

Chapter 5

Freedom Movement and Hindustani

Pundit Nehru wrote: 'In Bombay there used to be quadrangular cricket matches between four elevens made up respectively of Hindus, Moslems, Parsees, and Europeans. The European eleven was called Bombay Presidency; the others were just Hindus, Moslems, Parsees. Bombay was thus essentially represented by the Europeans; the others, one would imagine, were foreign elements who were recognized for this purpose. ... English clubs in India usually have territorial names – the Bengal Club, the Allahabad Club, etc. They are confined to Britishers, or rather to Europeans. There need be no objection to territorial designation, or even to a group of persons having a club for themselves and not approving of outsiders joining it. But this designation is derived from the old British habit of considering that they are the real India that counts, the real Bengal, the real Allahabad. Others are just excrescences, useful in their own way if they know their places, but otherwise a nuisance.' [1]

[1] Jawaharlal Nehru *The Discovery of India* (1946) 13th Impression 1993. P. 294

That cultures blind otherwise apparently well-intentioned and reasonable people who never discover their blindness in their lives is normal phenomenon anywhere in the world. When in power such people play havoc with their own people and other nations.

After reading W.W. Hunter, nobody can believe that deep inside him there was a Christian who wished and believed that one day due to the superiority of the British and Christian faith, Muslims and Hindus of India would convert to Christianity. Apparently, it seems he had scientific and secular attitude to issues he dealt with. He wrote:

'We should thus at length have the Muhammadan youth educated upon our own plan. ... The rising generation of Muhammadans would tread the steps which have conducted the Hindus, not long ago the most bigoted nation on earth, into their present state of easy tolerance. Such a tolerance implies a less earnest belief than their fathers had; but it has freed them, as it would liberate the Muslmans, from the cruelties which they inflicted, the crimes they perpetrated, and the miseries which they endured, in the name of a mistaken religion. I do not permit myself here to touch upon the means by which, through a state of indifference, the Hindus and Muslmans alike may yet reach a higher level of belief. But I firmly believe that that day will come, and that our system of education, which has hitherto produced only negative virtues, is the first stage towards it. Hitherto the English in India have been but poor Iconoclasts after all.' [2]

Sarab Punjabi Manifesto

[2] W. W. Hunter: The Indian Musalmans: First Edition 1871, 2nd Edition 1871, Third Edition 1876, 1999 publication by Niaz Ahmad, Sang-e-Meel Publications, Lahore and I have quoted from the 1999 publication. I do not know if there was any other edition of this book and which edition was used for the 1999 publication. pp. 207-208

According to P. Hardy by ‘a higher level of belief’, Hunter meant Christianity: “Hunter, however, hoped that English education might be a first step towards weaning Muslims away from Islam and towards ‘a higher level of belief’ i.e. Christianity.” [3]

[3] P. Hardy: The Muslims of British India: First Corrected South Asia Edition 1998: Foundation Books, Ansari Road, New Delhi. P. 88, Footnote 80.

An ideologue of Urdu in Pakistan and the author of the 456 pages book ‘From Hindi to Urdu’ (Oxford Karachi 2011) Tariq Rahman concludes his work in these words:

‘And now coming back to South Asia before ending this book. We have just mentioned that for the last two hundred years or so, since modern Urdu and Hindi separated from each other, we have lived in perpetual strife. The peoples have drifted apart and so have the languages. ... Is it possible to arrest this trend and promote peace? I believe it is possible by removing the obstacle to peace – such as Kashmir, terrorism, and water disputes – but that is in the hands of the ruling elites of the two countries. What is in the hands of scholars is to debunk the myths which link Urdu with military origins or deny that words *prēm*, *sāgar*, *naēnā*, *chintā* - are part of the heritage of Urdu. It is, after all, that even now – after about two hundred years of separation and drifting apart – spoken Urdu and Hindi are the same language. It is only by not losing sight of the continuities and shared cultural features among Pakistanis and (north) Indians that we can hope to transcend the mutual hatred which threatens to annihilate this ancient world.’

The understanding behind writing this book seems to be the author’s belief in the victory and establishment of Urdu in Pakistan, finally. What Hindus did not let Urdu Party do in India, they have done in Pakistan, the argument must have gone inside him. Right or wrong, irrespective of how others would be affected, the end point of his endeavour is to portray Urdu in the ‘right’ place. The tested formula in their hands is to equalize things, Urdu and Hindi, India and Pakistan etc., preach good things, and sit on judgement. This is no scholarship, this is propaganda. If scholars are not honest, they are meek criminals who dare not act with hands.

To clarify, let us focus on his concluding lines as quoted above. The author writes: ‘since modern Urdu and Hindi separated from each other, we have lived in perpetual strife. The peoples have drifted apart and so have the languages.’ The

Freedom Movement and Hindustani

statement is wrong. The Urdu Party in India tried to seize, secure, acquire, wrest, usurp, hijack or appropriate Hindi. And the British were behind them. They were prevented but not defeated by the Indian people from doing this. He asks, “Is it possible to arrest this trend and promote peace?” No, it is not possible. They have to be defeated in Pakistan where they roam unlicensed. Without their total defeat, peace continues to be in danger. He says ‘Kashmir, terrorism, and water disputes’. But there was no ‘Kashmir’ before 1947, no terrorism before (say) 1978, and no water dispute even today. It is fashion these days in Pakistan’s totally Urdu Party led media to add water disputes to the list. Again trying to create equality: ‘but that is in the hands of the ruling elites of the two countries.’

Again wrong, in Pakistan things are in the hands of those who were brain-washed before 1947 and have been continuously under the influence of ‘drugs of ideology’ administered by the Urdu Party which proved to be civilizationally wrong at every step and suicidal for the peoples of Punjab, Sindh, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and Baluchistan community-wise as well as collectively at Pakistan level.

Is it so that what is left with our scholar is to tell us that words *prēm, sāgar, naēnā, chintā* are part of the heritage of Urdu and that spoken Urdu and Hindi are the same language? Prejudices transform themselves into new forms. Urdu Party, even today, is not ready to leave its claim on Hindi. They have not forgotten that Hindi did not surrender to Urdu! Now they have come up with a new sophistry – Hamari Boli! There is a website which has the title ‘Hamari Boli’ written in English, Devanagari and Persian scripts with a picture of Tariq Rahman’s above referred book ‘From Hindi to Urdu: A Social and Political History’ under the headline: ‘Definitive History Of Hamari Boli’. Now they want to bring peace by Romanizing Hindi and Urdu! What they say? ‘**Hamari Boli is the Hindustani, Hamari Boli is the reincarnation of Hindustani**’ etc. **Instead of telling those who use Persian script in India, Pakistan and elsewhere to start learning Devanagari script also because that is the only feasible way forward and knowing well that their idiotic attempt to Persianize India had failed, they, now want to Romanize India! It is disgusting.**

*

And this is how hamariboli.com

introduces itself:

About Us: We’re a civil society group based in Pakistan with members in India, US, UK, Canada and the UAE. We believe that People-to-People diplomacy is the best approach to bring about lasting peace among India and Pakistan.

What is Hamari Boli? It comes as a surprise to almost everyone that what is known as *Hindi* in India and *Urdu* in Pakistan is actually one and the same language, **The Hindustani!** Linguistically speaking, modern standard Hindi and

Sarab Punjabi Manifesto

Urdu (official languages of India & Pakistan respectively) are two Standardized Registers of the single language Hindustani, which was the lingua franca of the Mughal empire and later adopted by the British as the official language of British India (modern India, Pakistan and Bangladesh).

Why Hamari Boli? Hamari Boli is the reincarnation of Hindustani, gratefully acknowledging the richness and unity of the Desi Culture as evident in the meticulous amalgamation of indigenous and foreign cultures from the early Aryan settlers to the Middle Vedic Civilizations to the Afghan and Turkic period to the British Raj to modern Day India and Pakistan and the Diaspora Desis and their descendants spread all over the world. It is the living testament to the diversity and inclusive spirit of the Subcontinent.

Some specific arguments for the desirability of Hamari Boli (Unified Hindi-Urdu using Roman alphabet) are: 1) Too much money and efforts are being wasted trying to address one of the two scripts. The extreme Hindi-Urdu digraphia essentially means doing the same thing twice! Font support, content production is always limited to one or the other script. With the neutralized Roman script, Hamari Boli will serve both Devanagari and Nastaliq readers thus freeing resources which can be pooled to produce much greater and better content. For example, a Hamari Boli Wikipedia! 2) By neutralizing the script, Hamari Boli will solve the illegibility problem and will make written Hindi-Urdu perfectly mutually legible thus making the works of Hindi and Urdu writers accessible to readers across both sides of the border.

*

Just contrary to all this bigotry, it is enlightening, interesting, and inspirational to know how Indian Freedom Movement or Indian National Congress and in particular Mahatma Gandhi were able to come out of this confusion with dignity and honour.

In nutshell, the so-called Hindustani, whatever it was, was the product of two ruling cultures of India,

Muslim and British. When I say 'it was the product', it gets an independent status which it was not. If somebody wanted to believe Hindustani was a language, he could believe and would have reasons to explain. If somebody wanted to believe it was Urdu, he could believe that and for that he would have reasons to explain. Go back, if somebody wanted to believe Urdu was not an independent language, it was in fact Hindi, he could believe that and he would have reasons to explain. And if somebody wanted to believe Urdu was a separate language, he could believe that and would have reasons to explain. Further later, if not before 1947, he could point his finger towards Pakistan for a living and practical proof. These were all distractions for the people and impediments which the Freedom Movement had to overcome.

Mahatma Gandhi 1918: The Viceroy Lord Chelmsford (1916-1921) “had invited various leaders to a war conference in Delhi. I had also been invited to attend the conference. ... So I attended the conference (27 April 1918 – mam). The Viceroy was very keen on my supporting the resolution about recruiting. I asked for permission to speak in **Hindi-Hindustani**. The Viceroy acceded to my request, but suggested that I should speak also in English. I had no speech to make. I spoke but one sentence to this effect: ‘With a full sense of my responsibility I beg to support the resolution.’ Many congratulated me on my having spoken in **Hindustani**. That was, they said, the first instance within living memory of anyone having spoken in **Hindustani** at such a meeting. The congratulations and the discovery that I was the first to speak in **Hindustani** at a Viceregal meeting hurt my national pride. I felt like shrinking into myself. What a tragedy that the language of the country should be taboo in meetings held in the country, for work relating to the country, and that a speech there in **Hindustani** (emphases mine - mam) by a stray individual like myself should be a matter for congratulations! Incidents like these are reminders of the low state to which we have been reduced.” [4]

[4] [M.K. Gandhi: An Autobiography or ‘The Story of My Experiments with Truth’, first published (vol I) 1927, (vol II) 1929; This edition by Penguin Books, 1982 edition (Reprint 1983). pp. 397, 400] *

That Mahatma Gandhi writes Hindi-Hindustani indicates the dilemma he was facing. And this was due to the British. If officially the name ‘Hindustani’ was current, he had to say so. But he did not leave the name ‘Hindi’ unsaid. What was the position of Hindi when Mahatma Gandhi said this and later wrote i.e. from few years before 1920 to few years after that?

“By the time that the All-India National Congress was finally transformed into a genuine mass movement under Gandhi’s leadership after the First World War, the Hindi cause was sufficiently developed and the language had achieved sufficient official recognition in the populous provinces of U.P. and Bihar to make it increasingly serious rival to Urdu.” [5]

[5] Hindi and Urdu since 1800: A common reader, By Christopher Shackle and Rupert Snell, 1990, The School of Oriental and African Studies. P. 12

But they were ready to sacrifice for the unity of the country hoping that Muslims would respond. “In fact, only the highly Sanskrit form of Hindi and the highly Persian form of Urdu are poles between which communication does not take place, due to their lexical differences, but there was a popular form, covering variants of Urdu and Hindi, Hindustani, which could have served as a unifying language for the north of the country. Gandhi attempted to play this card. He had Hindustani adopted as the official language of his party, the

Sarab Punjabi Manifesto

Indian National Congress, in 1925, and he was followed in this by Nehru, who declared in 1937 that the language ‘would bring Hindi and Urdu closer together and will also help in developing an all-India linguistic unity’”. [6]

[6] Language Wars and Linguistic Politics: Louis-Jean Calvet Oxford University Press 1998. Pp. 126-127

*

At such a rising position of Hindi the adoption of Hindustani in 1925 as the language of the Congress must clearly be seen as depicting the practical manifestation of the ‘Passion for Unity’ of Mahatma Gandhi. It was to counter the British mischief. They were ready to abandon the name Hindi and make way for the Muslims to abandon the name Urdu for the unity of the county. It was too big a sacrifice. Overall, I do not believe there was confusion in their understanding. It was an attempted compromise which did not materialize due to stubbornness and extremism of Muslims.

But perhaps there was lack of clarity here and there. Pundit Nehru writes: “The modern Indian languages descended from the Sanskrit, and therefore called Indo-Aryan languages, are: Hindi-Urdu, Bengali, Marathi, Gujrati, Oriya, Assamese, Rajasthani, Punjabi, Sindhi, Pashto, and Kashmiri. The Dravidian languages are: Tamil, Telugu, Kanarese, and Malayalam. These fifteen languages cover the whole of India, and of these, Hindi, with its variation Urdu, is far the most widespread and is understood even where it is not spoken. ... The real language question in India has nothing to do with this variety. It is practically confined to Hind-Urdu, one language with two literary forms and two scripts. As spoken there is hardly any difference; as written, especially style, the gap widens. Attempts have been, and are being, made to lessen this gap and develop a common form, which is usually styled Hindustani. This is developing into a common language understood all over India.” [7]

[7] Jawaharlal Nehru: The Discovery of India: Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial fund Edition: 13th Print 1993. P. 169

The end portion of the above statement of Nehru betrays non-clarity: ‘Attempts have been, and are being, made to lessen this gap and develop a common form, which is usually styled Hindustani. This is developing into a common language understood all over India.’ This was too simplistic. But such individual misunderstanding, if it was so, was not reflected in the collective stand of the Freedom Movement which was clear-headed that a new name had been given by the British to an already existing language Hindi which was at that time being called Urdu also with the belief of Urdu’s separateness from Hindi.

*

Mahatma Gandhi on National Language and Script

(1)

The Need for Hindustani: I have ventured to advise every student to devote this year of our trial to the manufacture of yarn and learning Hindustani. I am thankful to the Calcutta students that they have taken kindly to the suggestion. Bengal and Madras are the two Provinces that are cut off from the rest of India for want of a knowledge of Hindustani on their part. Bengal, because of its prejudice against learning any other language of India, and Madras, because of the difficulty of the Dravidians about picking up Hindustani. ... Do not consider for one moment that you can possibly make English a common medium of expression between the masses. Twenty-two crores of Indians know Hindustani—they do not know any other language. And if you want to steal into their hearts, Hindustani is the only language open to you. [8]

[8] [Young India, 2-2-1921] [http://www.mkgandhi.org/towrds_edu/chap15.htm]

(2)

A Common Script: ... It is generally agreed that that medium should be Hindustani—a resultant of Hindi and Urdu, neither highly Sanskritized, nor highly Persianized or Arabianized. The greatest obstacle in the way are the numerous scripts we have for the vernaculars. If it is possible to adopt a common script, we should remove a great hindrance in the way of realizing the dream, which at present it is, of having a common language. If I could have my way, I would make the learning of Devanagari script and Urdu script, in addition to the established provincial script, compulsory in all the provinces and I would print in Devanagari chief books in the different vernaculars with a literal translation in Hindustani. [9]

[9] [Young India, 27-8-1925]

[http://www.mkgandhi.org/towrds_edu/chap15.htm Taken on 30-12-2014]

(3)

Thoughts of Mahatma Gandhi on National Language Mahatma Gandhi spoke: “It would be a great advantage if Lokamanya Tilak would speak in Hindi. He should, like Lord Dufferin and Lady Chelmsford, try to learn Hindi. Even Queen Victoria learned Hindi. It is my submission to Malaviyaji that he should see to it that, at the Congress next year, no speeches are made in any language except Hindi. My complaint is that, at the Congress yesterday, he did not speak in Hindi.”

Sarab Punjabi Manifesto

Mahatma wrote the resolution, “That, in view of the fact that the Hindi language is very widely used by the people of the different provinces and is easily understood by the majority of them, it seems practicable to take advantage of this language as a common language for India.” [10]

Mahatma Gandhi wrote: “The numbers of words most used in the essays and books that are written in Hindi nowadays will not exceed three hundred according to my estimate. Within so few words is all Hindi learning circumscribed. We think, write essays or books and give speeches within this narrow compass. How many things used every day in our homes, fields and factories have no Hindi names and how many ideas have no appropriate Hindi words? If this is true, it is very sad and shameful; it is a sign of poverty of thought. It is said that Shakespeare used 20,000 words in his works, and Milton 10,000 words. What a wealth of words in their language and what poverty in ours! In spite of this state of affairs, if we wish to make our national language glorious, then, at least for its own sake we must increase our knowledge. It is not a matter of shame to borrow words from another language and make them our own. It is shameful only when we do not know the words current in our language and therefore use those of another; for example, when we forget the word ghar and say house, or employ mother for mata, father for pita, husband for pati and wife for patni.” [11]

Mahatma Gandhi wrote, “Although all people theoretically admit that Hindi alone can be the national language, yet the requisite love for the Hindi language is not apparent among young men of the provinces where the mother tongue is Hindi. Whatever literature is being published in Hindi is mostly translation. If, however, some original piece does come out it is found to be insignificant. It might be argued that Rabindranath is not born every day and Tulsidas is one among millions. Nevertheless, all of us can at least create a climate for the advent of poets like Tulsidas and Rabindranath, namely, a sincere zeal among young men. As their devotion to Hindi grows so would Hindi pervade the environment, leading to a flowering of a few genuine poets as well? Today neither the fervour nor the endeavour is manifest in the language of the young men having Hindi as their mother tongue. The grammatical errors occurring in the Hindi of the young men of U.P. and Bihar are not at all to be seen among the Bengalis and Maharashtrians. No doubt the national language is being propagated in provinces like Madras, etc.; but I have seen that Hindi teachers are not easily available. They are not energetic and their capacity for self-sacrifice is very limited. There ought to be innumerable young men ready to dedicate themselves exclusively to the propagation of Hindi; but I have not come across such persons, if any. Undoubtedly young men are available who are eager to serve at subsistence wages, but they are not equipped to teach Hindi.

Freedom Movement and Hindustani

“If young men will it, this shortcoming can be overcome. With the initiative of a single young man this work can make progress. If one loses heart and rests on one’s oars in face of a distressing situation in a certain field, the situation deteriorates further. It is the duty of a devoted person to try to relieve the distress without delay and not sit with folded hands fearing obstacles on the way. Every school should have an association for the promotion of Hindi. It would be the duty of such associations to make progressive use of Hindi in all fields, to evolve new technical words, never to use a foreign language in politics, etc., to make a sound study of abstruse books, to provide Hindi teachers wherever necessary and to organize volunteer Hindi teachers for honorary work, etc. Even if a single young man in every school is fired with this zeal he will not stay inert but will sprout into an association and will induce his fellow students to join it. The only way to keep up the awakening among the young men today is for them to utilize every moment of their lives for some sort of social service. It is to be noted that in this article Hindi also means Hindustani.” [12]

Mahatma Gandhi wrote, “The Muslims were the first to create literature in Hindustani. Their fakirs and saints used this language for their religious teachings and explained the principles of the Sufi religion in it also. Later, poets adopted it, and because Muslims used the language there came about a mixture of Persian and Hindi words. The sounds of Persian and Arabic letters also crept in which are not found in Brij but which have remained in Hindi up to date. The colloquial language which the Muslims employed is the language spoken even today round about Meerut and Delhi. It is termed Khari Boli or Hindustani.....” [13]

[10] RESOLUTION AT NATIONAL LANGUAGE CONFERENCE; December 30, 1917

[11] Hindi Navajivan, 7-11-1929

[12] Hindi Navajivan, 26-12-1929

[13] Harijan, 29-3-1942

[Dr. Yogendra Yadav Gandhian Scholar Gandhi Research Foundation, Jalgaon, Maharashtra, India;

http://www.internationalpeaceandconflict.org/profiles/blogs/taughats-of-mahatma-gandhi-on-nationallanguage#.Uujc7_nTnIU Taken on 30-1-2014]

*

Difficulties for the Honest and the Patriots

Let us try to answer this question as to why the British brought into India another linguistic factor they called ‘Hindoostanee’, later simplified as ‘Hindustani.’ India was no less encyclopedic in languages that the British had to ‘invent’ a new name. The first question which should be focused upon is that whether the British were

Sarab Punjabi Manifesto

innocent in introducing a new name in the linguistic arena of India. The first principal is that we should be doubtful. The second principal is that the case history of British imperialism in India should aid us in determining whether there were ulterior motives behind Hindustani. The third principal is that if there is no satisfactory clarification from the British, this will strengthen the suspicion, ultimately transforming it into certainty. On each score, the verdict is going against the British.

When they came they destroyed Bengal, when they left they destroyed Punjab. They are wrongly credited for uniting India. It is contemptible to think that way. They were building their empire, not uniting India. Was it a united India when there were 562 states/ principalities within India when they left? In fact because of their long range and successive negative actions, (the pre-1947) India lost its unity and post 1947 India its peace. Then they left India when they were exhausted by Adolf Hitler. Nobody knows, without Hitler, what more evils were up their sleeves that they would have unleashed in India. Therefore, the reason of introducing Hindustani should be seen in such perspectives.

What was the need of giving an Indian language another name which was itself popular according to Gilchrist himself? Could this be a neutral or an apolitical move? Was it a mere fancy of an individual which got perpetuated? Whatever, if it was not political, it was stupidity.

I can safely say now that the British deliberately created such problems and did such things and in such ways that they always remained uncaught. It should be understood that creating problems was their longterm investment. Whom they did not try to manipulate? If they wanted to use Urdu after expelling Persian, why to give it a new name? What was their problem in letting the languages advance naturally? Look at the irony, Muslim interventionists tried to own Hindi and called it Urdu and then the British interventionists tried to own Urdu and called it Hindustani. Both blocked the path of Hindi.

It means the British knew linguistic scene in India. And why should have they not known it? The British East India Company had its presence in Bengal since about 1650. About one hundred years later the company was organized into three independent presidencies at Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay.

Therefore, we can safely say that by Hindustani they meant Urdu (obviously Persian script) but would not say so. And as some works of Hindustani were printed in Nagari script it means Hindi script was refusing to be pushed out. It should be understood that whenever there is confusion the wrong party would get undue advantage. That seems to be one reason that Urdu is still around.

By 1800, the time of Hindoostanee under discussion, what was the position of the British in India? The defeat and death of Tipu Sultan in 1799 left the field open between Marathas and the British for the supremacy of India. Charles Metcalfe,

Freedom Movement and Hindustani

one of the ablest of the British officials in India, wrote in 1806 that there were no more than two great powers in India, the British and the Marathas. And it was by 1818 that the Maratha power was finally crushed and the British became, then, the unchallenged sovereign power of a very great part of India. [14]

[14] Jawaharlal Nehru: The Discovery of India: Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial fund Edition: 13th Print 1993.

P. 276

Another aspect, so far the British were using Persian, the official language they had inherited from the Muslims. Looking forward to replace Persian with English when they become unchallengeable power in India, it was natural to prepare for that in the meantime. And if the Company continued to consider itself or by others as the agent of the Delhi emperor in whose name money was coined till 1835, the time of switching from Persian to English had not come. Therefore setting up of Fort William College in 1800 for the teaching of vernacular languages **Tamil, Telugu, Kannada, Marathi, Bengali, and Hindustani along with classical languages** Arabic, Persian, and Sanskrit seems to be an anticipatory move for the time when English at the top and the vernaculars below will play their role.

If on the part of the British there was no calculated move, Urdu would have occupied the place of Hindustani as at that time Urdu was in the forefront while Hindi far behind. The existence of Urdu itself meant that it had taken Hindi's place. In other words Urdu was impersonating Hindi. If the British wanted to use the language of the Northern India, Urdu was the natural selection. This is what they did by giving it a new name.

By adopting the name Urdu, they would have been in a fixed position. They would have been isolated from Hindi and clearly seen as favoring the Muslims. And they knew that Urdu was a script and not a language. Therefore why should they bind themselves with something which itself is not secure. By bringing in Hindustani, they became the masters of the linguistic situation in north India. They became the definers and trend-setters of the time. They stood on a higher pedestal and telling Indians what is what in the field of language. Because they needed Urdu, therefore they gave it a seat just behind them and Hindi at a distance further behind. In this way what Muslims had done with Hindi, the British upheld it. They promoted Urdu because they were using it. By giving the name Hindustani, they became owners of

Urdu in an indirect manner. This move perfectly fits into their overall conscious decision to 'own' Muslims as the foundation of their Indian empire. The policy stayed in place even after 1947.

Sarab Punjabi Manifesto

By Hindustani, they sat on judgment for the North Indian language scene. They occupied that unique position from where they push forward or backward Urdu or Hindi according to their needs and perceptions.

India was mainly Hindu. They were the peoples of India. The British staying in power basically depended upon them. But by manipulating Muslims they could prolong their rule. Hindustani was long-range investment in this field. Along with religion it proved to be a powerful tool in Indian politics.

Bollywood film actor Om Puri visited Lahore. Shoaib Ahmed of Dawn (15-3-2014) reported from Faiz Ghar, Model Town, Lahore: A questioner wanted to know how he successfully performed in different languages. He said Punjabi was his mother-tongue. "My Hindustani improved at NSD (National School of Drama) for I acted in many Hindustani plays there. (My) English also got polished there." He said he could also speak 40 per cent of Bengali.

Whether it was reported correctly or not that Om Puri did utter the word 'Hindustani' instead of 'Hindi' or 'Urdu'; either way, persistence of confusion, habit, ideology or prejudice, whatever, for so long is obvious. The confusion created by the British by naming Urdu (the Muslim name for Hindi) Hindustani around 1800 is still there. Before Partition, apart from confusing many, it was damaging Hindi and encouraging the Urdu Party. After that, it got big boost in Pakistan while remaining in India at the same time. And it is not unusual that when Hindi is face to face with the wider world, it has to explain not only Urdu but Hindustani also - the punishments of innocence! It is difficult to know what others understand by Hindi's explanations. Mischief once inserted in a society takes very long time to leave if not expelled consciously. ■