Experiencing Globalization

At the end of this session, you should be able to understand
- the history of English and its varieties in the inner, outer & extended circles as well as local & global versions of the English language based on our guest speaker Prof. S. Sridhar's lecture on "The other side of English: Local identities in a global language"
- the role of the UN Human Development Report in setting objectives for the world community to tackle global problems in the coming 10-20 years & the attempt of re-setting the agenda of powerful global institutions, such as the IMF, World Bank, WTO
- the sources/roots, and possible solutions of ethno-religious conflicts at the example of India: diversity & tolerance policies, power sharing, multiculturalism, UN mediation….by viewing and discussing the Wide Angle video: The Soul of India

Presentation: "The Other Side of English: Local Identities in a Global Language"
by Prof. S.N. Sridhar (Stony Brook Professor of Linguistics & India Studies, Dept of Asian & Asian American Studies)

Student Information: Stony Brook Summer Study Abroad in India
- Location: In hip Bangalore, South India
- May 24 – July 2
- 15 credits, inc DECs
- Best deal in Study Abroad programs
- Under $6000, all inclusive
- Contact Study Abroad office (2-7030) or Center for India Studies (2-9742)

The Spread of English
- English in the 16th century
- Attitudes toward English
- John Milton, English poet
- English in the 18th century
- John Adams
Great Global Languages of the Past
- Sanskrit
- Pali
- Greek
- Latin
- Chinese
- Arabic
- French

Language Spread: Factors
- Migration
- Conquest and Colonization
- Religion
- Education
- Culture
- Entertainment
- Trade
- Others…
- How these apply to English

The Empire of English
- “The sun never sets on the British Empire”
- Geographical spread
- Demographic spread
- Functional spread

Typology of Spread
- As a native language
  - U.K., U.S.A., Canada, Australia, S. Africa,
- As a non-native language
  - Asia, Europe, Africa,

Braj Kachru’s Model of the Use of English World-wide: The Three Circles of English
- The Inner Circle
• The Outer Circle
• The Extended Circle

The Inner Circle
• U.K.
• U.S.A.
• Canada
• Australia
• New Zealand
• S. Africa

The Outer Circle
• South Asia (India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Nepal, …)
• Southeast Asia (Singapore, Malaysia)
  - also Hong Kong
• East Africa (Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania)
• West Africa (Nigeria, Ghana, etc.)
• Southern Africa (S. Africa, Zimbabwe)

The Extended Circle

Functional Differences between the three Circles
• Native vs. Non-native speakers
• Second vs. Foreign language Status
• Institutional status as a Second language (range of intra-national functions)
• Nativization (evolution of non-native norms)

Localization of English: Evolution of World Englishes
• British English
• American English
• Indian (South Asian) English
• African English
• Caribbean English
• Hispanic English
Case Study: English in India
• How many speakers?
• What is English used for?
• How is English taught & learned?
• How is English used?
• What is its impact and implications?

History of English in India
• Was English imposed on India?
• 18th c. demand for modernization
• 1835: Macaulay’s “Minute:” The colonial imperative
• Establishment of universities: Uniform system of education
• Emergence of a national lingua franca

English in India: Domains
• Education
• Administration
• Law
• Lingua Franca
• Business
• Media
• Literature

Interaction with local languages and culture
• Substratum influence (Mother tongue effects, e.g., accent, syntax, etc.)
• Global language, local culture
• Composite cultures – code-mixing
• Mixed languages: Hinglish, Chinglish, Spanglish, Franglais, etc.

Problems with Globalization
• Endangered Languages
**Indianization of English**
- Phonology (Pronunciation patterns)
- Morphology (Word formation rules)
- Lexicon (Vocabulary, idioms)
- Syntax (Sentence formation rules)
- Pragmatics (Usage in context)

**Implications**
- What is Standard English?
- Traditional models
- British vs. American English
- Native vs. Non-Native English
- Who decides?
- What criteria are involved?
- Polycentric Model

**Theoretical Implications**
- Paradigm of globalization and its interaction with globalization

**Further Reading**
- Braj B. Kachru (ed.) *The Other Tongue* (U. IL)
- *World Englishes* (journal, Blackwell)

View and discuss the Wide Angle Video: “The Soul of India”
Source: http://www.pbs.org/wnet/wideangle/

The latest round of communal violence in India has left more than 600 Muslims dead. Was this just another riot in India's long history of religious struggle? Or was it the direct result of Hindu nationalist government policies? The video describes how India's Muslim minority is caught between conflicting views of Indian national identity--multiculturalism and Hindu nationalism.
Background
Roughly 82 percent of India is Hindu and the remaining 18 percent, numbering between 190 and 200 million people, belong to a variety of faiths: Islam, Christianity, Sikhism, Jainism, Judaism, etc. At nearly 12.8 percent, and numbering about 130 million, Muslims are the largest minority. Finally, at two percent, and numbering approximately 20 million, Christians are the third largest Indian minority. Hindu nationalism has historically been hostile to these last two religious communities in India.

Mahatma Gandhi, unquestionably the father of Indian independence, was in favor of "composite nationalism," or what we today would call multiculturalism. According to composite nationalism, being a good Muslim is perfectly consistent with being a good Indian. Religion (and language) do not define India; India is multicultural and pluralist. Pluralism is embodied in India's laws (such as protection of minority rights and educational institutions) and in political institutions (such as India's federal system, which -- among other things -- allows Indian states to determine for themselves which of the country's many languages it will use for official business). Gandhian composite nationalism drove India's freedom movement and is the foundation of modern India's constitution.

In contrast, today's "Hindu nationalists" focus on the primacy of Hindus in India and demand that all non-Hindu groups should play a secondary role in national life. They "can stay as a younger brother," is how their leader puts it. Hindu nationalism was a minor force during India's freedom movement, as well as for four decades after independence. But since the late 1980s it has become a powerful force. Though it has not been able to defeat the multicultural view of India completely, it has certainly been in ascendance. Hindu nationalists are part of a ruling coalition in the federal government in Delhi. Of the major states in India, only in the state of Gujarat have they been able to run the government entirely on their own in recent times.

Although often ignited by present-day economics and politics, ethno-religious communal violence draws upon a long history of struggle between Hindu and Muslim power. Under the leadership of Jawaharlal Nehru, India on January 26, 1950, adopted a new constitution. Providing for a federal union of states under a parliamentary system, it attempted to defuse communal conflict by ensuring all Indians, regardless of caste, ethnicity or religion, fundamental rights. Nevertheless, Nehru and the prime ministers that followed have continued to struggle with the legacy of partition. Exacerbating the lingering bitterness between Pakistan and India were several unresolved territorial issues: upon independence, three princely states had yet to join either Pakistan or India. Two of these, Hyderabad and Junagadh -- ruled by Muslims but with predominately Hindu populations -- were forcibly annexed by India. In 1949, the Hindu ruler of Kashmir -- which was 85 percent Muslim -- finally opted to join India, prompting the first of three India-Pakistan wars, one of which resulted in the creation of Bangladesh in 1971.

Today, Pakistan holds one-third of Kashmir; India holds the other two-thirds and accuses Pakistan of supporting terrorism among Kashmiri separatists. (By mid-2002, the two countries, both nuclear powers, were again on the brink of war over terrorism.
linked to the region.) During the 1990s, the Kashmir problem combined with more ancient grudges to feed Hindu nationalist populism. India's current ruling party, the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), was helped to power through its endorsement of a militant Hindu plan to demolish the Moghul-era Mosque of Babur in Ayodhya.

On Dec. 6, 1992, thousands of Hindu extremists, armed with hammers and crowbars clambered atop the 430-year-old Ayodhya mosque in northern India and began dismantling it. Within hours, they had razed the structure to the ground, clearing the site for a proposed Hindu temple.

Since that time, Hindu nationalists have continued to press for permission to build a temple in its place. In February 2002, 58 Hindu nationalists returning from a rally in Ayodhya were burned to death when a gang of Muslims set their train on fire. This attack sparked anti-Muslim violence throughout the state of Gujarat during the first week of March, 2002, which resulted in the deaths of hundreds of Indian Muslims. Altogether, the destruction of the mosque prompted India's worst religious riots and since then more than 2,000 people died across the country.

**History**

1528: Mosque constructed in Ayodhya on supposed birthplace of Hindu deity, Lord Rama.

1992: Hindu activists destroy Ayodhya mosque, sparking Hindu-Muslim riots that kill over 2,000.

Feb. 2002: Fifty-eight people killed when Muslims in Godhra burn train carrying Hindu activists from Ayodhya.

March 2002: Hindu activists vow to build temple in Ayodhya. Supreme Court bars all religious activity from site.

Feb.-March 2002: At least 1,000 people killed in religious violence in state of Gujarat.

**The Struggle for National Identity**

The Hindu nationalists argue that emotions and loyalty make a nation, not laws and institutions. Laws, they say, can always be politically manipulated. One should explicitly ground politics in Hinduism, not in laws and institutions.

But who is a Hindu? Savarkar, the ideological father of Hindu nationalism, gave a definition in Hindutva: "A Hindu means a person who regards this land...from the Indus to the seas as his fatherland (pitrabhumi) as well as his holy land (punyabhumi)." The definition is thus territorial (land between the Indus and the seas), genealogical ("fatherland") and religious ("holy land"). Hindus, Sikhs, Jains, and Buddhists can be part of this definition for they meet all three criteria. All of these religions were born in India. Christians, Jews, Parsis and Muslims can meet only two, for India is not their holy land.

How can such "non-Hindu" groups be part of India? By cultural (not political) assimilation, say the Hindu nationalists. Parsis and Jews, they argue, are already assimilated, becoming part of the nation's mainstream. This leaves us with the
Christians and Muslims. "They," wrote Savarkar, "cannot be recognized as Hindus. For though Hindustan (India) to them is the fatherland as to any other Hindu, yet it is not to them a holy land too. Their holy land is far off in Arabia or Palestine.... Their love is divided."

This forms the basis for Hindu nationalism's adversarial relationship with India's Christians and Muslims. Of the two, ultimately, Muslims have been designated as the principal adversary of Hindu nationalism -- partly because of their numbers, and partly because a Muslim homeland in the form of Pakistan, after all, did partition India in 1947.

According to the Hindu nationalist ideology, to become part of the Indian nation, Muslims must: accept the centrality of Hinduism to Indian civilization; remorsefully accept that Muslim rulers of India between the years 1000 and 1757 destroyed pillars of Hindu civilization, especially Hindu Temples; not claim special privileges such as maintenance of religious personal laws (These are special laws that govern minorities in such non-criminal matters as marriage, divorce and inheritance.); and not demand special state grants for their educational institutions.

In India, scholars have repeatedly told us, Islam developed two broad forms: syncretistic, and exclusivist. The former has a doctrine adapted to local culture, while the latter attempts to exclude all ideas that were not part of original Islamic doctrine. In India, syncretistic Islam integrated into the pre-existing Indian culture long ago. Syncretistic Islam has produced some of the pillars of Indian culture, music, poetry and literature. Indian Muslims of various hues have also fought wars against Pakistan.

The political and ideological battle of the Hindu nationalists should be against Islamic fundamentalism and Muslim separatism, not against everybody who professes faith in Islam. By generating an anti-Muslim discourse, the Hindu nationalists risk embittering all of the country's 120 to 130 million Muslims permanently, including those with syncretistic attitudes toward the majority Hindu culture.

The battle between the contrahents is a battle for the essence, peace and dignity of India. Hindu nationalists have still to convince a majority, or plurality, of Indian voters - - including Hindu voters -- that they should shed their multicultural moorings. On the basis of electoral statistics, scholars of Indian politics continue to believe that the odds of a multicultural India disappearing are very low. India's democracy, in short, is the best bulwark against the spread of Hindu nationalism as an ideology.

Source: Ashutosh Varshney is the director of the Center for South Asian Studies at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, where he is also a professor of political science. This essay draws from the author's latest book, "Ethnic Conflict and Civic Life: Hindus and Muslims in India." His writing has also appeared in THE FINANCIAL TIMES, THE WASHINGTON POST and NEWSWEEK.
Questions for Class Discussion
1. Is the dominance of U.S. American culture a threat to the existence of other cultures? What do other like about it and what do they detest? Why?
2. While experiencing globalization, how important is it that people of different cultures, especially U.S. Americans, understand and learn about other cultures?
3. Do you think governments should censor foreign cultures and languages and restrain the flow of global information and interaction?
4. Could resentment against globalization cause it to slow down?
5. Is a hybridization of cultures something we should strive for?
6. Why do people in the same locales experience globalization differently and people in different places experience it similarly?
7. The whole world is now divided into “nation-states.” Can you think of another or better ways to govern people? Do we already see signs of another future?
8. How can one incorporate more “responsibility” and democratic control into the globalization process considering the speed and universality of changes?