

THE MARGINALIZED SELF

Tales of Resistance of a Community



Edited by

Rahul Ghai • Arvind K. Mishra • Sanjay Kumar

Introduction

RAHUL GHAI, ARVIND KUMAR MISHRA
and SANJAY KUMAR

WHY 'DEVELOPMENT' FAILS to reach the 'poor' is a rather vexed question. It has had different explanations depending on the ideology, politics, position, and status of those who seek these answers. The question assumes significance as poor communities continue to live in abject poverty and the disparities between very rich and very poor both within countries and between different regions of the world is widening. Few would dispute that this is a major impasse in development theory and practice. However, the question may also be framed differently: why do 'poor' reject 'development'? Why are they not viewed as more active makers of perspectives and shapers of their own destinies, rather than being continuously smothered by top down prescriptive recipes of 'development', some would say dispossession? Implicit in this rejection of 'development' by 'poor' is their will and tenacious spirit of survival that fleets past the self-laudatory trappings of the modernist project of development. Looked at in this way, the formulation that 'poor' are 'objects' to be bestowed with the benign fruits of development—a

formulation that has dominated the history of the modernist development project since its inception—needs to be questioned first and foremost. This critical appraisal of development theory and practice is long overdue to recognize and appreciate the active agency of ‘poor’ as critic of dominant model of development, and participants and makers of their own ‘development’ from their own vantage point.

Development is only one kind of social change advocated and effected by the power elites who subscribe to the idea that linear progress of non-Western societies is possible only by using scientific rationality and technology. However, despite the conviction and effort of the governmental and non-governmental agencies to bring about development in the target societies, its success and influence are not uniform in its different segments. As in every society there is pre-existing inequality, the dynamics of development accentuates this inequality further. A historical and structural approach to development and underdevelopment is likely to offer better explanation of underdevelopment of most of the non-Western societies. Andre Gunder Frank (1969) has rightly argued that it is the project of development itself that creates the phenomenon of underdevelopment. It may be argued that due to the combined effect of such dynamics and resistance shown by some communities (mostly poor ones) results in the marginalization of the latter.

Marginality: A Site for Emergence of the ‘Marginalized Self’

Marginality, produced by the dynamics of development programmes, is more than a one-dimensional phenomenon. In one sense, it refers to poverty, deprivation, powerlessness, and low status. For example, the two geographers, Bradley Cullen and Michael Pretes (2000) observe: ‘Research on marginality generally assumes a hierarchical relationship between the marginal and the

non-marginal. Usually this relationship is expressed in a Center/Periphery (or Core/Periphery) model’ (p. 221). Similarly, Judith Roberts (2014) observes that:

The groups or individuals that experience life on the fringes are denied full access to opportunities and resources that are normally available to dominant groups (e.g. housing, employment, civic engagement, democratic participation, and due process under the law). . . . The marginalized are always aware of their location in relation to those at the centre. . . . The place in the centre is where we are absent, voiceless, or invisible. (Roberts 2014: 191, 192)

This kind of depiction of marginality, mainly propagated through mainstream development discourse and also endorsed by many applied social science disciplines such as social work, management studies, and educational science, overlook the other meanings of marginality—perhaps unexpected—positive aspects that a marginal position may be endowed with.

It is worth noting that the term ‘marginal’ has a Latin root ‘*marginalis*’, which refers to an edge or border. Sociologist Robert Park (1928) equated marginal man with a ‘cultural hybrid’ individual. Everett Stonequist (1935) also defined marginality as a space between two cultures or two worlds. Louis Wirth (1928) reflects almost similar understanding about the margin in his classic, *The Ghetto*. One of the founders of the discipline of sociology, Georg Simmel (1908) used the term ‘the Stranger’ to refer to the marginal person, and argued that such a position may offer extra advantage where one is not constrained by a set of rules or expectations. Victor Turner, an anthropologist, (1967) used the term ‘liminality’ to characterize the individual who is between two positions, reminding Park’s concept of the marginal man. Although this feeling of being caught between two positions may create a state of confusion, it may also provide an opportunity to view life from a position having a richer experience, a position from which to critically scrutinize the dominant culture. Jeff Ferrell

(2012), a criminology scholar, while recognizing the potentially serious detrimental effects for those who find themselves dislocated, spatially and geographically, also suggests that occupying such a position allows an outsider perspective, equipped with a resolve to question the legitimacy and morality of individuals and community responsible for causing, sustaining and justifying their marginality. It is not surprising that the victims of development wilfully cling to their sense of marginality despite the seductive charms of worldviews of the dominant community. Their seemingly irrational tendency does not appear so if one can understand that marginality offers them opportunities in their day-to-day struggle to witness greed, selfishness, sense of insecurity, immorality and hypocrisy of the champions of the ideology of development. Development, except in economic sense, does not appear to them as a desirable goal and their own 'underdevelopment' is not entirely a state of despair and embarrassment. In view of the contested nature of development, people belonging to different communities show varied attitudes and responses towards the former following their cultural norms. Of late, social scientists have been using the concept of 'self' to understand and explain characteristic thinking, emotion and behaviour of individuals and community. It is also recognized by the scholars that self bears the stamp of culture, politics and economy of a given society. Its corollary is that marginalized communities' self-concept will be qualitatively different from that of the non-marginalized communities. In the following paragraphs, a theoretical framework of development, formation and functioning of the self of marginalized community will be presented, which will be referred to as *marginalized self*.

Although, human body provides foundation for the beginning of self, there is more to self than the physical body. There are several basic kinds of experience that create an elaborate and complex basis for selfhood apart from the bodily sensation. In fact, sense of self may transform our experience of having a body too. Baumeister (1997) has proposed three main universal experiences whereby

bodies become selves. Later on, in the course of development, culture of society can alter, shape or modify these experiences but they constitute the basic nature of self. The first of these is the experience of reflexive consciousness, which enables human beings to think, examine, and analyse their own behaviour and thinking. By virtue of reflexive consciousness, self exists as a subject as well as an object. It is a fact that only human beings have the capacity to reflect on their thinking, emotion and action. The second root of selfhood is its relatedness to others. Self cannot develop in isolation; its development requires presence of others in the life of the person. Even notion of self-contained, independent self is a product of current prevailing culture of Western societies, and not a natural form of human self. The third root of selfhood is its executive function. This is the active decision-making faculty that initiates actions, exerts control, and regulates the self. Deciding to take or not the moral responsibility of one's actions becomes possible due to executive function of self.

Self, rather than being a natural entity, is socially constructed and its features are prone to undergo transformation with change in the society. As society influences self, similarly self does influence society too. In other words, self and society constitute each other. Society shapes self through its linguistic and other practices. In *The History of Sexuality*, Michel Foucault (1986) drew attention to various social practices (for example, writing daily diary and confession) through which certain kind of self is formed and maintained. By engaging in such practices, individuals learn to examine aspects of themselves through self-reflection. Quite often, self-reflection is practiced under the guidance of a person who is recognized by the society as equipped to perform this role such as teachers, counsellors, priests, etc. Such self-monitoring has become highly systematized in contemporary society.

The term 'technologies of the self' refers to socially sanctioned procedures that encourage or teach people to address themselves systematically to their own feelings, thoughts and conduct. As these

procedures are socially institutionalized in society with significantly different 'technologies of self' people will collectively experience and understand themselves differently. This also implies that with the change of these technologies there will be corresponding changes in the self-concept. That is why self-concept of an individual or a group is not permanently constructed once and for all. It will not be far-fetched to argue that 'technologies of the self' of a society reflects its culture, showing thereby that culture shapes and maintains self of a society/community. However, there is no mechanistic causal relation between culture and self as the latter also exerts influence on the former through its executive function capacity.

Self is simultaneously both personal and social entity. Self-Categorization Theory (Turner et al. 1987) posits that self is inherently fluid and dynamic and has capacity to operate at personal and collective level in response to the situation in which the individual is embedded. Further, there is no permanent and qualitative difference between personal and social identity; the difference between the two is only in terms of level of inclusiveness. Empirically, it has been observed that the group with lower power/status (hereafter marginalized group) in a society tends to maintain collective identity whereas the members of dominant group operate at both personal and collective level. In a situation where members of marginalized group perceive rejection or humiliation of their group, they cope with such situation by asserting their collective/group identity. In other words, collective identity functions as a resource for the members of subordinate groups. This is a valuable theoretical insight about the thinking and action of marginalized group, provided by Social Identity Approach (SIA) which includes both Social Identity Theory (Tajfel and Turner 1978) and Self-Categorization Theory (Turner et al. 1987).

From the perspective of SIA, human mind is socially structured rather than existing a priori. Human mind develops during social interaction among individuals and it functions according to the

needs and values of self. Based on empirical research within the theoretical framework of SIA, Turner and Oakes have observed,

self-categorizing provides a varying social definition of the perceiver, and varying, socially defined self actively shapes and determines cognition by directing its functioning from the specific vantage point of a given self. Changing one's self-definition can, in turn, change values, self-relevance, goals, knowledge, the boundaries of social influence, the perception of agreement and disagreement, and so on. (Turner and Oakes 1997: 366)

One of the major insights that can be drawn from this theoretical discussion is that human perception, especially in social domain, is relative and is determined by the self. Perception is active, selective, constructive, elaborative, evaluative, motivated, and always takes place from the particular vantage point of the perceiving self (Turner and Oakes 1997: 367). This kind of understanding about human perception and cognition challenges the positivist-empiricist assertion that the valid knowledge is necessarily uninfluenced by human subjectivity. It is important to note that members of a particular group/community share self-categorization, which is historically situated and constrained by the social structure of his/her society. Hence, members of a community will tend to have shared perception and understanding about many things that are of common importance to them and they will differ from the members of differently placed communities in a systematic manner.

There is growing recognition among some scholars that holding a marginal position may carry with it the potential for a more critical and radical experience than is commonly assumed, although structural conditions may largely dictate one's marginal status. The most striking example is Bell Hooks's declaration of marginality as a site of resistance (1984). She contends that marginality 'offers the possibility of radical perspectives from which to see and create, to imagine alternatives, new worlds'. Henry Giroux (1997) also recognizes the presence of 'different cultural logics'

amongst very differently placed communities. Acknowledging and respecting 'different cultural logics' may also remind the dominant communities about the lop sidedness and narrowness of their worldviews. Thus, marginality is useful not only for the marginal, but is healthy for the entire humanity in philosophical and political sense as it offers opportunity for creativity, innovation, and new possibilities in the society.

Margins have been sites of both repression and resistance. Since members of dominant community have power to repress, members of the marginalized communities have power to resist. Marginalized self is not necessarily powerless, it possesses a different kind of power. It has power to understand why and under what conditions human beings become repressor of their fellow. Further, due to their marginality they can perceive moral degeneration of their oppressor. They also have moral power to imagine an alternative worldview wherein exploitative relationship between groups has no legitimacy. In such worldview, there will be meaningful and respectful place for all communities without experiencing any pressure to give up their right to live differently. Marginality also offers an aesthetic sense to appreciate diversity in human society. Marginalized selves resist any attempt to make the world homogeneous. They question those who speak about them and on behalf of them, but do not try to speak to them and with them. They also challenge the self-styled liberator (development expert) who hardly recognize the capacity and wisdom of the victim of exploitation.

In the context of the Indian nation-state, which has produced its own version of development, such questioning seeks to recover the experience of marginal communities as active subjects who can contribute to the development dialogue. Especially in a context where the historically marginal, the socially excluded Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes/Denotified Tribes comprise over 28 per cent of a predominantly rural and multicultural population, a repositioning of the dominant dispensation of development to

incorporate the perspectives of marginal communities is vital for a more just and equitable notion of human development. While this kind of questioning is beginning to gain credence, there is a need for empirically substantiated studies focusing on regions and communities that add to our understanding about the relation between the 'poor' and 'development'. According importance to the experiences of marginal communities, however ambiguous, is one important step towards transcending the boundaries of the top-down, expert-dominated and prescriptive constitution of knowledge that characterizes most dominant development paradigms.

Five essays in this volume attempt to illustrate, individually as well as collectively, the richness of the concept of marginality and highlight the strengths of the community due to its given position. These essays also aim to recover the wisdom and dignity of the marginalized community of Musahars from the trappings of a development discourse that has stifled and objectified them, treating them like stereotypes constituted out of deeply entrenched and pronounced biases of class and caste power. Together the essays attempt a comprehensive study of various aspects of the ritual and material practices of the Musahars, who occupy the lowest strata among the poor and backward groups in Bihar. Musahars are a stigmatized community and are mostly ostracized from the social life of the village.

Most efforts of development involving the Musahars have not yielded positive results and the development discourse on the Musahars is characterized by hopelessness and apathy. Their wandering lifestyle, non-acquisitive nature, rudimentary makeshift dwellings, and continuing aboriginal practices like hunting and gathering have led to the perpetuation of demeaning stereotypes. Conventional socio-economic research usually fails to understand them according to the neat, often restricting categories of analysis and instead views them in ambiguous and suspicious terms. Despite the fact that the Musahars work as casual wage labour

in the toughest and most menial of tasks and constitute a large percentage of Bihari agricultural labour, they are discriminated against in the government's job creation and employment schemes as they are not considered dependable wage labour (Shashi Bhushan 2002: 6–18). It is quite common to attribute their unemployment to their 'detestable cultural practices', seen by the dominant development discourse as one of the causes of their continued backwardness.

Through an assiduous collection and analysis of the voices of emancipation, resistance, dignity of labour and life, celebration of labour, collective sense of past, and myths of collective identity, this book seeks to liberate the Musahar community from the straitjacket of discriminatory stereotypes, empower them by forming an alternative knowledge pool that could contribute in future struggles for justice and dignity. The central argument of this epistemology from the perspective of the Musahar community is that positive consideration must be given to the role of cultural practices while planning and implementing interventions for development. It is argued that the cultural practices of Musahars have to be understood as dignified and valid world views. In doing so, they seek to offer a corrective to the rather pejorative image given to the community, being considered stubbornly changeless and incapable of reinventing themselves in the face of crisis or taking initiative.

The Musahars are classified as SCs in Bihar and number around 1.4 million, accounting for almost 2.5 per cent of the total population of the state. Predominantly engaged in agricultural labour and casual labour at the brick kilns, the Musahars are mostly settled in the districts of Gaya, Nadwa, Munger, Bhagalpur, Purnea, Muzzafarpur, Darbhanga, Saran, and Champaran. Apart from Bihar, the Musahars are also found in the neighbouring states of Jharkhand, Uttar Pradesh, and Bengal.

The essays explore different aspects of the culture of the Musahars—their rich ecological knowledge, popular myths,

legends of valiant heroes recounted with enthusiasm during the numerous fairs and festivals. It is argued that these ample living cultural resources consolidate processes of collective identity formation and strengthens community ties. These communitarian ties help the Musahars withstand onslaughts on their precarious status, invent and deploy coping strategies for survival, nurture collective representation by inventing new cultural idioms that strengthen processes of social awakening and questioning the dominant social order and active participation in democracy. This 'we' feeling imparts them with a 'capacity to aspire' and hones the necessary skills and capabilities to pursue their own dignified vision for holistic empowerment. To offer a refreshingly alternative perspective to counter the dominance of expert knowledge and top-down development planning, the essays in this book primarily reconstruct oral narratives and discussions with members of the Musahar community, in order to seek out their worldview, their perspective on what constitutes 'dignity', 'skills', 'education', and indeed 'development'.

The unchanging, static image of the Musahar community in development discourse perhaps owes a lot to the lack of historical perspective. With this view as its starting point, this book explores the sense of past and present as it exists in the worldview of the Musahars and finds it markedly different from the dominant narrative of bondage and servitude that upper caste Hindu society subjects them to. In the ecstatic mass recounting of myths, the Musahars radically reinterpret the dominant Brahminized versions of history to construct a past that is rebellious, brave, and imbued with the spirit of dissent. The Hindu caste order presents their subordination as a low and impure caste as a naturalized fact of history. However, the Musahars' systems of self-representation, such as the periodic celebration of the deeds of their valiant heroes and devout ancestors, demonstrate close links to the egalitarian mystic ideals espoused by saints like Kabir. The 'ontological metamorphosis' as one of the authors in the

volume puts it, that the Musahar community has undergone in the last seven centuries, from being a hunter in the jungle who wandered at will, to becoming an unfree labour; from being a worshipper of nature to becoming an untouchable in the Hindu caste system is represented in a manner that is different from the conventional caste histories by upper castes that have long legitimised exploitation and oppression. The Musahars' primordial myths critique and deconstruct the notion of the past that has been thrust upon them by these histories from outside. They also provide the basis for Musahar awakening and emancipation, and have the potential to transform their destinies in the present.

Descendents of the Kol, a Chotanagpur tribe, Musahars are scattered all over the paddy-growing areas of eastern India, providing unskilled labour. Many elements of the Musahar society are still a continuation of their tribal past as is evident from their food gathering and hunting practices, domestication of pigs, their nomadic character and non-acquisitive nature; these elements 'link them to the tribal society' (Singh 2002). They began to migrate to the paddy-growing plains of Bihar around the twelfth century. Successive waves of arable expansion throughout the late medieval and early modern period created the socio-economic conditions and the ecological context for their integration as landless labour in the settled arable cultivated Gangetic plains. Ties of servitude bound them with particular upper caste masters. This bondage to gruelling agricultural labour was hereditary, and the Musahar got a small share of the paddy in return for his services.

The widely present and historically constituted ties of agricultural bondage (the *kamiauti* system) among the Musahars and their masters from the upper castes took shape in the context of arable expansion in south Bihar. This was marked by a pronounced agricultural seasonality that had its own well developed practices of control over *kamias* (bonded labourers) by upper castes that ensured an assured supply of farm labour especially during the peak agricultural seasons. These all-encompassing cultural relations

were objectified and naturalized by legal contracts and gave rise to a new form of bondage that was one of the structural conditions of marginality bequeathed to the Musahars (Prakash 1990).

The studies in this volume seek to influence the development policy and action framework in a state that is reeling under backwardness for a host of reasons. Bihar is the third most populous state in India with 8.1 per cent of the country's population. The state, though richly endowed with natural resources, has recorded poor economic growth in the past few decades and ranks high among the slowest growing regions of the country. Bihar is predominantly rural with 89 per cent of the population living in rural areas and a rural poverty ratio of 44.3 per cent, the second highest after Orissa. Deep-rooted poverty in Bihar has its own specific regional profile: 'firstly, colonialism and the contingent deindustrialisation denuded Bihar of its resources and skill base; secondly, the land tenure system after a tardy three decades of land reform continues to perpetuate; thirdly, lack of public investment; and fourthly, the kinds of social movement that the state had witnessed' (Gupta 2010).

The challenge of poverty in Bihar is enormous due to complex social stratification. Poverty is heavily concentrated amongst the landless or near landless agricultural households, with these two vulnerable groups constituting 70 per cent of the households in Bihar. Small and marginal farmers comprise 93 per cent of the state's agricultural community. A vast majority of people in Bihar are severely deprived of basic human needs that encompass not only food, water, shelter, and clothing, but access to education, health, participation in political processes, security, and dignity. Those who are chronically poor experience multi-dimensional poverty and the Musahars form a large section of this marginal population.

In the multi-caste and class society of Bihar—where entrenched structures of oppression and the deep-seated prejudices of the upper castes inform political processes, policy constructs and bureaucratic

action, and where the problems of social exclusion continue to be acute, leading to discrepancies in the identification of the poor, and ineffective targeting for different welfare schemes makes a mockery of inclusive development—studies like these which emphasize key elements of the worldview of these communities are a valuable contribution towards understanding social change. For development interventions to address such debilitating deprivations, a proactive engagement with the perspectives and worldviews of the Musahars should form the basis for the processes of empowerment of these communities.

The critical need to restore these 'hidden voices' in development has been pointed out by many. As one such collection about the value of oral testimony in development says:

Bringing together what people say and think in the form of oral testimony, and then communicating through these testimonies, is one way of correcting a bias which runs throughout the whole development debate and dictates the majority of development initiatives. It is a way of giving volume and power to the voices of people who are outside the development establishment and ensuring that they are heard (Slim and Thompson 1993: 4).

The importance of listening to and integrating the voices and aspirations of the poor and marginal is critical in the design and planning of what the World Bank and United Nation agencies refer to as the 'new generation programmes of poverty reduction' in their effort to understand 'social exclusion and inclusion and getting beyond "income poverty" to understand the other dimensions of poverty'.

The contributors to this volume acknowledge the seminal importance of the emerging perspectives on development at the global level that emphasize culture, which views culture as capability and development as well-being. These perspectives have provided the theoretical framework for most of the papers in this volume. Destruction of culture and silencing the voices

of the other has been the leitmotif of processes of conquest and oppression in the two centuries of colonial and imperialist rule these areas of Bihar were subjected to. According to nineteenth-century colonial doctrines, the West's dominion over the colonies was a cultural obligation which stemmed from their position as a superior civilization. Over time the imperialists formulated the doctrine of the 'double mandate': economic profit, of course, but above all the responsibility to elevate the 'coloured races' to a higher level of civilization. During these periods, 'development' was mostly used to justify the increased exploitation of natural resources. These 'two commandments of the double mandate converge under the imperative of "economic development" as "cultural progress" was absorbed by "economic mobilization"' during the 1940s (Wolfgang Sachs 1992).

Culture was consigned to oblivion in the post-World War II rhetoric of economic growth and reconstruction. The modernization perspectives that have dominated development since the 1950s were primarily shaped by the economists. It has been argued that the 'complexity of dealing with culture in development in the last fifty years has to do with the failure to distinguish the constitutive, functional, and instrumental aspects of the cultural discourse' (Arizpe 2003: 163). Development discourse primarily talked in terms of economic growth and stability while culture was relegated to the restricted meaning of the arts, artists, and heritage.

The publication of the influential UNESCO report, *Our Creative Diversity*, in 1995 was a decisive moment when 'culture took an anthropological turn,' (Wright 1998: 7–15) and it was persuasively argued that development is embedded in the deep structures of culture. The immense diversity of human societies needed to be looked at on their own terms and not necessarily as approximations of any formulaic economic growth prescribed by the West. Following this, there has been an increasing recognition that culture, which is the 'soul of development', can no longer be

ignored and needs to be explicitly incorporated in the understanding of human development. This calls for 'transcending economics' and broadening the notion of development that has conventionally stood for uniformity based on Western values. This re-positioning sees the hope for the future in acknowledging the constitutive power of culture of the marginalized in shaping the processes of development. In proclaiming this 'cultural dimension to development' there is an effort to liberate culture from 'the primordial trap, a mystical haze, or a source of hegemonic power'. Elucidating further on the implications of the cultural lens, it has been argued that 'incorporating cultural notions within an economic framework' can enable us 'to go beyond simplistic notions of culture as a hindrance to development' (Rao and Walton 2004: 358).

In attempting to liberate culture from the economic growth syndrome, the emerging perspectives suggest positive strategies for integrating 'Indigenous Cultural Knowledge as skills into the processes and programs of what is called "Development"' (Vatsyayan 1996). In proposing a vital link between development as well-being and culture as dignified worldviews at the fringes, these articulations point to the necessity of situating and engaging with the perspectives of the marginal communities in overcoming the reductive basis of development as simply growth (Ghai and Kumar 2010).

Development acquired a new meaning for Third World countries when they gained freedom from colonial rule. With underdevelopment as the foundation of India's tryst with destiny, development primarily meant rapid industrialization and high economic growth, to avoid neocolonial domination. As Chakravarty points out, alluding to the specific context of the beginnings of Indian planning, the basis of development planning hinged on a consensus over a 'commodity centred approach', the chief aim of which was 'accumulation of capital' for launching rapid 'large scale industrialization' (Sukhamoy Chakravarty 2000:

51, 190). Keeping this as the main objective, the homogenizing modern Indian state espoused a 'developmental ideology' that aided 'self-definition of the post-colonial state' as well as 'rule by consent in the liberal democracy'. This was achieved, as Partha Chatterjee (1995: 51–72) argues, 'by forging a rhetorical unity between the will and sovereign powers of the state and the people-nation', by 'declaring a programme of economic development for the nation as synonymous with the well-being of the people'.

While communities were reified into administrative categories to facilitate rule, as subjects of development welfare and political manipulation, they were seldom seen as human beings with creative potential inherited orally through traditions that were generations old. Most of the development frameworks since then have rested on the assumption of a deficiency to be fulfilled in these deprived communities. This 'deficiency model' has been the most dominant, an ideal type of development that seeks to explain the causes of underdevelopment of marginal communities. This model of development dispensed by the experts derives its legitimacy through the construction of underdevelopment of regions and communities.

Independent India inherited this colonial representation that reified the Musahars as the other, as rat-eaters condemned to the most menial agricultural labour and with no entitlements to land either for habitat or cultivation. They have been the single largest source of unskilled agricultural labour in the region ever since. Recently, they have started migrating to Punjab during the harvest season to find work. Many of them break stones in quarries, while some work as daily wage labourers in the neighbouring towns, and a few others work in brick-kilns as far as Allahabad. They are largely concentrated in Gaya district where they constitute 17 per cent of the entire Scheduled Caste population. The literacy rate among them is 1.1 per cent. Musahars—socially considered 'untouchables' today—entered the fold of Hindu caste around three centuries ago. Even now the majority of Musahars live

in makeshift huts or one-room mud-houses on land they do not own.

It is in the Magadh region of Bihar (mostly areas falling under the present boundary of Gaya district) where they have the greatest concentration. The present volume has contributions from seven members of the field research project with the Musahars of the Gaya district undertaken in 2005.

The first chapter 'Culture, Development, and Capital of Farce' begins with an eloquent analysis of the uneasy relationship between culture and development that has developed over the decades. The author points out how phrases like 'culture of poverty' that spread like the 'flame of a straw mat' have legitimized an epistemology of the white man in development studies. This conception of development as civilizing burden—a legacy from colonial rule—located reasons for the lack of its success of in the laziness, insularity, unwillingness to take risk, and obsessive link with the past of the subjects of development. This dominant attitude blamed the culture of the poor for this obscurantist and reactionary baggage that prevented them from enjoying the fruits of development. Throughout most of the decades of post-World War II development era, development economists and their fabulous creation of *Homo economicus* ruled the thinking and practice of development.

The essay goes on to discuss the 1990s that witnessed the resurgence of the debate between culture and development, especially in the context of major institutions like the World Bank and UNESCO, which demonstrated a sympathetic disposition and positive attention to culture. In the later part of the essay, the author acknowledges the insights offered by anthropologists like Arjun Appadurai and Mary Douglas in delineating the idea of culture as collective thinking as opposed to the individual-oriented thinking of most economic formulations, and seeks to recover, highlight, and foreground the future in understanding culture as 'lending a capacity to aspire'.

Emboldened and hopeful about this new perspective about culture, the author then examines the culture of development to ascertain if development is denied to some because of the dominant cultural norms and values that constitute much of the development baggage in the post-colonial nation-state.

Invoking the paradoxical irony that Musahars—also known as Bhuiyas, etymologically 'of the earth'—have negligible landholdings and 'the yearning for a homestead land is probably the strongest among all of them across the region', the author cautions us against a simplified understanding of the world of the Musahar as a motley mix of 'contradictions and extremes' which produces and sustains the pejorative stereotypes that cast the Musahars as incapable of developing. The author argues persuasively that these elements of the world of the Mushars are also an indication of the inhuman conditions the Mushars inhabit, as they are forced into bondage right from birth and have little choice but to migrate to escape the drudgeries of exploitation at the hands of powerful upper castes.

The essay goes on to describe in evocative terms the contemporary folklore recorded from Musahar women to excavate the kernel of social consciousness of the Musahars as dignified beings with aspirations to transformation through education. Arguing against the stereotyping of Musahars that are coloured by caste and class biases, he underscores the importance of understanding the worldview of the Mushars on their own terms, to know their perceptions of change and development. This 'critical cultural eye' has to form the basis of development if the concept is to develop further dialogue. The author makes the important point that the passionate renderings of Musahar folksongs are ritualized reproduction of their suffering and their acumen of survival. While these songs and myths express despair and agony, they also ridicule and challenge the dominant Brahminical order and its protagonists, and the judicious deployment of these songs provides these subjugated groups with a stratagem for collective mobilization towards positive change and empowerment.

The next chapter on 'Myth, Culture, and Democracy' is a discussion of the myths and ballads popular among the Musahars. The author begins with an analysis of the primordial myth of the Musahars, the myth of their founding ancestor Deosi that traces the origin of the Musahars to the Kol tribe of Cheru and is popular in the oral traditions of the Musahars in central and eastern Uttar Pradesh. The second myth is about the female ancestor Savitri, which exists as a sub plot in the *Ramayana* epic. The third myth is popular in north Bihar and relates to the two Birs, the warriors Dina and Badri, symbolically akin to Rama and Lakshmana of the *Ramayana*, who came to the world to protect the poor labourers from the exploitation of rich landlords. These heroes are idolized, temples and worship sites are constructed around them, they are publicly venerated during religious occasions, fairs, and festivals commemorating them have proliferated among the Musahars in recent times. These fairs are extremely popular, attracting large numbers to soulful performances of ballads about these heroes. The author points out that these songs represent the collective psyche of all the Musahars. It is now becoming increasingly evident that the processes of positive assertion of the past, which mostly involve reinterpreting Brahminical symbols and myths to subvert the dominance of the Great Tradition and upper castes, plays a critical role in the efforts of stigmatized groups to claim an alternative representation.

In the telling and retelling of these myths at various occasions lies the promise of emancipation, of attaining self-respect through symbolic assertion. The author goes on to delineate the twin processes that facilitate the active participation of Musahars in parliamentary democracy. He points out that fairs and festivals organized by the community members to celebrate the memory of their caste heroes have emerged as important focal points for political parties, who use these occasions as platforms for political mobilization of the community. At another level, that of the internal organization of the Musahars, these tales of dignity

and lost affluence galvanize the community and motivate them to engage in development, upward mobility, and acquire social confidence.

The argument about the positive impact of this recasting of the heroic ballads among the community is further strengthened by an important observation that these are popular among the youth of the community and are not merely the nostalgic yearnings of a glorious past limited to the elders. All this leads the author to conclude that the communities are emerging as active participants in the democratic struggle through their own cultural resources. He sees in this an instance of how cultural capital is being transformed into political and developmental capital for community betterment.

Reflecting on large-scale movement away from agricultural labour as 'an important feature' of Bihar's transition from a 'feudal economy to a capitalist economy' in post independent India, is the chapter titled 'Looking Beyond the Implementation Paralysis in the Indira Awas Yojana: Narratives of the Musahar Community'. This chapter also analyses the causes behind the gross failure of the government's habitat guarantee schemes to provide entitlements to habitat for Musahars. It seeks to contest the cultural construction of Bhuinyas and Musahars as savage rat-eaters and free-willed wanderers that is deep-seated in the development discourse of the state. This is considered as one of the key reasons as to why they fail to qualify for or draw benefits from developmental measures such as provision of shelter and land. This narrow cultural construction of identity has produced further deprivation among the Bhuinyas and Musahars.

The essay argues for understanding causal and historical linkages between mobility, migration, and development. In finding that the neoclassical economic theory of push and pull factors alone is not sufficient to understand the phenomenon of migration of these groups, it joins hands with other emerging research in the region that sees the increase in 'out migration' not only as distress

migration. This is a more organic understanding of migration as it has grown in a community, historically emerging as a cultural asset. Migration is a well established coping strategy that comes to the nomadic Musahars quite instinctively. In trying to understand the 'subjectivities of the migrants' the study aims to 'peel off the multiple layers of mobility in an attempt 'to unravel its links with marginality and development by placing the Bhuinyas and their mobility in a historical plane'.

The author persuasively shows how the colonial etymological and ethnological explanations straitjacket the different stages of socio-economic formation, simplifying them into a linear evolutionary process. He emphasizes that mobility among the Bhuinyas and Musahars needs to be examined from multiple vantage points. The essay takes us through the different historical periods of Musahar life: as hunter-gatherers, their long history of bondage, and their subsequent association with sedentary agriculture. In doing so, it questions the persistence of the deep-seated prejudices that deny the present condition of the Musahars. The last section of the essay is an examination of the politics of this denial in the exclusion of the Mushars from schemes like the Indira Awas Yojana, a 1990s government housing scheme to provide shelter and housing for backward communities, mostly landless agricultural labourers, Scheduled Castes in particular. The major question that arises here is do the Musahars possess the basic asset for constructing a house, i.e. homestead land?

This beleaguered quest for homestead land has always escaped the Musahar community as subsequent historical circumstances reproduced versions of this deprivation, including that of the postcolonial state in Bihar. Mired in 'bureaucratic feudalism' and entrenched notions of discrimination by the upper castes, the state fails in delivering the distributive justice of development as it falls prey to cultural constructions that naturalize the myths of a tribal past as recorded by colonial ethnography, disregarding the community's rich historical trajectory of mobility.

The following chapter titled 'Changing Food Notions and Social Mobility: The Practice of Pig Rearing by Musahars in South Bihar' seeks to demystify the discourse on dirt and pollution around the occupation of pig-rearing by the Musahars. It seeks to examine the extent of the pig's intervention in the changing social, political, economic, and cultural relations amongst non-Dalit communities. The essay eloquently describes how the pig that was once a powerful symbol of untouchability and pig-rearing a detestable cultural practice making the Musahar the despised impure Other, has made a place for itself in the local public space, and is influencing non-Mushar and Savarna lifestyles. The author bases his argument on an analysis of the expanding business in the local markets where directly or indirectly, both pig-rearing and pig-eating have become current amongst the youth of non-Dalit communities. The continuation of the cultural practice of pig-rearing among the Musahars points to another possibility. The journey of Babu Chand Majhi, who started his commercial trek from two pigs three decades ago and now runs a successful business owning forty thousand pigs, points to the adaptation of this cultural practice for dignified survival in modern times. The author rightly cautions against seeing a profession in a form essentialized to a caste, and goes on to make the proposition that pig-rearing has to be looked as a viable source of livelihood based on cost-effective inputs from principles of entrepreneurship and knowledge of animal husbandry. Through a fascinating glimpse of the workings of the clandestine markets of fried pork, and the changing tastes of upper castes who prefer to consume pork, the essay shows how the pig has made deep inroads into the social life of other castes. Not only is the number of these sneaky pork eaters increasing, but the upper castes also invest money in the pork-rearing business and trading of pigs. This displacement of previously stricter rules of social conduct and etiquette lays bare the fact that the much-touted purity-pollution axis around the pig has no scriptural foundations in Hinduism. The essay also

persuasively argues that the pig is of high symbolic and ritual significance and has multidimensional value for the Musahars, for whom it is a 'companion in crisis'. This perspective refuses to see it as a cause of persisting backwardness—as has been espoused by the Kabirpanthis among the Musahars, who consider the unclean practice of pig rearing as a factor polluting the Musahar lifestyle. In their effort to disarm the essential silliness of the pig, they do not fully come to terms with the centuries old, strong ideological undercurrent flowing within the community, which is part of the dominant ideology they seek to oppose. For the author, these constructs of the otherwise resistant ideology tell us of the deep imprint of the dominant ideology on the mental, cultural, and social fabric of the subordinate community. But the vehement resistance that the Kabirpanthis express towards hollow and expensive rituals which are gifts from 'the hypocritical school of Brahminism' amply demonstrates that while the subordinate community may accept subordination, the parallel process of resistance continues.

The last chapter titled 'Power of the Margins: A Critique of Discourse on Underdevelopment' excavates varied sets of voices from among the Musahar community that are contemporary discourses on emancipation. The rich textual analysis makes a case for knowledge as deliberate action to bring about change. The author makes the case that unless a different image of the community is portrayed, it will not be possible to do any significant work for their emancipation.

The ensuing narrative interweaves biographical sketches of prominent social reformers and activists among the Musahar community in recent times. Dasarath Manjhi, now an octogenarian, had been one of the leaders of the community right from his days of razing the hillock near Gehlor way back in the 1960s, through the turbulent years of armed struggle of the mid-1970s and till the post-1990s when there was much hue and cry about liberalization and globalization at both state and national levels.

Another biography of resistance is of Bhagawati Devi who has raised the issue of entitlement of Musahars to homestead land. The arduous toils of Musahar social activist Baleswar Prasad and his wife Jayanti Devi from Bapugram are also brought to the fore. Their efforts over decades has transformed Bapugram from a wasteland into a beautiful flourishing village. Land had been levelled and forest cleared through sheer human labour. Most of the inhabitants were *kamias* who fled from their *maliks* (owner of bonded labourers) when they received land under the auspices of the Bhoodan Movement. For the author, there is an underlying common thread of dignity as a core ethic of Musahar community life that lies beneath these narratives. He further adds that the emerging multiple voices of the Musahar community provides enough suggestions that for them food and dignity are not separate issues. The 'social geniuses' of Musahar society are sympathetic to the community's idea of change and expectations from the future that emerge from their everyday life experiences. Their voices of emancipation have organically developed through a dialogical process. Unlike the commonplace perception of the Musahar community as poor, silent, powerless, and unthinking, they see the Musahars as capable of being enabled, worthy to lead a dignified life, and contributing to the welfare of society and the nation at large. According to such real philosophies of life, 'change' or 'progress' should necessarily respect the ethos of the community and create enabling conditions where they have the freedom to choose for themselves. And in this choice for freedom lies a fundamental quest for self-esteem as a cardinal value of human existence.

The aim of this book is to represent the rich texture of the lives and struggles of the Musahar community, to form the basis for meaningful positive change, with development as a dialogue for well-being. By identifying the valuable cultural assets of the community, the book argues that cultural practices should be considered as assets rather than a hindrance to development.

By substantiating this argument with analyses of the value of cultural practices among the Musahars themselves, the book makes a passionate plea for considering the Musahars as dignified human beings with the vision and capability to make a positive contribution to the realization of development.

It has been our conviction that the production and representation of such alternative viewpoints of marginal communities are needed to advocate for an agenda of development as well-being, but also to engage in affirmative action that seeks to represent the concerns of a marginal community that has been the victim of conventional development paradigms.

References

- Arizpe, Lourdes, 'The Intellectual History of Culture and Development Institutions', in *Culture and Public Action*, ed. Vijayendra Rao and Michael Walton, New Delhi: Permanent Black, 2004, pp. 163–84.
- Baumeister, R.F., *The Self and Society: Changes, Problems, and Opportunities in Self and Identity*, ed. R.D. Ashmore and L. Jussam, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Bhushan, Shashi, 'Reflections on the Material Conditions of the Musahars', in *Asserting Voices Changing Culture, Identity and Livelihood of the Musahars in the Gangetic Plains*, ed. Sanjay Kumar and Hemant Joshi, New Delhi: Deshkal, 2002, pp. 6–18.
- Chakravarty, Sukhamoy, *Writings on Development*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Chatterjee, Partha, 'Development Planning and the Indian State', in *The State and Development Planning in India*, ed. Terence J. Byres, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1995, pp. 51–72.
- Cullen, B.T. and M. Pretes, 'The Meaning of Marginality: Interpretations and Perceptions in Social Science', *The Social Science Journal*, vol. 37, no. 2, 2000, pp. 215–29.
- Farrell, Jeff, 'Outline of a Criminology of Drift', in *New Directions in Criminological Theory*, ed. Steve Hall and Simon Winlow, New York: Routledge, 2012, pp. 241–56.
- Foucault, M., *The Care of Self: The History of Sexuality*, vol. 3, New York: Pantheon 1986.
- Ghai, Rahul and Sanjay Kumar, 'Cultural Perspectives on Sustainable Rural Livelihoods', in *Interrogating Development: Insights from the Margins*, ed. Frederique Marglin et al., New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2010, pp. 17–42.
- Giroux, H., *Pedagogy and the Politics of Hope: Theory, Culture, and Schooling: A Critical Reader*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1997.
- Gupta, Shaibal, *International Seminar on Poverty in Bihar: Pattern, Dimensions and Eradication Strategies*, organized by Institute for Human Development In association with Asian Development Research Institute Supported by United Nations Development Programme, Patna, 18–20 April 2010.
- Hooks, Bell, *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*, Boston: South End Press, 1984.
- Park, R.E., 'Human Migration and the Marginal Man', *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 33, no. 6, 1928, pp. 881–93.
- Prakash, Gyan, *Bonded Histories: Genealogies of Labor Servitude in Colonial India*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Roberts, J.E.B., 'Discipleship with the Marginalized at the Centre', *International Review of Mission*, vol. 103, no. 2, 2014, pp. 189–99.
- Simmel, G., 'The Stranger', in *On Individuality and Social Forms*, ed. Donald N. Levine, 1908; repr., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971, pp. 143–9.
- Singh, Kumar Suresh, 'Musahar: Community Context and Equality', in *Asserting Voices Changing Culture, Identity and Livelihood of the Musahars in the Gangetic Plains*, ed. Sanjay Kumar and Hemant Joshi, New Delhi: Deshkal, 2002.
- Slim, Hugo and Paul Thompson, *Listening For A Change-Oral Testimony And Development*, London: PANOS, 1993, p. 4.
- Stonequist, E.V., 'The Problem of the Marginal Man', *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 41, no. 1, 1935, pp. 1–12.
- Tajfel, H. and J.C. Turner, 'An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict', in *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, ed. W.G. Austin and S. Worchel, Monterey, CA: Brooks, 1979, pp. 33–47.
- Turner, J.C., M.A. Hogg, P.J. Oakes, S.D. Reicher and M.S. Wetherell, *Rediscovering the Social Group: A Self-Categorization Theory*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1987.
- Turner, V., *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967.

Vatsyayan, Kapila, 'Foreword', in *Interface of Culture and Development*, ed. Baidyanath Saraswati, New Delhi: IGNCA, 1996.

Vijayendra Rao and Michael Walton, 'Conclusions: Implications of a Cultural Lens for Public Policy and Development Thought', in *Culture and Public Action*, ed. Vijayendra Rao and Michael Walton, New Delhi: Permanent Black, 2004, pp. 359–72.

Wirth, L., *The Ghetto*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928.

Wolfgang Sachs, 'Development: A Guide to the Ruins', *New Internationalist*, vol. 232, June 1992, pp. 2–8.

Wright, Susan, 'The Politicization of 'Culture'', *Anthropology Today*, vol. 14, no. 1, February 1998, pp. 7–15.

2

Culture, Development, and Capital of Farce

ARUN KUMAR

IN EVERYDAY DISCUSSIONS on culture and development, especially in a society that thrives on privileges and inequities, we invariably see those living on the margin blamed for their lack of development. 'Your culture is at fault', is a common refrain. It is not rare to see this internalized by the marginalised themselves. But more often than not, it's the hegemonic discourse—seeking to hide the core of its cultural make-up, which is defined by the denial of development to the lowered and broken—that adopts this stance. The idea of development is seldom singular, but the dominant labours to make its own as the most appropriate idea of development. The purpose is simply to negate that another worldview, another way of being may exist. With an inverted lens, however, it is indeed possible to see that at any given moment there may exist several different times; that several worlds may exist simultaneously in a single given space. To decipher that we, of course, need to unlearn the prevalent ways of seeing and hearing. Let's see if we could do that while seeking to gain some insight into the lives, dreams and struggles of the Musahars in Bihar today.

*A slightly different version of this chapter was first published in *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. XLI, no. 40, 7 October, 2006.

Vatsyayan, Kapila, 'Foreword', in *Interface of Culture and Development*, ed. Baidyanath Saraswati, New Delhi: IGNCA, 1996.

Vijayendra Rao and Michael Walton, 'Conclusions: Implications of a Cultural Lens for Public Policy and Development Thought', in *Culture and Public Action*, ed. Vijayendra Rao and Michael Walton, New Delhi: Permanent Black, 2004, pp. 359–72.

Wirth, L., *The Ghetto*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1928.

Wolfgang Sachs, 'Development: A Guide to the Ruins', *New Internationalist*, vol. 232, June 1992, pp. 2–8.

Wright, Susan, 'The Politicization of 'Culture'', *Anthropology Today*, vol. 14, no. 1, February 1998, pp. 7–15.

2

Culture, Development, and Capital of Farce

ARUN KUMAR

IN EVERYDAY DISCUSSIONS on culture and development, especially in a society that thrives on privileges and inequities, we invariably see those living on the margin blamed for their lack of development. 'Your culture is at fault', is a common refrain. It is not rare to see this internalized by the marginalised themselves. But more often than not, it's the hegemonic discourse—seeking to hide the core of its cultural make-up, which is defined by the denial of development to the lowered and broken—that adopts this stance. The idea of development is seldom singular, but the dominant labours to make its own as the most appropriate idea of development. The purpose is simply to negate that another worldview, another way of being may exist. With an inverted lens, however, it is indeed possible to see that at any given moment there may exist several different times; that several worlds may exist simultaneously in a single given space. To decipher that we, of course, need to unlearn the prevalent ways of seeing and hearing. Let's see if we could do that while seeking to gain some insight into the lives, dreams and struggles of the Musahars in Bihar today.

*A slightly different version of this chapter was first published in *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. XLI, no. 40, 7 October, 2006.

persuasively argues that the pig is of high symbolic and ritual significance and has multidimensional value for the Musahars, for whom it is a 'companion in crisis'. This perspective refuses to see it as a cause of persisting backwardness—as has been espoused by the Kabirpanthis among the Musahars, who consider the unclean practice of pig rearing as a factor polluting the Musahar lifestyle. In their effort to disarm the essential silliness of the pig, they do not fully come to terms with the centuries old, strong ideological undercurrent flowing within the community, which is part of the dominant ideology they seek to oppose. For the author, these constructs of the otherwise resistant ideology tell us of the deep imprint of the dominant ideology on the mental, cultural, and social fabric of the subordinate community. But the vehement resistance that the Kabirpanthis express towards hollow and expensive rituals which are gifts from 'the hypocritical school of Brahminism' amply demonstrates that while the subordinate community may accept subordination, the parallel process of resistance continues.

The last chapter titled 'Power of the Margins: A Critique of Discourse on Underdevelopment' excavates varied sets of voices from among the Musahar community that are contemporary discourses on emancipation. The rich textual analysis makes a case for knowledge as deliberate action to bring about change. The author makes the case that unless a different image of the community is portrayed, it will not be possible to do any significant work for their emancipation.

The ensuing narrative interweaves biographical sketches of prominent social reformers and activists among the Musahar community in recent times. Dasarath Manjhi, now an octogenarian, had been one of the leaders of the community right from his days of razing the hillock near Gehlor way back in the 1960s, through the turbulent years of armed struggle of the mid-1970s and till the post-1990s when there was much hue and cry about liberalization and globalization at both state and national levels.

Another biography of resistance is of Bhagawati Devi who has raised the issue of entitlement of Musahars to homestead land. The arduous toils of Musahar social activist Baleswar Prasad and his wife Jayanti Devi from Bapugram are also brought to the fore. Their efforts over decades has transformed Bapugram from a wasteland into a beautiful flourishing village. Land had been levelled and forest cleared through sheer human labour. Most of the inhabitants were *kamias* who fled from their *maliks* (owner of bonded labourers) when they received land under the auspices of the Bhoodan Movement. For the author, there is an underlying common thread of dignity as a core ethic of Musahar community life that lies beneath these narratives. He further adds that the emerging multiple voices of the Musahar community provides enough suggestions that for them food and dignity are not separate issues. The 'social geniuses' of Musahar society are sympathetic to the community's idea of change and expectations from the future that emerge from their everyday life experiences. Their voices of emancipation have organically developed through a dialogical process. Unlike the commonplace perception of the Musahar community as poor, silent, powerless, and unthinking, they see the Musahars as capable of being enabled, worthy to lead a dignified life, and contributing to the welfare of society and the nation at large. According to such real philosophies of life, 'change' or 'progress' should necessarily respect the ethos of the community and create enabling conditions where they have the freedom to choose for themselves. And in this choice for freedom lies a fundamental quest for self-esteem as a cardinal value of human existence.

The aim of this book is to represent the rich texture of the lives and struggles of the Musahar community, to form the basis for meaningful positive change, with development as a dialogue for well-being. By identifying the valuable cultural assets of the community, the book argues that cultural practices should be considered as assets rather than a hindrance to development.

Editors

Rahul Ghai is Associate Professor, School of Development Studies, IHMR University, Jaipur. His broad areas of work are understanding marginality and human well-being in a transforming India.

Arvind Kumar Mishra is Assistant Professor, Zakir Husain Centre for Educational Studies, JNU, New Delhi. His prime interest is in social psychology, marginality and alternative development.

Sanjay Kumar is a researcher, development practitioner and founder of the Deshkal Society, Delhi. He specializes in apprehending marginality, change and development of oppressed and marginalized communities in India.

Contributors

Rafiul Ahmed • Rahul Ghai • Arun Kumar •
Sanjay Kumar • Arvind Kumar Mishra •
Badri Narayan

Jacket photograph courtesy Sanjay Kumar

Jacket design by Pinaki De

₹ 1095

ISBN: 978-93-89933-80-2



9 789389 933802