Chapter II

Towards Conceptualising Marginalisation, Development and Social Capital Interface

"It is necessary to place the concept of spatiality, the created space of social organisation and production at the very heart of critical human geography in order to disclose the social relations that are inscribed within and constituted through its various forms and productions."

Edward Soja., The Ontology of Space: Explanations and Socio Spatial Dialectics.

Introduction

The theories that have been utilized to construct the primary concepts that help structure this study are largely social theories, essentially engaged with social, political, cultural tendencies and characteristics in societies. As Peet opines, "Social theory is particularly important as a combination of storage and bridging device, storing summarized results of work in one area in the form of ideas which can be transferred across theoretical bridges to other fields." This chapter will bring out the relations that exist within the society creating networks, these social relations are embedded in the space which itself "is a set of relations between things creating a hypercomplexity in which each fragment masks not one social relationship but many." It is explored herein how "unequal development, conventionally thought of in non-spatial terms, as vertical differentiation of economic sectors, branches and firms is also 'horizontal' or inherently spatial.

The theoretical construct of the study is located in the space pertaining to marginalisation and social capital amongst the tribal and non tribal social groups of Jharkhand. This is embedded within the civil society network along with ideals of alienation that serve as a frame in which the study is situated. Marginalisation is construed here as a kind of process that successively creates deprivation through inequality in the spatial interaction of the tribal and non tribal communities. Tribal society is classically interpreted as an egalitarian society, yet inequality in the socio-economic structural spheres is evident. This is the transition from tradition to the modern societal development within the tribal society. The initiators of this
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3 Ibid, p. 106
change are located outside the tribal society, within the non tribal society. Thus, today two kinds of distances exist: distances within the tribes and distances between the tribes and the non tribes. The focus of this study is entirely on the latter. What is explored herein is the power networks embedded in the idea of the eternal ‘other’ conditioning social ethnic discrimination that create marginal conditions of survival for some segments of population in civil society. Marginalisation as a process is difficult to quantify, it can only be studied as manifestations of the process. This is studied here as land alienation, a site of everyday contestations between the tribal communities and non tribal communities in the rural areas, as well as between the forces of governance and tribal communities. In the context of the Chota Nagpur region, presence and operation of the marginalisation process has been oft researched and is well established.

The purpose of the study is to locate the processes wherein the distances between the tribes and the non tribes in the same locality increase and its relationship to the traditional rights and livelihood sustenance. Dominant actor in bounded space creates inequality, as the tribes were the dominant actors in terms of land resources the study focused on how this vital resource has moved out of the control of the tribal communities and the resultant alterations in the livelihood sustenance measures between the two social groups. Inequality thus created enhances the marginalisation process so much so that the earlier dominant position of the tribal communities is lost and they are pushed the margins of survivability. Inequality, deprivation and discrimination are all active participants of this process.

The idea of social capital used here is based primarily on the strength of the kinship, clan, and family networks. Here, the concept of social networks becomes important for as Loury comments, “Economic analysis begins with a depersonalized agent... but it cannot adequately capture the ways that racial inequality persists over time. In actuality, individuals are embedded in complex networks of affiliations ... Each individual is socially situated, and one’s location within the network ... substantially affects one’s access to various resources”. Importance of family and community in determining individual growth thus gains credence based upon human capital theory.

Social Capital is that aspect of the societal relationship networks that is quite comparable to the marginalisation process and yet acts in a diametrically opposite direction, sustaining
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5 Refer to resource allocation models in Chapter II.
livelihoods rather than creating survivability problems. This is also an invisible part of the societal networks and is embedded in it similar to the marginalisation process. It is the society, its norms and the conduits that create and sustain these networks that determine the nature and scope of the functioning of both the aforementioned processes. An important characteristic of this is: the type of society it is; the various forms and norms of civil society are thus the broad contours that contain, sustain and regulate these networks. There are other features also that are inherent within these arguments; those of the livelihood strategies and the environments that the networks function in. Intermingled explorations include the role of state in determining resource ownership, distribution, usage, social structure and relationships between the different social groups. The individual is thus embedded within these complex networks that function simultaneously. As Heilbroner et al observes one cannot look to economic theory to solve the problems of poverty and deprivation and marginalisation in non-western cultures. “Solutions there must be found in the historical and cultural practices of the time and place under consideration. Culture and historicity are the core concepts of social analysis, and work not based on this foundation will be faulty and misleading”7. Following this, all the concepts have been located in specific historical processes tracing their trajectory and is utilised to locate the ground reality of tribal and non-tribal social groups in Jharkahnd.

This chapter is divided into four sections:

II.1. Civil Society: The Space of Network Location
II.2. The Idea of Marginalisation
II.3. Social Capital: Modes of Contesting Marginalisation
II.4. Sustainable Livelihood Strategies

Thus these are the four concepts that form the primary base on which this study is built. There are also other concepts that are implicit within these arguments, termed as the latent concepts they are dealt within the next chapter. This chapter seeks to establish the major concepts that will structure the study.

II.1 Civil Society: Space Of Network Location

Civil society as a category in the framework of social relations has come up in the recent past as almost a universal antidote for the ills that plague the societal development, the norm that can

help the societies become better performers in all arenas\(^8\). As Havel remarks, "In a period of rising political animosities and mistrust, it [civil society] has come to express a political desire for greater civility in social relations"\(^9\). Civil society as a concept is not new, what is new is the resurgence that is being witnessed within this category. In the earlier period, when the model of state led development dominated in the conceptions of social change and development, civil society as a category was a silent perception. It is once again the terminology of the Enlightenment Project, a part of the western political development in which “the Enlightenment invented society as the symbolic representation of collective human existence and instituted it as the essential domain of human practice”\(^10\).

The concept is laden with multiple meanings as well as shrouded in ambiguity. It is commonly assumed that the conditions that create the space for the development and growth of civil society are the brushes with authoritarian state and extremely close political regulation of every aspect of social life of the citizens, economic, social and political, thus controlling the identity formation processes and building the societal image in a particular imagery. “The common pattern has been the appearance of a multiplicity of non-negotiable identities and colliding self righteous beliefs, not a plural representation of malleable interests”\(^11\). The hope is that the category of civil society is the bridge that will ease the process of transition in societies, as Dahrendorf observes, “If we are to understand the dramatic changes occurring in Latin America and Eastern Europe in particular, the concept of civil society is indispensable, especially if we are to understand the stakes of these ‘transitions to democracy’ as well as self understanding of the relevant actors”\(^12\). The ideal of the societal development: towards democracy, and the “means through which the communities will achieve this is the through the thriving civil society”\(^13\) that will exist in those nations.

\(^{8}\) The Idea of a Civil Society, Humanities Research Center, North Carolina. p. 1
The origins of the concept can be traced distinctly to three distinct theoretical strains: John Locke, the Scottish theorists of the Commercial Society and Hegel. The traditions for all of them vary and yet are also similar at certain platforms.

Locke, the author of the social contract in English jurisdictionarily primarily viewed society as a ‘benign state, a legitimate political order’ and “distinguished sharply between true civil societies in which governmental power derives in more or less determinate ways from the consent of their citizens and political units which possess at least equivalent concentrations of coercive power, but in which there is neither recognition nor the reality of dependence of governmental power upon popular consent”. Locke saw political legitimacy as founded upon unbroken chains of personal trust. A civil society was that where the mode of human interaction was trust. His views echo formulations of social capital as a major player in the buildup of civil society wherein the major focus is on the trust networks shared by the various actors in that society. Locke’s later work that he only acknowledged in his will the ‘Two Treatises of Government’ published in 1689 saw him distinguish between legitimate political power and coercive power. In the Second Treatise that deals with the State of Nature is the most illuminating. “The State of Nature is a jural field of freedom and equality amongst the members of a single species ... a theoretical analysis of the fundamental relations right and duty which obtain between human beings, relations which are logically prior to the particular historical situations within which all human beings always in fact find themselves ... it is the normative framework within which human history occurs” and this was also subject to the jurisprudence of the Christian God, making this view of civil society deeply theological.

The theorists of the commercial society provided a secular conception of civil society during the enlightenment period in Scotland. They came into being as a solution to the power struggle between the church’s edicts and the problems faced by the Christian conception of community. They postulated that the human society was held together not by trust alone but also by interdependent need. “The nature of these interdependencies established the necessity of society and dynamics of this process was now captured by the concept of civilization, which
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17 __________ (2001) op. cit., p. 44.
described a progressive development of human capacities”18. Khilnani (2001) opines that crucial to the viability of such a society was a commitment to an effective system of justice, embedded in law and upheld by political authority19. This governed the possibility of effective markets, which both fulfilled existing needs while continually generating new ones and whose dynamism followed a steady refinement of civility. Moreover, the relations were not just governed by need but also this was the realm of private friendship and free interpersonal connections, of morals, affections and sentiments20. According to Smith, commercial societies made possible a higher form of human association, based on the economic need as all pre industrial relations were based on exchange and not upon exclusive and non- voluntary relations like kinship, bonds of patron – client relations etc21.

Hegel is one of the foremost of all civil society theorists concerned with the possibility of creating and sustaining a community under modern conditions and introduced the distinction between ‘state and civil society’22. “Hegel’s solution tried to integrate the individual freedoms specified by the natural law tradition (from Hobbes to Locke to Rousseau and Kant) with a rich vision of community existing under conditions of modern exchange23. Reidel has interpreted Hegel’s redefinition of civil society where he no longer used it as a synonym for political society but defined it on one hand as distinct from the family and on the other hand distinct from the state as well. Civil society for Hegel was the realm of instrumental relations between atomized and isolated individuals and an arena governed by utility24. According to Jones, civil society for Hegel embodied an intrinsically valuable acquisition: it was the space higher principle of modern subjectivity could emerge and flourish and equally a sphere of recognition25. It was horizontally rather than a vertically organized model ... it enabled the possibility of identification between persons and enables conditions of mutuality based on rights and duties: it embodied rationally grounded norms, which determined conduct and which, required active inculcation. Civil society
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22 Ibid, p. 23
could only emerge through institutionally mediated cultural and historical processes of interaction, through above all the processes of social recognition. Avineri (1972) further clarifies that the system of possession, property and exchange, universalized across civil society, was an instantiation of this web of recognition, and this universality was made explicit in and itself recognized in the state. The state was thus not an externally imposed construct, but rather the ratification of a pre-existing entity.

According to Mahajan, Andre Beteille (1999) is among the few social scientists who do not identify civil society with forums of participation, be they voluntary associations or community bodies. Instead, he specifies that civil society represents ‘open and secular’ institutions that mediate between the individual and the state. Institutions that are open to all categories of citizens irrespective of their caste, colour, creed or gender and whose internal arrangements are not determined by religious laws are thus categorised as civil society. For Beteille, these ‘open’ institutions of civil society embody and endorse the modern idea of citizenship. They set aside ascriptive community identities and treat all individuals as citizens in an equal manner. Since institutions of civil society give pre-eminence to individuals as citizens rather than to their identity as members of specific communities, such as caste, race or gender, they can only exist when the social-political order based on hierarchy is replaced by a system based on the equal rights of individuals.

Mahajan sums up the perception of civil society concisely: while discussing the concept of civil society three points are to be emphasised. First, in a democracy civil society and state are not antagonistic bodies. On the contrary, both express the same spirit as they seek to promote the claims of equal citizenship. Second, association of democracy with forums of participation may in fact violate some of the principle with which democracy is closely linked, namely, equal protection for minorities and the rights of all citizens. Participation may by its very force legitimise the will of the majority in a society. Third, in a society marked by systemic discrimination, strict adherence to the principle of formal equality and rule by impersonal laws may not be enough for promoting the ideal of citizenship. The latter entails the distribution of assets and opportunities in a way that diverse groups can have access to them. So long as socially

\[ \text{26} \text{ Ibid.} \]
\[ \text{27} \text{ Avineri, S (1972): Hegel’s Theory of Modern State. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.} \]
valued assets remain the monopoly of some groups the principle of formal equality may hinder the realisation of equal citizenship²⁹.

II.2 The Idea of Marginalisation

The idea of marginalization is one that simultaneously denotes an abstract ideal and a concretised reality that is representative of some of the cruelest and callous situations to be faced by human beings. This study is based on an interdisciplinary theoretical construct, in that no single theory is utilized for the study. The discourse is that of underdevelopment and marginalization which locates itself in the economies of discrimination and deprivation that is seen in the caste system prevailing in the Indian society and in the modern period in the emerging space of gender discrimination studies. Perception of alienation assumes centrality within the idea of marginalisation. Concepts of exclusion as developed by the World Bank in its run up to the publishing of the World Development Report 2000 and 2001 is also important as they encompass similar ideals of discrimination and deprivation in relations between poverty and social inequity. The emergent space thus created is essentially the “ruptures in history”³⁰ that allow insights into the selectively forgotten enclosed spaces of historical construct of tribal inhabitance. Various concepts of marginalization are explored here in order to bring out its multidimensional and embedded nature. This section is divided into three sub sections whereby the three different ideas are discussed.

II.2.1 Concept of Alienation in Social Science

II.2.2 Prejudice and Rational Choice: Economic Theories of Discrimination and Deprivation

II.2.3 Theory of Exclusion: An Integrated Measure of Marginalisation

II.2.4 Marginalisation as a Product of Spatial Differentiation, Widening Disparities and Economic and Social Discrimination

II.2.5 Caste Systems in India: Social Causes of Discrimination and Deprivation

II.2.6 Politics of the ‘Other’: Orientalism in the 20th Century

These concepts are all interlinked and they form a dense network of myriad significance and differential imports according to their location and magnitude.

²⁹ Ibid.

II.2.1 Alienation as a Concept in Social Sciences

Alienation as a concept in the social sciences is essentially a Marxian construct. Alienation as a concept and framework defines the state of human being in a social situation wherein he is separated from himself. As Rao comments, "Starting with Hegel, it was used by Marx in his early writings to describe and criticise a social condition in which man far from being the active initiator of the social world seemed more a passive object of determinate external processes".\(^{31}\) Hegel's idea of alienation was highly "non-materialistic and idealistic with mythical overtones". For Hegel, it was not the real world living human beings but "the absolute idea that undergoes alienation".\(^{32}\) This means that the alienation is not working in the real world but is acting on an idea that is perceived by some one. Its existence is only at an ideal level denies it the right to exist in real world conditions.

In Colletti’s (1975) opinion Karl Marx has criticised the idea put forward by Hegel, by saying that Hegel’s philosophy suffers from the double defect of being at one and the same time from "uncritical positivism and uncritical idealism."\(^{33}\) He further clarifies it, by commenting, "It is uncritical idealism because Hegel denies the empirical, sensible world and acknowledges true reality only in abstraction, in the “Idea”. And it is uncritical positivism because Hegel cannot help in the end restoring the empirical object world, and originally denied the idea has no other possible earthly incarnation or meaning."\(^{34}\) Therefore Hegel’s idea cannot be disregarded but neither can it be used in the in any real world situation.

According to Marx, in his early writings (Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts (EPM) the concept is formulated as “estranged labour” phenomena. Alienation in Marx’s conception of man in the capitalist society is the process that facilitates the exploitation of many by a few. Sharma further quotes Marx, “Alienation is fundamentally a particular relation to property, involving involuntary surrender to antagonistic other”.\(^{35}\) A human subject can also view it as a process of relinquishment of a possession to a claim to something; this also transforms people into antagonistic groups. Swingwood opines “Alienation is also described as a process by which man is progressively turned into a stranger in the world which his labour has

\(^{32}\) Ibid, p. 25.
\(^{34}\) Ibid, p.20.
created”. For Marx, alienation was a characteristic feature of social relations under which the conditions of peoples life and activity, that activity itself and the relations between people, appear as a force which is alien and hostile to the people. He considers alienation as an inevitable form of capitalistic social relations.

In EPM (1844) he wrote, “though private property appears to be the reason, the cause of alienated labour, it is rather the consequence … later this relation becomes reciprocal”. Sharma, commenting on Marx’s attitude towards alienation expresses the opinion that according to Marx, while private property is the product of alienated labour, it is also a means by which labour alienates. He further opines that Marx in his latter works systematises his analysis while presenting the paradox of capitalist production of ever increasing material wealth at one pole and ever increasing impoverishment of the working class on the other, and aptly perceives the “exploitation” of capitalist and alienation of wage labour. Thus alienation and exploitation both became characteristic features of capitalistic society.

The formulation of private property in land in turn is included in the larger debate surrounding the issue of whether the creation of private property in land by British rulers in India is an accomplished fact or not. According to Bagchi, “Most wars in recorded history have been fought regarding control over land and its produce and therefore its analysis is of utmost importance in analysis of social change, economic transformation and political revolution”. He further comments “the lack of private property in land, the union in the person of the sovereign of both the public and private spheres of social life, and hence the lack of separation of the strictly political sphere from civil society have been regarded separately and jointly as the characteristics and constitutive elements of ‘oriental’ societies and merely specifically of ‘oriental despotism’. In Krader’s view this tradition of economic writing dates back to Jean Bernier in the seventeenth century but was authenticated by G.W.F. Hegel in eighteenth
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40 Ibid. p. 354.
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century. Stokes opines that this view was also adhered to by a very important group of policy
makers in colonial India. Bagchi picks up the dissention and comments “Paradoxically enough,
the alleged lack of individual property as against mere possession in the village communities of
Asia (including India) and their subjection to the sovereignty of the state provided the germ of
the Asiatic mode of production as conceptualised by Karl Marx”.45

An opposite view to the above argument also exists that credits the Asian lands to be
endowed with the institution of private property in land. The implicit recognition of the presence
of private property in land in the Mughal dominions goes back at least to Tavernier, a
contemporary of Bernier.46 Guha states that amongst the British officials and policy makers
Philip Francis ascribed to the view that the zamindars or the landlords were the proprietors of the
soil.47 Krader mentions that Mark Wilks was of the view that in the Mysore kingdom of the
eighteenth century land was owned by individual cultivator.48 Montstuart Elphinstone also
supported this in his journals on the Maratha territory.

“However the second view was drowned in the need that the European writers of the
eighteenth century felt of conceptualising the Orient as the changeless ‘Other’ to which
European countries would also approximate if they failed to carry out the kinds of revolution
they mere hoping for. Then of course, with the spread of European colonialism the Orient had to
be seen as that passive corpse which European colonisation / conquest would gleanings into life.
Some of even Marx’s writings could be interpreted along similar lines”49

However, in reality some forms of private property in land did exist though this fact was
not recognised by everybody. This was “fractured by the need of the colonial state to finance
operations- almost exclusively from land- a need that necessarily had to interfere often arbitrarily
with the pre-existing patterns of possession and ownership”.50 Richard Jones (1831) was one of
the very few political economists of the eighteenth century who recognised the fact. But a
systematic analysis of the way in which the revenue systems introduced by the British fractured

47 Calcutta.
48 Krader, L. (1975): The Asiatic Modes of Production: Sources. Development and Critique in the Writings of Karl
Marx. Van Gorcum, Assen.
49 Ibid, p.56.
the possibility of creating a property owning peasantry or initiating a process of accumulation based on improving productivity remains still needs to be carried out for different regions in India. Embedded in all this were the seeds of land alienation process that escalated in a large scale movement upon the introduction of the Permanent Settlement Act in 1793.

Once the exploitative relations were established, alienation followed naturally. The process is carried on by as Sharma states “Marx mentions objectification of human beings which leads to estrangement”. Rao (1987) mentions that Karl Marx deals with the concept of alienation of man from four different dimensions:

1. From the product of his labour
2. From himself life activity
3. From his species being
4. From other men

Marx himself states “In other words, alienation must be viewed and understood from different perspectives such as in relation of the worker to the product of his labour, in relation to the activity of production itself in terms of its impact on the worker, and in the context of individuals and social life of man in his relation to nature, to himself, to the object and to the other men”. Satyanarayana (1975) opines that the tribal communities lived by and large in pre-capitalistic socio-economic formation having communal ownership of land. This was became the community ownership of land on India was not commodities prior to the down of the British capital.

Land is not only a source of livelihood according to PUDR (1981) but is also connected with their sense of history and is a symbol of social prestige for them. The communal ownership meant owning the land in its own right. Yet to understand the dynamics of the land
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51 Sharma, op. cit., p.354.
52 Rao, op. cit., p.29.
54 Colletti, op. cit., p.266.
56 Prior to the entry of the British capital in India, these society were not markedly disturbed by the previous nature rulers. The break up of community ownership of land during the period of the Britishers who penetrated with their capital into these areas through activities made the land das a component of the private property (Rao1987:48).
problem in totality one needs an "understanding of the logic of the 'underlying forces' that
govern its ownership pattern... such a discussion would essentially involve an analysis of 'the
mode of production' from its historical perspective." 60

Marx states "a distinct mode of production determines the specific mode of consumption,
distribution, exchange and specific relations of these different phases to one another"61. The
relation of a particular political form that took over could be generated out of the economic form
that exists. Rudra further quotes Marx to bring out the interrelationship, "the specific economic
form in which unpaid surplus labour is pumped out of the direct producers determines the
relation of rulers and ruled, as it grows directly out of production itself and in turn reacts upon it
as a determining element. Upon this however is founded the entire formation of the 'economic
community' which grows out of production relations themselves, thereby stimulating
simultaneously its specific political form". 62

The social formation of tribes dates pack to the pre-class society of the hunter gatherer
stage. Slowly with changing food relations the inter tribe and intra tribe relations in society
emerged. But in spite of all these changes the idea of private property did not come up. As
Kosambi comments "Land was territory, not property: game and food gathered was shared out to
all. Food production is more efficient than food gathering, the settled agrarian method of life less
uncertain than tribal hunting and scavenging off the products of nature which left man decidedly
more helpless in his struggle with the environment". 6364

This happened when the tribal groups like Munda, Hos, Santhals settled down to settled
agricultural practices. They helped in clearing land and set up villages, called 'hatu' and the
original land clearing right was 'Khuntkati' in the Munda areas. The food production stage
could lead to generation of more surplus which was made possible by the division of labour.

59 The mode of production is "a definite form of activity, of those individuals a definite form of expressing their
life, a definite mode of life on their part." As individuals express their life so they are what they are therefore
coincides with their production, both with "what" they produce and "how they produce. The nature of individuals
thus depends on the material conditions determining their production" in Karl Marx and Engels. The German
Ideology. 1968. Moscow p.32.
60 Rao, op. cit., p.88.
61 Rudra, Ashok, (1983): 'Class Relations in Indian Agriculture', in S.A. Shah (ed): Agriculture in India, Popular
Prakashan, Bombay.
64 There is no concrete evidence of emergence of kingship among Mundas nor on the origin of the Naehansis. S.C.
Roy (ibid: 141: 1915: 136-81) and Dalton (1872: 164-68) recorded a myth of origin according to which the first Raja
may have been a Naga adopted by a manki. See P.C. Roy Chowdhury 1965b: 143-44 and K.S. Singh 1971b:170,
Next came the barter economy and continued till the entry of the British rulers into the area and transformed land into a commodity. As Sen states, “Prior to the advent of the British rule land was inalienable form the tillers of the soil. Rights inland were divided among the king, the feudal lords and the peasants from whom, as a general rule, land could not be taken away. The bourgeois concept of private property in land did not yet develop, except sporadically here and there. But the steadily growing monetization of the economy maturing into money rent shook the roots of this inalienability, and land became a commodity. It could also be purchased and sold like any movable property.”

II.2.2 Prejudice and Rational Choice: Economic Theories of Discrimination and Deprivation

Becker was amongst the foremost to develop the concept of discrimination in the economic arena in 1957. He argues that all actors are economic beings embedded in the social system creating multiple choices in the process seeking better opportunity. Becker used this structure to study unrelenting racial and sexual discrimination, (in the United States, in the context of the White and the Black Communities) investment in human capital, crime and punishment, marriage and divorce, the family, drug addiction, and other dimensions of society till then viewed as ‘noneconomic’. He thus formulated economic theory to study prejudice. His research thus examines income inequality through the functions of the market, work experiences in the labour market, government strategies, household choices, and economic opportunities. Whereas most of the issues are not directly linked to the households, there is the element of personal choices made by them that decide the degree of inequality. “Discrimination was a non-pecuniary ‘taste’ which within market interaction generated pecuniary costs. Discrimination in the market place by any group reduces their own real incomes as well as the real incomes of the minority.”

Social problems were analysed using economic tools to an extent that economic approach became synonymous with the study of human behaviour in all walks of life and realms of society. Becker defines the economic approach as the relentless and unflinching use of the combined assumptions of maximizing behaviour, market equilibrium and stable preferences.
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Arrow (1972)\textsuperscript{70} and Phelps (1972)\textsuperscript{71} counter this view of prejudice it by arguing for importance of available information enabling the households to make rational choices. This view is corroborated by Loury (1998) when he states “Information based models afford a more realistic account of market discrimination faced by blacks today”\textsuperscript{72}.

Becker's theory of discrimination has also been criticized for an "under socialized" view of the individual\textsuperscript{73} “Classic Durkheimian and (Karl) Polanyian themes of social systems of rules and values, the embeddedness of culture, etc., have been resurrected in a modern sociological critique of the neoclassical view of the individual”\textsuperscript{74}. The rational choices to be made by the households is contested by claims that it is non rational rather than rational procedures that guide the household’s choices. “It is the influence of our parents, our situation within the community, the religious morals of that community form the basis of human behaviour, not rational choice. With that shift away from utilitarian rational choice, comes an entire package of reassessment from social science methodology to discourse within the polity to public policy\textsuperscript{75}. Fine also critiques Becker by observing that his analysis had primarily depended upon the non-market as if market, and the market as if utility maximising individuals facing resource and price constraints\textsuperscript{76}.

Currently, the prominence of discrimination faced within the labour market has given way to skill based racial inequality between different ethnic and racial groups. “The differential racial skills prevalent in the labour market brings out the embedded nature of discrimination leading to deprivation; it is also seen as a reflection of social and cultural factors – geographic segregations, deleterious social norms ... peer influences and poor educational quality – that

\textsuperscript{69} \textit{The Economic Approach to Human Behaviour}. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, p. 5.
have a racial dimension"\(^\text{77}\). This evidences the fact that nature of inequality in the economic sphere is not just a function of the market system but also pertains to the quality of labour available in the market. “Though this does not decry the fact that the magnitude of discrimination and job as well as wage discrimination is more in the market place, rather, these are the conditions that ultimately result in the unequal market conditions”\(^\text{78}\).

Here, the concept of social networks becomes important, for as Loury (1998) elaborates, “Economic analysis begins with a depersonalized agent... but it cannot adequately capture the ways that racial inequality persists over time. In actuality, individuals are embedded in complex networks of affiliations ... Each individual is socially situated, and one’s location within the network ... substantially affects one’s access to various resources”\(^\text{79}\). This focuses attention on the significance of family and community background in shaping individual accomplishment. Loury argues that “familial and communal resources—that is social and cultural capital – explicitly influence a person’s acquisition of human capital”\(^\text{80}\). This argument has a wide support base and has been utilized by many to bring out the economies of discrimination as seen in the works of Anderson (1990)\(^\text{81}\), Waldinger (1996)\(^\text{82}\) and Akerlof\(^\text{83}\).

However, Mark Granovetter’s alternative project, for example, focuses attention on the social structures, organizations and groups within which economic activity is embedded, including the state in its capacity of shaping ownership, authority, and financial relationships between business groups. Granovetter tries to overcome both the problems of under- and over-socialized view of the individual, stating that “actors do not behave or decide as atoms outside a social context, nor do they adhere slavishly to a script written for them by the particular intersection of social categories that they happen to occupy”\(^\text{84}\). Herein, institutions are viewed as both the product and shaper of individual choice.


\(^{78}\) Loury, op. cit.

\(^{79}\) Ibid.

\(^{80}\) Ibid.


Pure economic analysis is limited by its own reason and assertion and the queries that it can actually make. "Praxeological reasoning requires a more flexible form of thought, which does not mechanically "close" the system as in equilibrium styles of reasoning, but nevertheless enables us to establish the boundaries of action."85 As Heilbroner (1996) observes one cannot look to economic theory to solve the problems of poverty and deprivation and marginalisation in non-western cultures. "Solutions there must be found in the historical and cultural practices of the time and place under consideration. Culture and historicity are the core concepts of social analysis, and work not based on this foundation will be faulty and misleading."86

II.2.3 Theory of Exclusion: An Integrated Measure of Marginalisation

Rene Lenoir in 1974 introduced the concept of 'exclusion' in 'Les Exclus: Un Francais sur dix, in Lenoir' by excluding about 10% of France's population from varied population segments to create development. This term was utilized by Cannan put forward different varieties of social disadvantage arising out of unemployment, ghettoisasion, fundamental changes in family life and discrimination, deprivation and marginalisation of a segment of the populace the world over.87

Arjan de Haan argues "that the value of the concept lies in focusing our attention on two central elements of deprivation: its multi-dimensionality, and the processes and social relations that underlie deprivation This was mainly conceptual, thinking about the usefulness of the social exclusion as a framework for understanding deprivation. Social exclusion broadly defined is the process through which individuals or groups are wholly or partially excluded from full participation in the society within which they live. It is the opposite of social integration, mirroring the perceived importance of being part of society, of being included."88

The work of Hilary Silver (1994) has stressed the variety of definitions given to social exclusion and integration, depending on contexts, and that the definitions come with "theoretical and ideological baggage."89

85 Boettke Op. cit.,
In an Anglo-Saxon tradition, social exclusion means a rather different thing. One of the main theoretical differences appear to be the fact that 'poverty' is seen as an issue which is separate from 'social exclusion' – perhaps nearer to the underclass debate – rather than as an element of social exclusion. The Anglo-Saxon tradition is characterised by Silver as a specialisation paradigm, drawing on liberal thinkers like Locke. This perceives social actors primarily as individuals, who are able to move across boundaries of social differentiation and economic divisions of labour. Unenforced rights and market failures are seen as common causes of exclusion. Liberal models of citizenship emphasise the contractual exchange of rights and obligations. In this paradigm, exclusion reflects discrimination, the drawing of group distinctions that denies individuals full participation in exchange or interaction. The third paradigm described in Silver's earlier work is the 'monopoly paradigm'. Unlike the liberal tradition, the monopoly paradigm focuses attention on the existence of hierarchical power relations in the constitution of a social order. Group monopolies are seen as responsible for exclusion. Powerful groups restrict the access of outsiders through social closure. Inequality is considered to overlap with such group distinctions, but it is alleviated through participatory social institutions.

The ILO utilised the concept of exclusion to include both individuals and groups, in its study of a number of developing countries. This study defined exclusion/marginalisation along two dimensions: (i) disempowerment at the individual level, and (ii) structural obstacles at the societal level which deny some groups access to resources associated with citizenship. Exclusion is defined as “the notion of social exclusion offers a way of integrating loosely connected notions such as poverty, deprivation, lack of access to goods services and assets, (and) precariousness of social rights. This approach has the advantage of including many different forms of deprivation, but is less interested in distinguishing how different forms of exclusion affect poverty outcomes.”

In this context, it seems crucial to stress that people can be – and usually are – excluded in some areas (or dimensions), and included in others. Appraising the idea of social exclusion

---
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Jackson, (1998)\textsuperscript{93}, points out that women are not categorically excluded but integrated in particular ways, through reproductive labour for example. Also, marginality may produce the conditions for women to protest, and be included in collective organisations. The central definition of the notion of social exclusion stresses the processes through which people are being deprived, taking the debate beyond descriptions of merely the situation in which people are.

More broadly, social exclusion has been defined as “the process through which groups or individuals are wholly or partially excluded from full participation in the society within which they live”\textsuperscript{94}. This indeed indicates the process of marginalisation. Social exclusion is defined as the opposite of social integration, mirroring the perceived importance of being part of society, of being ‘included’\textsuperscript{95}.

The concept is based on two strands: First, it is a multi-dimensional concept. People may be excluded, e.g., from livelihoods, employment, earnings, property; housing, minimum consumption, education, the welfare state, citizenship, personal contacts or respect, etc\textsuperscript{96}. The concept focuses on the multi-dimensionality of deprivation and marginalisation, on the fact that people are often deprived of different things at the same time. It refers to exclusion (deprivation) in the economic, social and political sphere. Second – social exclusion implies a focus on the relations and processes that cause deprivation. People can be excluded by many different sorts of groups, often at the same time: landlords exclude people from access to land or housing; elite political groups exclude others from legal rights; priests in may exclude scheduled castes from access to temples; minorities may be excluded from expressing their identity; labour markets, but also some trade unions exclude people (non-members) from getting jobs; and so on. The figure indicates the relationship between economic exclusion and socio-political exclusion.


Figure II.1: Economic Exclusion And Socio-Political Exclusion

Thus exclusion/marginalization happens at each level of society. Group formation is a fundamental characteristic of human society, and this is accompanied by exclusion of others. The concept can be utilized beyond mere descriptions of deprivation, and focusing attention on social relations, the processes and institutions that underlie and are part and parcel of deprivation and marginalisation. The disadvantages faced by the excluded may be, and often are, interrelated. For example, people belonging to minorities Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and OBCs or school drop-outs or women may have a greater risk of being unemployed or employed in precarious jobs and hence be low paid, less educated, recipients of social assistance, have little political power, and fewer social contacts. Research on social exclusion focuses on the extent to which these dimensions overlap. Which of these dimensions forms the central one – if any – will be dependent on the context; as stated above, a social exclusion concept forms the basis for context-specific analyses, and can allow for contesting definitions of integration. Thus in some societies or among some groups labour market participation may form the crux around which other elements of deprivation and marginalisation revolve; whereas elsewhere or among other groups religious identity is more important.

Sen (1998) in a recent contribution welcomes the social exclusion framework, because of its focus on “relational roots of deprivation ... (bringing) concentrated attention on features of deprivation”, and “its practical influence in forcefully emphasizing the role of relational features.
in deprivation and marginalisation\textsuperscript{97}. He believes that a social exclusion framework reinforces the understanding of poverty as capability deprivation leading to marginalisation. Contributing to the clarification of the possible meanings of the concept, he makes two distinctions. First, he distinguishes the constitutive relevance of exclusion (exclusion or deprivation is of intrinsic importance in its own) from its instrumental importance (exclusion itself is not impoverishing – like exclusion from credit – but it can lead to impoverishment of human life). The two can overlap, like landlessness that can be responsible for generating deprivation (instrumental) but also have value in itself, in cases where being without land is like “being without a limb of one’s own” (constitutive). Second, he differentiates between active and passive conclusion: active exclusion occurs for example when immigrants are not given full political status or citizenship; while passive exclusion exists when deprivation is caused without deliberate attempt, for example because of a sluggish economy\textsuperscript{98}.

Thus, there are large overlaps between a notion of social exclusion, and definitions of poverty. With a broadening of notions of income-poverty, incorporating notions of vulnerability, and the entitlements framework, convergence of thinking about deprivations seems to predominate. A notion of social exclusion – especially as defined within a ‘solidarity’ paradigm – may lead a step further in the direction of a holistic understanding of deprivation. The application of the notion is not restricted to particular situations of deprivation – the value of the notion lies in the light it sheds on these situations, and hence would be equally relevant for deprivation in richer countries as in situations of mass poverty\textsuperscript{99}.

Thus it can be said that social exclusion, deprivation and discrimination are inherent and implicit in the marginalisation process caused primarily by the unequal access to opportunities and resources of both economic and socio-political nature.

\textbf{II.2.4 Marginalisation as a Product of Spatial Differentiation, Widening Disparities and Economic and Social Discrimination}

Marginalisation as a concept has primarily been used in gender geography and to define the regional inequalities. The base of the concept is that, due to economic, social and political circumstances, some population groups are pushed to the very margins of survival, that is, can
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barely eke out a living. They are called the marginalized. It also denotes spatial differentiation since the process of marginalisation is implicit in the construction of spatial inequality. Here, Soja’s (1989) views on the social organization is of use; he argues that “it is necessary to place the concept of spatiality, the created space of social organization and production at the very heart of critical human geography in order to disclose the social relations that are inscribed within and constituted through its various forms and productions”. Soja’s argument places him in a similar position to that of David Harvey’s projected historic-geographical materialism.

Soja further opines “spatiality situates social life in an active arena” where the various social actors by their actions construct it and thus is social change affected. Therefore if there is domination of one actor due to certain advantages accruing to that actor in the social space, then the other actors in the same social space are marginalized. This approach has also been called the ‘third space’ or third approach. Rose uses the concept to define the marginalisation in gender, “these studies interpret women’s lives not through categories of production and reproduction, but through another kind of sociality (this work) has created a women’s space, but one which does not depend on an essentialist understanding of women, and in this manner it escapes the terms through which masculinist geography interprets space, ... The subject of feminism must be positioned in relation to social relations other than gender”. She further clarifies that “this space is not so much a space of resistance as an entirely different geometry through which we can think of power, knowledge, space and identity in critical ... ways”. As Smith states, “third space seems to offer a different conceptualisation of the constitution of society”. This is the spatial aspect of marginalisation, where space is structured through power patterns to produce differences. The same can be applied to the construction of differences in the spaces occupied by the tribal communities and the other Indian communities.

102 Many other theorists have also worked on the concept of third space, such as Homi Bhabha (1994) has used this concept in the construction of identities, and defines third space by hybrid identities, Gillian Rose (1993) has made use of it in gender construction in geography and, Smith (1997) has made use of it in the explanation of present social culture formation.
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There is an economic aspect to the spatial differences that constitute the marginalisation process amongst the tribal communities of Chota Nagpur. Here also parallels are drawn from gender geography. Boserup (1970) has enunciated this in her work on the harmful effects of economic development on female gender in the work fields, creating a situation of subordination and lower status. Thus marginalisation occurs in the women's lives due to economic development. Indeed in Palmer's view, this has happened as a result of rise in the work bundles of women, as now they have to do two or more jobs to maintain the household.106 This leads to examination of rural development policies, where Dixon (1978) shows how the benefits from development process do not reach the female half of the rural population.107

This is echoed in Karlekar's (1982) work, who opines that the process of development has proved to be destructive and detrimental to the female labourer, since they are bypassed in the developed economy.108 Row (1985) argues that the industrialisation process leading to development has with the introduction of high technologies has reduced employment opportunities for female labour.109 Krishnaraj (1988) opines that displacement of female labour has taken place due to increased industrialisation with its selective employment and high capital investment. Mies, (1986)110 is of the opinion that women have traditionally been seen as natural resources, (the concept of kshetra in Indian land terminology) and have been exploited as one would the natural resources thereby causing marginalisation.111 Bina Aggarwal has shown how with increase in the farm technology the access of women to agricultural work has decreased, thus lowering their economic position and leading to lowering in their social status also.112 There are a variety of other studies such as Brydon and Chant (1989), Deasi and Krishnaraj (1990), Dietrich (1992) and Momsen (1991) who all subscribe to the view that modern developmental process has created marginalisation in the lives of the women in the underdeveloped nations. These can also be applied to the tribal communities, who face similar
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discriminatory attitudes in the work arena and in the social field. Thus this concept has been used in the study.

The next part of the study concentrates on the processes that can hinder the onslaught of the process of marginalization with structures from within, which will help the development of the affected people by themselves. One such process that has been in existence is known as the social capital networks, though formally noted in the recent years has always worked amongst the communities.

II.2.5 Caste System in India: Social Cases of Discrimination, Deprivation and Marginalisation

The caste system is a complex network of interdependent yet separated, hereditary, endogamous, occupationally specialized, and hierarchically ordered social groups which is the distinctive social institution of Indian continent whose the origins are definitely from the tribal, religious and cultural differences between various groups. Amongst the colonial ethnographers, Risley (1915) viewed caste as the racial dominance and conquest, subjected groups becoming lower castes. This notion concentrated on the idea of caste as a “rigid, unchanging, archaic and oriental system”\textsuperscript{113}. Dipankar Gupta defines it as “a form of differentiation wherein the constituent units of the system justify endogamy on the basis of putative biological differences which are semaphored by the ritualisation of multiple social practices”\textsuperscript{114}. Gail Omvedt (1994) defines caste as “fragmented, unarticulated normally unconscious rules of behaviour embodied in social relations characteristic of caste societies, but also more explicitly in the articulated and the elaborate ideologies which are used by those seeking to maintain or contest hegemony within the society or to challenge the society in that basic way”\textsuperscript{115}. It is thus linked to descent, lineage, kinship, land rights (under the jajmani system), karma doctrine, exchange of eatables, morphology of villages and the concept of pollution (pure bred and impure bred).

According to Ahmad (1999)\textsuperscript{116} three major viewpoints regarding caste are prevalent. “First, it is viewed as a product of division of labour. Secondly, it is viewed as a cultural phenomenon and operates as an institution. Thirdly caste is viewed as social stratification leading

to the institutionalization of social inequality”. The word ‘Caste’ is not an Indian word, it
originates from the Spanish word casta meaning ‘pure breed’. There are various Indian terms
that mean caste, the most oft used being jati and varna. The term jati denotes endogamous
groups and the term varna denotes the system of stratification of the Indian society, the entire
strata being divided into four varnas, the brahmans at the top, followed by the Kshyatriya, then
vaishyas and lastly the shudras. It is postulated in the Vedas (manu smriti) that this classification
denotes the four parts of the human body wherein the brahmanas are the mouth and the brains,
the kshatryyas the hands that protect, the vaishyas are the middle portion, and the shudras are the
feet, therefore they are associated with menial jobs involving dirt and refuse of the society, and
therefore the lowest of the low.

The Britishers who colonised India, were the first people to concentrate on caste as a
social phenomenon, they defined it in terms that they could use and understand. In that the
present day interpretation of caste is essentially an ‘Orientalist’ construct. This view is
substantiated by the fact that they used it as a social and economic category to as an extreme
form, thereby freezing it in time and space, thereby characterising it as primitive and inflexible.
Thus, caste was not just an element of discourse or the rationale for colonisation (in the name of
modernising the nation) it was the practical means by which the colonial administration knew its
subjects, for as Dirks (1992) comments, “under colonialism caste became a specifically Indian
form of civil society, and the most critical site for textualization of social identity, but also for
the specification of private and public domains, the rights and responsibilities of the colonial
state, the legitimising concepts of social freedoms and societal controls, and the development of
documentation and certification regimes of the bureaucratic state”. This idea implicitly creates
a differentiation on the basis of caste and the people on the lower side are inherently
discriminated, since by implication, it is the higher castes who are the owners of the land, when
land market was created by the British after the Permanent Settlement Act of 1793.

The other face of orientalism was visible in the caste studies conducted by American,
European and some Indian anthropologists and sociologists. Primary amongst them was the

---

117 This concept was introduced in literary theory by Edward Said, (1978) in Orientalism, whereby the eastern or the
Oriental and here the Indian society is viewed as an object of study and constructed as the ‘other’ to the Western
‘self’ and then privileges the knowledge so produced as superior to that of the Indians themselves.
119 Choudhary, B. B. (1958): Agrarian Relations in Bengal after the Permanent settlement, 1793-1818 unpublished
D.Phil Dissertation, University of Calcutta.
study by Louis Dumont that was published in 1966\textsuperscript{120}. He argued that caste group was a strictly structured groups (his work was extremely influenced by the French structuralist Levi Strauss) and that ruptures were in that inter group relation were not permissible since modern research based literature on India mistakenly focused attention on the delineation of the caste group, considered as a substantive entity. The important thing rather was not the nature of the caste group (who it included what it called itself, how many sub-castes it included) but the nature of the relations between the groups. He argued that “too often, the system is taken as a mere collection of blocks and their arrangement is neglected”\textsuperscript{121}. Thus to him, the caste system is a hierarchy not just in a sense of a system of superordination and subordination achieved by an exercise of power, but also in the sense of a system ordered by values. “The system is based on the hierarchical opposition of the pure and the impure, an insight that transports us into a purely structural universe: it is the whole which governs the parts and this whole is very rigorously conceived as based on the opposition”\textsuperscript{122}.

Dumont’s work has been critiqued by many Indian sociologists as saying that the deliberate stress on ideology of et caste system had produced an intellectual view of the Indian society which ignored the role which interests played in the enactment of caste. But even Beteille, stayed primarily within the hierarchical structure of the caste analysis, since he viewed castes essentially as status groups based on a particular type of social honour. However, he also takes into cognizance that caste was not the sole organising principle of the Indian society and local social processes were to be understood in terms of the dynamic relationship between caste and class\textsuperscript{123}.

From this time onwards, many empirical studies were conducted on the caste phenomena.\textsuperscript{124} One of the most notable is that of Berreman, who brings out the psychological aspects of deprivation sin the caste relations in India. This idea of the difference between high and low castes and the intrinsic deprivation of the lower castes also is part of a common psychological mechanism, as shown by Berreman (1979) is fieldwork in a North Indian vililage,
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"Discrimination and denigration of low castes may often result from the displacement by people of high castes of their own internalized self hatred, which results from guilt feelings they have acquired from their empathic awareness (probably repressed in most cases) of low caste deprivations. Denigrations of low caste groups may also simply be a rationalization of of the deprivations imposed. Kardiner and Ovesey have remarked that 'once you degrade someone in that way, the sense of guilt makes it imperative to degrade the object further to justify the whole procedure'\textsuperscript{125}

The sense of deprivation had by now invaded all the caste based studies being carried out, be it that by M. N. Srinivas with as view of sanskritisation process for the lower castes to become like the higher castes\textsuperscript{126} (with a dominant sense patronization) or the studies of inequal relations causing marginalisation and discrimination in the caste relations in society that lead to their emergence on the political scene as brought out in the study by Kothari\textsuperscript{127}. While ideological or ideational aspects of caste were certainly important for a theoretical understanding of the system, it was its practice on the ground primarily that of deprivation and discrimination that determined the nature of caste politics. As Jodhka states, “during the post-Mandal period or, to use M.N. Srinivas's expression, in its late 20th century *avatar* (Srinivas 1996), the question of caste has come up 'from below' primarily as a question of politics. Thus, while it may have been important for anthropological theorizations of caste to focus on where it could be seen in its 'purest' forms, the question of caste will perhaps need to be raised and theorized differently when the primary concern is political, viz. how to fight caste oppression”\textsuperscript{128}, meaning marginalisation of the scheduled caste and other untouchable caste groups.

In the recent times, it was a newspaper article about Practichi (India) Trust that was set up by Amartya Sen from his Nobel Prize award money, which carried out a survey in three districts of West Bengal – Midnapur, Birbhum and Purulia – to evaluate the system of primary education that brought the latent marginalisation and discrimination practised against the lower castes. One of its findings as mentioned by Professor Sen to the press in Calcutta is that in some schools scheduled caste students were still forced to sit separately\textsuperscript{129}. Anjan Ghose (2001) further brings out the entrenched nature of the discriminations and degradations of the caste system in
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Bengali society, when he mentions the various experiences that the scheduled caste people face in the villages of West Bengal. “That this (mentioning the above quoted newspaper article) is not an isolated observation is testified to by a report on practices of untouchability published a few years ago in a well-known Calcutta weekly. The report vividly brought home the persistence of caste discrimination in rural West Bengal, Debu Mukhi, a hani by caste, of Rohini village in Jhargram sub-division of Midnapur district mentioned that inspire of the much publicized literacy campaign in the district their children were kept segregated in school. He said, 'Teachers tell our children to bring their own asaans (small mats) and they are asked to sit separately in class.'

But spatial segregation in school or residential segregation in the village is not the only discriminations they face, as was learned from the doms and hanris (two scheduled castes) of Rohini. For many years after Independence, they had to wear bells around their neck whenever they ventured outside their locality (para) to forewarn the upper castes of their approach! Though these practices have waned others persist. The doms and hanris are not allowed inside the homes of the upper castes and if they stray inside then the premises have to be washed and plastered afresh with cow dung. Their touch is still considered polluting and for the brahmin, baidyas and kayasthas, a purificatory bath is mandatory on contact with them.

The scheduled castes are not allowed to draw water from wells and tubewells belonging to the upper castes. They are only allowed to use the public tubewells sunk by the government. Though they play the dhak (drum) during the Durga Puja or other festivals, they are denied the right to enter temples or offer prayers. At ceremonial feasts they are treated like scavengers and offered the leftovers in soiled leaf plates. As Jaladhar Patar of the same village puts it, ‘We and the dogs eat together after everyone else has eaten.’ And when the dogs have to be shooed away, the upper castes call out ‘shoo hani’! These are some of the very common and easily forgiven as non-violent methods employed by the higher caste society to ensure social and political exclusion in the society. In contrast, the other regions of India especially Bihar and Uttar Pradesh and Andhra Pradesh tell stories of blood shed in the name of caste based discrimination and degradation.
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The practice of untouchability, rooted in the caste system, stigmatises 260 million dalits in South Asia as "polluted" or "impure", thereby denying them entry into places of religious worship, participation in religious festivals, assigning them menial and degrading work including cleaning toilets, skinning and disposal of dead animals, digging graves and sweeping, and the forced prostitution of dalit women and girls through the traditional system of temple prostitution; the movement away from these activities or any effort to ‘better’ themselves is thoroughly punished by their betters that is the higher castes in many areas even today.

The new nomenclature for the scheduled castes and untouchables is the dalit, meaning downtrodden. Today, the starting point of dalit discourse is the atrocities and brutalities that are heaped upon them in everyday existence. It is this individual and collective socio-historical experience of oppression and exploitation that provides the fodder for dalit movements as also shapes the direction of dalit discourse. As Louis (2001) remarks “It is a given fact that the dalit movements and discourse begin with the atrocities that they are subjected to from birth in day to day operations, and the mind-set that controls and colours their behaviour. Coupled with this is their immense and inalienable innate power and prowess which equally defines the scope and space for dalit struggles and discourse”.

Once again, we see the marginalisation of these communities being replicated in the mirror of orientalism, as they (dalit communities) in turn practise the other’s and dominate over still lower caste groups as they have been hegemonised. As Kancha Illiah points out “there are indications that untouchability did not take this tyrannical form as long as it was practiced only by the upper castes. But when the lower castes began to practice untouchability towards each other, it adopted this rigid, inhuman form.” There is a need to investigate the social conditions and social forces that contributed to the harsh enforcement of untouchability, both among the dalits and between the dalits and non-dalits. This investigation would also unravel the root cause behind polarisation among the dalits.

This is not all. There is prevalence of discrimination in the labour market and the fact has been brought out repeated by Banerjee (1985), Thorat (1993) and Thorat et al (1999) to mention a few notable studies. Also type of job allocated is very important, they are usually allotted the
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most menial jobs (particularly cleaning carcasses, cleaning toilets, both public and private, scavenging, cleaning of burning ghats and burial grounds etc) with the lowest of payments. Moreover, as they rarely own any land to cultivate, they work as agricultural labourers and are the easily exploited so that they also become bonded labour. A closer look reveals the discrimination inherent in the allocation of jobs, land, basic resources and amenities, and even physical security. A closer look at victims of violence, bonded labour, and other severe abuses also reveals disproportionate membership in the lowest ranking in the caste order. A perpetual state of economic dependency also allows for abuses to go unpunished, while biased state machinery looks the other way, or worse, becomes complicit in the abuse.135

Thus caste discrimination is multidimensional and operates at all levels of society. As Bhim Rao Ambedkar concludes "The purpose of the caste system cannot be considered to be a prevention of racial intermixing, nor can this system be understood as a means of preserving purity of blood. The truth is that even before the caste system came into being, the various races had already got intermixed in India as far as culture and blood is concerned. To consider different castes as if they are different races would be to completely distort the facts. What racial similarity can there be between a brahman of Punjab and a brahman of Madras? What racial similarity can there be between an untouchable of Bengal and an untouchable of Madras? What racial similarity can there be between a brahman of Punjab and a chamar of Punjab? What racial similarity can there be between a brahman of Madras and a paria of Madras? Caste system does not divide races; it is the name of social division within a race".136

II.2.6 Politics of the ‘Other’: Orientalism in the 20th Century

The analysis of colonisation and its impact is closely linked to the choice of strategies and policies of development followed in a post colonial society. The historical roots and causes of backwardness, the inherited pattern of underdevelopment and the consequent obstacles to development crucially determine development strategies and policies. As Bipan Chandra says "The term colonisation as a modern category emphasising in a holistic manner a system of societal domination came into widespread use during the 1920s".137 An important part of this knowledge base is the Orientalist discourse that uses the politics of difference as a tool of
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governance. Orientalism is described as the reflection of the orient in Europe’s mirror or vice versa. Any way, the idea is to define oneself in contrast to the definitive other, that is how different is the self from the other. This is the basis of differentiation in Indian society, and though it was begun in the colonial era to define the European image in contrast to the Indian one, it has continued as various segments of the Indian society adopt it to define themselves. Thus, the tribal communities are the ‘other’ of the Indian society, since they are different from what the run of the mill Indians are supposed to be. This is a discourse that highlights the formation of inequality embedded in society, having grave implications in the social alienation processes that lead on to the economic alienation of the ‘other’ groups of people. Therefore, any projection of difference has a kind denigrating effect projected on to the other person.

The construct of the theories of state and governance in the colonial period is directly linked to political developments in Europe, particularly England. Kaviraj further opines that “this state is peculiarly dependent on and inextricable from some discursive structures, its history must be written as a part of the discourse of Enlightenment, in terms of rhythm, ruptures and punctuations of that different history. Its power is believed to be driven its functionaries and critics – both from the grand discourses of European rationalism- its theories, self definitions, narratives delusions and strategies. It uses that discourse to define and describe itself, to negotiate and bring under control the alien social world it has entered, Others in this social world, who have to deal with it as enemies, as friends, applicants for its favour, also see the centrality of this discourse to understand its institutions and their logic of functioning”. Thus, the colonial state was an extension and mixture of the enlightenment discourse prevalent in England in the eighteenth century and the space allowed to it by the host Indian society. The modern Indian state is a grim continuation of the colonial state in terms of legal and social frameworks in relation to the tribal societies.

The legacy of 200 years of western hegemony reflected in racism and exotism of the aboriginal continues to be recycled in western cultures in the form of stereotypical images of non-western cultures. Pieterse and Parekh (1997) opine, “in the context of imperialism and colonialism different times of inquiry converge on the themes of knowledge and imagination. On
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one hand, in the sceptical tradition, there is the theme of reality versus image or in the false imagery of domination, such as stereotypes, othering, orientalism etc.\textsuperscript{141} A different take on the imagery of power is concerned with the ways in which images, regardless of whether they are true or false, are constitutive of social relations and realities, Said’s Orientalism\textsuperscript{142} feature both these elements, the critique of orientalism as a false imagery as well as the acknowledgement of this imagery, whether false or true constituting certain practices and institutions. Images function as signals and markers in constituting boundaries, between self and other, us and them, normal and abnormal.\textsuperscript{143} Clusters richly flag salient boundaries or chains of images as indicated in works such as those dealing with images of race in 19\textsuperscript{th} century Britian.\textsuperscript{144}

Edward Said inherited two distinct bodies of literature that helped him construct orientalism. One concerned the place of Asia and particularly India in the historical construction of the “European imaginaire”. The second was the space of politics and ideology of orientalist projects emphasising their relation with expansion of colonialism. Other publications of this give are Wilhem Halbfass’s (1988) book India and Europe: An Essay in Understanding and Ronald Inden’s (1990) Imagining India. Breckenridge and van der Veer (1993) opine that “Theoretically Said and Inden’s work in as much as they have their roots in Foucault’s project to unravel the multiple relations of knowledge and power in the west and in Gramsci’s speculations about hegemony and resistance”.\textsuperscript{145} These perspectives in the nature of power have more recently been connected to orientalism and concerns about politics of representation.\textsuperscript{146}

The term “colonial discourse” means to understand the ‘language of historical representation of the colonial peoples and by extension of oppressed others more generally. The discussion of otherness has tended to imply that others are undifferentiated and that projects that focus on difference – whether the difference of general, race, class, or cultural otherness – have a homologous relation one to the other: race can stand for class and class for the culturally
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distant. Positioning the third world along side race and gender in debates on otherness is worthwhile, particularly when it calls attention to the legacies of domination and repression, the multiplicity of voices and the complexity of power that is culturally embedded in the everyday. Similarly, Ahmed comments “when Foucault uses the term discourse in dealing with western episteme, he presumes the presence of modern state forms and institutional grid that arose between the sixteenth and seventeenth century”. Sudipta Kaniraj has already elaborated on colonialism being a set of discourses, thus not one otherness exists in the colonial policy but many. Infact the projection of otherness is the politics of difference – creating divisions, ruptures and alienation in an already fragmented India society.

Early orientalism developed alongside the European Enlightenment. “This convergence of oriental and Enlightenment discourse facilitated the coalescing of important notions of modernity, citizenship and rationality”. Halbfass argues that India came to illustrate the theme of the eclipse and suppression of natural light through superstition and ritualism, a theme that enjoyed great popularity among thinkers of the Enlightenment. The view coincided with an indigenous Brahmanical notion of the staged deterioration of civilization to the depraved conditions of the present (Kaliyuga). Ludden is of the opinion that orientalism became the template for knowing an oriental other in contradistinction to European capitalism rationality and modernity.

Said describes Orientalism as “a systematic discourse by which Europe was able to manage and even produce – the Orient politically, sociologically, militarily, ideologically, scientifically and imaginatively”. Orientalism in India being the politics of difference, focuses on the essential difference between the east and west, and within India, between castes, religions communities and trines. van der Veer stresses this essential difference in relation to the prime religious other in India- the “Hindu
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other" and the "Muslim other" and how colonialism helped solidify these into a nation. This difference is inferred from Said's conclusion that orientalism is never for from what Dennis Hay has called the 'idea of Europe', a collective idea identifying as (Europeans) as against all other (non-Europeans) and indeed it can be argued that the major component in European culture is the idea of European identity as a European one. According to Said, subsequent American interest in the oriental world was political, as a result of some of the obvious historical accounts of it, but it was culture that credited that interest.

Thus orientalism emerged as a distribution of geopolitical awareness in aesthetic, scholarly, economic, sociological, historical and philological texts, a discourse that is produced and exists in an uneven exchange with various kinds of power – cultural, intellectual, political and moral. Orientalism became a versatile component of political discourse in Europe, as political disputes about India in relation Britian shaped understandings of both India and Europe. As Halbfass comments "Jones and Mill informed Hegel's study of India".

Similarly according to Krader (1975) and O'Leary (1989) parliamentary evidence for the Company Charter renewal and news despatches from India formed the basis of Marx's reports for the New York Tribune and his Asiatic Mode of Production. With the emergence of Europe as a dominant political force in the in the world, notions about its superiority theoretically become prominent. Ludden (1993) opines that "Beginning with Hegel, Europe's dynamism and historicity expressed Europe's primacy ...and India's at best secondary stature. For Marx and Weber, capitalism revealed and contextualized India's stagnant backwardness, which they explained using facts about traditional village economy, despotic governance, religiously based social life and sacred caste dimensions. Established as facts by colonial knowledge and by their

---

conventional authority in European political discourse, they were as truths for theorists to use in making sense of the world”.157

Yet, inherently there are some contradictions present in this idea of orientalism. The tendency was to denote a particular space such as India or more specifically village India’ as “unchanging” and therefore stagnant. It projects a linearity of vision that always does not correspond to reality where spaces evolve and change with time. Secondly as Breckenridge and van der Veer (1993) remark “the colonized subjects are not passively produced by hegemonic projects but are active agents whose choices and discourses are of fundamental importance in the formation of their societies”.158 Lastly, although it is a discourse that legitimates colonial rule but it continues to exert a considerable influence on the sociological understanding of India after independence.

11.2.5.1 Orientalism as a Practice and its Relevance in India Today

Indian life in many facets has been affected by orientalism it inherited, ranging from nature of vernacular fiction to the census collection. The projections of India according to van der Veer “as a land of differences, that its essence is unique and unfathomable .... owes itself to orientalist views of some sort”.159 Nehru’s Discovery of India, is a more systematic use of orientalism to craft a charter for nationhood, where he discovers a wise and ageless Indian nation, invaded, conquered, exploited and divided over centuries of foreign rules, but still remaining in essence of its traditions and still struggling for freedom. Nehru’s discovery is a journey towards national self awareness, as he discovers India’s identity in knowledge constituted by orientalism, he finds himself.160 Therefore it is seen how orientalism as a system of knowledge used by Europeans to bolster their own superiority and gain legitimacy colonialism was later used against them using similar techniques; an implicit example lies in the history of Indian nation formation during the freedom struggle.

Yet all this also created in India an “internal orientalism” (by analogy with Michal Hechter’s internal colonialism) the consequence of which is in Breckeridge and

van der Veer opinion “the very cultural basis of public life has been affected and infected by ideas of difference and division that have colonial and orientalist roots”.  

There is a vital link between orientalist discourse and the public sphere of today, the politics of difference in what makes one Indian different from another (difference between castes, class, tribe, mainstream, minority, religion etc) is but a follow on the pervading orientalist discourse. So even in the post colonial era a theory of difference that was deeply ingratiated in the practices of the colonial era control people in a strange continuity. Therefore “by thus, linking the discourse of the nation irretrievably to the politics of biologically and socially based group difference, all traditions of politics, thoughts, social groups, were seen as emanations of group identity and essential lewdly differences.... Laid the grounds for a political discourse in which all group differences could only be seen as dangerous separations”.

Following this discourse, the Indian ‘mainstream’ views the ‘tribal society’ as the ‘other’ and exhorts it to join them. Any articulation of their tribal identity is therefore viewed as separatism. Along with this the stereotype of a ‘primitive, backward, undeveloped’ persona is also attached to it. This has lead to serious problems of social alienation in the Chota Nagpur region. Thus the new comers to the region, the Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Bengalis, Biharis, Marwaris all viewed the land as ‘terra nullius’ as the Europeans colonizing America had once viewed the spaces peopled by the RedIndians and later on implied the same in reserving the forest wealth of India and especially the Chota Nagpur-region. The tribal people term them as ‘diku’ an outsider, exploiter and despoiler. If the adivasis were ‘no body’ occupying ‘no land’ then they could be treated as sub human beings and their land claimed by the others as their own.

After independence, this stream of thought was abolished, though the recognition of the difference with its imaging remained. What changed was the attitude –this was not an abrupt change but the result of the missionaries’ work, who also were a different kind of ‘other’. Thus began the process of integration, acculturation, a beginning to bring them into the greater Indian fold, like they were the “other Indians” as
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commented by Maity\textsuperscript{163}. This was a project similar to that of the colonial era as colonial rulers were present to 'civilize' the natives and makes then loyal "citizens" of the British Empire. Many nationalist historians and sociologists were involved in this process, the primary focus of which was through agricultural knowledge diffusion\textsuperscript{164}

Concepts of Hinduization and Sankritization were developed to explain social change in modern India. Kosambi opines that Brahmins acted as pioneers in underdeveloped localities into which they introduced plough agriculture that replaced slash and learn cultivation or food gathering\textsuperscript{165}. Ghurye has also expressed the idea of integration and assimilation; he used the language about the exploits of warrior saints who acted as agents of "Indian acculturation" and how it should be continued in post independent India "a moral duty of the main stream"\textsuperscript{166}. Chatterjee is one of the earliest proponents of the idea of Sanskritization, particularly in the North -East\textsuperscript{167}. Srinivas used concept of Sanskritization in a more structural sense by advocating processes of social mobility in gaining a better caste terms and the reform religions that existed like the Vaishnava cult and the Bhakti cult played an important role in his analysis\textsuperscript{168}.

As is evident, the tribal identity of a tribal person was seen as 'other'. Any tribal person who embraced any other religion then become a part of that religion, his status changed to that of the other religion other. The Indian psyche was constructed as an essentially Hindu one. The primitive under developed was what bothered the mainstream more. This is so because these social realities were reflected in the economic system of the society. Herein lies the seeds of inequality that creates marginalisation in the tribal communities. The various kinds of knowledge systems were biased against them, as slowly, their resources for survival was taken away, since it was required by the other people to develop. India after independence embraced the god of development that determined patterns of inclusion in relation to resource allocation.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{165} Kosambi, D.D. (1975): \textit{An Introduction to the Study of Indian History}. Popular Prakashan, Bombay, p.172.
\item \textsuperscript{166} Ghurye, G. S. (1957): \textit{Caste and Class in India}. Popular Prakashan, Bombay.
\item \textsuperscript{167} Chatterjee, Suniti Kumar (1951): \textit{Ancient India}. Minerva Publishers, Calcutta.
\item \textsuperscript{168} Srinivas, M.N. (1966): \textit{Social Change in Modern India}. Allied publishers, Bombay.
\end{itemize}
II.3 Social Capital: The Modes of Contesting Marginalisation

Social Capital refers to the trusts, networks, and norms (societal) shared by a community or as a group of people that helps them to make decisive actions in a highly effective manner to address common aims. The study of marginalization and social capital is important because it facilitates the study of conflict over resource availability, distribution and usage and is also a structuration component in the creation of power hierarchy. The increase and decrease of social capital is also an indicator of the processes of social change. Though it can be said that the idea originated in the eighteenth century (in de Toqueville’s works) it was brought to the notice of the present world first by Pierre Bourdieu, and most recently by Robert Putnam.

According to Bourdieu, social capital refers to the sum of resources or assets which accrue through the possession of a network of relationships. Adding on to this definition, Kolankiewicz asserts “social capital comprised both the network and assets available for mobilization through network”. In a traditional society, the upper class/castes have more access to the social capital through their attributional position. Today, due to the forces of modernization, the conditions are in a more fluid state, so the relational position of the individuals which is expressed through his possession of social capital adds another dimension to the nature of differentiation. The closeness of the structural set-up of a particular society is defined by the extent to which the relational and attributional positions converge; this also provides another path for mobility in the power hierarchy. Thus, if people’s development is viewed “in terms of expansion of opportunities that the individual in the society enjoys”, social capital would seem to be quite significant.

United States has through out history been considered as amore equally, democratic society viable in Alexis de Tocqueville’s ‘Democracy in America’ in 1834-35. According to Tocqueville “Americans of all ages, all stations in life, and all types of disposition are forever forming associations. There are not only commercial and industrial associations in which all take part, but others of a thousand different types--religious, moral, serious, futile, very general and

---


very limited, immensely large and very minute. . . . Nothing, in my view, deserves more attention than the intellectual and moral associations in America.\textsuperscript{173}

Many researches based Tocqueville's notions of 'associations' have proved that in different spheres of life norms and networks of trust and interrelationships affect quality of life and the workings of the social institutions. Simultaneously it has also been noted that same ethnic groups have strong bonding within themselves that are utilized to counter emergency situations. This shows how social relationships are translated into economies of work along with the importance of these invisible but omnipresent relationship networks.

\subsection*{II.3.1 Social Networks}

Significance of social networks has been the studied throughout the evolution of the sociology of development. Some of this work is situated in the developing countries, and some of it elucidates the peculiarly successful 'network capitalism'\textsuperscript{174} of East Asia. Even in developed nations of the West, in market economies, researchers have uncovered exceptionally well organised, supple 'industrial districts' based on networks of collaboration among workers and small entrepreneurs. These dense interpersonal and inter organizational networks undergird ultramodern industries, from the high tech of Silicon Valley to the high fashion of Benetton.

Robert Putnam's study of subnational governments in different regions of Italy concludes that the norms and networks of civic engagement also powerfully affect the performance of representative government\textsuperscript{175}. Although all these regional governments seemed identical on

\begin{footnotesize}

\textsuperscript{175} Robert D. Putnam. Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).\end{footnotesize}
paper, their levels of effectiveness varied dramatically. Research in the quality of governance was gauged by pre-existing traditions of civic engagement (or its absence). Voter turnout, newspaper readership, membership in choral societies and football clubs—these were taken to be the signature of a successful region. In fact, historical analysis suggested that these networks of organized reciprocity and civic solidarity, far from being an outcome of modern socioeconomic system were a force in its creation.

The processes through which civic engagement and social connectedness produce such results are multiple and complex. Social scientists in several fields have recently suggested a common framework for understanding these phenomena, a framework that rests on the concept of social capital\(^\text{176}\). By analogy with notions of physical capital and human capital—tools and training that enhance individual productivity—"social capital" refers to features of social organization such as networks, norms, and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit.

Networks of public commitment structure sturdy norms of generalized reciprocity and encourage the emergence of social trust. Such networks make possible synchronization of communication, strengthen reputations, generate solutions to problems of collective actions. When economic and political negotiation is embedded in dense networks of social interaction, the marginalized has a better chance of being heard. At the same time, networks of civic engagement embody past success at collaboration, which can serve as a cultural template for future collaboration.

There are many manifestations of social capital. Fukuyama\(^\text{177}\) opines, "While social capital has been given a number of different definitions, many of them refer to manifestations of social capital rather than to social capital itself. The definition I will use in this paper is: social capital is an instantiated informal norm that promotes cooperation between two or more individuals. The norms that constitute social capital can range from a norm of reciprocity


between two friends, all the way up to complex and elaborately articulated doctrines like Christianity or Confucianism. They must be instantiated in an actual human relationship: the norm of reciprocity exists in potentia in my dealings with all people, but is actualized only in my dealings with my friends. By this definition, trust, networks, civil society, and the like which have been associated with social capital are all epiphenominal, arising as a result of social capital but not constituting social capital itself.

Fukuyama in his paper differentiates between the idea of social capital, if indeed capital as private or public goods. He quotes Partha Dasgupta who considers social capital as a private good that is pervaded by externalities of both positive and negative nature. In contrast Coleman considers it as a public good and therefore would be ‘underproduced’ by private agents interacting in markets, though Fukuyama holds the view that which though Fukuyama gives an example of a positive externality as “is Puritanism’s injunction, described by Max Weber, to treat all people morally, and not just members of the sib or family.

Virtually all forms of traditional culture-social groups like tribes, clans, village associations, religious sects, etc.-are based on shared norms and use these norms to achieve cooperative ends. The literature on development has not, as a general rule, found social capital in this form to be an asset; it is much more typically regarded as a liability. Economic modernization was seen as antithetical to traditional culture and social organizations, and would either wipe them away or else be itself blocked by forces of traditionalism. Why should this be so, if social capital is genuinely a form of capital? In reality most of these trust networks are narrow entities, bounded by family and kinship ties at its widest expanse and does not expand to encompass the greater society, making it “segmentary that is, they are composed of a large number of identical, self-contained social units like villages or tribes in nature. Modern societies, by contrast, consist of a large number of overlapping social groups that permit multiple memberships and identities. Traditional societies have fewer opportunities for weak ties among
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the segments that make it up, and therefore pass on information, innovation, and human resources less easily\textsuperscript{181}.

That social capital indeed has an impact on the various communities in India has been brought out by many authors. Nirja Jayal (2001)\textsuperscript{182} has applied this to a tiny Himalayan village and concluded that the stock of social capital in the community has helped them fight increased levels of deforestation.\textsuperscript{182} Dwaipayan Bhattacharyya (2001) in his article on the school teachers of West Bengal concludes that the process of empowerment amongst the school teachers of the state to demand their own dues has been made possible by the social capital in the form of group connections and unions available to them. Bishnu Mohapatra (2001)\textsuperscript{183} takes the microcosm of Indian democracy: a village in Orissa that uses social capital networks and its strengths resolve a situation of conflict resolution brought about by relative prosperity and changed political influence (the RSS factor in Orissa has now disrupted the peaceful societal coexistence) amongst the villagers. Neela Mukherjee (2002)\textsuperscript{184} shows how in the forested tracts of West Bengal in a study based on four villages of Midnapore district, enhancement of social capital stocks helps in sustainable resource management, rather than just the enactment of the institutions. Swain and Blomkvist (2001)\textsuperscript{185} use the concept to bring out the wide variety of social capital stock that can be created and destroyed in a democracy. They use a wide variety of examples to showcase their view, beginning from the social capital being built by organizations like the Rashtriya Samaj Sevak Sangh and the Bhartiya Janta Party to multinationals corporations that operate in India.

\textbf{II.3.2 Economic Modernisation and Resource Usage}

In economic life, it was suggested by the social scientists of the 1960s and 70s that modernization meant that the processes governing economic well being should change from informal to formal modes so that economic progress could advance without any hindrance. In the bygone eras, perhaps the social capital was the only resource which governed economic life, as

\textsuperscript{181} Fukuyama, Ibid
\textsuperscript{183} Mohapatra, Bishnu N (2001): Social Connectedness and Fragility of Social Capital View from an Orissa Village. Economic and Political Weekly. Vol. 32. No. 28, July 21\textsuperscript{st}, July 21\textsuperscript{st}
an advocate of modernization Weber had suggested that in contrast "rational bureaucracy rational bureaucracy constituted the essence of modernity."\textsuperscript{186}

The prime economic importance of social capital as identified by Fukuyama is "to reduce the transaction costs associated with formal coordination mechanisms like contracts, hierarchies, bureaucratic rules, and the like."\textsuperscript{187} In fact, even in modern period the synchronization based on informal ties forms an important underlie in any economic activity. Taylor whose interconnecting spheres visualized work arenas in a highly centralized, bureaucratized manner, created many inefficiencies as decisions were delayed and information distorted while moving up and down hierarchical chains of command. This is also an example of top down development practices, and the lack of development in the Chota Nagpur is perhaps a prime example of the results of such impositions. Workers who are much closer to the sources of local knowledge are now authorized to make decisions on their own, rather than referring them up a managerial hierarchy. This often leads to great gains in efficiency, but is totally dependent on the social capital of the workforce. If there is distrust between workers and managers, or widespread opportunism, then the delegation of authority required in a typical "lean" manufacturing system will lead to instant paralysis.\textsuperscript{188} Similarly, the development paradigm has changed to the bottom up methods that lets local knowledge set the course for the type and kind of development required in the region.

"The outcome of high levels of social capital can be seen in collective action for public goods provision", writes Deepa Narayan. "These outcomes may be a manifestation of social capital but are not social capital itself. The measure of social capital should not include success in achieving outcomes, but rather focus on the structure and functioning of social groups and associated norms."\textsuperscript{189}

\textsuperscript{186} Fukuyama, \textit{Op. cit.}
\textsuperscript{187} Ibid.
II.3.3 Integrating Social Capital Forms into Development Perspective

Social capital can be viewed from a micro, meso, macro or integrating perspective\(^ {190} \). Early research into social capital by Bourdieu (1985)\(^ {191} \) and Coleman (1988)\(^ {192} \) focused on the micro or individual perspective. From an individual perspective, the focus of social capital is on the benefits to an individual of group participation and on the deliberate construction of sociability for the purpose of creating this resource\(^ {193} \). Like other forms of capital, individuals or households can then deliberately invest in social capital. But social capital is not only generated deliberately. In fact, Coleman (1990)\(^ {194} \) argues that it is mostly generated as an accidental by-product of people interacting for some other purpose, such as short-sighted commercial reasons or simply because we are social animals and, within reason, get utility simply from having relationships.

Broadening the perspectives of social capital have expanded the concept of social capital enabling a register of the of social capital at the community, regional or national level\(^ {195} \). This is the view of social capital taken by Putnam (Bowing Alone, 1993) in his research on the role of horizontal connections on government efficiency in Italy. Meso or macro perspectives tend to avoid the role of the individual in creating social capital taking the stock as given. An integrating perspective of social capital then seeks to include elements of each of these views of social capital.

Given the focus of this research is on marginalisation processes and the livelihood strategies adopted by the tribal populace household strategies and rural development projects, the existence of social capital at a meso or macro level plays an important role as well as household decisions that directly or indirectly lead to the creation of social capital. For the purpose of this study, an integrating perspective is considered. As with other forms of capital, social capital is not a homogenous entity. Three categories of social capital can be identified: bonding social

\(^ {192} \) Coleman, (1988). op. cit.
\(^ {194} \) Coleman, (1990). op. cit.
capital, bridging social capital and linking social capital\textsuperscript{196}. "Bonding social capital refers to the strong ties connecting family members, neighbours and business associates. These groups tend to be more homogeneous in that they share a similar economic and social background. This can be beneficial in that it allows for easier flow of information but it can be limiting in that the similarities limit diversity. Bridging social capital includes the weak ties connecting individuals from distinct ethnic and occupational groups. These are horizontal connections between individuals from similar economic and social standing but different backgrounds. One benefit of such ties is the diversity that such connections bring. Linking social capital consists of ties between distinct social and economic classes such as between poorer households and those with influence in formal organisations including government agencies, the police and banks. This type of link can assist in the flow of information between the poor and those in a position of power"\textsuperscript{197}.

For communities seeking to use social capital to improve livelihoods, the value of social capital depends on the number and types of relationships that a household has and the quality of those relationships, where quality refers to how well established the relationships are.

Although discussions of social capital have focused on its positive role for individuals and society, social capital can also be a limiting factor in the choice of activities and assets used by households\textsuperscript{198}. "The creation of community groups that build relationships for some individuals may lead to the exclusion of other individuals – nonmembers may not receive the benefits of group participation and may even be negatively affected. Group homogeneity may limit the benefits of diversity of economic activities and of ideas. Groups may also promote conformity, which can stifle entrepreneurial activity and limit business success. Those who do become successful may be pressed upon to support those who have fared less well. Furthermore, a group’s social capital that once had a positive value may come to have negative consequences by placing heavy personal obligations on members that make it difficult to benefit from cooperating in broader groups"\textsuperscript{199}.

\textsuperscript{197} Ibid, p. 25-71.
II.3.4 Relationship Between Social Capital and Livelihoods

While recognising that social capital is not entirely positive, Narayan and Pritchett (1999) identify five mechanisms through which social capital can potentially benefit livelihood outcomes. They are:

1) "More efficacious government: Government efficacy is improved through better horizontal relationships (bridging social capital) and vertical relationships (linking social capital.) There are two possible reasons for this. First, government officials are embedded in civil society and thus more responsive to the needs of society when relationships are stronger and more numerous. Second, the presence of these relationships allows for better monitoring of government provision of services and thus is likely to improve government service delivery.

2) Solving common pool problems: Communities with higher levels of social capital are more able to take actions that avoid the negative consequences of excessive exploitation or undermaintenance of common pool resources. Since negative environmental effects are often the result of individual incentives that can only be overcome through collective action, social capital is used to enforce collective action. Sustainable management of resources will allow households to continuously draw on that resource for livelihood provision.

3) Diffusion of innovations: In communities and regions with better social capital, information on innovations is likely to flow more quickly. With better information on innovations, households are able to obtain the benefits of new technologies more quickly.

4) Lowering transaction costs: High transaction costs in market exchange are partially the result of limited information and an inability to enforce sanctions. Better social capital is likely to enhance the flow of information and allow for social sanctions against unacceptable behaviour thus lowering transaction costs. High transaction costs are often cited as a limiting factor in rural development. Social capital that limits these transaction costs improves the livelihood opportunities for rural households.

5) Informal insurance: With adequate information about outcomes and work effort, households with horizontal relationships are in a better position to pool risk and create informal insurance mechanisms. Such mechanisms may allow households to invest in riskier activities. Informal insurance arrangements then insure households against risk, avoiding depletion of assets in the event of negative outcomes, and allowing households to take more risk, thus improving the expected returns to activities. Households that find themselves in an environment in which they
are able to develop relationships can use these relationships to improve and maintain livelihoods.\textsuperscript{200}

As the earlier discussion implies, social capital may (or may not) be valuable to households in its own right or used in combination with other categories of capital to maintain and improve livelihoods. Like other forms of capital it may be strengthened through investment, depleted through use or neglect (a form of depreciation) or transformed.\textsuperscript{201} Investment in social capital implies activities that enhance the rights of a household to draw on social capital. Actions, such as providing labour for a community member or food for a relative who has suffered a shortfall, provide the household with rights to reciprocal actions from the recipients of assistance. Activities, such as participation in farmers' groups, church groups and other organisations can create an atmosphere of trust and cooperation which can be used in collective action.

The value of being able to draw on social capital for livelihood maintenance can be substantial. Social capital is unequally distributed geographically and socially because institutions vary across geographic regions and even within regions and communities, and because household investment in social capital, whether the investment is deliberate or accidental, differs.\textsuperscript{202} As such, the use of social capital in livelihood strategies may differ.

Since social capital can be an important component of a livelihood strategy and a tool to combat the process of marginalisation, a key to the entire mire of relationships is how can civil society and social capital interact to create better functioning of this invisible form of capital. Fox (1996) notes three ways in which social capital is built, or in his terms, how civil society is 'thickened'. "First, individuals within the state may be able to occupy key positions and use the resources at their disposal to help strengthen local organisations and their contacts. Second, NGOs, religious groups, international organisations and other organisations with community-based groups can use resources (including their own social capital) to help build local organisation and social capacity; that is, the capacity to develop social capital independently. Third, local groups can mobilise and build social capital autonomously by creating organisations..."


and strengthening all sorts of social interaction. These actions can affect the density and quality of relationships as well as the institutions that govern these relationships. By creating an environment that allows the fostering of social capital, households may be in a better position to invest in social capital and use it in their livelihood strategies.

The implications of this discussion to the understanding of livelihood strategies is that first, organisations and institutions within society play an important role in the formation of social capital and its use in household livelihood strategies. Second, institutions can both limit and enhance opportunities for households and care must be exercised when fostering social capital development. Third, social capital is not homogeneous and in many cases not fungible in that it can serve only limited purposes. Fourth, like physical, natural, human and other forms of capital, social capital can be influenced by the actions of the state, NGOs and other organisations. This can be done directly, through assisting households in expanding the social capital base, or indirectly, by creating a context that facilitates local social capital development.

**Defining Social Capital: Some Commonly used Definitions**

Whereas physical capital refers to physical objects and human capital refers to the properties of individuals, social capital refers to connections among individuals – social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them. In that sense social capital is closely related to what some have called “civic virtue.” The difference is that “social capital” calls attention to the fact that civic virtue is most powerful when embedded in a sense network of reciprocal social relations. A society of many virtuous but isolated individuals is not necessarily rich in social capital. (Putnam 2000: Bowling Alone: The Collapse And Revival Of American Community, New York: Simon And Schuster: 288-290, p. 19)

Social capital refers to the institutions, relationships, and norms that shape the quality and quantity of a society's social interactions... Social capital is not just the sum of the institutions which underpin a society – it is the glue that holds them together. (The World Bank 1999, worldbankpoverty.net.org).
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II.4 Sustainable Livelihood Strategies

A livelihood comprises the assets, the activities and the access to these that together determine the living gained by an individual or household. According to Chambers and Conway (1992) "a livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living. A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stresses, and shocks, maintain or enhance it's capabilities and assets, while not under mining the natural resource base". There is some question of whether this, and similar definition of livelihoods, sufficiently encompasses all the relevant considerations for the well being of rural households.

Sustainable livelihoods are composed of various linkages: Ability to create productive employment (on-or off-farm, wage labour) income, raise productivity levels, poverty reduction, creation of buffer for reducing risks, welfare and capacity (what people can do or be with their entitlements), livelihood adjustment, coping, reducing susceptibility and resilience, natural base sustainability (most rural livelihoods are dependent on natural resource base, especially to some extent).

Ability to pursue different livelihood strategies depends on the basic material and social assets that people have in their possession. There are two kinds of assets as such in the livelihood segment:

"Tangible: Land, access to labour and or equipment and technology, access to capital and credit, etc.

Intangible: Skills, knowledge, good health, Social relations, networks, affiliations etc on which to draw, when pursuing different livelihood strategies. In order to create livelihoods people must combine the assets that they have access to and control over resources. Livelihood strategies are embedded in the social strata where social differentiation is the reality. In such a situation, not all have same possibilities, for, the same activities may fit in very differently for different
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types of actors, whether they are aiming to minimize risk-survival strategy or expansive/opportunistic: taking advantage of new opportunities.\footnote{Goldman, I (2000): “Micro to Macro: Policies and Institutions fro Empowering the Rural Poor”, Report for DFID, London.}

Figure 2 charts the mechanisms of a household livelihood strategy and the course of policy for creating and maintaining sustainable livelihoods. This figure is adapted from Alain De Janvry and Elisabeth Sadoulet (2001)\footnote{De Janvry Alain and Elisabeth Sadoulet (2001): “Income Strategies Among Rural Households in Mexico: The Role of Off-farm Activities.” \textit{World Development} 29(3):467-480.} and has used by Paul Winters, Leonardo Corral and Gustavo Gordillo (2001)\footnote{Winters, Paul, Corral, Leonardo and Gordillo, Gustavo (2001): \textit{Rural Livelihood Strategies And Social Capital In Latin America: Implications For Rural Development Projects}, Working Paper Series in Agricultural and Resource Economics, Graduate School of Agricultural and Resource Economics \& School of Economics, University of New England, Armidale.}. The foundation of a livelihood strategy is the asset position of the household at any given point in time, household assets are defined broadly to include natural, physical, human, financial, public and social capital as well as household valuables such as jewellery.\footnote{The types of capital that house holds access can be categorised in a variety of manners. One common categorisation is to define four types of capital: natural, human-made (physical), human and social after (Serageldin and Steer, 1994). This categorisation reflects a desire to provide greater detail in the types of capital used by households although each of these categories can be subsumed in one or the four categories commonly presented.}

These assets are the stocks, that faces decline of value with times. It can also be which extended and enhanced with progressive investment. Decisions regarding approaches to strengthen and diversify livelihood position are considered carefully by eh households and both present condition and long term goal to be gained are carefully considered. Thus this becomes a vibrant strategy that addresses the need of the households both for the present and the future. The ownership status and the significance of the asset influence its value. If assets are owned absolutely, it shows access to that resource. Therefore its net worth is more than compared to a disputed asset ownership. This can also impact the capacity of asset transferability. “Land, for example as an asset, that has a clear and transferable title may be sold while human capital, although clearly owned, cannot be exchanged in the manner that land can. Assets can be productive, in that they can be used as inputs in a productive process, or nonproductive, such as household valuables.”\footnote{Barrett and Reardon. (2000). \textit{Op. cit.}}
The choices made by the household regarding livelihood activities are based its access to livelihood options and opportunities available to them to make the change. This choice is governed by a wide variety of factors from natural to human (civil society, state policy and market functioning to name a few). Figure 2 sets out the components that influence and govern livelihood strategies of the households.

Source: Adapted from De Janvry Alain and Elisabeth Sadoulet (2001) and Winters, Paul, Corral, Leonardo and Gordillo, Gustavo (2001).
A livelihood strategy is the process of selection of activities and ventures for sustenance and improvement of livelihoods. Comprehending this process means the appraisal of the households' assets, activities and outcomes while considering its specific locational context that governs its choices. The diversity of assets and distinctive contexts means there are various conduits that households may adopt to improve and maintain livelihoods. The concept of livelihoods is, however, a dynamic concept that recognises long-term strategic planning by households. Outcomes in a given period may not only be used to maintain well-being (through consumption) in a given period but may be invested in assets for future well-being. For example, income may be used to purchase household valuables or physical capital and participation in community projects may enhance social capital. “Property rights regimes dictated and enforced by the state shape investment in natural assets, as does the functioning of land markets.”

As seen in Figure 2, the perspective of sustainable livelihood can broadly be divided into four factors – natural forces and three human forces, markets, the state and civil society – all of whom impact the household’s choice of activity and investment. State policy and efficiency control market forces in rural areas. “The effectiveness of state policy is dependent on civil society and the effectiveness of civil society depends on how it is supported by state policy. The acceptance of state dictates depends in part on civil trust in the state, which depends in turn on social capital shared between the state and civil society.” The norms that govern interaction of individuals in formal and informal contracts (the social capital of that actor) can influence market transactions. The response of the state and civil society to natural forces determines the impact of disasters and influences the state and civil society. The context in which rural households operate is complicated by all of these factors and the nature of their interaction.

Civil society shapes activities because institutions determine the acceptability of and returns to activities, influence the use of assets and establish the rules that govern the use of social capital. Institutions can be defined as a “set of ordered relationships among people, 
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which define their rights, exposures to the rights of others, privileges and responsibilities”\(^\text{219}\). According to North they act as a guide to human interaction so that when we wish to greet people on the street, drive an automobile, buy oranges, bury our dead, etc., we know (or can easily learn) how to perform these tasks. Institutions determine how certain assets are used\(^\text{220}\).

Similar to the workings of other tangible and intangible assets, social capital can be used to generate and move ahead in securing better livelihood options. Social capital has been defined as the features of social organisation, such as trust, norms and networks, that can improve efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions\(^\text{221}\). Social capital is dependent on two factors: the quantity (density) and quality of interpersonal relationships. Since social capital is embedded in societal structure and social relations, institutions influence its creation and use. “An active civil society can serve as a ‘nursery’ for building social capital. From an individual perspective, the focus of social capital is on the benefits to an individual of group participation and on the deliberate construction of sociability for the purpose of creating this resource”\(^\text{222}\).

“SL analysis is defined as the process of identifying the resources and strategies of the poor, the context within which they operate, the institutions with which they interact and the sustainability of the livelihood outcomes which they achieve, provides a way of picking a path through complexity at the micro level”\(^\text{223}\). SL analysis is by definition “contextual” (since the specific context is an integral part of the framework), and its findings will therefore tend to bear out the general rule that there is a trade-off between accurately reflecting complex local conditions and generating data, which can be easily aggregated and / or compared with information, from other localities\(^\text{224}\). This is an alternative formulation of sustainable livelihoods framework primarily based on the Scoones (1998) shown in Figure 3.


The complex of ideas, principles and tools, that comprise “Sustainable Livelihoods” (SL) has gained eminence in development thinking and policy initiative within a very short time. A number of SL approaches has emerged\(^{225}\), with context specific approaches being the most preferred. The one framework usually utilized by development agencies is that developed by Ian Scoones\(^{226}\) is shown in Fig 3. “Analysis using SL framework enables a disaggregated understanding of the resources available to and strategies pursued by different individuals, households and social groups within a particular context”\(^{227}\). The SL framework focuses on the ideas “that institutions and organisations can support or constrain livelihoods by affecting people’s access to resources, their ability to pursue certain activities and the returns they can

---


expect from those activities, mostly allied to land and land related activities"228. In SL context, policy should therefore be understood to affect livelihoods by changing, reinforcing or reducing the supportive or constraining role played by existing institutions and organizations, or by introducing new institutions and organizations to the local arena229. At the same time, the framework emphasizes the importance of choices and strategies, and thus highlights the fact that people are not simply passive victims or beneficiaries of policy decisions230. “Livelihood adaptation is a continuous process, though in practice people's ability to choose how they respond may be severely constrained (by lack of resources, by unfavourable context or by the operation of institutions and organizations not affected by policy) that it takes the form of coping or 'negative adaptation'”231

The concept of exclusion as a part of the marginalisation process is important here since the institutions and organizations means policy influences by people, and thus the question arises that which people since clearly, not all groups have the same capacity to exercise influence. Thus some are included and some excluded. “This is the domain of power and politics, an area where some are favoured and the rest are not, though, this is combated by the accruing of social capital to those excluded”232. This power is often not portrayed as explicit but latent as is the situation in most of the third world nations233. The framework emphasizes the “importance of people's own agency (however constrained) in determining responses, this is important as it is expected that the SL analysis should help identify and strengthen poor people's decision making and participation”234.

Understanding social capital in such circumstances becomes most important as this is one of the key resources that people draw on in constructing their livelihood portfolios. As Grootaert points out, “the concept has been applied to patterns of social relationships at three levels: Horizontal links (or norms of reciprocity) between household, group or community members, vertical links between more and less powerful people or groups and diffuse links between people

229 For example, the introduction of forest boundaries for collection of minor forest produce in India has reduced the tribal communities entitlements bundle by curbing their access to a certain resource.
and groups in society. Herein he identifies the first relation with Putnam (1993), the second with Coleman (1988) and the third with that of North (1990) and Olsen (1982).

This results in a focus on “poor people’s ability to make claims on each other equally (or slightly less) poor people, rather than their ability to lay claim to support from centers of authority in general and government in particular” Sen, (1984) who emphasised the importance of intangible assets in reducing vulnerability also emphasized the importance of claims to legal rights. His work outlines the ‘environmental entitlements’ approach, which is turn, has informed the SL framework developed by Scoones (1998). This is also echoed in the work of Leach, Mearns and Scoones (1997) and Swift (1989) wherein livelihood resources become ‘capitals’.

“Unwritten social contracts between the various actors in society, such as patrons and their clients, landlords and the tenants or traditional leaders and the junior members of their lineage groups can also play an important part in determining the viability of livelihood strategies, especially in terms of land relations and viability of livelihood strategies” As Moore and Putzel (2000) opine, the ability of the poor to mobilize politically, generally depends on the capacity of the state to respond. This is especially important where there is a high degree of inequality at the local level. While individuals or groups who are marginalized within a community are likely to be also relatively powerless in relation to state structures, this is not automatically the case. If the government agencies functioning in the mode of decentralized democratic manner are working properly and the government agencies remain outside the control
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of the local elites and can offer space from above, then they may be used by previously marginalized groups as a source of leverage in tackling the existing inequalities.

Thus the concept of sustainable livelihoods brings together all the strains of civil society wherein the marginalisation process occurs and social capital that is embedded in the civil society to contest the workings of the said process that creates situations of extreme poverty as well reducing the survivability options. Nevertheless, there is an emerging concern that, while the SL analysis provides a valuable way of structuring micro level studies of livelihoods, it gives little practical guidance on how to link the findings of such studies with macro level issues and in particular with policy analysis. As a result, there remains a wide gap between bottom up livelihood analysis and top down policy analysis, with the findings of the former generally being seen as too context specific and the findings of the latter generally being seen as too highly aggregated to reflect the complexity of livelihoods. Yet this is possible when social and political capital being utilized by the communities to empower themselves and resist the onslaught of the marginalisation process is understood and due importance being given to these factors by incorporating them within the framework of policy formulation.

Conclusion

A wide variety of theoretical formulations have been utilized to construct the study to bring out the multidimensional impacts of the two processes of marginalisation and social capital at the tribal non tribal interface in Jharkhand. Most of these are approaches are interlinked within themselves as well as with other factors such as the otherisation process, possession and access to knowledge that shape structure the power relations. These are also cyclical in nature, that is, they accrue back to the originator. The following are the crucial elements:

- Marginalisation is construed as a kind of process that successively creates deprivation through inequality in the spatial interaction of tribal and non tribal social groups.

---
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Marginalisation as a process completely debilitates the affected person/social group. It reduces entitlements and creates inequality resulting in deprivation accentuated by social discrimination.

Tribal society classically construed as an egalitarian society exhibits inequality in its societal and economic structures currently.

Inequality is formulated here as the distance between the tribal and non tribal society creating marginalisation.

Marginalisation is conceptualized as a product of spatial differentiation, alienation, widening disparities and economic and social discrimination.

The politics of the 'other' in the Saidian construct is utilized to bring out the inherent social discrimination prevalent among the non tribal population vis a vis the tribal population.

Social capital is a process that works in a directly opposite manner to that of marginalisation. It is conceptualized in the study as an underlying process based on the strength reposed in relationship networks.

The study does not negate the role of state or pose it as antagonistic to civil society rather, it focuses on increased participation and democratization of societal structures located within the civil society matrix as social capital residing within the societal structure can regenerate itself.

This self generation of the social capital from within the society gives it a stronger bargaining power in its interaction with the state. It is the state that controls the development initiatives, with the help of social capital a resilient society can influence the state.

Social capital is an integral part of livelihood sustenance creating assets and capacities for livelihood generation.

The correlation between the traditional societal high position held by the non tribal populace and resource availability has also waned due to the spread of democratic political system that gives the marginalized tribal people a chance to be the powerful ones. Their votes are necessary for the political process. Thus, being politically valuable, they build political connections and a path is created for their access to power and resources.
The framework of sustainable livelihood allows the incorporation of different kinds of assets both tangible and intangible available to the households.

Significantly, SL framework takes into account the specific context in which the household is located and the livelihood options that are thus available to them rather than a general availability for all people.

Concept of sustainable livelihoods brings together all the strains of civil society wherein the marginalisation process occurs and social capital that is embedded in the civil society to contest the workings of the said process that creates situations of extreme poverty as well reducing the survivability options.

Asset investment used to maintain and improve livelihoods is an integral part of the SL framework. This can be achieved by optimizing the usage of whatever assets are owned outright by the households.

The status of ownership of assets is important as it determines the value of that asset to the livelihood options of the household.

Patronage relationships and unwritten contracts are important factors influencing the livelihood options of the households.

The outcome of sustainable livelihood is food security and relatively risks free survivability.

Sustainable livelihoods is utilized as an inbuilt factor by numerous development agencies attesting to the importance of social capital in creation of policies of livelihood governance.

Policy in the in understanding of sustainable livelihoods is the tool that is utilized by the government and other dominant social actors to affect livelihoods by changing, reinforcing or reducing the supportive or constraining role played by existing institutions and organizations, or by introducing new institutions and organizations to the local arena. At the same time, the framework emphasizes the importance of choices and strategies, and thus highlights the fact that people are not simply passive victims or beneficiaries of policy decisions.
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• The theoretical significance of the study of the marginalisation process and social capital does not lie in the idea it will create an atmosphere of societal peace and harmony. It includes policies and political conflict within its ambit. The idea is to focus on non-material resources at a micro level and their possible impact on macro development scenario. An important note in this is the collective memory prevalent in the group since this holds the tread of connectedness of the group.

• The various concepts are operationalised by utilizing them to locate the on ground situation at the tribal non tribal interface in Jharkhand in the next chapters.