

Regional Warli Folk Cultural Heritage Breed

Dr. Dinesh K. Bhoya

Mahila Arts College, Motipura,
Himmatnagar, Dist. Sabarkantha

Abstract: Many of the tribal communities in India. Literature is still not able to bring on board their own cultures. Original culture is natural. The relationship with nature. Adivisini first duty to preserve the work they witness to the world. It gave birth to the culture. Conservation of soil animals, have a close relationship with the bird. The tribes around the world. Social system due to economic growth in some countries today, Is divided into economic groups. There has also forgotten their own culture in the society. India was not my original intention to bring in six Warli tribal literature pane sansakrtine My aim.

The Overwhelming motif of this that stretches across three periods of Warli History the pre-British period the colonial era and the post-independence era, is the depiction of the 'outsider as exploiter' However, an increasing devolution of self-assertion in-recent years has provided such hitherto marginalized groups a new opportunity to claim their rights and reaffirm their identities in a new context. But self-rule needs a history and a reconstruction of Warli history can only begin with relook at their oral traditions.

When the colonialists first discovered oral cultures, they rather patronisingly assumed that if language distinguished men from beasts, it was writing that distinguished the civilised from the savages! In the ultimate analysis writing as a representational technology was a decided advantage in such an encounter. And when there preliterate people did begin writing it was often the 'others' who wrote about them and seldom in their own language. This could not but alienate them further from an authentic self-representation. Recording the oral history of such people, where they will speak for themselves, is but a small attempt to redress this huge disadvantage.

The underlying ethnocentrism and chauvinism of such a presumption served the political purposes of their dominant colonizers to the point where their treatment of such preliterate peoples. Mostly tribals, would make one wonder, as Montaigne did in his Essays – who really are the more barbarous, the colonized or the colonizers! But what is more significant is why writing gave such an overwhelming advantage in this clash of cultures. Why could not an the

literate one did? This is surely a pertinent question for any venture in oral history.

Writing has always marked a quantum jump in the history of human community. Tzvetan Todorov commenting on the clash of cultures in the New World concludes that the absence of writing is an important element of the situation, perhaps the most important.

Interestingly the absence of writing did not lead so much to 'a loss of past' for the formal discourse in an oral culture was in fact dominated by memory. It was 'rather a fatal loss of manipulative power in the present... The culture that possessed writing could accurately represent to itself (and hence strategically manipulate) the culture without writing, but the reverse was not true' (Greenblatt 1991)

Too easily have tribal societies been considered as societies without a history. Such recollections as they do have of their past are recorded in their oral traditions that is grouped together under the over riding rubric of myth and legend. What would qualify as their history is by and large what has been recorded by other communities and that in relation to the others' i.e. these historians', own past. This yields only a reflected history, constructed through the perspective of others, and for these others. Certainly this is a great cultural deprivation since we know how important historical memories are in the construction of community identities of an important cultural resource namely the mobilisation of their past to cope with the present.

But tribal societies have a rich oral tradition in which their collective memories are recorded. It is a living tradition and a

changing one precisely because it is alive. However, if historical construction are to privilege written documents and dismiss oral history, then these oral traditions stand devalued.

And yet we know that every 'text' whether written or oral, must be read in its 'context' And it is precisely this dialectic between text and context that can authenticate a social history. A narrow positivist of history in search of 'objective facts' does not recognize this. In such a perspective oral traditions can yield merely a 'mythic history' with only a tenuous grounding in objective fact. This perspective obviously privileges literate society over oral ones, and all too readily condemns the latter to the eternal return of the seasonal cycle, without a chance of development and progress through time.

Once such a self understanding is internalised by a community, it cannot but lead to its progressive marginalization in the larger society in which it is placed, being left behind by the progress and development of other communities around. However, if we contextualise oral

traditions within the tribal societies that have given rise to them, then we can use them to make an authentic reconstruction of their past. In distancing ourselves from the positivist prejudice that privileges the objectivity of written documentation. We do not want to fall subjectivism of an oral tradition. Rather the more sources we can use to set the context, the richer will be the interpretation and understanding of the text, whether this be oral or written.

REFERENCES

- [1] Daxin Gujaratni Kuknivartao (Santibhai Achary P.27, 29Publication: Sree Zaverchand Meghani Lokvidhya Sanshodhan Bhavan Amdavad)
- [2] Daxin Gujarat Na Adivasi Nurtyo Vikram Choadhri, Dhuru Patel (Bhasha Sanshodhan Vadodra P. 19

IJIRAS