Prescribed for B.A. Examination, 1926] (*Bombay University Calendar* (1924-5) 787).
	Kenilworth: Scott	Scott—Kenilworth. [Prescribed for B.A. Examination, 1925] (*Bombay University Calendar* (1924-5) 787).
	A Modern Utopia: H.G. Wells	Wells.—Love and Mr. Lewisham [Prescribed for B.A. Examination, 1926] (*Bombay University Calendar* (1924-5) 788)
	Unto this Last: Ruskin	Selections from Ruskin, by H. Hampshire (G. Bell & Sons) [Prescribed for Intermediate Examination, 1924] (*Bombay University Calendar* (1924-5) 785).
	Golden Treasury complete with additional Poems	Shelley.—Selections (Golden Treasury Series) [Prescribed for B.A. Examination, 1924] (*Bombay University Calendar* (1924-5) 786). PALGRAVE's Golden Treasury (First Series), Book IV [Prescribed for the B.A. First Examination 1881, 1882; and Intermediate Examination for voluntary subject curriculum for 1905] (*Bombay University Calendar* (1880-81): 16, (1903-4): 577)

	Absalom and Achitophel—Part I: Dryden	Dryden.—Absalom and Achitophel, Part I. [Prescribed for B.A. Examination, 1924, 1925] (*Bombay University Calendar* (1924-5) 786, 787).
	In Memoriam: Tennyson	Tennyson—Selections, omitting I, Miscellaneous. (The King's Treasuries Series, published by J. M. Dent.) [Prescribed for Intermediate Examination, 1925] (*Bombay University Calendar* (1924-5) 785).
	Pippa Passes: Browning	Browning —The King and the — Introduction, Pompilia and the Pope. [Prescribed for M.A. Examination, 1924] (*Bombay University Calendar* (1924-5) 788)
	Othello: Shakespeare	Shakespeare.—Othello. [Prescribed for B.A. Examination, 1926] (*Bombay University Calendar* (1924-5) 785)
	Julius Caesar: Shakespeare	Shakespeare.—Julius Caesar . [Prescribed for B.A. Examination, 1924] (*Bombay University Calendar* (1924-5) 785).
	Merchant of Venice: Shakespeare	*Merchant of Venice* – Shakespeare [Prescribed for Intermediate Examination, 1924] (*Bombay University Calendar* (1924-5) 785).
	The Rivals: Sheridan	Sheridan.—The School for Scandal. [Prescribed for B.A. Examination, 1924] (*Bombay University Calendar* (1924-5) 786).

	Curriculum of the Gujarat Mahavidyalaya 1924	**Previous Curricula of the Bombay University[90]**
	Last Days of Pompeii: Lytton	-
	Child Harold—Canot IV *[sic]*: Byron	Byron – Childe Harold, Cantos III and IV [Prescribed for the Intermediate Examination for voluntary subject curriculum for 1905] (*Bombay University Calendar* (1903-4) 577)
	The Ordeal of Richard Feverel: George Meredith	-
	Pride and Prejudice: Jane Austen	Austen—Pride and Prejudice [Prescribed for the Previous Examination 1886, 1889, 1908] (*Bombay University Calendar* (1886-7): 15, (1903-4): 576)
	Pickwick Papers: Dickens	-
	Paradise Lost—Book I: Milton	Milton – Paradise Lost [different books prescribed for the Previous and B.A. First Examinations 1881, 1882, 1888, 1889] (*Bombay University Calendar* (1880-81): 16, (1886-7): 16).
	Every Man in his Humour: Ben Jonson	-
	Doctor Faustus: Marlowe	-

[90] The texts listed under this column do not represent an exhaustive list of all the instances across years when a particular text or author was prescribed. It is merely intended to be a representative list to illustrate the frequency of prescription of a certain text/author, thus constituting what could be viewed as a canon.

	The Doctor's Dilemma: G. Bernard Shaw	-
	The Post Office: Tagore	-
	Essays on Goldsmith and Johnson: Macaulay	MACAULAY—Lives of Johnson and Goldsmith [Both or one prescribed for the Previous Examinations 1907, 1909] (*Bombay University Calendar* (1903-4) 576)
	An Introduction to the study of English Literature: Pancoast	-
	The Making of English: H Bradley	-
	(Kothari, *Gujarat Vidyapith* 137-8)	-

The table serves to demonstrate how even the modified curriculum for English of the Gujarat Mahavidyalaya did not diverge significantly from the colonial curriculum of governmental institutions. This could not be traced to the need to make the curriculum amenable to students appearing for examinations, as it was against the 'principle' of the institution stated earlier – that curriculum should not be modified based on the need of examinations. Besides, and more significantly, several prescribed texts are different from the syllabus of the University of Bombay. However, even these are drawn from texts previously prescribed in government universities—texts that had nearly developed a canonical status in the colonial curriculum. Besides these, other texts prescribed are either exactly the same or belonging to the same author as prescribed in the government curriculum.

Gauri Viswanathan has observed that towards late nineteenth century, literary study developed a "historical orientation" which was designed to constitute "literature as an expression of culture and society" (127, 135). She particularly points out the ideological homology between wealth of the colony and knowledge of the metropole, as if both were

objects that could be unproblematically transplanted from one end to another: "[t]he material classification of knowledge as property, which is alternatively possessed, appropriated, received, distributed, and redistributed further strengthens the justificatory claims of commercial expansion" (Viswanathan 140).

Literary education was a key element of discussion and debates over colonial education not only for its ability to straddle often opposing claims of "reason and faith, utility and tradition, and empiricism and revelation" (Viswanathan 108), but also for its potential to shape attitudes and generate ideas. Viswanathan observes how one of the utilitarians—Henry Sumner Maine—raised concerns over the literary curriculum because "he saw as potentially insurrectionary…[t]he fact that educated Indians were reading Goethe in translation" causing "infinitely greater concern in British administrative circles than their reading the works of political liberals like Locke or Hume" (157). Chapter Two has explored this aspect in detail through the example of *Idylls of the King* as a text for literary study in the colony.

Viswanathan views curriculum as "a vehicle of acquiring and exercising power" (167), and specifically, British curriculum in nineteenth-century India as "designed to transmute even the faintest traces of mobilized, unified sentiment against British rule into internal schisms" (168). While she does not argue that the impact of this effort on native society was perfectly as intended by the coloniser, it is definitely questionable why or how an institution designed to purportedly reject the yoke of British civilizational-political dominance, should allow the study of the texts/discourse that were conscious and direct vehicles of "stratified conferring of cultural power on a dominated society" (Viswanathan 168).

Alok K. Mukherjee finds a similarity between the position of revivalists of nineteenth-century India who supported English education because "English, for all of them, held the key to a future that, in fact, was a return to the past—at least in a cultural sense" and Gandhi (171). For Alok K. Mukherjee, "[i]t was this revivalist dream that Gandhi was to articulate years later in his vision of free India as 'Ram Rajya'" (171).

Alok K. Mukherjee also focuses on the intended audience that the specific design of the English curriculum for higher education indicated. He takes his example from the "early course of higher English education" which, however, "sowed the seeds of what later became the undergraduate liberal arts programme" (189). He observes that "these were not curricula meant for children of the lower orders of Indian society…and the lesser sections of urban society, for the content of both—the 'useful' subjects as well as the literary subjects—was likely to be of little or no relevance to their daily need or reality" (A. Mukherjee 189). This

casts even a more problematic light on the inflexibility of the Mahavidyalaya curriculum whose central aim was to increase the accessibility of education, as well as remedy the alienation that government education effected amongst its beneficiaries.

Alok K. Mukherjee refers to the texts of the curriculum as producers of hegemony (190). The position of two authors in particular—Milton and Shakespeare—remained unquestioned in the curriculum of English in India across almost three quarters of a century, and they also appear in the Mahavidyalaya curriculum. Alok K. Mukherjee traces their emerging dominance in the curriculum to the 1840s and the central intent to "concentrate focus on works that were distinctly Anglo-Saxon and Protestant" (192), and "deemed to exemplify the imperial idea of England" (191). Added to the list of "authors who exemplified reason, Protestantism and the idea of imperial Britain" are "Francis Bacon,…Joseph Addison, Alexander Pope, Samuel Johnson and Oliver Goldsmith" (Mukherjee 195). Further, with respect to Milton, he notes, "it was not the masterly prose polemicist of *Areopagitica* that was taught at this time, but the Protestant poet of *Paradise Lost*…" (A. Mukherjee 196).

The persistence of these authors and texts in the Mahavidyalaya's curriculum seems to suggest that, far from rejecting or challenging, the makers of this curriculum had rather embraced the idea couched in the early histories of English literature (by Frederick Schlegel and Henry Hallam), which through their "concepts of universality and their valorization of European culture…suggested that all texts, regardless of their material origin, could be subjected to a common interpretive practice" (A. Mukherjee 201). Santosh Dash has, further, argued that this perspective was drawn from Matthew Arnold's dominant views on poetry and criticism which defined "literature away from "practical consideration"", adding that "by strategically aligning it with the ancient Indian virtue of detachment, Arnold establishes the authority of the English literary text in the moral realm" allowing appreciation of ""the best that is known and thought in the world" while remaining completely detached from "a sordid history of colonialist expropriation and exploitation"" (*English Education* 32-3). Gandhi can be seen promoting a qualified version of this idea in his comments on the place of English literature:

> Nobody is talking about giving up English literature. We would have translated that literature into different languages. We would have followed the approach that is prevalent in countries like Japan, South Africa, etc. In Japan, there are many who are taught excellent German and excellent French in this manner. Their task is to find precious gems in these different languages and bring them to Japan via the Japanese language. It is not that Germany has nothing to gain from the English language, but

> that does not mean that all the Germans learn English. Only a handful of Germans, having learnt English, bring in new ideas to the German language and serve their mother tongue. We should also do the same. (Gandhiji, *Khari Kelavni* 60)

What Gandhi attempts is a separation of language from its literature; of the medium from the values that it promotes. English literature, for him, is a guileless receptacle of noble ideas much as the Anglicists and their apologists would have liked the native mind to believe in the foundational moment of colonial education policies. In Gandhi's approach to English literature, the English book successfully masks its position as a metonym of empire, to bring Gauri Viswanathan and Homi K. Bhabha's metaphors together.

In other words, Gandhi's idea of language seems to be marked by a metaphysics of presence or a belief in the transparency of language. In Gandhi, Bhabha's idea of empire as discourse seems quite literal and fatal. For him, it is the receptacle that decides the nature of the content, and thus, change in language can rid the content of its ideological function and the sense of lack and alienation it produced in the native society.

Thus, the Gujarat Mahavidyalaya did not make any significant impact on the value, position, or content of English literature.

The Gujarati Curriculum

This outlook emerges more strongly when one considers the Mahavidyalaya's curriculum for the mother-tongue—Gujarati. Education through the mother-tongue was the most fundamental and radical transformation in higher education in Gandhi's view. Therefore, in the first year of functioning, while the Mahavidyalaya continued the curriculum of government institutions for a few months, there was no gradual transition in introduction of Gujarati as the medium of instruction which was implemented right at the inception—described as the first "*sudharo*" in the existing system of education (Kothari, *Kelavni vade Kranti* 40). Table 2 presents a comparison of the curricular texts for English of the Gujarat Mahavidyalaya with the curriculum of the Bombay University.

Table 2

Comparison of Gujarati Curriculum of the Gujarat Mahavidyalaya and the Bombay University

	Curriculum of the Gujarat Vidyapith **1924** *(Gujarati is offered as a*	**Curriculum of the Bombay University** **1924** *(Gujarati is offered as an Optional*

	Compulsory and Optional Subject)	*Subject)*
Title of the Text		
Naval Granthavali by Navalram Laxmiram Pandya	Selections Part 2 prescribed for Previous Examination, and Graduate Examination for voluntary subject curriculum for 1924 (Kothari, *Gujarat Vidyapith* 121, 134)	Parts I and II prescribed for M.A. Examination for 1925 and 1927 (*Bombay University Calendar* (1924-5) 828)
Sarasvatichandra by Govardhanram Madhavaram Tripathi	Different parts prescribed for Graduate Examination, for the compulsory subject curriculum from 1922 to 1929, and the voluntary subject curriculum for 1924 (Kothari, *Gujarat Vidyapith* 124-5, 135)	Vol. IV. prescribed for M.A. Examination for 1924 (*Bombay University Calendar* (1924-5) 828)
Kādambari (Purva Bhāg) by Bhālan	Prescribed for Graduate Examinations for the compulsory subject curriculum from 1924 to 1928, and voluntary subject curriculum for 1924 (Kothari, *Gujarat Vidyapith* 125, 133)	Prescribed for B.A. Pass Examination, 1924; and M.A. Examination for 1926 and 1927 (*Bombay University Calendar* (1924-5) 829)
Raino Parvat by Ramanbhai Nilkanth	Prescribed for Graduate Examination for the voluntary subject curriculum for 1924 (Kothari, *Gujarat Vidyapith* 134)	Prescribed for School-Leaving Examination, 1924; and B.A. Pass Examination for 1926 and 1927 (*Bombay University Calendar*

		(1924-5) 827, 828)
Kavita ane Sahitya by Ramanbhai Nilkanth	Prescribed for Graduate Examination for the voluntary subject curriculum for 1924 (Kothari, *Gujarat Vidyapith* 134)	Prescribed for M.A. Examination for 1924 (*Bombay University Calendar* (1924-5) 828).
Milestones in Gujarati Literature by K.M. Jhaveri	Prescribed for Graduate Examination for the compulsory subject curriculum for all years, and the voluntary subject curriculum for 1924 (Kothari, *Gujarat Vidyapith* 125, 135)	Different chapters prescribed for B.A. Pass Examination for 1924 and 1925; and the entire book for M.A. Examination for 1924 (*Bombay University Calendar* (1924-5) 827, 828).
Sāthinuṅ Sāhitya by D.P. Derasari	Prescribed for Graduate Examination for the voluntary subject curriculum for 1924] (Kothari, *Gujarat Vidyapith* 135)	Prescribed for M.A. Examination for 1924 (*Bombay University Calendar* (1924-5) 828).
Brihad Vyākaraṇ by Kamlashankar P. Trivedi	Prescribed for Graduate Examination for the voluntary subject curriculum for 1924 (Kothari, *Gujarat Vidyapith* 134)	Prescribed for B.A. Pass Examination for 1924, 1926, 1927; and M.A. Examination for 1924 (*Bombay University Calendar* (1924-5) 827, 828).
Gujarati Language and Literature: Being the Wilson Philological Lectures Delivered by N.B. Divatia	Prescribed for Graduate Examination for the voluntary subject curriculum for 1924 (Kothari, *Gujarat Vidyapith* 134)	Prescribed for M.A. Examination for 1924 and 1926] (*Bombay University Calendar* (1924-5) 828)

For Dash, Navalram was one "of the three stalwarts of the Reforms [*sic*] movement in Gujarat" besides Dalpatram and Narmad ("Dalpatram's Laxminatak" 313). He was an intellectual who wrote a pro-reform essay in response to Narmad's scathing criticism of *sudharo* in his essay cited in Chapter Two. For Navalram, the radical impact of reform on native society included infusing "a spirit of rationalism", and ideas such as freedom, equality, industry, and material progress (Dash, "Dalpatram's Laxminatak" 312). However, he considers English education endemic for this impact and the "changes in all aspects of…life including politics and religion" that were to be wrought in its wake (Dash, "Dalpatram's Laxminatak" 312). He considers "this spirit of English education…as the life force of *Sudhara*…which he sees being active in the conditions of his contemporary society" (Dash, "Dalpatram's Laxminatak" 312). Navalram viewed the Gujarati language as straddling the legacies of both English and Sanskrit—the two languages that shaped the 'modern' vernaculars—in his appreciation of Narmad: "while other Gujarati writers "wrote pompous Sanskritised Gujarati, Narmad's prose is as native as it is simple, as mature as it is native. It earned the affection equally of the scholars of English and the scholars of Sanskrit"" (Kothari and Shah 139).

Sarasvatichandra was written in four parts over fifteen years from 1885 to 1901, thereby capturing the transitions in the late nineteenth century (Suhrud 181). Govardhanram's purpose in writing this novel was to educate the people of the country and help them throught the unprecedented transitions at the social and political level (Suhrud 182-183). Further, while the initial purpose of the novel was to "blend…the actual and the ideal", the ideal became predominant in the latter parts of the novel (Suhrud 184). Thus, Govardhanram seems to share a conceptual inclination similar to *Anandmath*, which considered the spiritual as the appropriate domain of revival and resistance, over the material, as discussed in Chapter Two. This view finds support in Manoj Soni's reading of the novel. According to Soni, "the intelligible material universe" of Govardhanram Tripathi was

> dominated by *Adhibhautik* element…concomitant in *Vichardhara* of that time which was largely *Atmalaksi*…the spiritual orientation was predominantly toward the Self-the *Atma*, rather than toward the Other, the *Samaja*. Govardhanram's concern for a better society was of course there, but the route to that goal was perceived to be passing through the Self-emancipation, and not through socio-political-technological dynamics. (322)

According to Govardhanram, "what he and his contemporaries were witnessing was a fusion of three civilisations – the modern West, the modern East and the resurgent traditions of ancient Indian civilisation" (Suhrud 184). Further, this transition was "*inevitable*" and the role of "the *educated* Indians…was one of *mediation* between these civilisational forces and the masses" (Suhrud 184; emphasis added). Viewing the political subjugation of India in providential terms, the difference between the East and the West in civilisational terms, and identifying the 'educated' as mediators in the process of 'translation' between 'higher' forces and 'lower' masses distinctly captures the structure of colonial education designed to justify and rationalise the violence of colonisation in the perception of Govardhanram.

It may be argued that Govardhanram's idea of inevitability arose out of surrender to a historical fact that could not be undone, rather than a conviction in the providential sanction to the civilising mission of the West. This defense weakens when evaluated against the nature of educated Indians who are to mediate the process of civilisational assimilation. Govardhanram intended his novel to act like a microcosm of the contemporary society and two of his protagonists represent the class of educated Indians—Vidyachatur and Sarasvatichandra. "Vidyachatur was educated in Bombay and was appointed as a teacher in an English school" and Sarasvatichandra "was a scholar and shining star amongst the intellectuals of Bombay" (Suhrud 186-7). The political position that Govardhanram advocates for this class was "not an offensive, nor a confrontation" but one based on "[t]he colonial concept of a 'constitutional' interaction and the need to cultivate elasticity [which] introduces an element of *caution*, of *pragmatic moderation*" (Suhrud 197-8; emphasis added). In other words, the very colonial and English education of these intellectuals and the persistence of a reformist political position continue to inform each other.

Rakesh Desai has credited Narsinhrao Divetia[91] (1859-1937) with building a British romantic sensibility into Gujarati poetry through his translations and transcreations. Pertinently, Desai associates Divetia's literary intervention with "the fourth part of F.T. Palgrave's Golden Treasury (1861), with the poems of the British romantic poets like Wordsworth, Keats, Shelley and Byron, [which] was frequently prescribed as a textbook in schools and colleges of Gujarat" (270). Dash puts Divetia's reformist political position quite plainly when he notes that "Narsinhrao, like many other writers of his generation, tried to bracket the literary-aesthetic away from the political in precisely the way the Congress sought

[91] Also appears in the alternate spelling 'Divatia'.

in its early years to bracket the social away from the political" ("Dalpatram's Laxminatak" 120).

Divetia describes his lectures on Gujarati language and literature as "an attempt…to deal with the position of the Indian Vernaculars Gujarâti in particular in the light of the general principles of comparative philology, showing how these principles have governed the evolution of these vernaculars, and how their individual growth was guided by special laws" (Divatia VI). Scholars like Siraj Ahmed have "mounted a spirit attack on philology—or comparative/historical philology, more specifically—as the root and rationale not only of modern colonialism since the eighteenth century but of much other malaises of the contemporary world" which also represents "colonial framework" in "knowledge production" (Bhattacharya 580). Baidik Bhattacharya argues that the "contours" of "philological governance" were "redrawn and its remits reassigned" in the nineteenth century to ensure "the continuity of the colony" (581). One of the representative example of such philological work is Grierson's *Linguistic Survey of India* (1894-1928). Following a detailed study of this survey, Javed Majeed concludes that it "absorbed two currents of his time—the international career of "Aryanism"" (Bhattacharya 599) which, alongside the "connection between race and philology…had acquired an international prominence" (Bhattacharya 597), and "the local developments in nationalist politics that often embraced language and religion as their defining selves" (Bhattacharya 599). I believe it is equally important to acknowledge the influence of European/English (mono)linguistic nationalism on native ideas of national-regional identity.

Just as Divetia was conscious of the western philological tradition in evaluating and historicising Gujarati, Riho Isaka argues that Govardhanram Tripathi (1855-1907) demonstrates consciousness of western literature alongside other "late-nineteenth-century scholars [who] were conscious of Western literature in examining their own literary tradition" (97). Isaka speaks here, specifically, of Tripathi's lecture 'The Classical Poets of Gujarat and Their Influence on Society and Morals' delivered in 1892 at the Wilson College Literary Society, Bombay, where he presented the work of medieval Gujarati poets "in such a way as to prove their literary value by comparing them with well-known works in the West" (98). She also observes how Tripathi attempted a recasting of medieval figures like Mira or Narsinh Mehta in the figures of nineteenth century social reformers, as well as the attempt to accord them a linguistically homogenous identity (Isaka 95-97). The latter tendency fed into the propensity of nineteenth century intelligentsia to attempt to define regions as socio-linguistic zones as partially observed in Grierson's survey.

In this context, it is important to note that this lecture by Govardhanram Tripathi, alongside P D Gune's *Comparative Philology* (1918) was part of the texts prescribed in 1924 for the Graduate Examination of the Gujarat Vidyapith (Kothari, *Gujarat Vidyapith* 134-5).

The only exceptions to the government curriculum for English are the prescription of one text by George Bernard Shaw and one by Rabindranath Tagore. On the other hand, in the Gujarati curriculum, the exception lies in the attempt to keep the students abreast with contemporary political developments. Under the *Saral Abhyāskram*, that is, the alternative simplified curriculum for those students who did not wish to compete for the first class or second class in the Graduate examination (Kothari, *Gujarat Vidyapith* 96), one of the recommended texts is the articles of the *Navjivan* periodical (Kothari, *Gujarat Vidyapith* 122).

Gandhi recommends in an article published in October 1916 that "a few people in Japan, learn English of a high standard, and make the ideas worth adopting from European reform available to their people by putting them in the Japanese language…those who enjoy good physical health and whose mental energies have not deteriorated, can convey the ideas beneficial to people available in languages like English through the medium of the Gujarati language" (Gandhiji *Kelavni no Koydo* 6). Gandhi's thoughts on reform, translation, and the 'development' of Gujarati language sound very close to the thinking around modernisation of Gujarati in the late nineteenth century intelligentsia.

Thus, while the choice to use Gujarati as a medium of instruction for higher education was radical, the curriculum prescribed was unable to fundamentally challenge the colonial epistemological hegemony. At one point, Gandhi avers that the difference between the Mahavidyalaya and government colleges would not be what is taught but the way in which it is taught. However, it is not only the texts prescribed that resemble the government curriculum, but also the theoretical and historical frameworks of Gujarati language and literature. Thus, the idea of Gujarati language and literature remained entrenched in late-nineteenth century revivalist-nationalist ideas which were in turn entrenched in European epistemological frameworks.

Thus, while Gandhi attempted to remedy the influence of European culture by rejecting the English language, its alternative Gujarati language itself had been significantly restructured and Gujarati literature reimagined through conceptual frames and epistemological assumptions received via English education. The Gujarati canon continued to

be dominated by the work and perception of the elite *sakshars*[92] and *pandits* of the second half of the nineteenth century. Hence, the larger question remained whether this Gujarati was capable of inducing the 'originality' that Gandhi sought in the native culture, when the language itself was transformed in the colonial encounter.

The grounding in colonial epistemology is further visible on considering the second most significant move with respect to the Gujarati language and the Gujarat Vidyapith—publication of the *Jodanikosh* in April 1929 and standardisation of Gujarati spelling.

Chapter One noted how reform was viewed as a modality to generate standardisation since the early phase of British political rule in western India. It is pertinent to note the echoes of this objective in the idea and contours of spelling reform.

Jodanikosh and Spelling Reform in Gujarati

Kothari states that formal efforts for compilation of the *Jodanikosh* were initiated after Gandhi's release from Yerwada jail in 1924 (*Kelavni vade Kranti* 68-9). The rules of spelling were decided based on "*shāstriya shūddhi* [prescriptions in the shastras]" and "*rūḍhi* [convention]" (Kothari, *Kelavni vade Kranti* 69). Professors of the Satyagraha Ashram and a committee appointed by the Gujarat Sahitya Parishad did the initial work of identifying principles of spelling, which was later continued by an independent department dedicated to compiling the *Jodanikosh* that brought out the first edition (Kothari, *Kelavni vade Kranti* 69).

The early indications of Gandhi's efforts to standardise the Gujarati language are found in his suggestion to the Gujarat Sahitya Parishad to form of a committee meant to observe and guide the trends in writing in Gujarati in 1909 at London at "a meeting of Gujarati speakers which had been arranged to send their congratulations to the third session of the Gujarati Sahitya Parishad due to be held in Rajkot" (Isaka 107). It demands consideration whether Gandhi's intention to 'purge' Gujarati of its 'corrupt' usages may not be an extension of his emphasis on purging it of English words when in use by Gujarati speakers.[93]

V. Sebastian has criticised the standardisation of spelling in the Jodanikosh for being instrumental in effecting what Pierre Bourdieu has termed ""symbolic violence" by which a dominant form of language in the form of standardisation is imposed on other cultures"

[92] The fourth question paper of the Graduate examination for English was on "A Special Author, or Translation of a foreign classic in Gujarati or Marathi." Under this, if the translation submitted by the student was found incompetent by the examiner, the student had the option of studying the oeuvre of any "*sakshar*" and appearing for the examination (Kothari, *Gujarat Vidyapith* 108).

[93] See Isaka 110, for Gandhis' recommendations to Mahadev Desai, Sarojini Naidu, and Mohammad Ali Jinnah, with regard to their use of English for communication.

(100). He also argues that the spelling reform undertaken by the Gujarat Vidyapith displayed a "classical bias reflected in opting for the Sanskrit-based codification" (Sebastian 101), and on these grounds, positions himself in favour of the Unjha Spelling School, widely known as the "Unjha Jodani Parishad" convened in 1999 that recommends simplification of "existing Gujarati orthography" (Sebastian 99).

Sebastian bases his argument of Sanskritised bias of the spelling reform represented in *Jodanikosh* based on two chief reasons. Firstly, he forwards Gandhi's own belief in Gujarati being "the daughter of Sanskrit" reflected in his famous and oft-quoted citation of this metaphor from Reverend Taylor's grammar (Sebastian 99), and ties this with Gandhi's location in the "nationalist discourse" of the time which was marked by a "definite effort to project Indian civilisation as the sole creation of the Aryans to the exclusion of the contributions of other cultural and ethnic groups" (100). The second reason that follows from the first is the standardisation of spelling based on the "*tatsam*" and "*tadbhav*" distinction in Sanskrit spelling, where *tatsam* refers to words borrowed from Sanskrit and *tadbhav* refers to "Sanskrit derivatives" (Sebastian 99). Thus, such a system required prior knowledge of Sanskrit for understanding of the correct or authoritative Gujarati spelling as argued by Somabhai Patel in the Unjha Jodani Parishad (qtd. in Sebastian 99).

Sebastian's article of 2009 has since become a point of heated debate among scholars, with three critical responses to it by Bharati Modi (January 2010), Suhag Dave (January 2010), and Himanshu Upadhyaya (June 2010). Modi rejects the argument that standardisation reflects a deliberate attempt to perpetuate social inequalities, and that such a process is natural in the course of any language (76). She disagrees that Gandhi dominated the course of standardisation, and therefore his personal views on language controlled the process (Modi 77). Having said that, she does not find the reliance on Sanskrit objectionable as "[g]iven that Sanskrit is the fountainhead of all Indo-Aryan languages [hence] the linkage with Sanskrit is inevitable" (Modi 77). Dave criticises the very use of the term 'standardisation' for being a misnomer of a process that was nothing more than "orthographic convention" (75). He supports Modi's position on the Sanskrit influence by arguing that as no spelling convention existed in Gujarati before the *Jodanikosh,* the convention available in Sanskrit was adopted for being "the easily available one not in the elitist sense, but as the one already established and which could be fruitfully taken over" (Dave 75).

Himanshu Upadhyaya takes a step back to review "the debates and institutional efforts on standardising Gujarati spellings in the 19th century," also bringing in the work of Isaka which predates Sebastian (26). He observes that the role and influence of "the Gujarat

Vernacular Society, the Education Department of Bombay Presidency and the report of the Committee appointed by Gujarati Sahitya Parishad in April 1912 in standardising Gujarati spellings in the late 19th and early 20th centuries" must be considered (Upadhyaya 27). He differs with Sebastian's assessment of Gandhi's personal bias towards Sanskritisation. He rather highlights Isaka's observation about how "how Gandhi, in his dream of developing a *lokbhasha* "which all people, regardless of educational background and religious affiliation, could share in common; repeatedly advocated 'simple' Gujarati" (Upadhyaya 27). This simplified Gujarati is where Upadhyaya finds the impact of Gandhi's insistence on "intercommunity communicative ethos" (29), that also led him to "ensure that the spellings in *Jodanikosh* were not pulled towards etymology and heavy Sanskritisation by the influence of pundits" (27). At the same time, Gandhi's views on what constituted 'correct' Gujarati were not clear, and "often reflected those of high-caste Hindu literati" (Isaka qtd. in Upadhyaya 27). Isaka further observes that ""in his 'experiment', Gandhi assigned these literati a leading role, and thus contributed to the enhancement of their leadership" which "in turn often resulted in imposition of their conception of language and literature on those who did not share them" (qtd. in Upadhyaya 27).

Whether it was Gandhi's search for origins or roots that could constitute a distinctly regional or national language, or his effort to simplify it to disallow its association with enunciations of only a particular group (the educated), his quest for alternatives was rendered impossible by the fundamental reconstitution of knowledge in the colonial educational project. Every aspect of identity had been subjected to 'reform', generating an "epistemic violence" in the sense in which Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak uses it; that is the impossibility of a (subject) position which allowed an alternative enunciation (282-3).

The previous section viewed how the same literati continued to dominate the Gujarati language and literature curriculum at the Vidyapith. I submit that this complexity emerges owing to the struggle between the nature and function of language change effected by the political process of colonisation and responses and challenges to it. Native languages found themselves subserving various identity-formation processes in the region, beginning with the reform movement that induced (western) modernisation into the nature of the language, revivalism which pulled it in the opposite direction of seeking its etymological roots, and nationalism shaped by diverse phases equally caught in the cusp between a modernity that pushed towards mimicking the coloniser and an originality that pushed in the direction of undoing the colonial intervention in the process of reclaiming a native 'identity'. Thus,

identity-formation itself was a complex and fractured phenomenon, further complicated in a multilingual society.

Language became a central force in building regional and national identities. For Gandhi's political project, it was not the nature but the function that language was required to play in the consolidation of the people of the country as 'one' community was prime. This oneness required a uniformity (represented in the attempt to standardise spelling) and the careful negotiation of variations (to disallow privilege to any one community and induce 'brotherhood' so to say). It is the contradiction between these two routes of creating oneness (as uniformity versus mutual respect/tolerance) that explains the unresolved nature of Gandhi's ideas on language.

Gandhi's deliberations were located within his efforts to develop strategies for practical politics, and not within academic-literary deliberations on language and/or literature. This is not to say that nineteenth-century deliberations on language and literature were disconnected from political considerations of colonisation, the impact of the west, erosion of the regional language and literatures under colonisation, or modernity vs tradition. However, the order of priorities was evident. They were, first, scholars on language and literature, or writers, teachers, and translators implicated in the institutional network of the colonial pedagogic project. Thus, their political approach to the British was subservient to the scope of their intervention in language and literature. On the other hand, Gandhi's political approach was the *a priori* condition to which tools like language and literature were subservient. That this clearly had a strong impact on the domains is unquestionable in an era that came to be named after Gandhi in literary and historical periodisations. However, if the studies analyse Gandhi's 'intentions' in the spelling reform process, they must evaluate his so-called biases within this context. Gandhi's focus is on the political impact and not the cognitive impact of language. Thus, he treats language as a transparent medium that is malleable to change as per his political ends, but fails to see its complicity in the institutional structure of colonisation, its pedagogic project, the interests of different stakeholders implicated in the process of change.

Reform, here, represents the point Gandhi misses quite literally. When an idea is generates in a specific historico-political moment, the linguistic term designating it carries the structures and biases of that moment and bears the shifts in these structures over time. Gandhi's inability to resist the dominance of the etymology of Gujarati (traced largely to Sanskrit), becomes a metaphor for the impossibility of undoing history in attempting to resist it. Reform is not merely a term in English, translated as *sudharo* in Gujarati, but represented a

specific set of political-cognitive propensities which continued to structure changes in the colonial structures, even when the popularity and currency of the term eclipsed. Gandhi could reject English, but not resist the Gujarati heavily influenced and restructured by European modernity. He could attempt to reform the Gujarati spelling to make it amenable for common people and communication, but could not override the biases of the intellectuals shaped by the *saksharta* accorded to them by colonial education. In other words, Gandhi subscribes to "a reductive and formulaic binary" between "English and the vernacular" (Dash, *English Education* 12). The Gujarat Mahavidyalaya curricula for English and Gujarati endorse Dash's observation that "the relationship between English and vernacular is more collaborative than oppositional. In fact, the vernacular seems to be made almost in the image of English" (*English Education* 20).

Baroda, Nationalism, and the Demand for an Independent University

In the same year that Gandhi established the Gujarat Vidyapith, Khasherao Jadhava[94] published a tract addressed to the princes of India focusing on their role in the project of consolidating themselves as a group, in the wake of the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms and the aspiration to view India as a federation. Jadhav attempts to negotiate the peculiar position of the native rulers faced with the prospect of political independence, which paradoxically for them, would lead to loss of political sovereignty. Yet, the ironies of colonialism meant that, in the system of paramountcy established by the British with respect to the native states, these rulers had already experienced the pulls between sovereignty and subjecthood, as noted in Chapter Two. Jadhav, further, tries to straddle the titles and positions of these rulers that came from an antiquated and pre-modern system of political rule with the demands of modern government and its push towards democracy. A solution to the problem was not far in the example of constitutional monarchy in the home government of the colonisers.

Perhaps it is this, alongside Jadhava's inability to radically challenge British subjugation owing to the political position of the Baroda state, that leads him to endorse the British empire and reason for a need to strengthen India as one of the prime pillars on which this empire rested (92). Echoing Sayajirao III's approach to institutional reform, he is keen for the native states and rulers to be viewed as equals of the British, as opposed to the relationship of trusteeship in which they were hitherto casted (Jadhava 98). No doubt India's

[94] Generally identified by the spelling 'Khaserao Jadhav', he is the person at whose home Aurobindo often stayed during his tenure in Baroda, and whose brother Madhavrao Jadhav was Aurobindo's close friend and aide.

role in the First World War and the political demands in its wake to compensate for its contribution were significantly moulding and fortifying Jadhav's argument. Further, the Montagu-Chelmsford reforms were equally shaping his thoughts: "The recent Proclamation bids fair to hasten the time when the public mind of India will have so expanded as to demand suitable institutions to enable her to be a deserving member of the mightiest federation of free nations that the world has ever seen" (Jadhava 105). His idea for the native rulers to act as 'kings' under the 'emperor' of the British dominions, was to enable them to become equally 'rulers' like the British monarch.

A fundamental part of his project was the education of the native princes. He criticises the Rajkumar College endorsed by the British in Rajkot in 1868 and set up for the education of members of the royal family by the princes and chiefs of Kathiawad: "present day education neither tends to awaken in them pride in a common past or hope for a common future" (Jadhava 106). Interestingly, several suggestions of Jadhava overlap with Gandhi's views on education.

Jadhava makes it clear that the goal of good government was the happiness and progress of the people (108). To ensure this "the *first* thing to do is to give education through the medium of an Indian tongue. It should *certainly not be a provincial vernacular* only but a language which is easily understood all over the peninsula. A *common language such as Hindustani* should be adopted as the medium of instruction and popularised so as to make it a bond of union between the Hindus and the Mahomedans" (Jadhava 108-9; emphasis added). While the common people were at the centre of Gandhi's political programme, the native princely order was at the centre of Jadhava's. While the two are united in the nationalist orientation of their ideas, the route for consolidation of the two different groups they focused on required different strategies. Gandhi's focus on Gujarati was shaped by several factors such as remedying the alienation between different sections of the same community, consolidation of regional identity which would be the lowest common denominator in the national identity, and making education accessible to all sections of the society. Jadhava's motivation in his choice of medium of instruction, on the other hand, was not only the strengthening of ties of the ruler with his populace, but consolidation of an alliance across princely rulers of India, to counter the "narrow provincialism and the danger of getting lost in case the unification of India becomes an accomplished fact" that prevailed over the minds of many (Jadhava 107-8).

The inspiration of European nationalism underlying Jadhava's project is quite explicit in his appreciation of the examples of Italy and Germany's projects of national consolidation

(107). Language, for him, offers crucial access to the shared history of the glorious rulers that India had witnessed before the weaknesses and internecine differences that led to British subjection. It is also pertinent to note that Jadhava pays homage equally to erstwhile Hindu and Muslim rulers. Thus, while Hindustani would afford a connection to the history and traditions of political economy and administration before the British, modern European languages would allow access to understanding formation of other nations and their institutions which helped consolidate their respective national identities. Thus, English is meant to be "a compulsory second language", and post completing his[95] education, the prince should travel to Europe and America, as well as Japan if possible (Jadhava 112). Further, in the spirit of preserving historical tradition, he advocates training of the princes in sports and warfare which suited their "hereditary vocation of the Kshatriya" which would make admission to "commissioned ranks in the army" more amenable to them (Jadhava 112).

The origin of Jadhava's concerns can be traced back to his description of "the first historic Conference of the Indian Princes" held on 29 October 1916 at Delhi, where he observes a lamentable attribute of the sons of princes (115), which he squarely attributes to British subjection:

> It was impossible not to be struck, before the Session was closed, with one sad feature that there was suspicion of one another among some of them as among individuals of the Indian gentry. As the Princes manifested on the issues before them an incapacity to think clearly, there is no reason to be wondered at this phenomenon, regrettable as it is. The Indian gentry as well as the Indian Princes are all under the same mental subjection of a great Western Power. And this is the manifest result of that subjection. (Jadhava 121)

Thus, according to Jadhava, the chief drawbacks of English education were that it had disconnected the native rulers from subjects and society, as well as their ancestral and cultural histories; and that they had robbed them of mental sovereignty—both in terms of inability to think independently, and inability to think like a ruler.

This ability, however, was present in droves in the ruler of the state where Khasherao Jadhava was the Survey and Settlement Commissioner, Agricultural Advisor, and *Suba* and District Magistrate. Viewed against the backdrop of developments in the Baroda state, Jadhava's tract seems to be oriented towards rallying support on a national scale across all princely orders for the initiatives already undertaken under Sayajirao III. Here, I specifically

[95] The pronoun preferred by Jadhav (112).

focus on the initiatives with respect to higher education, that is, demand for an independent university.

This move is directly linked to the point where Chapter Two concluded in two ways. It noted the effects of the Universities Act of 1904 and juxtaposed them with Baroda as a site of resistance to the ideology that deemed the natives as unfit for political sovereignty. First, it emerges out of universities becoming institutions exercising much greater control and centralisation following the Universities Act of 1904. Secondly, the complexities in this demand arose out of Sayajirao III's "anticolonial activities,[96] activities that he had successfully pursued through reform throughout the first decade of the twentieth century" (Bhagavan, "The Rebel Academy" 922).

Bhagavan traces the trajectory of the idea of an independent university at Baroda, right from 1908 to 1924-5 (923-931). There was a proposal by Alban Widgery and N.K. Dikshit in 1919 regarding "creation of a "civic" university in Baroda", which however did not take any concrete shape (Bhagavan, "The Rebel Academy" 925). The allied attempts in Baroda at negotiating independence from colonial control can be better understood when Jadhav's tract from 1920 is read alongside the confidential "proposal for a new "democratic" constitution for the state" drafted by Manubhai Mehta, Dewan of Baroda, and printed in 1924 (Bhagavan, "The Rebel Academy" 926). Bhagavan, further, traces "the idea for the constitution…to a confidential letter from the Gaekwad to Mehta, dated 25 October 1922 (Bhagavan, "The Rebel Academy" 926).

A significant comment in Mehta's document relates to the interpretation of the term 'responsible government' that, according to the previous discussion on Montagu-Chelmsford reforms, encoded the reformist position in the proposed changes in the empire's position towards India. Mehta writes:

> what is generally implied by Reform in the Constitution of an Indian State is a demand for Responsible Government; for making the Government more democratic and more responsive to popular aspirations and popular ideals… [Democracy] is not to be confounded with a "Republic", where the head of the Executive Machinery of the State, instead of being a hereditary functionary, is elected by the will of the people

[96] These 'anticolonial activities' led the colonial government to take the opportunity to turn "the Durbar incident" of 1911 into a charge for disrespect of the reigning monarchs of the empire leading to "harsh public and private criticism for over a year following the ceremony, with some even calling for his deposition from power" (Bhagavan 922). Following this, Sayajirao III was required to minimise and restrain his overt support and direction in the radical institutional reforms being undertaken at Baroda.

> .... What is implied by a clamour for Democracy is the recognition of ultimate Responsibility to the people. It is not inconsistent with the conception of a monarchy; but the ultimate source of Power ... is the Will or the Majesty of the People....Hope of reward and fear of punishment have been known to be two elementary impulses which have supplied motive power to human conduct and History abounds with proof that these motives have gathered that strength under the personal sway of benevolent monarchy which a bureaucratic rule can never aspire to import. This law of social dynamics sufficiently accounts for the fact that the clamour for Reform and political supremacy has been more insistent under bureaucratic rule in British India than in Indian India. (qtd. in Bhagavan, "The Rebel Academy" 926-7)

Thus, while the draftsmen of the colonial reforms replaced representative government with responsible government to focus on the need for natives to develop fitness and accountability to be able to shoulder the responsibility of managing their own affairs, Mehta interprets the term 'responsible' by focusing not on those who shouldered the responsibility but those whose responsibility was intended to be shouldered. This gap in interpretation not only supports Danzig's thesis that even if diverse interest groups agreed upon the same thing, they did so for different reason; but also proves how interpretation was a space of alternative possibilities, and thus, also a source of anxiety for the coloniser. Bhabha offers a fitting example of this in the episode of the exchange between a catechist and Indian natives. Bhabha discusses an exchange between a catechist Anand Messeh and a group of natives seated under "a grove of trees just outside Delhi" to lay out how the catechist's constant effort to establish a homology between the book of Gospel, European religion and the mediation of the European Sahib in making this "blessed" knowledge available, and the native responses that express both their selective adoption of elements from this homology, and understanding of the Gospel with reference to their own cosmology and religious beliefs (146-8).

Mehta establishes the native states as a space of resistance, much more amenable to the implementation of the principles of democracy, than the space of the coloniser structured with the desire for perpetuation of an alien rule. Moreover, he highlights how the use of the term 'reform' in this context remained merely a linguistic convention to designate change. In terms of the nature of changes proposed, it inhabited the conceptual space of revolt, more than reform. Bhagavan notes how Mehta documents the reappearance of the policy of reclamation that was the signature approach of Sayajirao III as a young ruler:

> For the first time since the Durbar, we find an adoption of "reclamation," the concept of repossessing "Western" ideas and recasting them as "Indian" that was ubiquitous in Baroda in the first decade of the twentieth century. In this case, "democracy" is freed from its Western moorings and reconstructed, in the very language of the Enlightenment, as a universal tool against subjugation and oppression. This point is hammered home in the conclusion to Mehta's proposal with *not-too-subtle allusions to the United States Declaration of Independence and the French Revolution's Declaration of the Rights of Man*, the implication in referencing these particular documents *being more than clear for the overall British colonial/Indian colonized relationship*... (qtd. in Bhagavan, "The Rebel Academy" 927).

The final movement for an independent university in Baroda that led to concrete initiatives also originated as an act of defiance and carried the overtones of revolution. Following the growing centralisation of university affairs since the Act of 1905, the "school-leaving examination board" of the university decided to embark on greater intervention in affiliating institutions with "new powers of supervision and punishment" in February 1925 (Bhagavan, "The Rebel Academy" 929). This move was opposed by the N.K. Dikshit, the Education Commissioner of Baroda, considering it an infringement on the policy of non-interference in affairs of the native state, and demanding that the Bombay University defer "to the directives of the princely state's Education Department"—a request that the school-leaving examination board refused (Bhagavan, "The Rebel Academy" 930). When another request to allow representatives from Baroda on the Examining Board was refused, Mehta wrote to Dikshit about considering the option of separating from Bombay University (Bhagavan, "The Rebel Academy" 931).

Shortly after, Sayajirao III appointed a commission on 24 September 1926 to look into the possibility of an independent university for Baroda (Bhagavan, "The Rebel Academy" 931). That the design and motivations of this university were directed at countering the reformist agenda of the empire is underlined in an illuminating comment by Bhagavan who refers to the "modern university" as "the *holy grail* of all nationalist movements" ("The Rebel Academy" 937). Clearly, one of Arthur's knights had decided to override Arthur's endorsement in deciding his fitness for the quest.

According to Bhagavan, the 'modernity' of this university was positioned against the 'older' systems in two ways:

(a) It was a “tool of “the present”, and “a means of extending social justice to the people” in contrast of the older university which “was a tool of imperial power” (“The Rebel Academy” 936).

(b) The modern university would focus on subjects of practical importance such as technology, agriculture, engineering, etc., as opposed to the older university and its emphasis on “liberal education” represented primarily by “history or literature” (“The Rebel Academy” 936-7).

An example for this was found in the American universities whose progress was pitted against the lack thereof in Britain and Germany (Bhagavan, “The Rebel Academy” 936).

English studies persisted in this scheme in the form of both literature and language. The commission considered “the constitution of an Arts Faculty indispensable. ... The great advantage ... will be the preservation of the academic tone and the humanistic ideals in the University. Nothing is more dangerous for University education than one-sided specialization in applied sciences divorced from literary culture” (qtd. in Bhagavan, “The Rebel Academy” 938). Further, the emphasis on modernity and reclamation of Western ideals and institutions meant that English was chosen as the medium of instruction “university because "there is *not as yet* a sufficiency of books [in languages other than English] which will be *suitable* for university classes," though lecturers and professors had full discretion to use vernaculars if they thought it feasible and appropriate” (Bhagavan, “The Rebel Academy” 938; emphasis added).

In this tendency to find a balance between “modernism” and the “classics” (qtd. from *Report of the Baroda University Commission* in Bhagavan, “The Rebel Academy” 939), English and the vernacular, and practical and liberal education, Bhagavan reads an “anticolonial strategy” that tried to appeal “at once to "vernacularists" and their pro-English opponents, as well as to more right-wing Hindu nationalist elements, respectively in its policies on medium of instruction and Oriental and Gujarati studies”, whereby it tried to assimilate the diverse streams of nationalism and make it a united force to reckon with (“The Rebel Academy” 939).

At the same time, Baroda’s “brand” of nationalism was different of other expressions of nationalism in higher education institutions, specifically the Gujarat Vidyapith. One of the strategies as used in the plan for the proposed university of Baroda helped “to hold nationalist divergencies in check”, which leads Bhagavan to qualify David Hardiman’s statement that “the nationalist movement in Baroda city was split between “Hindu patriots” and “Gandhian

nationalists", no major trouble occurred between these two groups in Baroda until 1939—"significantly the same year as Sayaji Rao's death" (Bhagavan, "The Rebel Academy" 939).

However, by 1929 with adoption of a new constitution by the University of Bombay, "the University allowed five representatives from Baroda to sit on the school Senate. One of the initial five people selected for a position on this council was K. G. Naik, a scholar who had also served on the Baroda University Commission a few years earlier" (Bhagavan 941). On 3 March 1930, Sayajirao III ordered termination of the movement for a University of Baroda. Bhagavan speculates that this decision may have been influenced by the growing momentum of the movement to claim politically independent status of India as part of a federation (Bhagavan, "The Rebel Academy" 942). Had the proposed university taken shape, it would have offered an important insights into the diverse curricular and pedagogic strategies for resistance to colonisation, as well as the shaping of a curriculum for English in the conceptual domain of revolt.

Bhagavan observes that while both the proposed Baroda University and the Gujarat Vidyapith represented diverse responses to challenge British control, the key difference was that while a *vidyapith* was completely independent of institutional control by the British, while a university, however the university required "British endorsement" to exist ("The Rebel Academy" 940). Yet, he adds that:

> It is a mistake, nevertheless, to therefore argue that "universities" were inherently tools of imperial oppression, since such a view is too simplistic for its privileging of physical over rhetorical spaces. The discursive arena is just as instrumental in determining reality as the material. Thus, rhetorics of the "university," such as those employed during movements for institutional establishment, are seminal to our understanding of the place of the university in colonial, and *ipso facto* in postcolonial, societies. (Bhagavan, "The Rebel Academy" 940)

Bhagavan's use of the term 'rhetoric' is important, here, for re-inserting the discussion in the domain of language. While Gandhi's strategy consisted in rejection (of modernity, English, western values), Sayajirao III's strategy consisted in reclamation (a word often used by Bhagavan to describe his Sayajirao's strategy). On the surface level, Gandhi's strategy seems more potent and radical than that of Sayajirao III. However, when one approaches the situation from the entry point of English studies and reform, Gandhi's approach to language reveals a belief in the metaphysics of presence.

On the other hand, Sayajirao III's effort to not simply adopt but adapt western institutions (both epistemological and political) to specific Indian/native circumstances, and

not await the benevolent grant of independent modernity, but to wrest it from the coloniser, opens up terms like 'reform' and 'modernity' which were the emblems of the pedagogic project of colonialism, for scrutiny and interpretation. It created and capitalised on the ambivalence of colonisation that was an important opportunity for resistance, as noted by Bhabha. Thus, Gandhi's project masked the functioning of language (and its literature) as a discursive institution in itself, while Sayajirao III's approach acknowledges the semantic and political possibilities of language, if not its cognitive implications.

This space was used by the colonial machine in gradual expansion of its domain of control as a simultaneous reading of Bhagavan and Jadhava would allow us to perceive. Speaking of N.K. Dikshit's initial resistance to the 1925 policy change in the university, Bhagavan notes: "The new regulations were thus not that great a change, but they highlighted the loopholes and inconsistencies of British administrative policy towards princely states" ("The Rebel Academy" 930). Jadhava observes with respect to the questions taken up at the Princes' Conference: "Most of these questions have arisen only because we don't know exactly what the position of the Rulers of Indian States is in relation to the Imperial Government…It can't be too often impressed on the minds of the Princes that it is their first duty to have their relationship [with the Crown] constitutionally established" (124-5).

Thus, Baroda continued to be a site that deployed the ambivalence generated in the colonial project to generate more critical understandings of its fundamental precepts. These guided its strategies of resistance.

The persistence of a colonial curriculum in the Gujarat Mahavidyalaya, the failure of the Gujarat Vidyapith to shift the fundamental biases of knowledge and turn knowledge into a site of resistance, and the falling apart of the scheme for a Baroda University point to a deeper process. I read this moment in the history of higher education and English studies as marked by the epistemization of reform.

> I draw the definition of an episteme from Foucault as referring to:
> the *total set of relations that unite*, at a given period, the discursive practices that give rise to epistemological figures,…possibly formalized systems…The episteme is not a form of knowledge or type of rationality which,…manifests the sovereign unity of a subject, a spirit, or a period; it is the group of relations that can be discovered, for a given period, between the sciences when one analyses them at the level of *discursive regularities*. (qtd. in Maclean 150-1; emphasis added)

In the above definition, I would like to replace the term 'sciences' with the enunciations surrounding the colony and empire whether in terms of policies, anticolonial rhetoric, or educational schemes, etc.

When the trajectory of the term 'reform' is surveyed in Chapter One, Two, and Three, it shows a propensity to signify the following:

(a) In terms of political signification, a propensity to opt for gradualist change which attempts to maintain the status quo rather than destabilise it; the converse of 'revolt'.

(b) In terms of semantic-cognitive signification, initiating a movement to homogenise two different entities through structural-conceptual alignment so that they can then be set up for 'comparison', resulting in the identification of 'lack' in one—identified as the addressee/beneficiary of 'reform'.

These are the 'set of relations' which constitute reform that 'united' in the moment of modernisation of British political systems that were inextricably linked to the empire, and which generate a set of 'regularities' in the varying discourses of politics, education, economics, etc. over a century and a half of colonisation surveyed in these three chapters.

I argue that it is the presence of this episteme that makes it 'impossible' even for a radical thinker like Gandhi[97] to separate knowledge from its epistemological straitjacket, and rather to accept its underlying assumptions that mask its ideological function. Gandhi does not use the term much but has adopted its biases, thus, demonstrating that, by this time, reform was unconsciously orienting the limits of what was possible and not in the domain of the colony. In other words, reform shows a propensity to "determine what ideas it is possible to conceptualise and what ideas it is acceptable to affirm as true" ("*The Order of Things*").

Conclusion

Reform offers a crucial entry point that allows the observation of persistence of colonial epistemological paradigms in forms of resistance that could radically challenge authoritative colonial structures in the domain of practical politics. On the other hand, responses that seemingly appear imbricated in colonial binaries reveal a keener understanding of its constitutive biases.

Thus, the imbrication of reform and education is more complex than simply offering justifications for each other. They significantly informed the larger pedagogic and ideological projects of western modernity in the colony. The example of Gujarat Mahavidyalaya

[97] Nandy identifies Gandhi's strategies of resistance as reversing colonial valorisation of a certain ideology of age and sex (48-63); however this resistance does not seem to have reached the domain of education.

highlights how de-linking education from its governing epistemes is neither a straightforward nor a simple undertaking.

The next chapter discusses the trajectory of English Studies post-independence and investigates the fortunes of the episteme of reform in the growth of the discipline.