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CONCLUSION

PHENOMENOLOGY AND POLICY-MAKING

This essay has been an excursion into theory and practice of the phenomenological study of identity. Our concern has been multi-dimensional: firstly, what is the criteria of subjective knowledge underlying the individual's awareness of his "minority" being? Does he realise his "minority" birth and if so how does he identify himself and his community as minorities? Secondly, if the individual uses generic terms of knowledge like inequality, deprivation and exploitation that transcends ethnic barriers, then what is the uniqueness of his being defined a minority? Is it only a language of hope for the downtrodden, of power for the privileged, a theory for the intellectual and an identity for the ignorant? What is the secret of tenacious survival of certain concepts wherein the image outlives reality?

Phenomenological insights are not very inspiring to administrators and ideologues of the welfare school. Since it rationalises subjective idiosyncracies of man, it can at times be even nightmarish to the policy-makers imbued with political romanticism of equality and collective welfare. Phenomenology is everyman's theory but phenomenological Marxism that we have followed strengthens the
interpretative basis of our arguments and hence can be partially galvanized for purpose of social engineering through compromises between the needs of the individuals and that of the community. We have seen that minoritization in the larger number of cases are perceived in non-ethnic terms but defined on ethnic lines. So anything starting from scarcity of houses to jobs becomes a "minority" issue because the overall perspectives in common man’s thinking is coloured by ethnic and not economic judgement, practical knowledge superceding the theoretical component of awareness as indicated by the data accordingly makes a mockery of normative efforts in the reverse. No wonder therefore the well meaning intentions of the Government for levelling the ethnic distances and inequalities are very rarely rewarded.

To root out communalism one has to understand "what is communalism" as seen by the people themselves. From our data it is clear that neither a Muslim nor a Christian wants to be uprooted from his primordial ethnic identity within the variations of sub-groups. The pre-existent categories of his identity may be an irritant to the bureaucrat and the intellectual. But for him whether it reflects his fears or hope, rationality or irrationality, it has a base in reality that cannot end will not be shattered by merely decrying it as feudal or anti-modern. Moreover, beyond accidents of history, one suspects, is the reality that human groups endure because it provides some satisfaction and sense of
security to a member; the adoption of a totally new identity may be both irrelevant and endangering to the self. So the language of equality that is very fondly flaunted by the modernists, need not be found meaningful by many. What if someone does not want to speak that language? Does he cease to be modernistic? If so, what is yardstick of modernisation? Is it collective equality or the mutual respect to man’s freedom of choice, to choose his own definition? Well, the bureaucrat would certainly favour the former and advocate pyramids of sacrifice for his developmental dreams. The greatest service of phenomenology is to enlighten the bureaucrat by unfolding before him the man behind his master plans. Subjective Sociology can acquire policy relevance only when these master plans demolish all package deals and come down to the grass root of cultural realism in which social relations and typifications are strongly embedded. When Sociology is made into social engineering, it is dehumanised for a mass experience. Contrarily, phenomenology raises the question of knowledge for what?

Indeed, much of the answer to the question we have posed is a matter of definition and self-definition. A Muslim or Christian is more often than not made "minority", by calling him one. Definitions can be very damaging and vicious as any other structures of social relations. Since social structure itself is made up of typified constructions,
one way of altering structures is to change the typification and knowledge-orientations. But simultaneously a concrete material basis has to be forthcoming to accommodate the bourgeoisizing efforts at new definitions. Otherwise, the essence of man will remain estranged from his existence due to inconsistency between the structural levels. Our data has adequately shown the "survival" phenomenon resulting in bewildering contradictions between material and ideational structures as manifested in the case of the compartmentalists, dualists and marginals. So a two-pronged attack suggests itself to be the most ideal way of resolving contradictions. We may demonstrate our contentions by the illustration of the typical Lucknow Muslim "minority" (the "typicality" here is determined by the concentration of size in particular mode of production predominantly organised under the rubric of ethnicity), the theoretical cases of the Chikkan worker, and of a Christian "Minority" viz. the skilled technician.*

The Chikkan industry with its unorganised labour is managed by the private sector with exploitative lines of distribution dividing the Hindu bourgeoisie and the Muslim labour. It is not a capitalist enterprise in the strict

* The hypothetical discussion of the "typicality" cases includes only the chikkan worker in the discussions. The rest are left to the imaginative participation of the policy-makers who, it is hoped, will read this thesis.
sense of the term, because the industry is more of a house-
hold craft than a factory unit. On the contrary, chikkan
craftsmen in Lucknow are predominantly Muslims just as
technicians are Christians. But among the emerging labour
force within the Christian community the technician is more
typical than the Christian teacher, at least as far
the chances of getting jobs outside the community's institu-
tions go. The technicians (whether Muslim or Christian)
represent the bulwark of Lucknow's labour force that have
jumped their "biradari" occupations on to non-ethnic areas
of economic activity. It is this force that holds the
maximum potential for generating new definitions and new
categories (because it holds the key to new surpluses).
Nevertheless, the chikkan worker believed to be representing
the traditional stronghold of Muslim worker is not all that
traditional given the expanding market for his economic
activity. His employer, the Rastogi is not only catering to
local demand but is an exporter as well. So the chikkan
worker in a way represents the prototype of situation where
the Government is supposed to offer a strong competition to
the monopolistic growth of the chikkan industry in the hands
of the Rastogis. The paternalistic role of the Government
however plays a very peripheral role as seen in the only two
chikkan co-operatives employing 30 workers as against a
massive labour force of 4500 under private control in the
district as a whole. At least for the chikkan industry, an
Export Corporation is available employing 1500 workers (Hindus and Muslims as a whole) whereas for the "Zardoji" work (that now enjoys an equal market to the chikkan) even that is not available. Hence the Rastogis preside over the economic pyramid; the middle men and other intermediaries take their share of the earnings that does not come under any official regulation the Government playing the ineffective role of a decadent father figure on paper. This is characteristic of neither feudal nor capitalist but an Asiatic form of bureaucratic capitalism and private monopoly in the chikkan manufacture. The ethnically insulated economic activity bound by the informal confines of the household is characteristic of the chikkan workers.

The "zardoji" are also ethnically homogenous being 99 per cent from the local Muslim community, but their venue of labour activity is shifted from the household to a semi-formal conditions of a work-spot.

In the case of technicians, both are possible, either as distinct cases or in combination. For instance, the comb-maker has some kind of semi-mechanised system of operation, whereas the car mechanic works in different setting altogether; still more different is the technicians in government employment. Gradually there is a decline of the ethnic ecology in the work situation as we proceed from the chikkan worker to the civil servant. Correspondingly,
mixed ethnics of the latter increasingly replaces the ethnic exclusivity characteristic of the former. Given this medley it is not surprising that the single definitional notion of nationalist identity moulded from mass casting of the citizenship self could not materialise. Equally simplistic is to think of a package deal solution, something like a "Christmas socks", containing novel gifts for all. There is normally a wide gap between the perception of the ailment and its understanding, a fact that is usually overlooked in the welfare plans and dole-outs. How can phenomenology become administratively sound and relevant? How can it de-politicalise ethnicity of a barber, baker and a businessman? Is it also not one of the fundamental responsibilities of a welfare state to see that no human blood is split in the name of Gods even if some individuals swear by it? The questions are imposing and some modest attempt has been made to find solutions.

The chikkan workers exist in conditions of labour bondage bound to the "benevolent" dictator i.e. the Rastogis by generations of debts. The industrial policy of the UP State Government provides for co-operatives to be set up in chikkan work, and, yet what do we find? There are a mere 30 workers in co-operatives at Lucknow as against 4500 under private sector in the city. Why? Not because the chikkan workers do not have faith in the "Hindu Hukumat" (Rule) but
allege that the officials are corrupt and eat a lion's share of profit; also, the terms and conditions for loans are very stringent. Rastogis are always forthcoming even if interests are heavy. So how can any sensible chikkan worker be persuaded into the co-operative movement? One way out is to create a heavy competition to the well-entrenched Rastogi interests by either co-operatives or through bank loans for the chikkan worker to emerge as an owner capable of creating a surplus. Consequently, this can certainly generate a totally new set of definitions and self-definitions. The Rastogi will cease to be less of a "Hindu" and more of an exploiter to be confronted economically rather than ethnically. (emphasis added) However, the very concept of chikkan worker as a Muslim appears distorted, when one finds many Hindu workers in the beedi-rolling industry owned by a Muslim monopolist in the city.

The two-pronged attack on mental and material sources is likely to have a more stabilising effect on the identity-formation and maintenance of individual than all the high-sounding official and academic talk on national integration. The de-mystification is therefore needed to start from the level of intellectual thinking and political will to determine the very sensitive issue of concepts and perceptions. Are Muslim chikkan worker, Hindu beedi-roller, Christian mechanic to be conceived as Muslim, Hindu and Christian first or as individuals, Perceiving them as
individuals is no threat to their religious identity in private. So we need urgently to demolish collective labels and re-establish the Individual. Conceptually, "Minority" is a redundant sociological category in the light of some current events in the country. But administratively, officially and politically it has a long and prosperous life. As Berger notes,

man who possesses power is in a position to know better than it comes to the finalities of other people's lives. Nevertheless, the exercise of power means to make choices - and inevitably these choices will supersede the wishes and definitions of reality of others whose power is less.

Unfortunately the mystification of minority syndrome lies in the inevitable clash of meanings at every level between the saviours of "minority" interests, the patrons of minority welfare, the policy-makers, and last but not least, the people branded as minorities. "A humanistic approach to development policy... will be based on the insight that no social process can succeed unless it is illuminated with meaning from within."
Notes and References

1 The term "pyramids of sacrifice" is borrowed from Peter L. Berger's book of the same title. Berger, Peter L., Pyramids of Sacrifice Political Ethics and Social Change, Allen Lane and Co., London, 1974. The usage of the term pyramids of sacrifice in this context refers to the policy of social levelling through progressive taxation, welfare and Public Benevolence Schemes so as to bring about socialist elan for equality in gradual steps.

2 This information was disclosed to the researcher in course of conversation with the concerned officials from Ministry of Industry, Government of Uttar Pradesh.

3 The term communal minority is normally used in India for religions outside the Hindu social order. Keeping religion as the frame of reference. However, the caste antagonisms within Hindus and the increasing awareness of caste identity together with the rising Harijan mobility has culminated into the Brahmin upsurge particularly in South India claiming its right for a minority status and privilege. Logically viewed, if caste minorities are recognised and officially notified as such, then the notion of a Hindu majority will be an utter myth; and consequently, the redundancy of the term 'minority', as it prevails now.


5 Ibid., p. 216.
## APPENDIX

### Table 30

Population of UP by Religion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Buddhist</th>
<th>Christian</th>
<th>Hindus</th>
<th>Jain</th>
<th>Muslim</th>
<th>Sikh</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Not Stated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1961 (UP State)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>84.66</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>14.63</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 (UP State)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>83.76</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 Lucknow District</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>78.96</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>19.78</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,617,846 (322)</td>
<td>(6,055) (1,277,511) (1,569) (319,977) (12,401)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971 Lucknow Urban Area</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,927</td>
<td>563,964</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>230,107</td>
<td>12,209</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Appendix contd) Table 31

**Minority Populations in India 1971**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Castes</td>
<td>79,995,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Tribes</td>
<td>38,015,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jains</td>
<td>2,604,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikhs</td>
<td>10,378,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>61,417,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christians</td>
<td>14,223,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Indian (Approx.)</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsis</td>
<td>91,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>53,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Minority</strong></td>
<td><strong>207,046,083</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of the total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.79</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All India</strong></td>
<td><strong>547,949,809</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Minority</strong></td>
<td><strong>207,046,083</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

These figures are taken from R.A. Schermerhorn's Book, *Ethnic Plurality in India*, University of Arizona, Arizona, Tuscon, 1978.
Table 32

Occupational Profiles - UP State, Lucknow District and Lucknow Urban Area, 1961-81

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UP State</th>
<th>Lucknow Dist</th>
<th>Lucknow Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>73,746,401</td>
<td>1,336,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>88,341,144</td>
<td>1,617,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workers</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>23,855,941</td>
<td>482,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>27,334,455</td>
<td>1,193,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivators</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>18,428,376</td>
<td>215,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>15,897,866**</td>
<td>185,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Labourers</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>3,261,178</td>
<td>19,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>5,453,829</td>
<td>37,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, Forestry, Quarrying, Fisheries</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>171,859</td>
<td>1,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>166,575</td>
<td>3,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacture (Household Industry)**</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1,801,746</td>
<td>19,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>901,605***</td>
<td>17,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other than Household</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>800,835</td>
<td>45,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>989,815</td>
<td>41,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>213,929</td>
<td>9,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>166,561</td>
<td>5,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade &amp; Commerce</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1,062,882</td>
<td>41,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1,110,546</td>
<td>47,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport &amp; Communication</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>399,265</td>
<td>26,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>473,568</td>
<td>33,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>2,710,081</td>
<td>102,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>2,260,812@</td>
<td>108,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Workers</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>44,896,260</td>
<td>856,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>61,006,689</td>
<td>1,156,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>110,885,874</td>
<td>2,528,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Appendix Table 32 contd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UP State</th>
<th>Lucknow Dist</th>
<th>Lucknow Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Labourers</td>
<td></td>
<td>44,157</td>
<td>23,457</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(R= 36,670)</td>
<td>(R=17,780)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U= 7,494)</td>
<td>U= 5,677)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Manufacture Processing</td>
<td></td>
<td>44,157</td>
<td>40,346</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(R= 6,728)</td>
<td>(R= 3,624)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U= 37,429)</td>
<td>U= 36,722)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td>234,149</td>
<td>256,760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(R= 38,990)</td>
<td>(R= 19,866)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U= 242,159)</td>
<td>U= 236,894)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,451</td>
<td>5,697</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(R= 9,642)</td>
<td>(R= 3,081)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U= 2,809)</td>
<td>U= 2,616)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,406,736</td>
<td>974,302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(R=647,291)</td>
<td>(R=444,191)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U=759,445)</td>
<td>U=729,841)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Sources: Census of India, 1961, 1971, Part II B(1), Economic Tables. For 1971, Provisional Tables are given for district and tehsil; the statewise figures are not calculated for UP as a whole.

** Note the decline of cultivators at the State and district levels but increase at the tehsil level for the decade 1961-1971.

*** Manufacturing in household has registered a fall at State and district levels but rise at urban level for 1961-1971.

© Whereas 'other services' shows a decline at state level but increase at district and urban levels.

@@ In the 1991 occupational classification, non-household manufacturing has been included in Other Workers and all the three groups i.e. Agricultural Labourers, household and Other Workers are categorised under main workers.
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