Original Article
ISSN (Online): 2582-7472

ShodhKosh: Journal of Visual and Performing Arts
Special Issue on Emerging Trends and Innovations
Across Multidisciplinary Research 7(9s)

PERFORMING PROTEST AND RECLAIMING IDENTITY: A STUDY OF SYMBOLIC VIOLENCE IN HANSDA SOWVENDRA SHEKHAR'S THE ADIVASI WILL NOT DANCE

Ishika Mahajan [1], Dr. Irshad Ahmad Itoo [2]

[1] Research Scholar, Department of English, Liberal Arts and Humanities, Chandigarh University, Mohali, Punjab, India
[2] Associate Professor, Department of English, Liberal Arts and Humanities, Chandigarh University, Mohali, Punjab, India

Received 25 February 2026
Accepted 21 April 2026
Published 12 May 2026

Corresponding Author
Ishika Mahajan,
mahajanishika67@gmail.com

DOI
10.29121/shodhkosh.v7.i9s.2026.8057

Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

ABSTRACT

The study analyzes how Adivasi women appear in Hansda Sowvendra Shekhar's The Adivasi Will Not Dance through the examination of how caste systems and gender roles and class distinctions and governmental authority create both symbolic violence and permanent social disappearance. The study uses Pierre Bourdieu's concept of symbolic violence together with Kimberlé Crenshaw's intersectionality framework to examine the ways Adivasi women face identity creation and identity marketization and identity suppression through mainstream social and political systems. The paper uses the title story to show how Adivasi women become cultural tokens who institutions use to demonstrate diversity while they lose their right to participate in political decision-making and obtain justice. State-approved ceremonies and public historical remembrance and institutional communication methods use symbolic violence to create the illusion of acknowledgment which actually leads to social exclusion. The protagonist uses his dance refusal to create a radical resistance which enables him to show his power through abstaining from speech and choosing to remain silent. The study shows that national narratives make it impossible to see people who have multiple forms of marginalization. The text creates an opposing model to dominant portrayals because it allows underrepresented groups to tell their stories which leads to subaltern studies and protest literature and intersectional feminist criticism debates.

Keywords: Adivasi Women, Subaltern Resistance, Cultural Marginalization, Protest Literature, Symbolic Violence

1. INTRODUCTION

Adivasi women occupy a vulnerable place in the social, cultural, and literary hierarchies in India, at the intersections of caste, class, gender, and indigeneity. They have been historically subjected to multiple levels of marginalization that go beyond caste suppression to economic dispossession, cultural invisibility, and political erasure. In colonial ethnographies, nationalist narratives, and popular imagery, Adivasi women have been represented as exotic cultural icons, hypersexualized bodies, or passive victims of poverty and displacement. Such representational practices are not neutral; they are complicit in the reproduction of what Pierre Bourdieu calls symbolic violence, the invisible and insidious enactment of cultural meanings and hierarchies that make domination natural and unchallengeable (Bourdieu,

Outline of a Theory of Practice 164). These misrepresentations sustain the power structures of domination by stripping Adivasi women of narrative agency and containing their lived experiences in the periphery of history and culture (Bourdieu, 164).

In Indian literary canons, this symbolic violence has been reflected in both absence and distortion. While Dalit literature has been known to gain prominence for negotiating the politics of resistance and claiming the dignity of subaltern communities, tribal literature and more so narratives with Adivasi women as their fulcrum, remain under-researched. Sharmila Rege notes how "the voices from below are doubly marginalized, once by the structures of caste and patriarchy, and again by mainstream feminist and nationalist historiographies that subsume or erase their specificity" (Writing Caste, Writing Gender 16). This erasure itself attests to the necessity for critical interventions that not only reclaim but also theorize Adivasi women's lives as insurgent sites of identity and resistance (Rege, 16). Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's provocative question, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" (Spivak, 271), is pertinent here, for it points out that not only is the subaltern woman spoken for, but she is also silenced by the very same structures that claim to speak on her behalf.

Hansda Sowvendra Shekhar's The Adivasi Will Not Dance (2015) is an important intervention in this discourse of erasure and distortion. The collection of short stories represents the nuances of Adivasi life in Jharkhand, specifically at the intersections of gender, sexuality, land, and labor. In the title piece, Adivasi women stand at the center of a paradox: whereas their cultural identities are fetishized for public consumption, through dance performances serving the interests of state and elite power, they are disallowed access to livelihood, dignity, and autonomy. The refusal to dance by the protagonist thus serves more than a gesture of individual resistance; it is a symbolic resistance against the hegemonic forces that appropriate Adivasi identity while obliterating Adivasi agency.

For the purposes of analyzing this text, the paper draws on two related theoretical frameworks. The first is Bourdieu's theory of symbolic violence, which describes the hidden means through which domination is exercised and reproduced in the cultural practices, institutions, and language. Symbolic violence in Shekhar's tales can be seen in the performances of cultural authenticity that are anticipated of Adivasi women, in whose bodies they are objectified to be shown while their voices are effaced in politics. The second lens is Kimberlé Crenshaw's intersectionality theory, which presents a model for understanding how structures of domination that overlap, including caste, gender, class, and geography, multiply the vulnerabilities of subaltern women. As Crenshaw contends, "the intersectional experience is greater than the sum of racism and sexism" (Mapping the Margins 140), alluding to the distinctive modes of marginalization that women of color, and in this instance, Adivasi women experience. Bringing this theory to Shekhar's book facilitates an investigation into how Adivasi women's oppression is not just additive but constitutionally different, which creates unique challenges of invisibility and erasure (Crenshaw, 140).

The aims of this research are threefold. Firstly, the research analyzes how symbolic violence appears in Adivasi women's representation within The Adivasi Will Not Dance, both within their staged performances and in their real-life experiences of displacement and dispossession. Secondly, the research discusses how Adivasi women's identities are constructed through intersectional oppression, opening up the double marginalization that arises from the intersection of caste, gender, class, and geographic peripherality. Third, it examines how silence, refusal, and withdrawal are converted into acts of radical protest that oppose hegemonic calls for representation and performance on dominant terms.

By situating Shekhar's work within the larger discourses of Dalit and tribal writing, feminist historiography, and subaltern studies, this paper highlights the need to read protest literature as a site of critical identity formation and resistance. The paper argues that The Adivasi Will Not Dance not only challenges the symbolic violence perpetrated against Adivasi women but also places them at center stage in claiming narrative power. In so doing, the text subverts hegemonic understandings of Indian identity and encourages a more expansive literary and historiographic canon that privileges the voices of the most regularly silenced.

2. HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL CONTEXT

The representation of Adivasi women in Indian cultural and literary discourses has long been shaped by colonial, nationalist, and upper-caste narratives that sought to define them within fixed categories of otherness. Colonial ethnographies tended to construct tribal women as hypersexual and primitive, reflecting what Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak defines as the "epistemic violence" of colonial knowledge regimes, in which the subaltern is spoken for instead of

being permitted to speak (Can the Subaltern Speak? 284). For example, British administrator and missionary Edward Tuite Dalton in his Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal (1872) frequently represented tribal women as childlike and uncivilized, thus supporting the colonial notion that they were in need of reform and assimilation into "civilized" Hindu or Christian standards. So too were Verrier Elwin's idealized ethnographies, such as The Muria and Their Ghotul (1947), portraying tribal women as personifications of natural sexuality, exoticizing their culture and denying them political voice (Ewin, 34). These portraits naturalized systems of civilization, appropriating a title of colonial and paternalistic reform and governance (Dalton, 112).

In the nationalist era, these representations were not overthrown but reworked. Adivasi and Dalit women were symbolically mobilized to be symbols of a unitary Indian identity, but their particular problems were dissolved in the discourse of national unity. Reformist Hindi writing of the late colonial era, frequently targeting "uplifting" upper-caste Hindu women, either erased Dalit and tribal women entirely or represented them as characters of excess morals and backwardness (Gupta 114). Sharmila Rege observes how nationalist historiography often co-opted the "voice of the oppressed woman" as a performative gesture, at the same time obliterating her caste and community affiliation (Writing Caste, Writing Gender 16). This symbolic co-optation flattened Adivasi women into cultural symbols, relegated to performative functions that reinscribed instead of subverted patriarchal and caste-driven frameworks.

Upper-caste literary portrayals also helped silence tribal voices. Tribal women were often stereotyped using reductionist tropes that depicted them as idealized, nature-based innocents or demonized them as debased victims of poverty and exploitation, with little room for agency or nuance (Devi, 186). In these portrayals, Adivasi women were symbolized, not subjected, their humanity reduced to metaphor for wilderness, primitivity, or societal decay. Bibhutibhushan Bandyopadhyay's Aranyak (1939) is a telling instance of this trend. Though admired for its poetic representation of the forest, the novel makes tribal characters, particularly women, peripheral to the protagonist's life journey. They are integrated into the terrain, and their existence cannot be distinguished from the wilderness they live in. The upper-caste author idealizes their lives, portraying them as holdouts from an dying world that is under siege by modernity, but does not represent their inner voices or dignity struggles. Through this manner, the novel mediates tribal subjectivity through an upper-caste objectification, framing them as objects of aesthetic reflection and nostalgia instead of resistance figures or social critique (Bandyopadhyay, 45).

As G. N. Devy notes, dominant Indian literary theory has long relegated tribal and Adivasi speech to "peripheral to the canon," confining them to ethnographic interest or folkloric detail rather than as knowledge producers (After Amnesia 128). This is not an oversight but a reflection of symbolic orders that prioritize dominant-caste aesthetics at the expense of silencing alternative epistemologies. By constructing tribal lives as marginal, literary discourses are complicit in symbolic violence, maintaining that these communities are represented but never self-representing (Devy, 128).

Dalit literary theory offers analytical instruments for problematizing this erasure. Sharankumar Limbale highlights that Dalit and tribal writing has to be read not as literary texts but as "testimony of oppression" and as critical demands for social justice (Towards an Aesthetic of Dalit Literature 31). Testimonio, as Limbale proposes, redrawing the parameters of literature, gives primacy to lived experience over aesthetic finish (Limbale, 31). Within this schema, the narrative self is indistinguishable from the group struggle, making writing an act of resistance. In the context of Adivasi women's testimonios, this vision underscores how literature ceases to be an abstraction and becomes a form of bodily protest. Testimony resists symbolic violence by recuperating narrative power, demanding that Adivasi women are not passive objects of narratives but active subjects whose voice shatters dominant historiographies.

Such re-framing also questions literary criticism itself, which has long been an accomplice in reproducing hierarchies of representation. By bringing to the fore Dalit and Adivasi testimonies, critics are forced to revisit the very premises of literary value and legitimacy. In so doing, they not only reclaim marginalized voices but also lay bare the ideological workings of upper-caste aesthetics that have long silenced them. The transition from representation to testimony is a moment of choice, from being spoken about to speaking for oneself, and highlights the need to read Adivasi women's accounts as interventions into social, cultural, and political regimes of domination.

3. MINORITY DISCOURSE AND ADIVASI IDENTITY

The minority identity discourse offers a crucial lens for understanding the lived experiences and literary portrayals of Adivasi women in Hansda Sowvendra Shekhar's The Adivasi Will Not Dance. Minority is used in sociological and political theory in a wider sense than the simple numerical one. Louis Wirth, in his classic essay "The Problem of Minority

Groups" (1945), makes the observation that minorities are less about numbers and more about their relative status within power systems, noting that a minority group comprises "people who, by reason of their physical or cultural characteristics, are set apart from the others in the society in which they reside for differential and unequal treatment" (347). In the Indian setting, Adivasis, constitutionally defined as Scheduled Tribes, are such a minority not numerically but structurally disempowered in political, economic, and cultural life.

The Indian Constitution introduces protective measures in the form of the Fifth and Sixth Schedules to shield tribal land and cultural self-governance, yet the developmental trajectory over time has consistently undermined such assurances. Virginius Xaxa argues that the Indian state, even with its constitutional protection, tends to reproduce "the marginal position of tribes by subjecting them to assimilationist policies or development projects that displace them from their land" (State, Society, and Tribes 62). Effectively, Adivasis become constructed as cultural minorities, fetishized as carriers of true tradition while at the same time being dispossessed of the very land and sovereignty that supports those traditions. This paradox finds itself at the heart of Shekhar's collection, where Adivasi groups are revered as cultural performers yet muted as political agents (Xaxa, 62).

The minority status of Adivasis is further strengthened by discursive practices that reduce them to symbolic figures rather than political subjects. As André Béteille insists, Indians minorities tend to be "represented in the public sphere not in terms of their rights and claims but in terms of their social difference" (The Backward Classes in Contemporary India 53). In Shekhar's anthologized title story, the insistence that Adivasi women dance at a political rally is an example of this compression of minority identity into cultural spectacle (Béteille, 53). Their Otherness is only valued in as much as it may be useful for majoritarian aims, whether in political show, tourism, or folkloric sentimentality. This appropriation illustrates Pierre Bourdieu's concept of symbolic violence, wherein domination occurs by presenting minority identities as legitimate representations while erasing their lived experiences (Bourdieu 164).

Essentially, the minority experience of Adivasi women is defined by intersecting structures of oppression. Kimberlé Crenshaw's intersectionality theory, while developed out of African American feminist imaginings, is useful here. Crenshaw is highlighting that minority women are marginalized in a manner not simply due to either gender or race but occurring due to intersections of various structures of power ("Mapping the Margins" 140). Likewise, Adivasi women are minorities as tribal subjects, as women in patriarchal orders, and as economically peripheral members of the working poor. They are aggravated in their vulnerability by geographic peripherality in rural Jharkhand, exclusion from political choice-making, and stigmatization of their cultural ways. Shekhar illustrates this state poignantly, where women are made doubly minoritized, expected to perform cultural authenticity but stripped of dignity, livelihood, and voice.

The construction of Adivasi identity in minority discourse also requires acknowledgment of literature as testimony. Sharmila Rege's argument that the narratives of Dalit women need to be read as "testimonios" and not as a traditional form of literature (Rege 16) can be applied to Adivasi literature. Sharankumar Limbale makes a comparable argument in Towards an Aesthetic of Dalit Literature, pointing out that Dalit and tribal literature needs to be appreciated as "testimonies of oppression and resistance" and not as separate aesthetic creations (31). To that extent, Shekhar's anthology is part of a larger minority literary tradition in which lived experience is a way of reclaiming subjecthood. As Sangati of Bama and Urmila Pawar's The Weave of My Life express the minority struggles of Dalit women, Shekhar's narratives bring Adivasi women to the forefront as minority subjects who challenge being reduced to cultural symbols (Bama 6; Pawar 73).

Such recognition also situates Shekhar's work within an international continuum of literature of minority protest. John Beverley's theorizing of testimonio in Latin American cultures underscores the political exigency of minority testimony challenging prevailing historical accounts (Testimonio: On the Politics of Truth 33). In the same vein, Indigenous women's writing in North America has long reappropriated cultural survival and resistance against settler colonial erasure. Shekhar's fictions speak to such global minority discourses, illustrating how literature from marginalized others across geographies acts to reclaim agency, confront erasure, and put the politics of survival at center stage (Beverley, 33).

The abiding pertinence of minority struggles further signals the importance of Shekhar's intervention. Adivasis are among the most dislocated groups in India because of mining, industries, and environmental destruction. Shashibhushan Upadhyay Pathak contends that globalization has deepened the "crisis of tribal identity," leaving Adivasis in vulnerable roles where their culture is commodified while their land is being dispossessed (Tribal Identity and the Modern World 91). Protests such as the Pathalgadi movement in Jharkhand showcase how Adivasi groups continue to exercise their minority rights against state overreach, only to suffer violent repression in the process. Shekhar's refusal theme in The

Adivasi Will Not Dance resonates with these conflicts, rendering modern political protest into literary expression (Pathak, 91).

By centering the Adivasi woman as a minority presence, Shekhar's writing broadens the scope of protest literature beyond gendered subalternity into the field of minority discourse. The women in his narratives refuse not just as individuals but as representatives of a collective minority subjectivity that has historically been muted in Indian literary and political histories. Their silence, refusal, and testimony disrupt the symbolic violence of hegemonic representation and demand an alternative narrative of survival and dignity. Protest literature, therefore, is not merely a genre of cultural resistance but also a political activism in minority discourse.

4. TEXTUAL ANALYSIS

Summary of The Adivasi Will Not Dance

Hansda Sowvendra Shekhar's The Adivasi Will Not Dance (2015) is a short story collection based mainly in Jharkhand, evoking the lives of Santhal Adivasis torn between cultural survival and structural oppression. The stories put center stage the challenges of oppressed communities who are frequently marginalized in mainstream Indian fiction. Shekhar declines to idealize tribal existence, presenting instead unflinching descriptions of displacement, poverty, caste bias, and sexual exploitation. His women, especially, are the exemplars of the contradictions of inhabiting identity in a culture that both exoticizes and disappears them. Das et al. (2026)

The title story, "The Adivasi Will Not Dance," embodies this contradiction with especial power. A gathering of Santhal women are invited to dance their traditional dances at a political rally, a performance designed to present "authentic tribal culture" for the gaze of elite onlookers. While their cultural identity is made spectacle, their material conditions, hunger, land appropriation, lack of schooling, go unremarked. The refusal to dance on the part of the protagonist is a symbolic act of resistance that lays bare the violence of demands for cultural authenticity. In other narratives, Shekhar probes the exploitation of migrant workers ("November Is the Month of Migrations"), Adivasi food habits and their stigmatization ("They Eat Meat!"), and the susceptibility of women to sexual attacks and prostitution ("Merely a Whore"). Even in the more gentle stories like "Yellow Is the Colour of Mangoes," the intricacies of Adivasi life are presented without relying on the innocence and primitivity stereotypes that have persisted in upper-caste portrayals (Shekhar, 68).

By narrating these stories, The Adivasi Will Not Dance gives voice to minority voices and establishes the pride of Adivasi experiences. By placing Santhal women's and men's stories at the center, Shekhar resists the symbolic violence of dominant literary and cultural narratives that have silenced or misrepresented them in the past. His book positions Adivasis not as romantic vestiges of a disappearing wilderness but as living communities confronting oppression, survival, and resistance in contemporary India. In doing so, the collection functions as a powerful work of protest literature, reclaiming narrative space for voices at the margins (Shekhar).

4.1. SYMBOLIC VIOLENCE AND REPRESENTATION

Theory of symbolic violence introduced by Pierre Bourdieu which constitutes the subtle and often unnoticed manifestations of oppression through language, culture, and social events gives a very profound and productive perspective for interpreting Hansda Sowvendra Shekhar’s The Adivasi Will Not Dance. According to Bourdieu, symbolic violence “is exercised upon a social agent with his or her complicity” (Outline of a Theory of Practice 164), hence making the relations of domination to appear as the natural state of things and to be legitimate. The summoning of Adivasi women for the performance of their traditional dance at a political rally is among the crucial moments of such symbolic violence. The invitation is not so much a request as an expectation and thus it speaks of power operating through seeming inclusion. The women are not inquired about their needs, what has been taken away from them, or the rally's impact on their lives; rather, their worth is confined to their ability to represent the “authentic tribal culture” for an outside look. The dance thus becomes a cultural extraction, similar to the extraction of land and labor that underpins Adivasi dispossession in other parts of the text. What is taken here is not material but symbolic: their cultural identity is appropriated and exhibited while their political subjectivity is obscured.

The call for "authenticity" is another way to control people. By insisting that Adivasi women act like a static, folkloric version of themselves, the dominant narratives do not allow them to become modern political subjects but rather transform them into cultural capital for others. Representation does not bring recognition here; instead, it permits the

power to rule by changing the invisibility of the oppressed into a spectacle and the power over them into a party. In this manner, Shekhar reveals that symbolic violence works by covering itself with the cloak of inclusion and that cultural recognition, when separated from justice, turns into a technology of erasure instead of empowerment.

4.2. INTERSECTIONAL OPPRESSION

Kimberlé Crenshaw's intersectional theory gives a clear view of the way the different power structures that are overlapping produce the vulnerable ones with unique and compounded characteristics. Crenshaw asserts that "the intersectional experience is greater than the sum of racism and sexism" ("Mapping the Margins" 140). In The Adivasi Will Not Dance, the main character is an Adivasi woman, and her identity puts her in the middle of the next: caste, gender, class, and geographical marginality. She is poor and female and, on top of that, tribal which implies she is on the outside of the dominant caste, economically, and politically invisible.

This intersectionality leads her to be vulnerable in many areas: financially through displacing due to mining and industrial development, socially through making her a sexual object and thus framing Adivasi women as being culturally available and morally outside the mainstream, and politically through being systematically excluded from the decision-making processes except when their bodies or traditions are to be used for elite or state agendas. These different kinds of oppressions do not merely add up but act upon each other, thus creating a specific type of marginalization that is different from and less severe than that experienced by women of dominant castes or men of Adivasi castes.

The narrative brings forth the intersectional vulnerability through the body that is the figure itself. The body of the Adivasi woman is the main site where power is exercised: it is demanded to be seen, to have rhythm, and to be submissive, a flowing representative of tribal liveliness for public viewing while at the same time being made invisible in the spheres of starvation, uprooting, working, and brutality. The Adivasi woman thus emerges as very visible in her cultural aspect and at the same time she is treated as a non-citizen. This contradiction uncovers the fact that intersectional marginalization not only takes place at the social structure level but also at the physical level, making the body a site of power by controlling when it can appear, how it must move, and for whose sake it must act.

4.3. REFUSAL AS PROTEST

The protagonist's no dancing is the highlight of the narrative that has titled it. It is the refusal to dance that will put an end to the cycle of symbolic violence because it will take away the complicity that the violence depends on. The woman, by not dancing, will be in charge of her body and her culture and thus will turn silence and withdrawal into acts of resistance. Following Spivak's claim that the subaltern woman is deprived of speech or heard only within dominant discourses ("Can the Subaltern Speak?" 284), Shekhar's text complicates the concept of voicelessness by showing refusal itself as a way of speaking, a speech that is done through absence rather than through presence.

Here, silence is not passivity; it is a counter-discourse that reveals the violence that is inherent in the demand for cultural performance. The protagonist, by not dancing, refuses to be depicted as a mere symbol of authenticity for consumption and upholds a kind of dignity that does not require approval from the very structures it fights against. Withdrawal, then, is not retreat but refusal, a conscious disruption of the systems that take over tribal identity while simultaneously erasing tribal agency (Scott, 29).

Crucially, this opposition is manifested in the content as well as the narrative form. The audience expects to see a show, ritual, and cultural display, while they get the opposite experience of interruption, absence, and denial. This withholding of the narrative is a reflection of the political withholding that the heroine realizes: the protagonist denies the state cultural legitimacy, and the tale, in turn, denies the reader representational satisfaction. Thus, the refusal is no longer just an action within the plot but a guiding principle that shapes the narrative, the politics and the form uniting in a common gesture of resistance.

5. DISCUSSION

The Adivasi Will Not Dance has been the focal point of this research, where symbolic violence and intersectional marginalization manifest not as mere theories but as actualities incorporated into daily existence. The Adivasi women's cultural performance at a political event has been used as a case to show how power claims minority identity while not delivering justice in terms of material goods. The acknowledgment of the minority group by the authorities becomes a

means of controlling the group rather than of erasing the group by recognizing it, thus creating a show of inclusion that covers up the reality of dispossession, hunger, and political exclusion.

In the given situation, Adivasi women are the most powerless group of all since they belong to the intersection of the four factors mentioned: caste, gender, class, and place of living. Their suffering is multi-layered; hence, they can be identified as the symbols of oppression and at the same time invisible to politicians. Shekhar's story points to the fact that this paradox is the main reason for the continuation of inequality that has the same cause of the difference being turned into a display and the suffering being rendered silent.

The text, however, gives a new meaning to the concept of resistance. The protagonist's noncompliance with the performance of the dance does more than just parallel the traditional route of resistance; it actually withdraws legitimacy from the practice of proving one's authenticity through performance. Silence becomes here a moral and political act that challenges the mainstream expectations. The noncompliance does not mean the demand for recognition according to the dominant standards but rather the demand for recognition with dignity free from any display.

In the context of protest literature, Shekhar's work resonates with the testimony modes that grant priority to the lived experience rather than to the aesthetic distance. His stories do not present the hardships in an idealized manner or the uprising in a theatrical way; they highlight, as significant political actions, the daily survival, retreat, and silent resistance, the very acts of living under a regime. The very power of the text is in this insistence on mundane resistance that challenges oppression without using the oppressor's language or concepts.

6. CONCLUSION

The Adivasi Will Not Dance reconfigures protest literature by revealing the cultural recognition that masks inequality as one of the ways in which domination is maintained along with coercion. By highlighting symbolic violence and intersectional vulnerability, Shekhar shows how Adivasi women are made visible as cultural signs and at the same time, erased as political agents. His stories disturb colonial, nationalist, and upper-caste representations that have always spoken for and never listened to tribal communities.

Very importantly, the text reinterprets resistance as non-violent refusal rather than violent confrontation. The main character's silence is not lack of power but a deliberate choice to withdraw from a system that depends on her participation for its legitimacy. Thus, Shekhar transfers the language of protest from being a spectacle to being an ethics, from being seen to not being willing to be used.

This move places Shekhar in a counter-tradition of marginal writing that considers literature as a testimony and survival rather than just a representation. His writing proclaims that dignity does not depend upon being visible in the dominant frameworks and that resistance can be through silent disruption, everyday endurance, and reclamation of narratives.

Future studies might develop this analysis further by side-by-side checking Adivasi women stories with Dalit women's testing voices to see the commonalities and conflicts among the marginalized groups. Ecofeminist theories could make it more clear how the destruction of nature is connected to women's disempowerment, while oral traditions and indigenous storytelling would still be the main sources for keeping the resistance understanding alive beyond the written literature. All such directions together re-affirm protest literature as a critical area to think again about power, identity, and survival from the margins.

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

None.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

None.

REFERENCES

Bama. Sangati: Events. Trans. Lakshmi Holmström. Oxford University Press, 2005.
Bandyopadhyay, Bibhutibhushan. Aranyak. Trans. Rimli Bhattacharya. Penguin, 2000.

Beverley, John. Testimonio: On the Politics of Truth. University of Minnesota Press, 2004.
Bourdieu, Pierre. Outline of a Theory of Practice. Cambridge University Press, 1977.
Béteille, André. The Backward Classes in Contemporary India. Oxford University Press, 1992.
Crenshaw, Kimberlé. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color." Stanford Law Review, vol. 43, no. 6, 1991, pp. 1241–1299.
Dalton, Edward Tuite. Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal. Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing, 1872.
Das, S., Nandi, P., and Mishra, K. (2026). Social Media As A Catalyst for Protest Mobilisation Against Sexual Violence: Digital Activism, Celebrity Influence and Offline Participation in India. ShodhSamajik: Journal of Social Studies., 3(1), 40-50. https://doi.org/10.29121/ShodhSamajik.v3.i1.2026.63
Devi, Mahasweta. "Draupadi." Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Breast Stories. Seagull Books, 1981.
Devy, G. N. After Amnesia: Tradition and Change in Indian Literary Criticism. Orient Longman, 1992.
Elwin, Verrier. The Muria and Their Ghotul. Oxford University Press, 1947.
Gupta, Charu. Gendering Colonial India: Reforming the Normative Order. Permanent Black, 2008.
Limbale, Sharankumar. Towards an Aesthetic of Dalit Literature: History, Controversies and Considerations. Trans. Alok Mukherjee. Orient BlackSwan, 2004.
Pathak, Shashibhushan Upadhyay. Tribal Identity and the Modern World. Orient BlackSwan, 2017.
Pawar, Urmila. The Weave of My Life: A Dalit Woman's Memoirs. Trans. Maya Pandit. Columbia University Press, 2008.
Rege, Sharmila. Writing Caste, Writing Gender: Narrating Dalit Women's Testimonios. Zubaan, 2006.
Scott, James C. Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance. Yale University Press, 1985.
Shekhar, Hansda Sowvendra. The Adivasi Will Not Dance: Stories. Speaking Tiger, 2015.
Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture, ed. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, University of Illinois Press, 1988, pp. 271–313.
Wirth, Louis. "The Problem of Minority Groups." The Science of Man in the World Crisis, ed. Ralph Linton, Columbia University Press, 1945, pp. 347–372.
Xaxa, Virginius. State, Society, and Tribes: Issues in Post-Colonial India. Pearson, 2008.