RESEARCH JOURNAL OF ENGLISH (RJOE)
www.rjoe.org.in | **Oray's Publications** | ISSN: **2456-2696**
An International Approved Peer-Reviewed and Refereed English Journal
Impact Factor: *8.373 (SJIF)* | **Vol. 10, Issue 3 (July, August& September;2025)**

The Afterlife of Macaulay's Minute: Language, Power, and the Struggle for Cultural Sovereignty

Anoushka Tanwar,
Independent Scholar, Solan, Himachal Pradesh, India

Paper Received on 15-07-2025, Accepted on 17-08-2025
Published on 17-08-25; DOI:10.36993/RJOE.2025.10.3.424

Abstract

This study examines the lasting impact of Thomas Babington Macaulay's *Minute on Education* (1835), a colonial blueprint aimed at producing a cadre of intermediaries who could operate within the machinery of imperial administration while being distanced from their own indigenous systems of knowledge. Far from a historical relic, its linguistic hierarchies continue to structure power, privilege, and cultural legitimacy in postcolonial India. Drawing on postcolonial theory- Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's critique of language as a colonial weapon, Frantz Fanon's analysis of the psychological fractures caused by linguistic domination, and Homi Bhabha's notions of hybridity and ambivalence- this work examines how English remains entrenched in law, education, governance, and social mobility. The persistence of this linguistic order reproduces epistemic violence, erases local knowledge systems, and fosters internalised cultural inferiority. Yet resistance is neither absent nor marginal: from policy-driven language revival to grassroots digital activism, acts of decolonising the linguistic sphere are reshaping the terms of cultural sovereignty. By tracing both the historical roots and contemporary manifestations of Macaulay's vision, the study argues for an education system that restores parity between indigenous and global languages- creating intellectual spaces where cultural heritage and global engagement can coexist on equal terms.

Keywords: Colonial education, Postcolonial theory, Linguistic imperialism, Epistemic violence, Cultural displacement

Introduction

In 1835, Thomas Babington Macaulay penned his now-infamous *Minute on Education*, declaring with unwavering arrogance that 'a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia.' This was not merely a passing opinion- it was a manifesto for cultural engineering. In doing so, the colonial administration set out to manufacture a carefully tailored elite; people who would look like the local population, yet think, speak, and judge the world

through an entirely British lens. It was a deliberate act of cultural reprogramming, not merely to shape but to strip away, replacing indigenous identities with imperial ideals. Almost two centuries later, the shadow of that Minute is still long and unrelenting. English has become more than a language in postcolonial South Asia; it is currency, capital, and a gatekeeper to social mobility. The ability to speak and write it fluently remains a passport to elite institutions, prestigious jobs, and transnational legitimacy. Its dominance is so deeply woven into the fabric of public life that it often passes as neutral, inevitable, even desirable. But this is no accident- it is the enduring legacy of a colonial education system meticulously designed to privilege one language, one worldview, and one epistemology over countless others. This paper interrogates that legacy, not as a relic of history, but as an active force shaping contemporary South Asian identity and access to power. It asks uncomfortable questions: How did a policy drafted in the chambers of colonial governance succeed in displacing entire knowledge systems? How has English continued to function as an instrument of exclusion, long after the Union Jack was lowered? And what forms of cultural, psychological, and epistemic violence are silently perpetuated each time indigenous languages are relegated to the margins? Drawing on postcolonial theory, linguistic anthropology, and historical analysis, this study argues that Macaulay's educational vision did not simply 'modernise' South Asia- it engineered a hierarchy of languages that persists to this day, sustaining deep divisions in access to education, opportunity, and cultural legitimacy. To confront this afterlife of Macaulay's Minute is not a matter of nostalgia; it is a matter of decolonising the mind, reclaiming suppressed epistemologies, and reimagining an education system that serves the people it claims to empower.

Constructing and Contesting Empire's Language

Colonial Education Policy in British India

The introduction of English education in colonial India was neither an innocent academic reform nor a mere administrative adjustment- it was a calculated intervention in the cultural and intellectual life of the subcontinent. Among all colonial education directives, none is more defining than Thomas Babington Macaulay's *Minute on Education* (1835), which crystallised the ideological foundation of British policy in India. Written with a confidence bordering on contempt, the Minute dismissed centuries of Indian literary, philosophical, and scientific heritage as being of 'less worth' than the smallest fragment of European writing. Its underlying purpose was to replace the existing systems of knowledge with a curriculum steeped in British thought, literature, and moral philosophy.

The British administration aimed to cultivate a group of educated intermediaries who could facilitate governance by aligning their thinking with imperial interests. This was not merely about linguistic proficiency; it was about producing subjects whose intellectual and moral compass pointed toward Britain. The suppression of indigenous languages in formal education was central to this process, ensuring that epistemological authority rested squarely in the colonial centre rather

than in local traditions. In essence, the policy enacted a form of cultural dispossession- one that continues to cast its shadow over postcolonial South Asia.

Postcolonial Critiques of Colonial Education

Decades after the formal end of British rule, postcolonial theorists have interrogated the long-term effects of this educational agenda. Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's *Decolonising the Mind* argues persuasively that language is the most potent weapon of cultural domination. For Ngũgĩ, the imposition of a colonial language displaces the native tongue, disorienting cultural memory and reshaping identity in ways that serve the coloniser's narrative.

In *Black Skin, White Masks*, Frantz Fanon delves into how language operates as a site of psychological control within colonial power structures. His work illustrates how colonised subjects internalise the language of the oppressor as a marker of prestige, inadvertently reinforcing the very hierarchies that marginalise them. Fanon argues that adopting the coloniser's tongue reshapes one's very sense of identity, often producing a fracture between self-perception and inherited cultural roots.

Homi Bhabha introduces yet another lens in his discussions of hybridity and ambivalence. While colonial education seeks to create a faithful replica of the coloniser, it inevitably produces subjects who are 'almost the same, but not quite.' This hybridity can serve as a site of resistance, but it also reveals the deep contradictions within colonial projects, where the intended erasure of difference produces complex, layered identities instead.

Modern Scholarship on English in Postcolonial India

Contemporary scholars have expanded these critiques by examining the role of English in India's post-independence era. Alok Rai, for instance, positions English as a potent class marker in modern India. The language, he argues, now functions less as a remnant of colonial rule and more as an internal mechanism of social stratification, separating the 'English-educated' elite from the vast majority who remain excluded from its privileges.

Gauri Viswanathan's *Masks of Conquest* adds another crucial dimension by tracing how English literature itself became a tool of imperial governance. She reveals that the teaching of canonical English texts in colonial India was not about cultivating aesthetic appreciation; it was about instilling moral and political values aligned with imperial ideology. Literature, in this sense, became an instrument for consolidating British cultural hegemony while displacing local literary traditions from the educational canon.

Taken together, this body of scholarship underscores that the afterlife of Macaulay's Minute is neither accidental nor benign. It persists through institutional structures, cultural hierarchies, and psychological inheritances that continue to

privilege English as the ultimate marker of knowledge, legitimacy, and modernity. Understanding this legacy requires moving beyond nostalgia or critique- it demands confronting how deeply the colonial project succeeded in shaping the intellectual and cultural horizons of the present.

Colonial Legacies in Contemporary Language Policy

The British may have left in 1947, but their language never boarded the ship home. English remains not just a language of communication but a structural backbone of India's governance, legal system, and educational apparatus. Court proceedings in the Supreme Court and most High Courts are conducted almost entirely in English, creating an unspoken precondition for access to justice: linguistic fluency. This reality means that for many citizens, the path to legal recourse is mediated through translators or intermediaries- an echo of the colonial dependency on intermediaries that Macaulay himself envisioned. The language of law, still firmly anchored in colonial diction, preserves an intellectual hierarchy where English is associated with authority and correctness, and regional languages are relegated to the margins.

In higher education, particularly in the sciences, technology, medicine, and law, English functions as an invisible but unyielding gatekeeper. Entry into elite institutions like the Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs), Indian Institutes of Management (IIMs), and National Law Universities (NLUs) depends heavily on English-language competence, regardless of the intellectual calibre of candidates in their mother tongues. This perpetuates an entrenched divide in opportunity, ensuring that the benefits of education are disproportionately accessible to those who have already inherited English fluency through urban privilege or generational advantage. English-medium schooling has emerged as one of the most potent status markers in contemporary India. For middle- and upper-class families, enrolling their children in such schools is not merely an academic decision- it is a calculated investment in professional mobility, cultural capital, and the performance of cosmopolitanism. The prestige of these institutions stands in sharp relief against underfunded government schools, which often operate in regional languages and lack both infrastructural support and societal esteem. This dynamic reinforces what sociologists call the 'English divide,' a socio-linguistic gulf separating the urban elite from rural and working-class populations.

The 'English divide' is not a metaphor- it is a lived reality. In metropolitan hubs like Delhi, Mumbai, and Bangalore, English fluency can open doors to corporate boardrooms, diplomatic circles, and elite social networks. In rural districts, its absence can mean exclusion from these very spaces. The result is a two-tiered citizenship in which linguistic ability determines one's mobility, access to resources, and perceived legitimacy in the national discourse.

This linguistic hierarchy is deeply entrenched in state recruitment processes. The Indian Administrative Service (IAS) examinations allow candidates to choose from a range of regional languages, but English proficiency remains a de facto advantage. Written components may offer linguistic flexibility, but the interview stage is often heavily weighted towards those who can perform fluently in English- a performance still subconsciously associated with intellectual refinement and leadership capability. The outcome is predictable: candidates from

English-medium backgrounds are overrepresented, reproducing the colonial ideal of governance conducted in the master's tongue. In fact, even a common man, surfing on YouTube, when stumbling upon a mock IAS interview, views the candidate speaking in English more intellectual in comparison to the one who is not. It is an unsaid learned assumption.

Corporate hiring practices reinforce this paradigm. Multinational corporations and even domestic companies with global aspirations routinely prioritise English-speaking candidates, treating language as a proxy for competence. In sectors such as banking, information technology, and law, job interviews are almost exclusively conducted in English, regardless of the region or the linguistic profile of the clientele. This is not simply a matter of practicality; it is an implicit assertion that professionalism is inseparable from linguistic alignment with the West.

Perhaps the most telling legacy of Macaulay's vision lies in the stark disparity between private and government schools. Elite private institutions- often following international curricula, emphasise English fluency, global exposure, and cultural confidence. Government schools, by contrast, frequently operate in regional languages and struggle with resource deficits, teacher shortages, and low public perception. The result is a stratified educational landscape in which access to English becomes the currency of aspiration, while its absence confines communities to cycles of limited mobility.

Seventy-eight years after independence, India is still negotiating the contradictions of this legacy. English functions simultaneously as a bridge to global engagement and as a barrier to equitable participation. It empowers a section of the population to navigate transnational spaces, yet it disenfranchises others by excluding them from the same opportunities. This contradiction- offering empowerment to some while denying it to others- remains one of the most persistent and telling legacies of Macaulay's Minute. It is not simply preserved in historical archives; it lives in the policies we enact, the institutions we uphold, and the ambitions we cultivate.

Cultural Displacement & Epistemic Violence

The imposition of English in colonial India was never merely a linguistic policy; it was a cultural re-engineering project. By privileging English as the medium of education, administration, and intellectual discourse, the colonial state displaced

centuries-old indigenous languages, literary traditions, and modes of thought. This was not an incidental side effect- it was an intentional dismantling of cultural ecosystems, designed to create a new hierarchy in which English stood as the language of intellect, power, and prestige, while indigenous languages were recast as local, parochial, and unfit for 'modern' knowledge.

This privilege of English brought with it an erasure of literary canons that had sustained communities for generations. Classical Sanskrit texts, rich Punjabi poetry, Tamil Sangam literature, and countless oral traditions were pushed to the margins, no longer considered relevant to the making of the 'educated' subject. In their place, Shakespeare, Milton, and Wordsworth became the new benchmarks of literary refinement. The epistemic violence here is twofold: first, the displacement of indigenous languages as legitimate vehicles of knowledge; second, the reframing of what counts as knowledge itself. Philosophy, science, and jurisprudence in the subcontinent were reinterpreted- or outright ignored- through the filter of Western epistemology.

This linguistic shift was not limited to institutional spaces; it seeped into the psychological terrain of the colonised subject. The internalisation of linguistic inferiority remains one of the most insidious aftereffects of colonial policy. English fluency became synonymous with intelligence, sophistication, and authority, while speaking in one's mother tongue in formal contexts was- and often still is- associated with inadequacy or lack of education. This is not merely a question of preference; it is the lingering imprint of a colonial project that equated Western linguistic and cultural norms with universal value. The psychological toll is profound: generations have been taught, directly and indirectly, that their native linguistic identity must be subdued to access prestige and opportunity.

The phenomenon is perhaps most visible in contemporary media, which functions as both a mirror and an amplifier of these hierarchies. Television anchors on national English news channels frequently project themselves as more credible and 'serious' than their counterparts in regional-language media, despite serving vastly different audiences. Advertising reinforces the prestige of English, with brands framing it as a marker of aspiration, success, and modernity. Even in cinema, code-switching into English is often used to signal a character's social mobility or education, subtly reinforcing the notion that English equates to progress.

The loss of indigenous epistemologies extends beyond language into the very frameworks through which knowledge is produced and validated. Systems of medicine like Ayurveda and Unani were reframed as traditional or alternative, subordinate to the scientific paradigms imported from Europe. Indigenous approaches to astronomy, agriculture, and environmental management- once grounded in centuries of empirical observation- were dismissed as outdated, even

when their efficacy had been proven in practice. This reframing was not neutral; it delegitimised entire knowledge systems, ensuring that the intellectual authority to define 'truth' rested firmly with the colonial worldview.

This cultural displacement is ongoing. The schooling system, media narratives, and employment structures continue to reproduce the privileging of English at the expense of linguistic diversity. This is not simply a case of globalisation or pragmatism; it is the long aftershock of an epistemic earthquake set in motion by policies like Macaulay's Minute. When the very languages in which people think, dream, and create are devalued, the result is not just linguistic loss- it is the fracturing of cultural selfhood.

To address this legacy requires more than policy reform; it requires dismantling the deep-seated belief that progress must be mediated through the linguistic lens of the coloniser. Without such a reckoning, the prestige of English will continue to operate as a form of cultural capital that stratifies society, alienates communities from their intellectual heritage, and perpetuates the very hierarchies colonialism left behind.

Resistance and Decolonising Language

If colonial language policy was a deliberate act of erasure, then resisting it is equally deliberate- an assertion of presence against centuries of imposed absence. In many postcolonial societies, restoring and elevating indigenous languages has become a central strategy for reclaiming cultural identity and agency. In India, states like Tamil Nadu have long defended Tamil-medium education as a matter of both identity and intellectual sovereignty, resisting the centralising pressures of English and Hindi alike. In Sri Lanka, post-independence policies mandated the use of *Sinhala* and Tamil in administration and education, asserting linguistic rights as integral to nation-building. Kenya's curriculum reforms have similarly re-centred *Kiswahili* in schools, challenging the residual assumption that English must remain the default medium of intellectual discourse.

Policy initiatives toward multilingualism represent a direct institutional counter to the hierarchies left by colonial rule. The National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 in India, for example, advocates for instruction in the mother tongue at the foundational stages of schooling, positioning linguistic familiarity as a pedagogical strength rather than a weakness. While implementation remains uneven, such measures mark a symbolic and structural departure from the monolingual elitism entrenched by the British. Internationally, UNESCO's advocacy for mother-tongue education underscores the global recognition that linguistic diversity is not a barrier to progress but a precondition for equitable participation in it.

Resistance also manifests in less formal but no less significant ways. The phenomenon of code-switching- whether between English and Hindi, or between

English and regional languages in Kenya, Nigeria, and beyond- functions as a subtle yet potent form of linguistic defiance. Hybrid forms such as *Hinglish, Tanglish,* or *Sheng* dismantle the purist boundaries set by colonial language ideologies, producing speech that refuses to conform entirely to either the colonizer's or the colonized's linguistic rules. These hybrids carry their own cultural charge, reflecting lived realities in multilingual societies and challenging the idea that mastery of 'pure' English is the only legitimate form of modern expression.

The digital sphere has intensified these resistances. On platforms like YouTube, regional-language content creators command vast audiences, often outpacing English-speaking counterparts in reach and influence. Wikipedia's multilingual editions allow contributors to build repositories of knowledge in languages historically excluded from formal academic canons. Social media has made it possible for linguistic communities to bypass institutional gatekeepers altogether, producing literature, commentary, and scholarship in their mother tongues for a global audience. The internet, while dominated by English, also offers a paradoxical opportunity: the very medium that once amplified English hegemony is now being repurposed to destabilise it. Decolonizing language is not about rejecting English outright; it is about refusing its monopoly. It is about creating a linguistic ecosystem where English is one among many legitimate vehicles of thought, rather than the sole arbiter of intellectual legitimacy. This requires sustained political will, educational reform, and above all, the reimagining of what counts as knowledge and who gets to produce it. The future of linguistic justice depends not only on preserving indigenous languages as heritage but on using them as living, evolving instruments of scholarship, governance, and creativity. Only then can the afterlife of Macaulay's Minute be transformed from a lingering wound into a closed chapter.

Conclusion

The legacy of Macaulay's Minute is not an artifact sealed in colonial archives- it is a living structure embedded in the linguistic hierarchies and educational systems of contemporary India and much of the postcolonial world. The deliberate elevation of English over indigenous languages was never merely a pedagogical decision; it was a calculated act of social engineering. By positioning English as the gateway to employment, governance, and cultural legitimacy, colonial policy created a stratified society where language became both a ladder and a barrier- offering opportunity to a select few while alienating the majority from their intellectual and cultural inheritance.

This framework endures in the persistence of English as the dominant language of law, higher education, and elite professions. It has normalized the belief that mastery of English is synonymous with competence, modernity, and even intelligence, while indigenous languages are relegated to the realm of informality or folklore. This is not just a linguistic hierarchy- it is a sustained form of epistemic

violence, eroding the value of local knowledge systems and silencing alternative ways of knowing.

Linguistic decolonisation is, therefore, not an exercise in cultural nostalgia but a radical project of justice. It calls for dismantling the myths that equate progress with monolingual English dominance and for rebuilding educational frameworks that recognise indigenous languages as legitimate mediums of advanced thought. This involves policy reforms that place multilingualism at the core of curricula, active revival of marginalized languages, and the creation of academic spaces where local and global knowledge coexist on equal terms. The work is neither quick nor easy, but the stakes are profound. A truly decolonized education system would allow communities to think, dream, and create in the languages that carry their histories, philosophies, and visions for the future- ensuring that global engagement enriches, rather than erases, the cultural sovereignty of the people.

References

Fanon, Frantz. Black Skin, White Masks. Translated by Charles Lam Markmann, Grove Press, 1952.

Macaulay, Thomas Babington. Minute on Education. 2 February 1835.

Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature. James Currey, 1986.

Bhabha, Homi K. The Location of Culture. Routledge, 1994.

Rai, Alok. Hindi Nationalism (Tracks for the Times). Orient Blackswan, 2001.

Viswanathan, Gauri. Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India. Columbia University Press, 1989.