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Introduction

The issues that I discuss in this chapter concern several aspects of the Asian presence of the English language, and are not restricted to methods and methodology. The concerns are about the constructs of the language that we use in a wide range of functional domains, about the ideologies, and the altered contexts that relate to the Asian reincarnations of the language. In other words, these issues relate to the Asian sociolinguistic, ideological and literary reinventions of the language. Actually, these issues go beyond English. One has to ask in what ways the Anglophone Asian contexts, whether linguistic, social, or cultural, are altering English, and in what ways English continues to alter Asian languages and literatures.

Thus, this chapter is yet another expression of what Peter Strevens (1992), using Marlowe’s words, has called ‘the outward sign of inward fires’. We have already entered another millennium, and ELT professionals have been busy designing plans for ‘English 2000 and beyond’ (Bowers, 1995). The debate on the theoretical and applied conceptualizations of the field of English studies has acquired a unique vitality and energy in its various incarnations around the world. It is the opportune time to take another look, in this new context, at our conceptualization of world Englishes in Asia — or what may be called the world of Asian Englishes.

The title ‘Asian Englishes’ is intended to alter and relocate the focus of our ongoing debate on this linguistic icon. The English language is generally discussed as a language that is in Asia, but not of Asia. This perception raises challenging questions about the almost permanent immigrant status of a language and the rights of a language to naturalization. I believe that answers to these questions are important, particularly for linguistically and culturally pluralistic Asian societies. And so far as English is concerned, these questions are not less important for societies that have traditionally considered themselves, linguistically or culturally, homogeneous. I am particularly thinking
of the dimensions of English that I have emphasized over the past four decades, i.e. the acculturation and nativization of the language, and the resultant Englishization of other Asian languages and literatures.

There is no paucity of metaphors that define the constructs of English in Asia and elsewhere. The metaphors ‘the world language’, ‘the language on which the sun never sets’, and ‘a universal language’ are particularly loaded. These are metaphors of ‘indivisiveness’ and ‘partnership’. But the reality is different. Then there are metaphors of distance, Otherness, and conflict that refer to the deception perceived in English as a medium and its messages, for example, ‘a Trojan horse’, ‘the other tongue’, ‘stepdaughter’, and ‘stepmother tongue’. And on the other extreme is the characterization of the English language as ‘the most racist of all human languages’ (Ngugi, 1981). In this jungle of metaphors English is Hydra-like with many heads, including one that, in India’s metaphysical writer Raja Rao’s view ‘elevates us all’ (1978a). Rao has no hesitation in equating English in India with the Brahmanic sacred language Sanskrit, as discussed in Chapter 7. The metaphors ‘the flowering tree’ or ‘the speaking tree’ point to yet other dimensions of English, that of its multiculturalism, its pluralism and its immense hybridity. The discussion that follows combines some aspect of all these metaphors, since most of them also represent our Asian perceptions of the language. That is not surprising, since Asia comprises a linguistic, literary, cultural, ideological and, of course, political, world of its own — a vast world of hybridities.

In this Asian world of Englishes, the prolonged presence of the English language has raised a string of challenging questions that have been discussed in literature, not only in English, but also in other major languages of this vast region (e.g. Bengali, Chinese, Hindi, Japanese, Malay, Singhala, Tamil, and Urdu). In Asia, for example, there has been an articulate and provocative debate in Japan, in the Philippines, and in Singapore. We see now that Hong Kong, Thailand, and Malaysia are gradually becoming active participants in this most controversial and virulent linguistic debate of our times. And the reason is that English in one way or another has a presence in the most vital aspects of Asian lives including our cultures, our languages, our interactional patterns, our discourses, our economies, and, of course, our politics. But above all, English has had a major role in altering our identities as individuals, societies, and the identities of Asian languages. These transformations are evident in a variety of contact languages and literatures in Asia and other parts of the world.

What is now a vibrant, and somewhat contentious, linguistic debate across cultures has indeed been present in colonial Asia for most of its history. And now, during the post-1960s, this debate has acquired a new vitality, added concerns, and a variety of daunting dimensions. The presence of this debate is indeed a good sign. It is, therefore, not uncommon to be asked: Whose
language is English, anyway? The question is a mix of part assertion and part intellectual probe.

Epistemological concerns

I shall add some epistemological concerns to this cross-cultural debate, but not necessarily restricted to Asia. These concerns are due to the intensity of the debate about re-thinking English studies, practically in every major area of Asia (e.g. see Dasgupta, 1993; Dissanayake, 1985; B. Kachru, 1983a, 1983b and later, Thumboo, 1985; see also Bautista, 1997; Foley, 1988 and Foley et al., 1998).

In order to respond to these concerns, two questions come to mind. First, what conditions must a transplanted colonial language in diaspora fulfil to be accepted as part of the colonizees' linguistic repertoire? In other words, why not consider the reincarnated English in the Philippines, Singapore and India — just to offer three examples — as a part of our local pluralistic linguistic heritage? After all, English has been with us in various parts of Asia for almost 200 years. That presence in relation to time compares very well indeed with the transplanting of English in North America, in Australia, and in New Zealand. The second question brings us close to an ongoing pan-Asian debate about the English language. Why not consider the diaspora varieties of English, for example, in the Philippines, Singapore, Malaysia and India as functionally viable parts of our linguistic and cultural heritages? A heritage that has left indelible sweet-and-sour traces on our cultural and linguistic histories.

These concerns must be confronted to further strengthen our ongoing process of pluralistic foundations — cultural, social and linguistic. We need to redefine and reconstruct concepts such as NATIVENESS and NON-NATIVENESS of languages we use within the dynamic sociolinguistic contexts of Asia. We need to focus on their Asianness and Asian identities. These questions are like double-edged swords. However, these epistemological concerns cannot and should not be separated from our current emotional debate about languages and the place of English in designing and redesigning our language policies. I expressed these concerns in the 1980s with reference to English in India’s multilingual context. In India, as it is well known, there is a continued agonizing and schizophrenic debate about the status of English and its role in the region (B. Kachru, 1994a). The story of this debate actually goes back to the 1830s, when Thomas Macaulay’s Minute introduced a language policy for the subcontinent with English as its major component, as discussed in Chapter 3.

These multilingual societies, which have passed through a host of post-
colonial contexts, must confront these two concerns for pragmatic, political, and economic reasons — but more so for strengthening the pluralistic foundations of our societies. Asian sociocultural and sociolinguistic reasons of convergence and cultural interaction have made it vital that we redefine the concepts of the *nativeness* and the distance-marking *otherness* of the languages we use.

**Language and nativeness**

The questions concerning *nativeness* of a language have acquired most provocative connotations in language policies and language conflicts. In the present context, this debate is generally addressed with reference to English. In an earlier studies (see Chapter 2), I proposed that in the contextualization of world Englishes we make a distinction between **GENETIC NATIVENESS** and **FUNCTIONAL NATIVENESS** of the language in our multilingual repertoires.

**GENETIC NATIVENESS:** The historical relationship between, for example, Hindi, Kashmiri, and Bengali belonging to India’s Indo-Aryan group of languages is genetic. This relationship is thus different from, for example, that of the Dravidian languages, such as Tamil, Telugu, and Malayalam with Sanskrit. The interface between the Dravidian group of languages and Sanskrit is the result of extended contact, convergence, and the underlying cultural traditions. It is through such contact that languages belonging to distinct language families have developed a variety of shared formal features. It is again on this basis that South Asia has been characterized as a linguistic, sociolinguistic, and a literary area.\(^1\) Such typologies of shared identities, i.e. linguistic, literary, and cultural, have been proposed for other regions of Asia like Southeast Asia and the Pacific region.

**FUNCTIONAL NATIVENESS:** Functional nativeness is not necessarily related to the genetic mapping of a language. Functional parameters are determined by the **range** and **depth** of a language in a society. Range refers to the domains of function, and depth refers to the degree of social penetration of the language. These two variables provide good indicators of comparative functions of languages in a society and of acquired identities and types of acculturation represented by a transplanted language. In determining functional nativeness one must consider, for example:

1. the sociolinguistic status of a variety in its transplanted context;
2. the functional domains in which the language is used;
3. the creative processes used at various levels to articulate local identities;
4. the linguistic exponents of acculturation and nativization;
5. the types of cultural ‘cross-over’ contributing to a new canon; and
6. the attitude-specifying labels used for the variety\(^2\)
I am specifically thinking of English here, but there is no reason why this concept cannot be applied to other languages as well, i.e. Chinese in the Philippines and Singapore or in diasporic contexts in the USA, UK and India; Hindi in Fiji; Korean in Japan, and so on.

**Contexts of the Asian presence of English**

The answers to the above two questions are essentially determined by the contexts in which English is used in Asia. For example, one might consider the following contexts in which English is used in each Asian country.

1. *HISTORICAL*, with reference to the language policies of major regions and the place of English in such contexts;
2. *FUNCTIONAL*, within the contexts of the uses of English in various domains;
3. *FORMAL*, with reference to major productive processes which mark the nativization of English;
4. *SOCIOCULTURAL*, with reference to the acculturation of English within the social and cultural contexts of the region;
5. *CREATIVE*, with reference to, for example, literary genres, professional genres, and the news media;
6. *EDUCATIONAL*, with reference to the status and use of English in the educational system at various levels in, and types of, educational institutions; and
7. *ATTITUDINAL*, with reference to the users’ attitudes towards the models and methods appropriate for the local users.

**Asian Englishes within the Three Circles**

If we consider Asian Englishes within the perspectives discussed above, one notices the following important facts. The first fact to consider is that Anglophone Asia provides an integrated profile of English within the Concentric Circles model of the spread of English. This model, observes McArthur (see also Chapter 11, ‘On getting the Three Circles Model backwards’, pp. 211–20):

... is a more dynamic model than the standard version, and allows for all manner of shadings and overlaps among the circles. Although ‘inner’ and ‘outer’ still suggest — inevitably — a historical priority and the attitudes that go with it, the metaphor of ripples in a pond suggests mobility and flux and implies that a new history is in the making. (McArthur, 1993: 334)
The Inner Circle is represented in greater Asia by Australia and New Zealand, where English functions primarily as a first language in majority of cases, though that profile is very dynamic. The Outer Circle is represented by, for example, India, Singapore and the Philippines. In these countries, English is used as an institutionalized additional language. The term ‘institutionalized’ has several implications as discussed in my original proposal of this classification in 1985. And the Expanding Circle is represented by, for example, China, Thailand, Taiwan and Korea, where English continues to be used primarily as a foreign language. However, dynamics of English in the Expanding Circle is fast changing.

The users of English in Asia’s two numerical giants, China and India, add up to approximately 533 million. This speech community, then, is larger than the total of the USA, the UK and Canada. In China the estimated figure of students enrolled in programmes in English as a foreign language is about 200 million (see Zhao and Campbell, 1995). A survey conducted in India (India Today, 18 August 1997) shows that my earlier estimated figure of 60 million was both conservative and dated. The latest figures tell us that:

Contrary to the [Indian] census myth that English is the language of a microscopic minority, the poll indicates that almost one in every three Indians claims to understand English although less than 20 percent are confident of speaking it. (India Today, 18 August 1997)
The estimated population of India is now over one billion. The survey figures, then, add up to 333 million Indians who possess varying degrees of bilingual competence in Indian English and almost 200 million in China. These are large figures. At one level these figures provide mute statistics describing the linguistic profile of one segment of Asia’s English-knowing bilingual population. But these figures relate to a vast human population and have immense linguistic, ideological, cultural and indeed ethical implications.

All three Circles of English in Asia have certain shared characteristics. First, that all the varieties of English used in Asia are TRANSPLANTED varieties; and that these varieties comprise formal and functional distinctiveness of the diaspora varieties of English in various degrees.

The second fact about English as an Asian language is that its demographic profile is overwhelming in the following senses:

1. that the total English-using population of Asia is more than that of the Inner Circles, including Australia and New Zealand;
2. that India, in the Outer Circle, is a major English-using country along with the US and the UK;
3. that English is the main medium in demand for acquisition of bilingualism/multilingualism in the whole Asian region; and
4. that in parts of Asia (e.g. in Singapore) English is gradually acquiring the status of the dominant language or the first language, whatever we mean by that term.

The third fact concerns the extensive creativity in the language in a broad variety of literary genres. The innovations in the medium and the acculturation of the messages that the medium conveys has resulted in an unprecedented cross-over of the language.

The fourth fact relates to the types of penetration — and functions — the English language has acquired among various levels of society in the region, for example, in the print, spoken (radio) and visual (television) media as a major resource of information — in addition to multiple regional languages. We see this in the profile of English in India, discussed above. It is further evident in, for example, in India’s press and print media. In 2000, reports India 2002: A Reference Manual (275), there were 49,145 periodicals and newspapers published in India, ‘in as many as 101 languages and dialects’. Out of this total, Hindi was leading with 19,685, English with 7,175 was second, and Urdu was third with 2,848.

The total ‘claimed’ circulation of newspapers during that year was 126,963,763 copies. In terms of their circulation, the English newspapers have a national pan-Indian circulation and some international distribution. That claim is supported by the number of Indian cities in which each English newspaper is printed. The Hindustan Times, printed in seven cities, ‘was the largest circulated single edition newspaper’ with 847,306 copies; The Hindu,
printed in nine cities, with 779,851 copies; *Ananda Bazar Patrika*, a Bengali daily (Kolkata) was third with 754,348 copies; and *The Times of India* was ‘the largest circulated multi-edition’ daily with 1,687,099 copies, and with several editions from seven cities. The following table shows the number of English newspapers by type (periodicity), and percentage of the total.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIODICITY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dailies</td>
<td>5,364</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>7.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-biweekly</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>17,749</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>5.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortnightly</td>
<td>6,553</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>10.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>13,616</td>
<td>2,868</td>
<td>21.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>3,425</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>36.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bimonthly/half-yearly</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>48.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>38.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19,140</td>
<td>7,176</td>
<td>37.49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All these vehicles of information are primarily managed by Indians and most written in various varieties of educated South Asian English. Furthermore, the initiatives in planning, administration, and funding for the acquisition and spread of English are largely in the hands of Asians for whom English is an additional language.

And, finally, there is the inevitable formation of ideology in and through the English language. In this region there is a most articulate continuous debate about three major ideological issues related to English: its colonial constructs, its ideological impact, and its hegemonic implications for the cultures. These questions indeed bring forth a string of issues related to Westernization, to the creation of conflicting identities, and, above all, to the types of resultant issues related to power and politics.

The albatross of mythology

The mythology about English as a language — its curriculum, its research agendas, and its pedagogy — continues to be constructed and imposed in a deliberate and planned way as a loaded weapon. The mythology manifests itself in the norms of language, reactions to creativity and innovations, and recognition of canons (see B. Kachru, 1992d; 1995c).

The power of the mythology is immense; it is like a linguistic albatross around the necks of the users of the language. The result is that innovative
and creative initiatives are paralyzed and these result in self-doubt when there is a conflict with the paradigms of authority. And such dominant external paradigms continue to be present in all Anglophone Asia. These paradigms function like linguistic arms of control. These arms of control, for example, include assumptions and hypotheses related to the following:

1. **language production** with reference to, for example, language standards;
2. **language function** with reference to models of functional language-types (e.g., English for Special Purpose, ESP), schemas for genres of writing, and communicative competence;
3. **channels of authentication** and authority with reference to native versus nonnative status;
4. **criteria for legitimization** of the canon and innovations in creativity within a canon;
5. **standardization** of performance tests in evaluation of competence; and **definitions** of interactional concepts such as intelligibility, etc.

### Table 2.2  Functional domains of English across the Three Circles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>INNER CIRCLE</th>
<th>OUTER CIRCLE</th>
<th>EXPANDING CIRCLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Code</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate trade</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic impact</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic creativity</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary renaissance</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News broadcasting</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific higher education</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific research</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social interaction</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Only English has function in this domain
+/- English as well as other language(s) function in this domain
- English has no function in this domain

Note that in recent years even in the Inner Circle countries (e.g., UK and USA) there is increasing presence of Asian and African languages in some of the above domains.

The power of mythology is imperceptible until we see its underlying presence in the formation of hypotheses, definitions of contexts, and legitimization of methods and methodology (e.g. see Canagarajah, 1999; B. Kachru, 1996b). Lévi-Strauss, (cited in Eribon, 1991: 141) warns us about the power of myths when he says that ‘a myth offers us a grid’, and it is the grid that:
makes it possible to decipher a meaning, not of the myth itself but of all
the rest-images of the world, of society, of history, that hover on the threshold
of consciousness, with the questions men ask about them. The matrix of
intelligibility makes it possible to combine them all into a coherent whole

These myths have a way of acquiring a life of their own. There are agencies
of control which intentionally use mythology as a foundation for models and
for various paradigms (e.g. see Phillipson, 1992 and later). In the past, I have
discussed these myths in several ways (see B. Kachru, 1995a and later; cf.
Chapter 5). I will mention here three sets of such myths to illustrate the point.
These three sets have one thing in common: they establish, as Foucault (1980)
asserts, the ‘regimes of truth’. In this particular case these ‘regimes of truth’
are of three distinct types:

The first set defines and determines the rank and hierarchy of
interlocutors, for example,

Myth 1: THE NATIVE SPEAKER IDEALIZATION MYTH;
Myth 2: THE NATIVE VS. NON-NATIVE SPEAKER INTERACTION MYTH.

The second set constrains both the message and the medium, for example,

Myth 3: THE CULTURE IDENTITY (OR MONOCULTURE) MYTH;
Myth 4: THE EXOCENTRIC NORM MYTH.

The third set legitimizes the control of innovations, creativity, and linguistic
experimentation, for example,

Myth 5: THE INTERLANGUAGE MYTH (cf. Chapter 5);
Myth 6: THE CASSANDRA MYTH.

This mythology applies to all major languages of power and control including
English as well as other languages of wider communication in Asia, Africa, and
Europe. However, my concern here is restricted to the presence of English in
the Asian context.

What this mythology and the resultant chains of control negate is the vital
sociolinguistic and identity-denoting concepts of PLURICENTRICITY and
POLYPHONY in terms of mantras. This concept proposes that world Englishes
have a plurality of centres. The major characteristics of these centres are that
they provide the norms and models for its acquisition; develop methods and
materials for appropriate localized pedagogical goals; use innovations in
literary creativity, genre development, and region-specific ESPs; develop
linguistic materials for authentication and local and regional codification;
recognize the convergence of English with local languages (e.g. Chinese, Malay,
Tamil, Hindi, Tagalog, Thai) as a natural process of convergence and
acculturation; and consider the formal processes of nativization as an integral
part of the linguistic variety and incorporate these features in the local
dictionaries and teaching materials of the variety.
The Asian world of English, then, comprises two distinct types of users. These may be broadly divided into norm-providing and norm-dependant categories:

**NORM-PROVIDING:** L1 norm (e.g. Australia, New Zealand); L2 norm (e.g. the Philippines, Singapore, India, Sri Lanka).

**NORM-DEPENDENT:** L2 (e.g. China, Japan, Taiwan, Thailand, South Korea).

That a country is ‘norm-dependent’ does not necessarily imply that a recognizable local variety is not used. The most significant dimension of pluricentricity is that the regional varieties of English have primarily local, regional, and interregional contexts of use: Singaporeans with Thais, Japanese with Indians, and South and West Asians with West, East, or South Africans and Europeans. The situation of predetermined interlocutors (Inner Circle vs. Other Circles or as ELT literature presents *native* vs. *non-native*) has no pragmatic and communicative validity, as discussed in detail in Chapter 6. And this pragmatic fact has serious implications in our continued subordination to ELT mythology, imposed by the ELT Empire, as I have attempted to show in this volume.

**Mythology and the Asian context**

The acceptance of this mythology is not always innocent. There are contexts in which the use of the mythology is initiated towards cultural, religious, ideological, and economic ends. Let me illustrate my point by examples: those of the Philippines, India, and Japan. These countries provide insights into the motivations for the initial introduction of English in these three Asian regions and about the continued direct and indirect efforts to maintain the ‘regimes of truth’ in theory, in methodology, cultural and religious enlightenment and in the constructs of ELT. The case of the Philippines, in many ways, is identical to that of South Asia and parts of Africa. In these areas English was introduced partly for its ‘civilizing’ effect. In 1898, when the arm of power of the USA reached the Philippines, it ended 300 years of Spanish domination. It is believed that President McKinley had a distinct agenda for this newly acquired colony: the agenda was ‘to educate the Filipinos and uplift and civilize and Christianize them to fit the people for the duties of citizenship’ (cited in Beebe and Beebe, 1981: 322). In South Asia, the agents of colonial expansion from the other side of the Atlantic did not have a much different agenda. We see that in the case of the Indian subcontinent, Charles Grant believed that ‘[t]he communication of our light and knowledge to them, would prove the best remedy for their disorders’ (1831–1832: 60–1). And in that part of the colonial world English was again introduced as a tool of ‘enlightenment’, of ‘light’, and of ‘civilization’, as discussed in Chapter 3.
In Japan, proposals were made by some Japanese to abandon the native tongue, Japanese, and adopt some ‘better, richer, stronger language, such as English or French’ (Miller, 1977: 41). And Arinori Mori even argued that ‘all reasons suggest its [the language of Japan] disuse’ (see Chapter 4). There was not just the suggestion that Japan adopt English as its ‘national language’, but there was a more extreme suggestion that the Japanese should acquire the ethnic qualities of Caucasians by inter-marriage with them. That indeed is just one side of the Japanese romance with English. And yet, there is another side, more virulent, more questioning, and extremely resentful of the hegemonic roles of the language. The details are given in Chapter 4 which specifically discusses Japan.

What I have just said about the colonial linguistic arm in the three parts of the world is not the end of the story. It was repeated in other parts of the world with equal vigour, commitment, and conviction, and often with extensive and ruthless might (e.g. see Cohn, 1985). But all that is in the past, and we are rightly told ‘You can never plan the future by the past’ (Bowers, 1995). That indeed is true. This dilemma reflects the agony and ecstasy we witness over the continued uses of English, not only in Anglophone Asia but around the world (B. Kachru, 1996c).

Current strategies

What we see now is that the earlier agendas have really not been abandoned. What has changed are the ways the agenda is presented and the strategies that are used for its implementation. Roger Bowers, one of the senior officers of the British Council in the 1990s, makes it clear that ‘the promotion of the English language is absolutely central’ as one of the ‘Charter obligations’ of the British Council (1995: 88). And he continues that:

 [...] we want to maintain the position of the English language as a world language so that it can serve on the widest possible stage as the vehicle for our national values and heritage [...]

I must confess that, Bowers also adds, ‘along with those of other English-speaking nations’ (1995: 88; emphasis added). We must give Bowers credit for being equally candid about the implementation of these goals in ELT: even more outspoken than that. He immediately agrees that ‘we have then a vested interest in maintaining the roles of English as a language, and of British ELT as a trade and a profession’ (1995: 88; emphasis added). What does Bowers’ declaration sound like? And, here I quote in his own words:
Now this begins to sound dangerously like linguistic imperialism, and if Braj B. Kachru were here, he would strongly object (as he has in the past) to putting national before supranational interests and to placing commerce before philosophy. (Bowers, 1995: 88)

The English language, then, according to Bowers’ statement, is an asset and instrument of the British as a vehicle of British values and culture, and as a resource for trade and profession. This is a ‘national’ agenda and the British perspective on English. And this perspective has been put more directly, if less diplomatically, by the director of ‘a dynamic worldwide chain of English language schools’ who told Phillipson, the author of *Linguistic Imperialism* that ‘once we used to send gunboats and diplomats abroad; now we are sending English teachers’ (Phillipson, 1992: 8).

And now what does one say about the other part of Bowers’ observation: Should one object to the Charter-mandated function of the British Council as ‘linguistic imperialism’? That indeed depends on the interpretation, and I will not discuss that question here.

Decolonizing text and context

The conceptualization of world Englishes has introduced other dimensions for the types of crossover in contexts and texts in Englishes. We find the use of terms such as ‘decolonization’ (see Dissanayake, 1985; Thumboo, 1985), ‘dehegemonization’ (e.g. Kandiah, 1995; Parakrama, 1995), and ‘liberation linguistics’ (see Quirk, 1988, 1989; cf. Chapter 7). The positions of the above groups are obviously not in tune with one another. Indeed, the ranks are becoming more and more clearly defined (e.g. see what has been termed the Quirk/B. Kachru controversy in Tickoo, 1991). The major points of the above controversies are that:

- the internationalization of English has come at a price;
- there is nothing like international English, but there are international functions of English;
- pluralism and diversity are an integral part of the internationalization of the language;
- the earlier paradigms — linguistic, literary and pedagogical — are flawed on several counts and these do not address current overwhelming cross-cultural and cross-linguistic roles and identities of the language.5

In a broader conceptualization of world Englishes these issues then take us to larger concerns, regarding canonicity, pluralism and diversity (for a detailed discussion and references, see B. Kachru, 1997b). First, they are used
with reference to the contextualization of English in functions which are
distinct from, and oftentimes contrary to, the original colonial agenda for the
language and its presuppositions. Second, they are used with reference to
assertions about the stylistic identities of the English medium (*madhyama*), as
opposed to the messages (*mantras*) that the medium conveys, as illustrated with
reference to the writings of Raja Rao in Chapter 7. Third, they are used with
reference to placing the varieties of English within the larger contexts of shared
formal and functional identities. This conceptualization has contributed to the
use of regional identity-marking terms such as the *Africanization* or *South
Asianization* of English (see Bokamba, 1982 [1992]; B. Kachru, 1981a). The
*Asianization* (or *Asian Englishes*) is yet another dimension of that
contextualization. Fourth, they are used with reference to the
‘dehegemonization of English’, primarily with reference to methodological and
pedagogical concerns.

**Canonicity, diversity, and Asian Englishes**

The issues related to canonicity, pluralism and diversity are not simple. These
concerns demand a fresh view about canon formation in language and
literature. Questions related to canonicity have had to contend with the two
diasporas of English, i.e. the first diaspora (in, for example, the USA, Australia
and New Zealand) and what I have called the second diaspora (in the Outer
Circle). In this increasingly confrontational war of canons, the basic issues
relate to the following four points:

- legitimacy of the canon
- attitudes towards the canon
- hierarchy of canons, and
- canonicity and marginalization

The participants in this war of canons represent three broad groups:

- established or hegemonizing canon(s)
- ‘loose canons’ (see Chapter 4), and
- canons under cannon

The canons under cannon do not refer only to the Asian, African, or
African-American canons. One example is that of guarding the hegemonizing
canon in Scotland. James Kelman, the author of *How Late It Was, How Late*,
who received the prestigious Booker Prize in 1994, encountered the same
attitude that Asians and Africans have traditionally experienced. His novel was
called a ‘disgrace’ by one of the judges, Rabbi Julia Neuberger, and ‘literary
vandalism’ by Simon Jenkins in *The Times. The New York Times* reported that:
In his heavy Scottish accent [Kelman] made a rousing case for the culture and language of “indigenous” people outside of London. ... “A fine line can exist between elicitism and racism,” he said. “On matters concerning language and culture, the distinction can sometimes cease to exist altogether” “[…] To me, those words are just another way of inferiorizing the language by indicating that there’s a standard,” he said. “The dictionary would use the term ‘debased’. But it’s the language! The living language and it comes out of many different sources, including Scotland before the English arrived.” (29 November 1994: B1–2)

Kelman recalls those times ‘when Glaswegian accents were banned from the radio’ or when Kelman’s two daughters, at age eleven, were ‘reprimanded’ in school for using the Scottish ‘aye’ instead of English ‘yes’. Kelman believes that it is wrong to call the language of his work ‘vernacular’ or ‘dialect’.

And just over half a century ago that same attitude was expressed about American literature in Britain. The great pandit of the American language, H. L. Mencken, summarizes well the British attitude towards American English when he writes that ‘this occasional tolerance for things American was never extended to the American language’. This was in 1936 (see Mencken, 1936). And now the question remains: Is this attitude about American English in Britain dead (cf. Chapter 8)? The answer to this question is an emphatic ‘no’; one does not have to go too far for the evidence. It was not too long ago that Prince Charles said that the American version of the language was ‘very corrupting’ and that the English version was the ‘proper’ one. He told the British Council that ‘we must act now to ensure that English, and that, to my way of thinking, means English English, maintains its position as the world language well into the next century’ (Chicago Tribune, 24 March 1995, section 1, p. 4).

And Prince Charles is not alone in taking this position; others like him are jealously guarding what is perhaps one of the major export commodities now left with Britain. It is, therefore rightly claimed that ‘Britain’s real black gold is not North Sea oil, but the English language. ... It’s difficult to qualify a national resource. The value of having, in the post-industrial age, people use the language of one’s own culture is virtually inestimable.’

**English on Asian terms**

It is indeed true that the sociolinguistic contexts in which Asian Englishes function in Anglophone Asia are not identical in each country: all the functions are not necessarily shared. What is, however, attitudinally shared is an imperfect past and an albatross of mythology that reinvents itself constantly. This is true of the Philippines, Japan, Malaysia, Hong Kong and Sri Lanka. I do not think that there are any serious exceptions to it.
The concept ‘English Conversation Ideology’ (*Eikaiwa*) is not unique to Japan. I will discuss this topic in Chapter 4. The major points of ‘English Conversation Ideology’ (*Eikaiwa*), as Tsuda (1992: 32) summarizes, includes an ‘emotional attachment to Western, primarily American culture; elevation of the “native speaker” and the “Caucasian race” in general to a status of “cultural superiority”, thus damaging the images of Japanese “self” and society’.

The continued stronghold of the albatross of mythology results in paradigms of questionable knowledge, and in the centralization of linguistic inhibitors that are the legacy of the imperfect past. We see this in the types of norms of linguistic control that Anglophone has accepted, and the assumptions and hypotheses Asians use in English textbooks to create a world of English for young Asians. An insightful comparative case study, with special reference to North and South Korea, has been done by Baik (see Baik, 1995) and another has been written for South Asia (see Canagarajah, 1999 and later; see also Chapter 10). These mythologies are imperceptibly present in the definitions, in legitimation of methods and methodology, and even in grammatical descriptions and lexicographical research. This mythology has appropriated all collective initiatives — intellectual and pragmatic. In each place there is a tendency to assign Asian users of the language to a predetermined place, locale and role.

These myths have led to the constructs of three types: that of HIERARCHY in terms of interlocutors and interactional contexts; CANONICITY in equating the medium with essentially Judeo-Christian contexts; and ICONICITY in terms of canons of creativity. There are ardent believers and promoters — of these myths in practically all Anglophone countries, and Asia is no exception to that. The evidence of this mythology is also present in the constructs of negativism that make us overlook the sociolinguistic realities about the functions of world Englishes. One such basic reality is that of PLURICENTRICITY. What this implies is that like many other languages of wider communication — e.g., Arabic, Chinese, Hindi — world Englishes have identity-articulating multi-centres, in Asia, in Africa and other regions.

These centres, ideally, should provide linguistic security to the users of a variety of world Englishes. In reality, this is not happening. The result of this *discourse of destabilization* is that a variety of sociolinguistic facts about world Englishes are ignored. Let me give you some examples here: first, that there are plural norms and models of acquisition; second, that these models of acquisition are functionally appropriate for a variety of contexts; third, that such localized functions contribute to innovations in linguistic creativity; and, fourth, that convergence of English with local languages is a normal process in language contact situations that results in various types of code-alteration (mixing and switching), and pragmatically authenticates the text. The recognition of pluricentricity strengthens and develops various arms of linguistic stability (e.g. dictionaries, reference and teaching materials, as
discussed in Chapter 10) that contribute to linguistic resources for the construction and linguistic stabilization of identities in Asia.

The use of the term ‘Asian’ as a modifier with English or ‘Asianness’, to characterize the processes used in articulating the Asian identities, is not an attempt to suppress the cultural and linguistic diversity of English in Asia, or the differences in status of English in various educational and political systems in the region. We cannot overlook the fact that Asia — or, if I may use the term ‘greater Asia’ in which one could include Australia and New Zealand — represents all the Three Circles of English, thus bringing to this region a ‘mobility and flux’, the underlying concept of the Three Circles. The implication of that ‘mobility’ and ‘flux’ is, as McArthur says, that ‘a new history is in the making’ (1993: 334).

However we cut the Asian slice of Englishes within the greater Asian boundaries, we must recognize certain vital facts about this vast region of land, cultures and histories just as we must when we talk, for example, about African Englishes. The major sociolinguistic characteristics of the Asian region are that:
1. all varieties of English are transplanted and are not indigenous to the area;
2. all varieties manifest distinct diaspora features at various linguistic levels in varying degree and depth; and
3. all Asian countries share the mythologies about English that has been cultivated over a period of time.

It is, however, to be emphasized that the roles of English in Asia have already acquired FUNCTIONAL NATIVENESS, as discussed earlier, and that ASIA’S ENGLISH must be viewed in terms of that nativeness, that includes uses of English:
1. as a vehicle of communication across distinct linguistic and cultural groups at one level of interaction;
2. as a nativized medium for articulating local identities within and across Asia;
3. as one of the pan-Asian languages of creativity;
4. as a language that has developed its own subvarieties indicating penetration at various social, functional and educational levels; and
5. as a language that continues to elicit a unique love-hate relationship yet that has not seriously impeded its spread, functions and prestige status.

The implications of focusing on the Asianness of English and its Asian identities demand that we consider the message that the myths about English convey to us (see earlier discussion).

One important exponent of English on Asian terms is the use of English as Caliban’s linguistic weapon, as discussed in Chapters 4 and 7, the integrative and liberating function of the language at one level of colonized societies. We can, of course, make a case for the disintegrative (should I say ‘colonial’?) roles of English as the medium of Western culture and values and so on. That is
only one part of the story. We see that even Caliban could take only so much abuse. The result of that legacy is the vibrant political discourse in South Asia, both unifying and divisive — and the fast-increasing Asian writing in English for example, in Singapore, in the Philippines, in India, and in Sri Lanka (for further discussion and references see B. Kachru, 1993, 1998).

In culturally, linguistically, and ideologically pluralistic societies there are multiple levels of acculturation and hybridity. One has to answer a string of questions about such hybridity: Which language, ethnicity, and, yes, religion is colonial, less colonial, and not colonial at all? In the case of South Asia one has to ask questions, for example, Persian and the linguistic outgrowth of the Persian South Asian contact with Urdu/Hindustani and other languages. One has to ask questions about the spread of Sanskrit and Hindi in the Dravidian South. In the case of parts of Africa, one might ask: Why is Swahili less colonial than, say, English? That does not, however, mean that the medium does not articulate identities; indeed it does. That is a sociolinguistic reality. Once a language establishes its autonomy, it is actually liberated, and its ‘liberated’ uses and functions have to be separated from its non-liberated uses. We see this position well articulated, for example, by Raja Rao in South Asia, Wole Soyinka in West Africa and James Kelman in Scotland.

There surely are ‘colonial Englishes’, and ‘Eurocentric’ and ‘racist’ Englishes. But these constructs refer to particular uses of the medium. Such flawed constructs are not intrinsic to the language. ‘Racism’ or ‘centricism’ can surely be illustrated in English, but it can with abundant examples be illustrated in other languages too; for example, Persian, Japanese, Chinese, Sanskrit, and Swahili, etc. There is indeed a considerable body of literature making a case for discourse and narrative of racism, sexism, Brahmanism, and Casteism in Sanskrit. In fact, the prejudice went so far that the Indian Pandits refused to teach Sanskrit to Europeans, as they were considered *mleccha* ‘impure’, and not fit to acquire the *devavâni*, ‘God’s language’, Sanskrit.

**Institutionalization of Asian Englishes**

The contextualization of English as an Asian language entails an Asian perspective in theoretical, methodological and pedagogical terms. I shall discuss these points briefly here.

In theoretical terms, the focus must shift from the monolingual paradigms to paradigms relevant and appropriate to multilingual and multicultural societies. It is not just a matter of conceptualization, but also one of appropriate methodology for research in such societies. Once the importance of paradigm shift is realized, we will certainly understand the limitations of our current imported materials and colonial constructs, their limitations in terms of our multilingual and multicultural societies, and their economic ends. I am
particularly thinking of the methods of English language teaching, the cross-cultural and cross-linguistic claims for success of the expanding pedagogical practices of English for Specific Purposes (ESP), and the use and pedagogical validity of packaged ‘recipes’ for various genres. And of equal importance are the ideological issues and assumptions that underlie ESP and genre studies and research in general. I shall discuss these points in detail in Chapter 6.

Conclusion

One might ask: Where do we go now with Asian Englishes? The indications are clear that beyond the year 2050 various incarnations of the English language will still be with us. English has unique functions, unparalleled domains and overwhelming diversity. It changes its face on each continent, in each region, and in each English-using nation. The colonial dimension of the language is just one dimension. And to these constructs of identities with this medium across cultures we add yet another dimension, a reincarnated dimension.

We see this dimension in ‘the creations of a new culture’ that Soyinka sees in the use of English (1993: 88) as ‘a new medium of communication’. What Soyinka says about Africa is indeed already true in the world of English in Asia. What Soyinka means when he says that ‘black people’ are carving new concepts by the use of the medium and what Quirk means by ‘liberation linguistics’ constitute one of the major strengths of the English language in Asia. We cannot overlook the significance of such a conceptualization for Asian uses of English. These arguments have more significant theoretical, methodological and sociological relevance than the mere mantras of the colonial constructs of the English language.

We now have two fast-developing literary genres concerning the roles of English in the colonial world. One expresses the ‘guilt’ of the colonizee users of language, the GENRE OF GUILT. And the other attempts to search and seek out the colonizer within oneself, which may be called the GENRE OF ATONEMENT. The approach of linguistic guilt and atonement somehow bewilders the minds of the once-colonized like me. I am a product of both the pre- and post-colonial eras of the Indian subcontinent, and not one of what Rushdie calls ‘midnight’s children’. A majority of us Asians have experienced layer after layer of colonizers’ (and conquerors’) onslaughts — and most such onslaughts have left their cultural and linguistic imprints. A large part of such imprints have been assimilated by us and have become a part of our multicultural and multilingual legacies. We soberly transmit these legacies to our children — to our future generations. And I would like to believe that transmission, conscious or unconscious, takes place without any guilt.

In my case and in my part of India in Kashmir, these linguistic and cultural
layers, some of the results of unwelcome onslaudts, include Afghan, Persian, Sikh, Dogra, British, and so on. Where does it leave me, whether linguistically, culturally, in literary creativity or regarding types of sociocultural changes? I ask: Confused? Multicultural? Linguistically ‘converged’? Enriched? Or just ‘colonized’ with a variety of layers? We cannot express ‘guilt’ about only one ‘layer’ — that of English. What happens to the other layers? We cannot use strategies that will destabilize us in terms of our tradition of assimilative multilingual and multicultural identities. That, to me, is both disruptive and self-defeating. I believe that linguistic and cultural hybridity is our identity and destiny.

Our major strategy, then, is that of Wole Soyinka, of Raja Rao, and of Edwin Thumboo, which is to acculturate the language in our contexts of use, on our terms, the Asian terms. The Australian Robert Hughes, now in the USA, is right when he says that ‘[in] society, as in farming, monoculture works poorly, it exhausts the soil’ (cited in Gates, Jr. 1993: 15). In this case, he is talking of the USA. And now, let us take this vision beyond the USA, for example, to South and East Asia, to the Pacific, to Australia, to the Eastern Hemisphere. That abstract vision of a majority of the human population, with its linguistic diversity, cultural interfaces, social hierarchies, and conflicts, is represented in various strands of Asian Englishes in Asian terms. We see it, for example, in Singapore, in Malaysia, in the Philippines, in India, and in Australia.

The architects of each tradition, each strand, have moulded, reshaped, acculturated, redesigned, and by doing so, they enriched what was a Western medium. The result is a liberated English which contains vitality, innovation, linguistic mix, and cultural identities. And, it is not the creativity of the monolingual and the monocultural: this creativity has rejuvenated the medium from ‘exhaustion’ and has ‘reinvigorated’ it in multiple ways.
CHAPTER 2

1. For a detailed discussion specifically on India as a linguistic area, see, for example, Emeneau (1956) and Masica (1976); as a sociolinguistic area, see, for example, D’souza (1992) and Mukherji (1963), and as a literary area, see, for example, B. Kachru (1992d: 149–159).

2. For references, see Bailey and Görlach (1982).


4. See B. Kachru (1986c) and later.

5. This ‘controversy’ has received wide attention in literature on world Englishes and ELT.

6. See, for example, B. Kachru (1992c).


CHAPTER 3

1. For references see Aggarwal (1982) and Ramaiah (1988).

2. Most of these studies are in the form of dissertations and theses submitted to various universities in South Asia, particularly the Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages, Hyderabad; Shivaji University, Kolhapur; Delhi University, Delhi; Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi; University of Poona, Pune; Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu; and Osmania University, Hyderabad, to name the major centres of such research (for specific references, see two useful bibliographical resources, Aggarwal, 1982; Ramaiah, 1988).

3. There were two attitudes towards lexicalization from South Asian languages: one of disapproval of such borrowing, and the other of considering such borrowing vital for the administration of the Raj. Regardless of these diametrically opposite views, the South Asian lexicalization of English continued to increase.

CHAPTER 4

1. In recent years, this aspect of Japanese English has been discussed in a variety of studies. In World Englishes over a dozen studies have appeared. See also Tanaka

2. This distinction was first made by Anne Pakir with reference to Singapore.


5. These fifteen universities were chosen for a very simple reason: their catalogues/bulletins were available in the Hamilton Library of the University of Hawaii at Manoa, Hawaii.

CHAPTER 5


2. Personal communication, April 1988.

3. It should be noted that there are, however, some exceptions, e.g. Halliday (1973; 1978); Hymes (1974); Labov (1973).

4. For an excellent example, see Hobson-Jobson by Yule and Burnell (1886), and B. Kachru (1983 b). See also Chapters 5 and 6.

5. For a review of the major issues and relevant references, see Hock (1986). The earlier paradigm of contact linguistics is presented in Weinreich (1953).

6. I am grateful to Rosa Shim for this and other observations on Korean.

7. There is now a considerable body of literature across languages exploring the sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic, literary and other motivations for such mixing, specifically with English and South Asian languages (see B. Kachru, 1983b: 193–207; Bhatia and Ritchie, 1989).

8. The attitude towards English in Europe has significantly changed since 1957. The new trends are well documented by the studies of Suzanne Hilgendorf and others.

9. For further discussion and references, see Asmah (1982) and Lowenberg (1984).


CHAPTER 6

1. In three randomly selected catalogues of publishers for 1985, I found the following titles advertised: Cambridge University Press, English for Science and Technology, L. Trimble; Pergamon Institute of English, Bank on Your English (M Pote et al.); English for Negotiating (J. Brims); Developing Reading Skills in ESP (includes volumes on biological sciences, physics, or medicine, telecommunications); Seaspeak (includes a Reference Manual, Training Manual, Teacher’s Guide and Workbook, Self-Study Course); The Language of Seafaring (P. Strevens); English
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for Maritime Studies (T. Blakey); English for Harbor Personnel (E. Joycey); English for Aeronautical Engineers (C. Sionis); Hotel English (P. Binham et al.); Restaurant English (P. Binham et al.); English for International Conferences (A. Fitzpatrick); Prentice-Hall, English for Adult Competency (A. Kelner et al.); Basic Adult Survival English (R. Walsh); Headlines (P. Karant); English for Academic Uses (J. Adams et al.); Scitech (Karl Drobnic et al.); English in Context: Reading and Comprehension for Science and Technology (J. Saslow); Computer Notions (L. Rossi); The Computer Book (M. Abdulazia); Language From Nine to Five: Developing Business Communication Skills (K. Rietmann). I did not have the courage to open the more ambitious catalogues of, e.g., Macmillan and the Regent Publishers.

2. See, for example, B. Kachru and Quirk (1981) and B. Kachru (1985a).
3. For various viewpoints on this question see B. Kachru (1976, 1985a, 1985b), Prator (1968), Quirk (1985), and Smith (1981, 1983).
4. There is no need to labour the point that no language or variety of a language is intrinsically deficient. The attitudinal and functional acceptability of a language is an external matter, educational or social. The formal reasons which may contribute to such acceptance relate to the lexical stock of a language or variety, and to its register range and style range. It is true that these factors contribute to the ‘intellectualization’ of a language and its functional efficiency in various contexts. The larger such ‘resources’ of a language or a variety, the greater is its effectiveness as a language for ‘specific purposes’. There are, of course, other factors too which determine acceptability: academies, teacher trainers, academic administrators, the media and social pressure.
5. For references to such studies see bibliographies in Bailey and Görlach (1982), B. Kachru (1982d, 1983a), and Smith (1981). See also McArthur (1993) and later.
6. In recent years there has been extensive theoretical and empirical research on this topic. For a detailed discussion and references see B. Kachru (1983a), the chapter entitled ‘On mixing’; see also Chapter 5.
7. For a detailed discussion of legal English see Mellinkoff (1963), also see V. Bhatia (1983 and later) for the characteristics of legal texts.
8. As has been shown in, for example, Chishimba (1983), Lowenberg (1984), Nelson (1984, 1985), Magura (1984), Bolton (2000, 2002), and Thumboo (2001).
10. Consider, for instance, the creative writing of Singapore writers, Kripal Singh, Arthur Yap and Cathrine Lim, or Sri Lankan writer Punanyakante Wijenaike, or Indian writer Raja Rao.
11. A number of other issues emerge which have been discussed in, for example, B. Kachru (1983a, 1985a, 1985b), Y. Kachru (1985a, 1985b); Smith (1981, 1987).

CHAPTER 7

2. For a detailed discussion see, for example, B. Kachru (1991a; 1996c).
3. See, for example, Padoux (1990: 372). For further analysis of literature on this topic, see also Alper (1989); Gonda (1963); and Padoux (1988).
7. See Jussawalla and Dasenbrock (1992: 144).

CHAPTER 8

2. For an extensive discussion on this topic in India, see Jussawalla (1985).
3. Note also a recent observation on this point by Vikram Seth. When asked ‘what do you think of the publishing scene in India and of the emerging Indian writers who write in English?’ Seth’s response was:

   I think it is very good that Indian publishing has become so diverse and so rich. It’s partly the publishing phenomenon and partly the writing phenomenon. Many Indians have become quite unselfconscious about the use of English. It doesn’t have colonial association for them. They use it as freely as their own language. *(India Currents, June 1993; Vol. 7, No. 3: 20)*

4. For a state-of-the-art survey of such research, see B. Kachru (1992c).

CHAPTER 9

1. The last speaker of Manx, a Celtic language, died in 1974.
2. The figures are from Singh and Manoharan (1993).

CHAPTER 10

1. For example, see Foley et al. (1998); B. Kachru (1997b) for selected resources up to 1996; see also Canagarajah (1999); Pennycook (1998a; 1998b).
2. See, for example, Agnihotri and Khanna (1997); Canagarajah (2002); Hall and Eggington (2000); Y. Kachru (1994b); Kamaravadivelu (2001); Pennycook (1989); Sridhar and Sridhar (1986); and Tollefson (2002).
3. See, for example, B. Kachru (1997b) for detailed discussion of relevant issues and references.
4. See Lowenberg (1992) and later.
5. For example, in the United States and the United Kingdom. There is a large body
   of literature on this topic presenting various perspectives. One perspective that
   may be of interest to readers of this chapter is that of Bailey (1990; see also Bailey,
   1996).
7. See, for example, T. Ram (1983) and B. Kachru (1983a, 1994a) for discussion and
   references.
8. The spread of English is represented in terms of Three Concentric Circles, which
   is outlined in Chapter 2 in this volume with reference to Asian Englishes (pp. 13–
   16). See also B. Kachru (1985b).
9. This is a very sensitive issue, and as yet no objective way to get reliable data on
   ‘self-identification’ has been determined. Since the variety-specific identificational
   terms have normally conveyed a meaning of substandard, unacceptable, and so
   on, one finds that the terms are generally used for another speaker of Indian,
   Pakistani, or Sri Lankan English and rarely for self-identification. It is only in recent
   years that the terms Indian, Pakistani, or Sri Lankan have been used to refer to
   local creative writing in English (see B. Kachru, 1986b; Baumgardner, 1995).
10. See B. Kachru (1983a: 165–89) for further discussion of this topic. See also relevant
    sections in Chapters 2 and 11 in this volume.
11. Two recent publications include more data on this topic: Baumgardner (1993)
12. One might add here that these attitudes in Goffin, Smith-Pearse, and Whitworth
    did not end after the 1930s; the attitudes still continue, often within the new
    paradigms of language acquisition and methodology of language teaching (see
    B. Kachru, 1996b).
13. In recent years considerable attention has been devoted to the ideological aspects
    of textbooks, including those in English. I believe that the first serious study
    drawing attention to selected grammar textbooks used in India from 1895 to 1976
    is Singh (1987). In the 1990s a number of researchers are analysing English
    textbooks used in Canada, North and South Korea, and the United States; see,
    for example, Nicholls (1994), Baik and Shim (1994) and Y. Kachru (1994a)
    respectively. For general interest and references, see also Dendrinos (1992) and
    Asia in American Textbooks (1976), which is an evaluation based on a study
    conducted by the Asia Society with support from the Ford Foundation.
14. For references and discussion see B. Kachru (1983a).
15. See, for example, relevant sections in B. Kachru (1982a [1992a], 1983a, 1986b).
16. See, for example, Tharoor (1989).
17. See also B. Kachru (1988c) and Kandiah (1991).
18. An answer to this question is much more complex than that. I have briefly
    discussed some reasons in B. Kachru (1996b).
19. I believe it is time now that local South Asian scholars revisit Michael West’s writing
    and re-evaluate the appropriateness of his insights to the South Asian educational
    context, particularly that of teaching English. I am specifically thinking of his
    following two books: Bilingualism (with Special Reference to Bengal) (1926) and
    Language in Education (1929). West also supervised production of a variety
    of textbooks and other resources for language teachers. I am particularly referring
    to West’s views on language teaching in bilingual contexts. His position on
    bilingualism and its implications, however, raise a host of questions.


22. For further discussion see B. Kachru (1986b, 1992b).


24. For a discussion of various perspectives on the Quirk concern and views on the use of standards and models, see the valuable collection edited by Tickoo (1991).

25. See, for example, Dwivedi (1970–1971) for English in Indian administration.


27. There still is a paucity of research on this topic. One important exception is the writings of C. D. Narasimhaiah, particularly his articles in *Literary Criterion* (Mysore). See also Devy (1993).


29. See, for example, Shaw (1981), Smith (1981), and Nelson (1982); for a detailed bibliography on this topic up to 1984 see Smith and Nelson (1985).


31. See the detailed bibliography in B. Kachru (1997b).

32. Prabhu (1987) refers to this project in his book. For a critique of ESP, see B. Kachru (1988b) and Chapter 6 in this volume. See also Tickoo (1988).

33. The terms *visible* and *invisible* were first used by Anne Pakir in this context. These terms capture well the channels used for the spread of bilingualism in English.

34. See, for example, Joshi (1991) and Rajan (1992). In recent years several useful sources of bibliographical resources on South Asian English have been made available. These include the following: Aggarwal (1982), Ramaiah (1988), and Singh, Verma, and Joshi (1981); Rahman (1991a, 1991b), Hashmi (1993), and Baumgardner (1993) are useful for Pakistan. There are extensive bibliographies in Cheshire (1991) and B. Kachru (1983b, 1986a, 1994a).
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5. For a detailed discussion of earlier such attempts, see B. Kachru (1976) and (1983b).


7. There is a long tradition of such prescriptivist materials that date back to 1930 (see for South Asia, Goffin, 1934; Smith-Pearse, 1934; Whitworth, 1907). This genre is still flourishing in various parts of Anglophone Asia.


10. For a description of Colloquial English there is a rich body of studies, for references and discussion, see Ling and Brown (2003); Brown (1992, 2003); Pakir (1993 and later).

11. Rubdy (2001: 348) says that ‘the official launch of the Speak Good English movement (SGEM) took place on 29 April 2000’.


13. For further examples of pro-English and anti-English positions, see Shah (1968), especially the views of Frank Anthony; Nirad C. Chaudhuri, K. R. Srinivasa Iyengar, C. D. Deshmukh, and Part IV for the views of the press, the professions and the public.
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