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Now, we’ve heard a good deal about why the subaltern cannot speak (). Once one has deciphered Spivak’s delightfully indirect ways, however, we realize that she is asking the more important question: ‘can the subaltern be *heard*?’ and the answer to that is ‘No sir, the subaltern cannot be heard, because although they are speaking, they are doing so in bhaasha and in prasang and stithi that you, who have been cultivated into certain other structures of language that also correlate, incidentally, with a more privileged and hence powerful position in society, simply cannot parse.’ In short, the subaltern are speaking, but nobody can hear them.

At the present socio-political juncture of the nation, both Indian feminist politics and reservation politics are central to the reform front: while three million women line up across 620 K to fight against a regressive ‘purity’ tradition, Rohit Vemula has only recently committed suicide, and Bhima Koregaon is still raw in our memories. The 1980’s backlash against reservation has not died down, and neither has the systemic oppression of women and Dalits. Can we assume, on the other hand, that conversation, i.e. speaking, has exploded? Caution is of essence. Which conversations have burgeoned, and which conversations cannot we hear? Are the subaltern talking or being talked about? Where are we looking for these conversations? What are we looking for? The matter, as Plato said, is complicated. Let’s return to these questions in a bit.

At her most simplistic reading, we can instantiate Spivak’s argument to say that, suppose the subaltern do not speak the language of a discourse, they are, if not silent, muted. Configuring this idea into the Indian context, we can locate the players here: English, of course, occupies the position of the language of academia and intelligentsia, the subaltern, in this case, are the Dalit communities and the communities of women, and the language which they can speak, presumably, is their homegrown native tongue: for the purposes and scope of this project, Hindi. The question, then, becomes this: what is the linguistic nature of the conversation around Dalit politics and women’s concerns, and **what is the difference between them**? Understanding this is key to beginning to unravel some of the questions above - although it is still not sufficient. For this, we must attempt to understand, first, the relationships of English and Hindi to both of the discourses under study.

Modern feminism in India, a feminism that is based in universal human rights and gender equality (rather than the feminism of, say, Rani Lakshmi Bai), can be considered to have begun in the nineteenth century, roughly around the abolition of Sati (1829), passed by the then governor-general of India William Bentinck, upon the petitions of Raja Ram Mohan Roy, among others. Raja Ram Mohan Roy also advocated for English education for India, supported by Lord Macauley in his famous ‘Minutes’: we need, he said ‘a class of persons Indian in blood and colour, but English in tastes, in opinions, in morals and in intellect’ (). The class of educated Indians, containing social reformers, that emerged, therefore, upon the onset of the twentieth century were belonged this class of English-speaking individuals, and it is this very class we observe today, who have the global morals and the parlance with which to talk about women’s rights. No wonder that feminism is considered still, today, to be restricted to ‘elite’ upper-5% circles: not yet a movement of the masses of Indian women. It is hardly an original hypothesis to say that English is a language of liberation for women, and a space occupying which they can distance themselves from an oppressive tradition, and integrate themselves into a global framework of universal human rights. Fun fact: a study has found that women tend to swear more in English than in Hindi. Given context, it is not difficult to see why.

This is, of course, still not the whole picture. Perhaps feminists, both men and women, would choose the equipment and discourse that an international language such as English provides: however, there are millions of Indians, especially women, who simply don’t speak English. This is the flipside to the situation: if we find, in fact, that this discourse lives in English, it indicates the truly subaltern are being neither addressed nor heard.

*Still*, we do not have the whole picture. It is not enough to label a discourse as Hindi or English: we must nuance our understanding of the registers we are looking for. Perhaps we are encouraged when we find people talking in Hindi about नारीवाद, बलात्कार, पाबंदियाँ, but not so much when they are talking of गौरव, खांदान, सती-सावित्री, संस्कृति. One is a modern discussion that entrenches this international movement into one’s ‘own’ language, and the other is a nasty regressive patriarchal discourse that we are not at all happy about. One figure statistics (like a Hindi-percentage analysis) obscure as much as they reveal: we will keep in mind, therefore, both of these trends when forming qualitative conclusions. The matter, as we said, is complicated.

English as a vehicle of deliverance figures also in the arena of Dalit politics. Dr. Ambedkar, for one, did his Ph.D at Columbia, and the seminal work for Dalit nationwide is his *Annihilation of Caste*, written in English (although then disseminated in various Indian languages); in fact, a Dalit community in Uttar Pradesh inaugurated a temple to the English language and Macauley because English was the key, in their eyes, to upward social mobility, better jobs and better marriages. It is, also, an ideological step away from regional tongues that are often inflected with caste-discrimination: an extreme example would be the Brahmin Tamil variant of Tamil, spoken by the Tam Brahms: caste divide often operates in one’s very manner of speaking in regional tradition. English, then, provides a neutral and promising space that permits aspiration and an escape from this all-pervasive system.

So far, we are on familiar grounds, and we have probably drawn some insightful parallels between these two social movements. Do we expect, then, to find the same registers of language with respect to Hindi and English in these discourses? The point at which they (theoretically) fallen apart comes next: we don’t, in fact, expect this, and for a couple of reasons.

Firstly, the reason we expect a lot less English than seems to be indicated above is that we are conflating two different target discussions: English is the language the Dalits *aspire to converse in*, and our corpus exhibits conversation *around Dalit politics*. This includes just about anyone talking about, say, जात and बहुजन समाज पार्टी, or their resentment against the OBC quota. We do not in fact know the identities of the handles whose tweets we have gathered; let us remember that while we cannot make any assumptions about these, we can still safely assume that the Dalit community, even if they do speak English, will be a minority.

Secondly, the Dalit community in India is a lot more politicized, or politically visible (which is not to say that Dalits themselves are politically visible), than that of women; which is manifest most obviously in the turbulence around caste reservation, but also in the existence, for example, of entities such as the BSP on a national scale. Furthermore, there is an extensive taxonomy (Mahars, Gujjars, Yadavs, Brahmins) that is associated with the multilayered system of caste, inherited from a traditional entrenched system of codification and social structure. None of this is to say that the patriarchy as a system is less entrenched in traditional regional language use, the point is simply that there is no terminology that Hindi provides that politicizes women as a unit – creating, therein, a generic discourse that would have been in a regional language. And so Dalit politics gets integrated into the mass discourse of politics in general, which it is not unreasonable to estimate (especially given the ahem interesting ideas of our current Prime Minister) contains a considerable Hindi component, and feminism as a discourse gets circumscribed by the boundaries of a particular educated section of society.

**So what are we doing about this?**

Good question. We are collecting data from Twitter, which it is fashionable to assume for convenience is representative of society at large, and we are testing this very hypothesis on it: i.e. that the discourse around Dalit politics contains a larger relative Hindi presence than that around women’s concerns. We looked at a couple of related statistics, such as the quality and presence of code-mixing in each corpus, a Tweet-level comparison, a line-level comparison, etc., but as we’ve mentioned earlier, number crunching is not the end-all of social analysis.

**What we found**

…let’s find something

**So what?**

Another good question. What are the stakes of this study? As a society in general looking to reform itself, the politics of speech is key to understanding representation and progress. Who gets to speak, and where, and how? Why, or why not? The significance of language cannot be emphasized enough, of course: in disadvantaging communities that cannot speak English, in shackling communities that want to adopt English along with what they perceive comes with it, in characterizing the conversations of a community that increasingly resents English.

Must we introduce a wing of social outreach that translates the concept and the discourse of feminism into regional languages, and brings them to the doorstep of the rural girl? Must we campaign for the reform of Hindi itself, as the French did for gender neutrality? Language is a site of expression and oppression, and the matter, as Plato said, is complicated.

For instance, Limbale’s “Marathi” would not be the same as that of a Chitpavan Marathi-speaking person from Pune.

Caste produces, through specific material practices and demography, its own vocabulary. It is this combination that is described as “dialects” employed by the dalits.

It is also clear, though, that the plea for English is not framed out of an inherent love for the Anglo-Saxon sounds or linguistic-literary traditions attendant to it, but rather because of its refusal to recognise caste as a priori, “a given

Moreover, dalits in India speak different languag- es, and so asserting one language would yield neither a territory nor a representation of all forms of dalit identities. English helps redefine identity and imagine a pan-Indian dalit unity, while also allowing a vocabulary of human rights.
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