CHAPTER - 5

IDEOLOGY OF MICRO-RESISTANCE MOVEMENTS

5.1. Introduction

As we analyze the common characteristics of the mrms emerging in various parts of the world, it is necessary to look at the factors and conditions that make them inevitable. Every such movement is moulded and motivated by a set of ideas and ideals which determine their purposes, goals and modus operandi. Such a set in the conventional sense is referred to as ‘ideology’ which is to be analyzed with reference to its multiple connotations. Lexicographers define ideology as a set of beliefs, held by a particular group that influences the behaviour of those people. Thus the behaviour, goals and actions of that particular group depend upon its given set of beliefs.

The French philosopher Destutt de Tracy coined the term ideology in the 18th century. Generally, ideology is a set of ideas and/or belief systems that emerge and work within a given socio-economic and cultural framework. “Ideology is a set of ideas, which provides a theoretical and operational framework for thought or action by its adherents” (Kundu et al. 17).
It is easier to consider ‘What ideology is not’ rather than to analyze ‘what ideology is’. Van Dijk in a web article states that ideologies are not

i) personal beliefs of individual people.

ii) necessarily ‘negative’ (there are racist as well as antiracist ideologies, communist and anticommunist ones).

iii) some kind of ‘false consciousness’ (whatever that is exactly).

iv) necessarily dominant, but may also define resistance and opposition.

v) the same as discourse or other social practices that express, reproduce or enact them.

vi) the same as any other socially shared beliefs or belief systems” (Van Dijk n.pag).

We have noted that ideology is not an individual’s ideas or beliefs, but it is collectively shared by the members of a particular group. In this sense, ideology is a part of what we consider as social consciousness or collective psyche. It is relevant here to note that all shared ideas do not become ideology. It is defined by the collective identity of a group that controls and organizes the social attitudes of the given group of people. So
there are some criteria to decide the essential characteristics of ideology. According to Terry Eagleton, the concept of ideology is a child of the Enlightenment, and in that sense it is concerned with ideas as social phenomena (1). Humans develop such ideas as the means to regulate and alter their social environment.

Van Dijk summarizes the social functions of ideology as follows:

i) It organizes and grounds the social representations shared by the members of groups.

ii) It is the ultimate basis of the discourses and other social practices of the members.

iii) It allows the members to organize and co-ordinate their actions and interactions in view of the goals and interests of the group as a whole.

iv) It functions as a part of the socio-cognitive interface between social structures of groups on the one hand and their discourses and other social practices on the other.

v) It functions to legitimize domination.

vi) It articulates resistance in relationships of power.

vii) It acts as guidelines for professional behaviour (n.pag).
From these authentic descriptions of the characteristics of ideology as a collective possession of human groups, we can infer certain points relevant to our discussion on mrms. It is therefore necessary here to focus on the double edged potential of an ideology as both theoretical and functional. This is evident in the power of ideology to become the basis of discourse in socio-political contexts. Ideologies generally ‘tend to justify the status quo’ (Berger 58), but at the same time they also ‘articulate resistance in relationships of power’. Ideology is instrumental in establishing domination by providing rationalization and justification of power, and hence its explicit function is the stabilization of power mechanisms.

5.2. Ideology and Class Conflict - The Classical Position

The traditional mould of ideology is hegemony that is determined by the bifurcation between two classes. Antagonistic classes hold conflicting ideologies and hence class conflict is reflected in ideological conflict. In order to understand the traditional meaning of ideology, Marxian analysis of ideology is an appropriate paradigm. Social consciousness, like collective economic production, is an inevitable product of group life. Thus, to a certain extent, society and social consciousness are co-born and cannot be separated analytically. Every society, irrespective of time and place, possesses its distinct collective consciousness. This does not mean that
social consciousness is a unitary phenomenon that is accepted and adopted by one and all the members of society.

According to Marx, life is not determined by consciousness but consciousness is determined by material life. Social consciousness is the byproduct of the material conditions of production. Hence in the Marxian scheme of analysis, economic structure is the most basic, necessary and crucial level of social life. This basic structure determines all legal, educational, artistic and political activities which form the superstructure. Economic forces determine and shape all other social conditions including the culture of a society. The basic structure brings the superstructure into being and determines its character. The normal function of superstructure is to maintain the existing economic structure by legitimizing and rationalizing the real conditions of economic exploitation.

In order to show how the economic system determines the customs, rules and practices in a society, we can take the case of slavery as an example. In the history of colonial invasion, there were instances of treating slavery as an economic necessity. We have noted that the normal function of superstructure is to legitimize the existing economic conditions and necessities. In order to justify the practice of slavery, the master class had created a legal system to dictate what slaves should and should not do.
These laws were justified with academic and religious doctrines. In a way, the superstructure reinforced the practice of slavery.

The hypothesis of economic necessity that explains and justifies the institution of slavery as a natural necessity is further corroborated with the ideology of racism which is obviously an integral component of the colonial ideology. Slavery is justified and legitimized in terms of ethnocentric interests propagated on the basis of master/slave dichotomy. Cultural artifacts like the racial superiority of the masters and the primitive state of the ‘aboriginals’ were constructed and propagated as part of colonial ideology. Projection of modern western culture and its representatives namely the wealthy white resulted in the marginalization of the non-white, non-European people as primitive and uncivilized.

In the Marxian view, cultural conditions become the ideological means to justify economic conditions. For Marx, economic conditions are the foundations of social life and culture serves only a supportive role in the historical process. But it is true that behind every economic system, there will be underlying cultural interests embedded in class consciousness. It is clearly stated that material production forms the base of social life and all other components of collective life play only a subsidiary role. Culture, for Marx, represents the superstructure that supports the mode, means and relations of production. For example, in traditional culture, princely power
or kingdom is considered as divinely ordained. Belief in God is taken for
granted in traditional cultures. They consider the power of God as infallible
and immutable and hence the King who is projected as the Ambassador of
God on the earth is declared fully insulated against opposition. Here the
dominant segment of society utilizes a belief system as the rationale for
exploitation and oppression of the masses by projecting royal power as
divinely ordained.

It is true that there are different classes in a community or society
and obviously there occurs the phenomena of class conflict. Class
antagonism, as conceived in Marxism, is obviously rooted in economic
factors. That is why classical Marxism had asserted the ‘most basic and
necessary determining’ role of economic factors. Even though this position
of ‘economism’ has been a target of attack for critics it was a point for
revision for New Left thinkers like Gramsci and Horkheimer. Class
consciousness necessarily leads to the formation of distinct class identities
shared by the members of the respective class. This class identity
necessarily leads to the tendency to alienate other class/es.

Thus alienation is the inevitable consequence of the rift/conflict
between classes. This conflict also manifests as ideological conflict. Hence
ideological divisions in association with class antagonism create and mark
schisms in social consciousness as those in society. In short, conflicting
ideologies indicate social conflicts. No ideology emerges and exists in a
social vacuum. Hence the existence of one ideology presupposes and
necessarily implies the co-existence of one or more rival ideologies.

Ideological conflicts are normally governed by

i) The tendency to dominate the other class.

ii) The imposition of self-interest of one class over another class, and

iii) The mutual exclusion of social groups.

Ideological conflicts imply the tendency to justify and glorify some
particular ideology. This is the position that “our ideology is the right one
and all other ideologies are wrong”. This implies the recognition of a
superior/inferior schism as necessary in the context of ideological conflict.
One group/class believes that their own ideology is superior and advanced,
and other ideologies are inferior and subordinate. It is true that human
beings themselves think that humans are the most superior animals. But
anthropocentrism - the belief that man is the centre and sanction of
everything - itself includes schisms in the form of the tendency to exclude
the other.

Even in an anthropocentric ideology like modernism, we can see
hierarchical schisms within human groups. One group of human beings
believes that other groups are not fit to be treated as humans. They are
marginalized in terms of colour/caste/gender. It is interesting to note that
ideologies imply schisms within the humankind i.e. between the dominant and the other or marginalized group. The dominant group believes that its ideology is right and hence it is their right and duty to impose their interests on the dominated group. The dominant group justifies and legitimizes its ideology by using force and threat. Ideology thus becomes the tool for proselytizing alien cultures/polities.

This can be further exemplified with reference to the caste system in Hindu society. Higher castes regulated the social system by dictating and practicing rules of social and physical distance represented in the worst form as untouchability. *Avarṇas* or the untouchables were deprived of all social privileges including temple entry and permission to use public pathways and avenues. They were not treated as human beings and were deprived of all human rights.

The ideological superiority claimed by a certain fraction of society necessarily produces the tendency to inferiorize other ideologies. This sense of self-projected superiority becomes the ground for dominating other classes. Ideologies emerging and existing within a class society will be inseparably linked with one or another hegemonic concern. Every class has the natural tendency to dominate other class/es. The phenomenon of class conflict or class struggle is the consequential effect of this tendency. Hence there is an inevitable and necessary correlation between the emergence of class and the phenomena of oppression and exploitation. This is the lever of
the formation of ideologies within a social system. Ideologies exist and operate on the collective level of human life and so they operate as a social force rather than as an individual concern.

5.3. The New Left Critique of Economism

It is true that without denying the reciprocal relationship between basic structure and superstructure, Marx considered the former as primary and superstructure as only a subordinate one. But the neo-Marxist thinkers were not happy with the Marxian recognition of the ontological primacy and independence of the basic structure. Antonio Gramsci, the most influential of New Left thinkers, held a corrective position about the conception of the relationship between structure and superstructure. He declares, “It is not the economic structure which directly determines the political action, but it is the interpretation of it and of the so-called laws which rule its development (Bobbio 33). Economic structure does not exist separately or independently because cultural factors always accompany the economic structure.

Unlike Marx, Gramsci argues that just by applying economic force in a society, a class cannot dominate other classes. That means any one class cannot dominate by mere force and threat. Gramsci shifted the emphasis to the political and ideological superstructure. He criticized Marxian economism by saying that not only economic changes but also cultural
changes are expressions of historical process. We cannot always decide which one is primary. The New Left rejection of the economic reductionism in Marxian theory gives us new insight into the nature and structure of the ideological bases of marxms. In order to delineate this possibility it is necessary to analyze the link between ideology and hegemony that defines the politics of domination and its antithesis namely the politics of resistance. In this context, it is relevant to recall Van Dijk’s earlier cited observation that ideology is not always necessarily dominant, but may also define resistance and opposition.

5.3.1. Ideology and Hegemony

The term ‘hegemony’, in general, refers to the modes and mechanisms of political domination, control and rule. Critical Marxists like Gramsci and Foucault had not only opposed the economist tendencies in classical Marxism, but also focused on power- hegemony phenomenon as the characteristic expression of ideological conflict. With reference to Foucault’s position, Brown observes, “Desire of power is, for Foucault, a bad thing. In his view, the desire for power is a negative position that attempts to control and stultify rather than to open up and vivify. Using the tool of knowledge must not be allowed to turn into or to stem from the desire to power” (2).
Berger observes that for Gramsci the term ‘hegemony’ has psycho-cultural implications too (63). The dominant class takes care to convince the dominated class that the act of domination is ‘natural and universal’. It is the just thing for the former to do so in order to save the latter from its ‘pathetic state’ in terms of psychological, civic, economic, cultural and similar other factors. The dominant group uses its cultural institutions for maintaining the status quo. Cultural and art forms are ideological tools used by the dominant class for brainwashing the masses. It utilizes culture for maintaining the existing social order to prevent any change. For example, the ruling class uses technology and media for justifying its modes of action and ideology. The dominant group uses the superstructure to justify and legitimize the existing conditions by hiding the real issues in social life. This is achieved by creating a false consciousness.

This kind of vicious and hidden intention on the part of the dominating section of society is extremely complex. We can have a glimpse of this process of mind manipulation to satisfy the interests and to achieve the goals of the powerful group with reference to cosmetic industry. It is probably one of the fast growing areas of business and consumption all over the world. One of the major products of cosmetic industry is meant for enhancing fairness of the skin. An often unasked but not irrelevant question is - Is there any cosmetic concoction to enhance the darkness of the skin? Presuming a negative reply, one can ask why it is so. In this case, white/fair
skin is regarded as the best/most beautiful skin type in contrast with dark skin. The fact is that human complexion is determined by the geographical and climatic conditions, together with the genetic make-up. Then, how can we say that white skin is better than dark/brown skin?

As in the case of complexion, the comparative degree of good in any case is not necessarily an actual outcome of dispassionate evaluation, but the product of an obviously cultural/ideological manipulation to serve the interests of the dominator. The ideology that glorifies slavery is repeated in cosmetic industry by creating a false consciousness to protect market interests. The expansion of fairness creams market is consciously or unconsciously based on the racist tendency of the Europeans who want to establish their skin colour as a mark of glory of the race. Thus the worship of fair skin is at the same time a psychological remnant of racist domination of the white that has become a profit making intrigue of the custodians of cosmetic industry. They prompt others to be like them by imposing their interests on the non-white people. This is the magic formula applied in cultural imperialism in a variety of ways.

Such instances of cultural and/or psychological manipulation of the dominated by the dominant are many even though some of them may look vague and silly at the first sight. If analyzed properly, even the simplest and most ordinary experience of the exploited groups will have such stories of
the dominators’ intricately designed propaganda traps that will ultimately become instrumental in subjugating the former. This tendency has different expressions and forms in different empirical contexts, and ethnocentrism is just one among them.

It is only natural that everyone believes that his/her way of life is right and good and therefore it will become the preferable way of life for others also. This is the mild form of ethnocentrism that is extended to the belief that one’s own culture is better than that of others and so others should also like his/her culture. This attitude will become negative when one tries to evaluate or measure other cultures with the scale of his/her own culture. One may hold the malicious presupposition that his/her own culture is the centre of everything. The extreme form of this ethnocentric attitude is the tendency to impose one’s culture on others by using power and exercising hegemony.

Here it becomes clear that the concept of hegemony is always associated with culture and ideology. Hegemony is an all embracing concept because hegemonic urge defines the assumptions and acts of a human group in relation to other human groups. This kind of domination is not easy to detect because it is a process which has no particular form or scheme. Berger distinguished between hegemonic and ideological domination thus: “Hegemonic domination is… more widespread, more
hidden or disguised, and more complete than ideological domination, which has “parameters” that can be located and addressed” (64).

Marx had pointed out the primacy of economic structure as determining and the subordinate status of cultural factors as determined. Here it is necessary to note that which one is primary is not the question, but what is important is the role of these structures in historic process. Both economic and cultural factors have their complementary role in moulding the social identity of human beings. The relationship between these two is to be analyzed in terms of reciprocity because they are in fact complementing and supplementing to one another.

We have already considered the phenomenon of colonialism as an economic hegemony over countries like India. It was also noted that if industrialization is the medium of economic hegemony then simultaneously westernization is the expression of cultural hegemony. Hence colonialism is at the same time the combination of economic hegemony and cultural hegemony exercised through specific ideological apparatuses like modern vs. primitive, civilized vs. uncivilized and so on. Summarizing the above, we can say that

i) Ideology, hegemony and culture are interconnected phenomena of social dynamics.
ii) The obvious function of ideology is to stabilize economic structure and to protect economic interests, but it cannot keep away from the function of cultural transmission and domination.

iii) Ideology is the vehicle of domination that is steered by the hegemonic urge of the dominating group.

iv) Ideology, as the vehicle of domination necessarily gives rise to its antithetical forms of resistance.

In the light of the preceding discussion, we shall explicate the ideological characteristics of mrms by examining if they can be explained with the concept of ideology as used in the conventional deliberations in classical and neo-Marxism.

5.4. Ideology of Micro-resistance Movements

Is there any tacit or explicit ideological undercurrent within the mrms emerging in various parts of the world? The question prompts a search into a common thread or motivation which guide and direct these movements. In order to bring out the ideological core of these movements, we have taken Marxian ideological analysis as a paradigm case, and it is made clear that Marxian concept of ideology is based on class division and conflict. The ruling class always wants to impose their own ideology on the dominated class by using power and hegemony. But this hegemonic urge,
which is a necessary component in the traditional conception of ideology, cannot be seen in the modes of action adopted by mrms.

The people engaged in mrms are not concerned with replacing the domination of the hostile group with their hegemony. They do not want to impose their interests and culture upon other groups, but want just to continue their lives in their culture and ecosystem that had been there for generations. So, they do not want to dominate other cultures but want only to preserve their own culture. Their task is not to dominate, exploit or oppress, but to resist. The only motivation or inspiration to resist is the threat to their subsistence and survival. The means of subsistence include their livelihood, shelter, culture, and ways of life.

Here it becomes clear that the ideology of mrms is not compatible with the classical definitions of ideology. In the traditional conception, ideology is always correlated with hegemony and in its most classical explanation as propounded by Marx and Engels hegemony is associated with class antagonism. That means hegemony is the inevitable and necessary extension of class conflict. So the phenomenon of hegemony cannot be separated from the conception of ideology in the context of class conflict. Hegemony can be comprehended only in terms of class antagonism. Hegemonic concern in the context of class struggle necessarily
involves dominance of one class over another. Struggle aims at replacing the hegemony of the dominator with that of the dominated.

Class struggle is motivated by the conditions in which the interests of the dominated class remain subservient to the interests and purposes of the dominant class. Economic interest is the basic motivating factor of class struggle, but it is never divorced from ideological struggle between the antagonistic classes. In terms of the Marxian interpretation, ideology of conflict is analytically placed within the superstructure, but it can never be treated as a negligible subsidiary factor in the dynamics of class struggle. It does not exist in a ‘heaven of ideas’ apart from the struggle for the propriety of economic institutions. Here holding hegemony is the ‘approved’ means to protect the interests of the power-holding class and to coerce the subjugated class to accept what the former dictates.

Various devices of oppression and exploitation determine the dynamics of dominator-dominated hierarchy in society. The dominant class always makes use of the mechanisms to convince the dominated about the ‘natural necessity’ of oppression and exploitation or to contain opposition by using force and threat. Holding this kind of hegemony is not in the agenda of mrms. They are concerned only with the issue of survival and subsistence. They want developers and dominators just to let them live. Their only need is to retain their habitat and source of livelihood. Now the
question left is whether there is any kind of ideology that is associated with and supporting mrms in the absence of hegemonic urge.

The ideological agenda of mrms includes the following:

i) resisting the projects of marginalization and displacement.

ii) protecting the cultural identity and natural autonomy and

iii) denouncing the sanctimonious claims of invaders.

It excludes the following:

i) projects to proselytize other cultures.

ii) intention for political usurpation and

iii) the urge to impose economic or cultural hegemony over alien groups.

5.4.1. mrms and Gandhism

It is true that mrms in many cases adopt certain techniques of Gandhian mode of protest or their novel derivatives. It is not exactly the Gandhian ideology but the mode of resistance that is being adopted since it is the only option for those who are involved in mrms. It is made clear that mrms are not consciously committed to the key ideals of Gandhism such as spiritualistic individualism or perfect non-violence. Rather than imbibing
the ideology, mrms are concerned with the possible option of *Ahimsa* in a do or die situation that has left them in such a helpless plight that they have no arms and ammunition to resist the strongly armed invaders. For instance, in the ongoing struggles we have discussed previously in section 4.3, the Gandhian techniques of ‘passive resistance’ like indefinite fasting has been extensively adopted to win over the oppressing rivals and the supporting systems.

At the first sight, we may think that mrms are motivated by the revolutionary spirit of Marxism or the non-violent determination of Gandhism. But the fact is that the participants of mrms are not concerned with or interested directly or necessarily in a particular ideology in the traditional sense. Needless to repeat, the essential motivation behind the emergence of these mrms is the inherent urge for survival and subsistence. The ideology of mrms is different from its traditional sense in the following aspects:

i) **Ideology as a set of distinct theoretical postulates is not their immediate concern.** They are not guided by any particular political theory such as Marxism or Gandhism. Even if they have an ideology, it is not crystallized into any specific ‘ism’.

ii) **Economic factors are not exclusively the determining causes of mrms.** Hence, Marxian scheme of class analysis, even
though it can be one among the different tools or techniques for analyzing the ideology of mrms, per se cannot be the only norm for the purpose.

In a face to face discussion, Dr. D. Surendranath, who is a veteran leader and spokesperson of various alternative movements, has expressed the view that since a particular mrm stems out of a specific eco-cultural background it need not have any asserted adherence to some established ideology like Gandhism or Marxism. Each mrm holds its own ideological characteristics which may be interpreted from different ideological angles.

5.4.2. mrms and Marxism

In the case of the conflict situations of mrms, the co-existence of the dominator and the dominated is not necessary and further it is a condition to be avoided for establishing mega projects like a dam or a nuclear reactor. Marxism conceives capitalism as the economic system which presupposes the necessary co-existence of the capitalist and working class in spite of the conditions of antagonism between them. That is why Marx had emphasized labour as the determinant of the dynamics of capitalist-proletariat co-existence. In the critique of Proudhon, he says, “The very moment civilization begins, production begins to be founded on the antagonism of orders, estates, classes, and finally on the antagonism of accumulated labour and actual labour. No antagonism, no progress” (53). We have noted that
this observation is not fully applicable to the conditions and situations of micro-resistance as the oppressing group is not always present with the oppressed in the vicinity of oppression. In the case of development-displacement pattern of exploitation, mostly the dynamics of oppression is remotely controlled. Hence the phenomenon of class antagonism in the context of mrms is not exactly the one as conceived in Marxism.

The correlation between the oppressing and the oppressed groups in micro-resistance contexts is not one of dialectical opposition between bourgeoisie and proletariat. The oppressing group invades the land of some indigenous people surely with the interests of bourgeoisie, but the target of their exploitation is not a proletariat that is linked with them in terms of labour. In the context of mrms, the process of exploitation acquires a new meaning. In the Nazi type of oppression, the oppressed are to be annihilated and in the capitalist type of exploitation the oppressed are let continue their existence within the same economic system. But in the case of mrms, loss of cultural identity and situations of physical displacement threaten the very subsistence of the oppressed. It is not a matter of exploitation and oppression in terms of labour, but in the form of displacement of the indigenous peoples for the purpose of establishing certain projects that they do not welcome for their own reasons. The problem is in fact the removal of local people from their traditional habitat by invading into their eco-cultural system rather than the direct exploitation of their labour. The
oppressed/displaced groups are not permitted to continue their existence in
the place of the project as the capitalists want the antagonistic proletariat to
continue co-existence within the selfsame system of production.

5.5. Bio-power and the Ideology of Subsistence and Survival

In spite of the dominators’ promises of ‘incredible development’, the
affected people do not listen to or trust upon their stories because the
promised projects are not only technologically but also culturally alien to
them. The native people are not oppressed within the locus of the projects
but instead they are forced to flee the spot to some strange place. In the case
of development-displacement paradigm of exploitation the development
mafia does not want the local people continue to live in the place of the
project; instead they are subjected to evacuation for the sake of
‘development’ that contains nothing to improve the life of the latter.

In mrm cases, the oppressed people are economically and culturally
autonomous. They do not demand the economic support of the oppressors.
Their only demand is - ‘leave us to live as we are living now’. The
oppressed groups do not want saviours. The oppressors and the oppressed
are not economically dependent, but the oppressors use their power and
authority to oppress the local people not with the intention to exploit or
eliminate them but to chase and evacuate them for occupying their land.
The oppressors are not concerned with the elimination of the lives of the
oppressed, but they want to interfere in their natural life - situations. This phenomenon is comparatively new when we compare it with wars between nations or the conflict between classes. Both in the case of class wars and international wars, elimination of life (of the enemies) or annihilation of the oppressing (rival) class is an inevitable programme, but this is not the case with mrms.

Foucault had observed that the 19th century had witnessed a new kind of power which he calls ‘bio-power’. With reference to Foucault, Brown had noted, “Bio-power is a form of relations that exert themselves not as a means to the death of those in its purview, but as a means of regulating life itself” (44). The oppression through displacement, which is common in micro-resistance situations, is in fact the exercise of bio-power which dictates the prey population ‘how to subsist and where to go’.

The conditions of mrms can be analyzed more clearly by importing this concept of bio - power into our analysis. What happens in the case of indigenous groups vs. dominating corporates is not the elimination or annihilation of the life of the dominated. Instead, it can be more clearly defined as invasion without the elimination of life. The purpose of micro level resistance is not to take over the hegemony of land and assets but merely to ensure the very survival of people. Hence we can aptly call it the
ideology of survival and subsistence without hegemonic concern which is the characteristic feature of mrms.

5. 6. Summary of the Study

For understanding ideology in the proper sense of the term it is necessary to go beyond the lexical definition of the term. It is not an individual’s belief but the ultimate basis of social transactions. The classical position regarding ideology, as is the case with Marxism, links it with class conflict and hegemony. New Left critics like Gramsci deny economism implied in Marxian theory and directs their study towards power-hegemony phenomenon as the expression of ideological conflict. Hence New Left thinkers consider ideological conflict as the indicator of conflict over hegemony.

Ideology of mrms is not compatible with the classical conception of the term. Hegemony is not the concern of mrms because their struggle is a face to face effort to ensure the basic conditions of survival and subsistence. They are fighting marginalization in order to protect economic and cultural identity with no intention for political usurpation.
NOTES

1. Gandhiji explained resistance in terms of soul-force vs. physical force. Hence, the prescribed mode of struggle involves techniques like indefinite fasting, non-cooperation with state machinery etc. One who takes part in the non-violent struggle is a Satyagrahi, meaning one who insists on Truth. The protestors in ongoing struggles like Narmada agitation and Kudamkulam agitation (See Chapter 4) have adopted techniques like Jalasamādhi, which involves their concerted voluntary action to stay themselves in the waters until death. Whatever is the case, these efforts of resistance echo the Gandhian call, Karō yā marō which means ‘do or die’.