

Vol 4 Issue 1 Feb 2014

Impact Factor : 2.1506(UIF)

ISSN No : 2230-7850

International Multidisciplinary
Research Journal

*Indian Streams
Research Journal*

Executive Editor
Ashok Yakkaldevi

Editor-in-Chief
H.N.Jagtap

IMPACT FACTOR : 2.1506(UIF)

Welcome to ISRJ

RNI MAHMUL/2011/38595

ISSN No.2230-7850

Indian Streams Research Journal is a multidisciplinary research journal, published monthly in English, Hindi & Marathi Language. All research papers submitted to the journal will be double - blind peer reviewed referred by members of the editorial board. Readers will include investigator in universities, research institutes government and industry with research interest in the general subjects.

International Advisory Board

Flávio de São Pedro Filho Federal University of Rondonia, Brazil	Mohammad Hailat Dept. of Mathematical Sciences, University of South Carolina Aiken	Hasan Baktir English Language and Literature Department, Kayseri
Kamani Perera Regional Center For Strategic Studies, Sri Lanka	Abdullah Sabbagh Engineering Studies, Sydney	Ghayoor Abbas Chotana Dept of Chemistry, Lahore University of Management Sciences[PK]
Janaki Sinnasamy Librarian, University of Malaya	Catalina Neculai University of Coventry, UK	Anna Maria Constantinovici AL. I. Cuza University, Romania
Romona Mihaila Spiru Haret University, Romania	Ecaterina Patrascu Spiru Haret University, Bucharest	Horia Patrascu Spiru Haret University, Bucharest,Romania
Delia Serbescu Spiru Haret University, Bucharest, Romania	Loredana Bosca Spiru Haret University, Romania	Ilie Pinteau, Spiru Haret University, Romania
Anurag Misra DBS College, Kanpur	Fabricio Moraes de Almeida Federal University of Rondonia, Brazil	Xiaohua Yang PhD, USA
Titus PopPhD, Partium Christian University, Oradea,Romania	George - Calin SERITAN Faculty of Philosophy and Socio-Political Sciences AL. I. Cuza University, IasiMore

Editorial Board

Pratap Vyamktrao Naikwade ASP College Devrukh,Ratnagiri,MS India Ex - VC. Solapur University, Solapur	Iresh Swami Ex - VC. Solapur University, Solapur	Rajendra Shendge Director, B.C.U.D. Solapur University, Solapur
R. R. Patil Head Geology Department Solapur University,Solapur	N.S. Dhaygude Ex. Prin. Dayanand College, Solapur	R. R. Yalikal Director Managment Institute, Solapur
Rama Bhosale Prin. and Jt. Director Higher Education, Panvel	Narendra Kadu Jt. Director Higher Education, Pune	Umesh Rajderkar Head Humanities & Social Science YCMOU,Nashik
Salve R. N. Department of Sociology, Shivaji University,Kolhapur	K. M. Bhandarkar Praful Patel College of Education, Gondia	S. R. Pandya Head Education Dept. Mumbai University, Mumbai
Govind P. Shinde Bharati Vidyapeeth School of Distance Education Center, Navi Mumbai	Sonal Singh Vikram University, Ujjain	Alka Darshan Shrivastava Shaskiya Snatkottar Mahavidyalaya, Dhar
Chakane Sanjay Dnyaneshwar Arts, Science & Commerce College, Indapur, Pune	G. P. Patankar S. D. M. Degree College, Honavar, Karnataka	Rahul Shriram Sudke Devi Ahilya Vishwavidyalaya, Indore
Awadhesh Kumar Shirotriya Secretary,Play India Play,Meerut(U.P.)	Maj. S. Bakhtiar Choudhary Director,Hyderabad AP India.	S.KANNAN Annamalai University,TN
	S.Parvathi Devi Ph.D.-University of Allahabad	Satish Kumar Kalhotra Maulana Azad National Urdu University
	Sonal Singh, Vikram University, Ujjain	

Address:-Ashok Yakkaldevi 258/34, Raviwar Peth, Solapur - 413 005 Maharashtra, India
Cell : 9595 359 435, Ph No: 02172372010 Email: ayisrj@yahoo.in Website: www.isrj.net



LOCATING A TRIBE: SOME PROBLEMS

Vikash Kumar

Abstract:-The concept of 'tribe' and 'tribals', as used in contemporary India, refers to communities more or less distinct from Hindu and Muslim society. These include hunter-gatherers and swidden cultivators, as well as some communities of pastoralists and plough agriculturists, generally resident in upland and forest regions. Taken together these groups make up approximately 8.03 percent of the Indian population. They are listed in a separate schedule of the Constitution of India. These 'Schedule Tribe' can avail of affirmative action in government jobs and parliamentary seats, as mandated by the Constitution. Whereas the tribes of central India have maintained closed links with mainstream, especially Hindu, Civilisation, the tribes of north-east have until very recently, been quite distinct from this 'mainstream'.

Keywords:Muslim society , agriculturists , Schedule Tribe , Civilisation , anthropologists.

INTRODUCTION :

Andre Beteille says that earlier anthropologists had not paid sufficient attention to the definition of tribal society, but tacitly assumed that what they were studying in Australia, Melanesia and Africa were various forms of tribal society. The tribe was less somewhat vaguely assumed to be a more or homogenous society having a common government, a common dialect and a common culture. Since Evans-Pritchard's time anthropologists, he says, have tried in a much more systematic way to provide a structural definition of the tribe particularly in the context of segmentary societies.

However as I.M.Lewis indicates, it is one thing to show how boundaries should be drawn between different tribes, and another to be drawn between different tribes, and another to specify the characteristic of tribal societies as such Lewis himself proposes the criterion of 'scale', introduced into anthropology by Godfrey and Monica Wilson in The Analysis Of Social Change, to define the nature of societies of this kind. According to them 'Ideally, tribals societies are small in scale, are restricted in a particular geographical area of their social, legal and political relations, and possess a morality, religion and world view of contemporary dimensions.'

A rather more interesting characterization of tribal society is the one provided by Sahlins. Sahlins has argued that the term tribal society is restricted to what are called segmentary system. Segmentary system are not only small in scale but represent a definite structural type which is quite different from the more complex social system in which peasantry and gentry co-exist. But if we define 'tribe' in this sense we will find that Santhals, Oraons and Mundas of Jharkhand correspond less to tribes than to what are broadly described as peasants, because these groups have adopted permanent agricultural activities and are economically superior in respect of other tribal groups of Jharkhand like Birhor and Mal paharia.

Tribe, Peasant and Caste:

There is thus no one way of defining tribal society. Definitions may be either very broad and loose or very narrow and restricted. It will be no doubt be argued that the definition of a tribal society as a segmentary system will not be much practical use in a country like India where segmentary societies cannot be easily identified. Beteille recognise Bailey as perhaps the only anthropologist working in the Indian field who tried to characterize tribes in terms of segmentary principles, but the contrast in which he is interested is not between 'tribe' and 'peasant' but between 'tribe' and 'caste'. In his work Tribe, Caste, and Nation, Bailey has shown that tribe, caste, and nation are different political alignments: three forms of allocating scarce resources, and of uniting to compete for those resources: three different kinds of arenas, in which are engaged three different kinds groups. Bailey has also shown that these three systems can be placed in a temporal order: that the caste system preceded the national system, and was itself proceeded by the tribal system. This is the direction in which political society is changing. Bailey says that the village has remained an arena within which individuals struggle with one another for power and the possession of land.

Vikash Kumar, "LOCATING A TRIBE: SOME PROBLEMS"

Indian Streams Research Journal | Volume 4 | Issue 1 | Feb 2014 | Online & Print

Andre Beteille argues that unlike Bailey, the majority of Indian anthropologists have not given much serious thought to the problem of creating a definition of tribal society which will be appropriate to the Indian context. Rather they appear to have wavered continually between textbook definitions of 'tribe' and prevailing classifications of Indian society into 'tribal' and 'non-tribal.'

The convention to categorize certain groups in Indian society as tribal was established during the nineteenth century largely by British administrators. From the 1930's onwards lists begin to be prepared of Indian tribes with a view to giving them administrative and political concessions. The list of scheduled tribes attached to the Constitution of India had its origins in these. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the list reflects the demands more of administrative and political circumstances than of academic or logical rigour. As a consequence the same group might be treated as a tribe in one state but not in another. A notable feature of British administration in India was the task assigned to the decennial census operations. This included not only the counting of heads but the classification of the population into various categories. The successive census operations resulted in the creation of an enormously complex system of categories for dividing the population into tribes, caste, sects and occupations several of the earlier officials in charge of census operations were men with a passion for ethnology, and this no doubt contributed to the complexity of the categorical apparatus they created.

Since our existing list of tribes derives largely from the work of these census officials, it would be only fair to say that they were not much concerned with the distinction between 'tribe' and 'peasant'. Initially they used the term tribe in a rather loose sense, using it frequently to describe groups such as the Jats and Ahirs. But by the time of 1931 census, of which J.H. Hutton was in over-all charge, the distinction between 'tribe' and 'caste' had become an issue of some importance. Tribe came to be viewed more and more in religious and not just ecological terms. If a group could be shown to be clearly 'Hindu' in its religious belief and practices, it was a caste; if it was 'Animists' it had to be treated as a tribe.

N.K. Bose says there are many ways in which tribes can be classified. One is by language, another is by religion; and third is by degree of isolation to which they are subject, which has led some to retain a larger proportion of their original culture than others. But Bose believes that the simplest way will be to arrange them into categories based on the manner in which they primarily make their living. Bose thus divides the tribal people into three principle categories, (i) hunters, fishers, and gatherers: shifting cultivations: and (ii) settled agriculturists using the plough and plough cattle. He lists two other categories viz. nomadic cattle keepers, artisans, and labourers; and workers in plantations and Industries.

It is true that a substantial number of tribal people are peasants today; this is because we no longer have tribes in their pure state but only tribes in transition. The notion of Indian tribes in transition was raised for systematic inquiring by D.N.Majumdar nearly forty years ago. Since then it has become a kind of stock-in-trade for most anthropologists writing about the tribal situation in India. Major changes have been taking place among India's tribal people in the course of the last hundred years. Their isolation has broken down or been reduced. In many areas shifting cultivators have become settled agriculturists using the plough and plough cattle with changes in technology there have come about corresponding changes in their organization of production. Patterns of landholding have changed. The lineage is less important as a corporate group than it was in the past, and the market economy is altering not only the relationship of the tribal village with the outside world but also the economic and social structure of the village itself.

If we come towards the contrast between tribe and caste, anthropologists have differed sharply on this question. Andre Beteille has suggested that the separation of caste and tribal society is evident in the Sanskrit division between Jati, communities settled in towns and villages, and with elaborate divisions of labour, and Jani, who inhabit hills and forests. Vidyarathi in his work Culture Contours of Tribal Bihar, similarly find evidence for Tribal communities in the ancient literature, citing examples from the Vedas, the Puranas, the Ramayana and the Mahabharata.

Bailey questions the distinction between tribes and caste society, which is often taken as self-evident. Isolation, animistic religion, economic backwardness, language and historically questionable origins have been used implicitly or explicitly to identify tribes, but Beteille objects that the last is insufficient for a sociological formulation; not all Tribal groups speak distinct languages; and remaining three criteria are often shared by low caste and in fact constitute a continuum, with individual group's positions determined by the proportion of the population with direct (Tribe) rather than mediated (caste) access to land.

Dumont responds, arguing that while no absolute dichotomy could be drawn between tribe and caste, suggests instead a surface or even a volume, would better represent the complexity of the situation. Socio-economic criteria could not be taken as reliable indicators, as their significance may differ: 'what is central in the one is marginal in the other.' It is such ideological differences which he considers to be more significant, although obviously less neatly measurable, than Bailey's formulation.

Dumont also points out that it is unclear whether Bailey is comparing the tribe to Hindu society as a whole, or to an individual caste. This point is taken up by Beteille, remarking that the tribe compared to Hindu society appears very different, but when compared to a particular caste, similarities become more apparent. There Beteille lists the easily observed differences between tribes and castes. There are two aspects to this. It refers to, first, to the geographical isolation of tribes or their concentration in inaccessible areas. The second aspect is more important for the sociologist as argued by Beteille: this refers to the fact that a tribe is a world within itself. A caste in contrast is always has linked to a larger whole, sharing a number of ties with other social groups. The second difference is language or dialect. The tribes speak a variety of dialects which can be shown to differ on a number of important counts from the major Indian languages. This is really crucial feature which distinguishes 'tribal' from 'non-tribal' peasants when they come to live together in the same region, district or village.

Religion is the last significant difference Beteille says that even if we were to set aside the dichotomy of 'Animism'

and 'Hinduism', we would have to agree that there are numerous elements of religious belief and practice common to Oraons, Santhals, Mundas and Hos which are sharply different from what we would commonly call as Hinduism. But religion, he cautions unlike language, is a loose criterion, for what we see “is a continuum without sharp breaks, and where we draw the line between 'tribal' and 'non-tribal' must remain arbitrary”. N.K.Bose, who combined the perspectives of ethnography and Indology in his study of tribe and caste, was inclined to stress the continuity between the two.

Bailey on the other hand warns us against the attempt 'to see particular societies disjunctively as either tribes or castes, and suggests that we view them in terms of a continuum. Briefly, Bailey's argument is that a caste society is 'organic' and hierarchical while a tribal society is 'segmentary' and egalitarian.

Beteille says that though anthropologists have argued for a very long time about the definition of tribe, but the tribal communities of India did not involve themselves in these general debates over definition. This he says is unfortunate, “not only because of the legal and constitutional significance of the problem, but also because of the size and variety of the tribal population of India”. There are said to be over 400 tribes in India, and they cover the widest range of variation in terms of race, religion and language, as well as economic and political organization. The earlier accounts of the peoples of India show a preoccupation with the identification and description of the various tribes and castes in the population, without any clear criterion of distinction between the two kinds of units what are now acknowledged as castes are freely described as tribes, and vice versa. Even today it is not always easy to tell whether a particular group should be described as a caste or a tribe. Anthropological convention has treated the tribe as a 'completely' organized society; that is a self-perpetrating system having within its boundaries all the resources necessary for the continued maintenance of a particular mode of collective existence. The tribe is in this sense a whole society and a whole culture, unlike the clan, lineage or the family. Each tribe has its own territory, which means that it is politically autonomous, whether or not it is politically organized. It also has its own language or dialect which is the mark of its distinctive culture.

Until recently Beteille reminds us social anthropologists have been inclined to take the boundaries of the tribe for granted, focusing their attention on its internal structure. It is as if a tribe could be understood on its own terms without taking into account other tribes or other societies of a different kind. The work of Evans – Pritchard, among the Nuer showed that a tribe is a tribe only in opposition to other tribes. The experience of India (and other Asian Societies) would seem to indicate that a tribe might usefully be viewed as a tribe only in opposition to a social order of another kind.

Nineteenth century scholars viewed tribal societies in the light of evolutionary theory. This was true not only of anthropologists like Lewis Henry Morgan but also of historians like Fustel de Coulanges. Morgan sought to demonstrate the stages of reconstructed the transformation of Greek and Roman society from a primitive to an advanced type. In all of this the tribe represented a type of social organization as well a stage in social evolution. The evolutionary perspective has been revived in the writings of Marshall, Sahlins and in Godelier's critique of Sahlins. Andre Beteille in his writings about tribe, caste and peasant states that – Godelier has drawn attention to the two schemes of classification presented in 1961, there are four types of organization corresponding to four stages of evolution: the band, the tribe, the chiefdom, and the state. Later it was somewhat simplified, and instead of four, we have three types, namely the band, the Chiefdom and the state. Godelier finds fault with Sahlins for collapsing the two middle terms of his first scheme (tribe and chiefdom) into one, and so making his later conception of the tribe somewhat more elastic than his earlier.

The encounters between tribe and civilization in India have taken a very different route. The two have interacted and co-existed for a long time even before the beginning of recorded history and earlier. Tribes have existed at the margins of Hindu civilization from time immemorial, and these margins have always been vague, uncertain, and fluctuating. The transformation of tribes into castes has been documented by a large number of anthropologists and historians. It can be also argued that transformations of caste into tribes are also taking place, but this process is not easily documented.

Defining 'tribe' has conceptual as well as empirical problems for the academician. But the term, as Beteille states, the tribe is a society having a clear linguistic boundary and generally a well-defined political boundary. It is within the latter that 'regular determinate ways of acting' are imposed on its members. The tribe also has a cultural boundary, much less well defined, and this is the general frame for the more, the folkway, and the formal and informal interactions of these members. Earlier, anthropologists regarded tribes as not merely societies of a particular type, but societies representing a particular stage of evolution. In the twentieth century the concept of evolution fell out of fashion. The advance societies are then seen to be distinguished from by the presence of certain emergent character which the latter tribes lack. These emergent characters are, evidently, differentiation and specialization. In all historically known forms of society which have grown beyond the tribal stage, there are division into social categories based upon the relations of production. In tribal societies, on the other hand, the relations of production are homogenous. Whatever the mode of production followed, whether hunting, gathering or 'primitive' agriculture there is no conspicuous separation of social categories on the basis of their differential positions in the system of production. As a corollary to the above, it follows that tribal societies are unstratified.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEFINITION OF TRIBE:

In the Indian case, the definition of tribe has been changing during colonial and post-colonial phases. Its definition was more significant administratively rather than anthropologically. The first serious attempt made by the British in India to deal with so called aborigines, the scheduled tribe, was in connection with the Paharias or Malers of Rajmahal hills (Jharkhand). The hill tract was administered by the collector without any of the regular laws of the British government, making

his own rules for the conduct of affairs. The Paharias were brought under the jurisdiction of the country court with some exception in their favour in 1827. The exceptions were sufficiently large to leave the administration of justice practically in the hands of the tribesman themselves. Before 1827 all the rules of the Hill Assembly were regulated through Regulation I of 1796. Under Regulation I of 1796, tribals had their own assemblies, their own rules of law; did not pay any kind of taxes to British etc. Ghurye in his work, *The Scheduled Tribe* states that the events leading to the withdrawal of Regulation I of 1796 are very instructive to all students who wish to understand the problem of the so-called aborigines. The system, if continued in the same form, was doubly costly to the government, which, receiving no rent from the land had to pay fairly large stipend to the landholders as a bribe to keep the peace, as in the past we know that they frequently revolted against British rule in forested area. Regulation I of the 1827 was based upon the report of a British officer named Sutherland, who submitted his report in 1819, condemning in strong terms the constitution, the powers, and the actual work of the Hill Assembly. He also commented adversely on the stipends paid to the leaders to maintain peace in Hilly areas. Many of them were no longer necessary, some of them were abused, and all of them were originally intended to be a sort of temporary bribe. In such background in 1823 the Government accepted the recommendations made in the report. Nevertheless, Government made it quite clear that the Paharias, Malers were not to be disturbed in their possession and free enjoyment of the hills, so that peace could be maintained. S.C. Roy in his work *The Birhor – A little known jungle tribe in Chotanagpur* tells us that in spite of being especially administered area, slowly but surely, ordinary laws and enactments in force in Bihar, Bengal and Orissa came to be introduced in backward Chotanagpur (Jharkhand) one by one. The immediate outcome of the outrageous and devastating Santhal rebellion of 1855 was that the Santhal pargana was formed as a separate district and declared a non-regulation area, thereby removed from the operation of general laws and regulation. There was to be no regular police, and all the police duties were vested in the villagers themselves, the headman of the village being held directly responsible. Indian legislature passed the scheduled district Act XIV of 1874, whereby the local government was empowered to declare in respect of the tracts specified in the Act. The following tracts were specified as “Scheduled Tracts” under it: Assam, Ajmer-Marwar, Coorg, Andaman Islands; in Bengal jalpaiguri, Darjeeling, Chittagong hill tracts, the santhal pargana, Chota Nagpur and Angul Mahal in Bombay, Aden, Sindh, in Central Provinces; Chattisgarh zamindari and Chindwara; in Madras, fourteen Maliahs in Ganjam, nine maliahs in Vizag, some area in Godavri district and Laccadives, including minicoy, Lahul and Spiti, Kimaon and Garhwal. According to N.K. Bose, the main purpose of the British policy towards the tribes was to secure peace and not necessarily to help the people to advance on the road to progress either by integration with the plains Hindus or otherwise. Consistently with keeping the peace, gradually survey settlement was carried out, and by slow stages regular land revenue was levied, wherever and whenever possible. All the tracts in which large numbers of the so-called aboriginal people resided were not comprised within the scheduled districts; it doesn't mean that officials, even of the highest grade, were unaware of the general and specific problems of cultivators and the so-called aborigines. The effects of the indirect rule through the expedient of a scheduled district in regard to the general welfare of the people were far from encouraging. The Paharias, enjoying the benefits of protected status and indirect rule for about 150 years, were found in more or less the same barbaric and miserable conditions in which they were found by the British at the beginning of their contact with them. N.K. Bose states that, the methods by which the problem of the so-called aborigines was attempted to be solved in the constitution (British Parliament) leads one to the conclusion that the steps were taken not so much because all the tribals were really thought to be incapable of profiting by the parliamentary institution of the Constitution, nor even because they were unsympathetically treated by public bodies composed almost wholly of their non-tribal countrymen, but because the Parliament wanted to have the satisfaction of having done something to help the tribals whom it had more or less neglected. The attitude of the British Government was a mixed one so far as the interests if the tribal people were concerned.

A major shift in the relationship of the tribal folk with their Hindu neighbours had been the unwitting results of peace and the good governance of the British. It threw open the doors of tribal areas to settlement by a band of people who came in only for making money under the shadow and protection of the British rule. This was a condition significantly different from the state when, in earlier, age, Hindus and tribals come into confrontation with each other and could survive only by mutual sufferance and not by means of protection offered by a third force.

A significant change has taken place in the life of the tribal people after India's Independence. The Indian Constitution, adopted by the Constituent Assembly on 26, January 1950, visualized a policy of progressive acculturation of the tribal communities in India. Thus the former policy of their isolation and segregation was finally abandoned. To promote the desired integration of the tribals into the national life of India the Constitution provided special safeguards for the tribal population (along with the scheduled castes and other underprivileged communities) for a period of ten years. This is extended till date, after every ten years.

Stephen Fuchs in his work *'The Aboriginal Tribes of India'*; sates that safeguards consisted in special facilities for the promotion of education among the tribal, such as scholarships, dispensations from school fees and a special grants, reservation of seats in Government services and such elected bodies as the Parliament, state legislature and territorial councils, and specified funds for organizing tribal welfare in the state and Union Territories. The Constitution also provided for the preparation of Schedules of these tribes and castes which were backward and thus eligible for these privileges. The tribes which were designed as 'Scheduled' were listed in a Presidential order of 1950, which was modified in 1956 by another order. A second Presidential order promulgated in 1950 listed certain areas which were considered backward and designated them 'Scheduled and Tribal Areas', special efforts were to be made for their development.

A tribal welfare department was instituted and launched in 1951. Its work was not intended to supplant, but rather to

supplement the general development programmes, undertaken by the government through such agencies as a National Extension Service and the community Development project. For more concentrated welfare work for the benefit of tribals so-called 'Tribal Development Blocks' were created during the Second Five Year Plan.

In order to gain a better knowledge of the aboriginals, their ways of thinking and living, their problems and difficulties, and to find better and more effective ways and means of helping them, research institutes were set up in various states for the study of the tribes and their environment.

While these development programmes for the benefit of the tribal population of India, with their vast expenditures and comprehensive plans, would convince us that the Indian Government has taken effective steps to integrate the tribals into the national life and to extend to them all the benefits to which all citizens of India are entitled. However, surveys of tribal welfare works, supported by statistics, show that the aborigines of India are not being integrated as effectively and completely into the national culture as intended by the Government and as warranted by the great number of workers engaged in tribal welfare work and the vast expenditures provided for this work.

The reason for the non-implementation of the various government schemes for the benefit of the 'Scheduled tribes' are many. Stephen Fuchs states that the main reason, though rarely mentioned in the report, is the fact that any tribal welfare works run up against the vested interests of a powerful non-tribal population. Almost everywhere in India the tribal communities are surrounded by and live in more or less close with non-tribals who supply certain indispensable commodities to them – but for a price. Sometime the price which the tribals pay for these services is very high: economic exploitation, social degradation, and cultural subservience. Any cultural, social and economic improvement of the tribal peoples is consequently against the interests of these non-tribals dominating over and exploiting them. Another reason Fuchs states for the relative failure of the tribal welfare work is the relative haziness of the men directing the acculturation programme about the means and ways to achieve the integration of the tribals in the national life.

Comparatively more effective welfare work is being done apparently by non-official agencies. Prominent among these are the Bhartiya Adimjati Sevak Sangh and various organizations affiliated to it, such as the Banwari Seva Mandal, the Bhil Seva Mandal etc. The Ramkrishna Mission and Christian missionaries are also doing some welfare work among the tribals. These organizations are liberally subsidized by the government. They do a certain amount of good work, but their activities, too, are impaired by a lack of training and by misplaced zeal for rather conservative Hindu ideals, such as vegetarianism and other food taboos, anti-alcoholism, and an intolerant attitude towards certain social customs of the tribals, such as Scanty dress, the enjoyment of dancing and great freedom in sex morals.

Debate:

The debate on tribal policy prior to Independence was caught in the two contradictory positions of isolation of tribal communities from the mainstream to protect their heritage vis-a-vis complete assimilation for their development. The Indian Constitution however envisages a policy of integration for tribals by safeguarding, protecting, and promoting the interest of the tribal people. However, even before independence, the nature of policy to be adopted had become an issue of heated debate between two scholar's viz. Elwin and Ghurye. At the core of the debate was the question whether tribes were to be kept in a state in which they are in isolation or should the attempt be to draw them into wider society so that they could also enjoy the same benefits as the larger section of society. Elwin's pamphlet called 'Aboriginals' published in 1943 created a sensation. He put forth the proposal of a national park for protecting tribals from the outside world.

In direct contrast to this position, was Ghurye who advocated the policy of assimilation. His views were that the tribes were Hindus or, to articulate more correctly, they were backward Hindus. He viewed them as 'inferior' and backward because of the fact that they were cut off from the large mass of the Indian population. In his opinion tribes were to be assimilated with the larger society so that they could be lifted out of their abject poverty and crude life style. Against the 'isolationist' approach of Elwin, which formed the basis of the British colonial policy, Ghurye viewed that the only solution to the problem was their progressive assimilation with the farmers and peasants of the adjoining districts. He had the vision to conclude that the major problems of the tribals were never different from the problems of poor rural people in general. In his book 'The Scheduled Tribes' Ghurye was critical of Independent India's government policies which showed the seeds of disintegration by its internally contradicting steps of laying down the integrationist approach in the Constitution and on the other hand promoting fission by giving importance to the idea of Scheduled Areas.

The nationalist leadership in post Independent India deemed both these views, as inadequate. This is very clear from the nature and types of provisions laid down in the Indian Constitution for tribals. On closer examination of the provisions made in the Constitution, one finds that the Constitution clearly favours articulation of tribal problems in the direction of integration rather than isolation or assimilation, without using the term and concept of integration.

Tribal societies have not been static. Change have been in general, however, slow and gradual with the contact and incorporation of tribes into the wider economy and society, there has been acceleration of social change among them. This is visible in all aspects of their societal lives. The situation of tribes in India has not been different in any way. After they were incorporated into the colonial state to begin with, and then with the process of national reconstruction in Post-independence India, the tribal world has been witness to phenomenal and far reaching change. There has been the integration of tribal areas with wider world through extension of roads, railways and other forms of communications. Tribes have now become a part of the land, labour, and credit market; there has also been a tightening incorporation of the tribal people in the larger economic and

political processes of Indian states.

¹. According to census of India report 2001
². Ghurye, G.S, 1963. The scheduled Tribe, Popular Prakashan, Bombay. p284
³. Gupta, Dipankar (ed.), 2005, 'Anti-Utopia: Essential writings of Andre Beteille' Oxford University Press, New Delhi, p116
⁴. Lewis, I.M, 1968, Tribal society, in David L. Sils, (ed.), International Encyclopedia of Social Science, Newyork, vol. 16, p147
⁵. Gupta, Dipankar, (ed.), 2005, 'Anti-Utopia: Essential writings of Andre Beteille', Oxford University Press, New Delhi, p 118.
⁶. Roy, S.C, 1915, The Oraons of Chota Nagpur, Man in India office, Ranchi. p123.
⁷. Smith. R. Saumerez, (1971), Caste, Religion and locality in Punjab census M.Litt. Dissertation submitted to the University of Delhi; Cited in Anti-Utopia Essential writings of Andre Beteille, Dipankar Gupta (ed.), 2005, P. 119
⁸. Gupta, Dipankar, (ed.), 2005, .Anti-utopia essential writings of Andre Beteille. Oxford University Press. p119
⁹. Bose, N.K, 1971, Tribal Life in India , National Book Trust, New Delhi, p23.
¹⁰. Majumdar, D.N, 1937, A tribe in Transition a Study in Culture Pattern, p. 125.
¹¹. cited in – “Children of the forest” or “Backward Communities”: The ideology of Tribal Development paper by Katherine Charsley, School of Social & Political Studies, Univ. Of Edinburgh, 2010.
¹². Dumont, L, 1970, Homo Hierarchicus: The Caste System and its implication, Vikas Publishing House, New Delhi, p.82
¹³. Bailey, F.G, 1961, Tribe and Caste in India, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, p15
¹⁴. Gupta, Dipankar, (ed.) 2005, Anti-utopia essential writings of Andre Beteille. Oxford University Press, New Delhi, p131
¹⁵. There is a vast literature on subject, but the best single account is in N.K. Bose, 1975, – “The Structure of Hindu Society.”
¹⁶. Gupta, Dipankar (ed.) 2005, Anti-utopia; essential writings of Andre Beteille, Oxford University Press, New Delhi, p133
¹⁷. Cited in “The Definition of Tribe in Tribe, Caste and Religion in India by Romesh Thapar”, 1977, Macmillan India, p. 12
¹⁸. Ghurye, G.S, 1963, The Scheduled Tribe, Popular Prakashan, Bombay, p 70.
¹⁹. An area which is not regulated by govt. laws or constitution.
²⁰. Ghurye, G.S, 1963, The scheduled tribes, Popular Prakashan, Bombay, p112
²¹. Hasnain, Nadeem, 2007, Tribal India, New Royal Book, Lucknow, p285
²². Fuch, Stephens, 1973, The Aboriginal's Tribes of India, Macmillan India, New Delhi, P.298
²³. Ibid,
²⁴. The pamphlet was a part of Elwin-Ghurye debate.
²⁵. Elwin however changed his position in his later writings.
²⁶. “Resource Rich Tribal Poor – Displacing people, destroying identity in India's Indigenous heartland” (2008), A report by Action Aid Indian Social Institute (N. Delhi)



Vikash Kumar

Publish Research Article International Level Multidisciplinary Research Journal For All Subjects

Dear Sir/Mam,

We invite unpublished Research Paper, Summary of Research Project, Theses, Books and Book Review for publication, you will be pleased to know that our journals are

Associated and Indexed, India

- ★ International Scientific Journal Consortium
- ★ OPEN J-GATE

Associated and Indexed, USA

- Google Scholar
- EBSCO
- DOAJ
- Index Copernicus
- Publication Index
- Academic Journal Database
- Contemporary Research Index
- Academic Paper Database
- Digital Journals Database
- Current Index to Scholarly Journals
- Elite Scientific Journal Archive
- Directory Of Academic Resources
- Scholar Journal Index
- Recent Science Index
- Scientific Resources Database
- Directory Of Research Journal Indexing

Indian Streams Research Journal
258/34 Raviwar Peth Solapur-413005, Maharashtra
Contact-9595359435
E-Mail-ayisrj@yahoo.in/ayisrj2011@gmail.com
Website : www.isrj.net