

Blurred Trajectories of Migration Among Tribes: A Study of the Chenchus of Andhra Pradesh and Telangana

Apparao Thamminaina

*Assistant Professor, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Hyderabad, India
Corresponding author: apparao.tamminaina@gmail.com*

Abstract

Since time immemorial, human beings have been migrating in search of resources to make a living or to occupy territories to establish power over the other. All types of human societies underwent the process of migration in one way or the other. But, migration of the members of a hunting-gathering community to urban centres is not a very common phenomenon. An interesting question to explore in this context is; what made a hunting-gathering community to migrate to urban centres? The paper explores historical as well as contemporary migration with the case study of a hunting-gathering community, the Chenchus of Telangana and Andhra Pradesh states of India. It examines the causes and consequences of migration and analyses the implications on Indian tribal Communities.

Keywords: Tribe, migration, chenchu, contractor system, Andhra Pradesh, Telangana

Migration is the movement of people from one territory to the other. International Organization for Migration (IOM) defines migration as “a process of moving, either across an international border or within a state. It is a population movement, encompassing any kind of movement of people, whatever length, composition and causes; it includes migration of refugees, displaced persons, uprooted people and economic migrants” (Perruchoud, 2004: 41). Migration is not a new phenomenon of human society. Since time immemorial human beings are migrating from one territory to the other for various reasons. It reflects the human endeavour to survive and progress. It might be the voluntary effort of human beings because of their enthusiasm to explore new territories or due to unforeseen adversaries of nature such as environmental shocks and stresses or man-made conditions. Migrations may not pose serious problems to the communities if they are voluntary. However, trends of modern development forcing people to migrate from their natural environs which often results in serious consequences to those uprooted communities.

The significance of migration depends on the kind of movement of people. If it is the “shifting of an individual or a group of individuals from one culture area or physical space to another, more or less permanently” (Sinha and Atallah, 1987: 5), it brings significant change in the community. It then has a significant impact on demographic structure, expenditure patterns, social structures and poverty levels. The earnings of migrants affect income, expenditure patterns and investment which subsequently changes relations at household and community levels. The nature of migration primarily reflects household subsistence strategies. Males predominate in most labour migration streams. But in a number of other cases, both men and women migrate together for work, especially among lower caste and tribals where constraints on women’s participation in non-household economic activities are fewer. In some sectors such as construction, brick kiln, and sugarcane cutting, family migration is prevalent as it is more economical for employers. The proportion of women out-migrants ranges from 18 per cent to 42 per cent in the case of some tribal areas (Haberfeld *et al.* 1999; Mosse *et al.* 1997). However, migration as a safety valve in poor areas is at question. There are two important reasons for migration from rural and tribal areas, they are; migration for survival and migration for subsistence (Dwivedi, 2012). These two types are the important outcomes of non-voluntary displacements. The first indicates the severe social and economic hardships faced by those communities, a situation where migration becomes necessary. These communities are generally landless, illiterate and drawn largely from Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and other depressed castes. The second reason for migration is also rooted in subsistence and arises because of the need to supplement income in order to fill the gaps of employment. Such communities often migrate for shorter periods and do not ordinarily travel very far from their homes.

TRIBAL MIGRATION IN INDIA

Tribal communities of India are most unfortunate and entangled in the scenario of modern development because of their mineral rich habitats. Some of the communities are displaced and few others are migrating to neighbouring plain areas in search of livelihoods since their territories are gradually encroached by non-tribals. Therefore, migration is rampant among tribal communities of India. The major reason is the displacement of tribal people from their natural environs, besides; intrusion of outsiders, scarcity of resources, lack of skills at new setting, and very rarely the motive of further development. Mobility is critical to the livelihoods of tribal people, socially deprived groups and people from resource-poor areas. However, because of lack of data, migration is largely invisible and ignored by policy makers (Srivastava and Sasikumar, 2003). Significant number of tribals, mainly from drought prone areas of Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Maharashtra, migrate to work in construction, tile factory, brick kiln and crop cutting in Maharashtra (Pandey, 1998). Among tribes of India; Saora, Munda and Santhal have a long history of migration. Huge population of

Saora are migrating to plantation cultivation in Assam and Arunachal Pradesh, whereas Mundas and Santhals migrate to NALCO site in Denkanal district of Orissa (Menon, 1995). Deshingkar and Start (2003) found that migrant family members are as high as 75% in the most remote and hilly tribal villages with infertile soils in Madhya Pradesh. In the tribal districts of southern Madhya Pradesh, 65% of households included migrants (Mosse *et al.* 1997). In Jharkhand, a study of twelve villages found that one-third of the households had at least one member migrating. Short-term migration was higher among poorer groups, involving over 80% of the landless and 88% of illiterate people and migration among SCs and STs was nearly twice that of upper castes (15% of the SC/ST households compared to 8% of upper caste households) (Dayal and Karan, 2003). There are extremely high rates of migration among tribals from southern Rajasthan who migrate to Gujarat to work in seed cotton farms and textile markets (Katiyar, 2006 and Venkateswarlu, 2004).

The National Sample Survey (2001) estimates show that Andhra Pradesh has the highest incidence of short-term or seasonal migration in south India. Large scale migration is from Mahabubnagar district is into manual labour (Rao *et. al.*, 2006). As per unofficial estimates, Mahabubnagar alone accounts for about one million migrants with around a third of the district's population having moved away to earn or enhance their livelihoods. They migrate to major towns of Andhra Pradesh such as Hyderabad, Vijayawada, and Guntur apart from cities like Mumbai. Samal (2006) believes that migration rates are high among Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes of this district. It is also believed that most of the people migrated to other regions for livelihoods failed to save money except a few. From the study on Akkaram village in AchampetMandal of Mahabubnagar District, Vijay (2011) believes that a large proportion of migrants households are spending all their earnings from migration on consumption, repayment of debts and daughters marriages, which consequently resulting in little surplus left for investment in productive activities. However, it depends on the factors behind migration and the nature of employment at a new place. Deshingkar (2010) put forward the issue of child labour. The children of migrant labourers are engaging in the farm related activities to earn extra income which in turn promoting illiteracy in the district. Migration for wage labour is undertaken not only by the landless and marginal farmers but also by small and even medium farmers. For instance, studies conducted in Mahabubnagar district reveal that farmers owning between 10 to 20 acres of land make up a significant proportion of migrants (Reddy, 2003; Reddy, 2002). At the same time, there are several systems of seasonal migration from Mahabubnagar District (Reddy, 2003), where people migrate to engage in activities like private or public project work and construction work in urban areas; migrate for agricultural work to irrigated areas and for traditional stone crushing work to rural areas and small towns.

Migration is also one of the major outcomes of neoliberal process. Increased communication facilities have made it more flexible since people are moving back and

forth across the territories with ease. At the same time, such flexibility negatively affected the tribes of India. The most important implication of it is the exploitation of mineral wealth from the forests of this country in the name of economic development. It subsequently displaced tribal communities from their natural resource base. Those people who were solely depending on the natural resources have been seriously affected by such displacement. The development strategies of the government are influenced by the development notions of the people other than tribals resulted in incompatibility between the ideas of people and the administration on development process. It has accelerated migration instead of accepting the formulas of development proposed by the state. Industrial development in the tribal areas hastened the process of migration since it has facilitated the entry of outsiders.

At the same time, the resource richness of tribal territories attracted the powerful outsiders, whose intention was to cultivate in the huge tracts of fertile land and other resources. It has given rise to intensive resource competition among the interacting ethnic groups. In this connection, Despres (1975: 4) argues, “by definition ethnic groups are competitive for the strategic resources of their respective societies.” To a hunting-gathering community such as Chenchus, certain resources (e.g., land) were irrelevant. In fact, agricultural land had no value for them when they were highly depending on food gathering and hunting activities. Therefore, they have ignored when it was occupied by the migrant outsiders. But, they have gradually realized the serious consequences of such kind of alienation. Srivastava (2008: 537) observes “Tribal world all over has witnessed its funding by greedy and rapacious outsiders; the genesis of tribal problem lies in asymmetrical cultural contacts.” As a result, a situation was arising where so-called mainstream ruling elites were treating the homelands of indigenous people as their internal colony and adopting colonial behavior towards genuine movements of indigenous people (Gupta, 2002). Apart from the impact of resource greed people, Chenchus have been influenced by the inflow of pilgrims to the popular pilgrimage, Srisailem; which is located in the midst of their habitat. Haimendorf (1948: 88) observes “For centuries they have had occasional contacts with pilgrims flocking to a famous Hindu shrine in the heart of their country.” These contacts had a slow and steady impact and led to migration of original inhabitants.

THE CHENCHUS

The Chenchus live in the Nallamalai forest of Telangana and Andhra Pradesh states of India. They are predominantly living in Mahabubnagar, Nalgonda, and Rangareddy districts of Telangana; Prakasam, Kurnool, and Guntur districts of Andhra Pradesh. They comprise a total population of 49232 (2001 census) and spread in a vast territory of Nallamalai forest. They have spread in innumerable small settlements known as *Pentas*. A *penta* usually consists of 5 to 15 houses. Some of the large Chenchu settlements are known as *Gudems*. A *gudem* consists of 30 to 60 houses.

Several stereotypes constructed on the nature of Chenchus by colonial administrators as well as researchers of pre-independent India. They were considered as wild and mischievous people. They rob travellers, killing them if they oppose (Taylor, 1862) wild tribe (Kurnool Manual, 1886); semi-wild, lazy, drinking set of brigands (Thurston, 1909) and semi-nomadic drunkards (Haimendorf, 1943). All these attributes are not apt to describe the Chenchus of present day. At present Chenchus is not completely a hunting-gathering or nomadic community but a “pre-agricultural” or “hunting-gathering” community in transition. Haimendorf (1943:4) opines that the Chenchus “are not only racially but also culturally survivals of most ancient India.” They are identified as the “Primitive Tribal Group (PTG)” by the government of India. A small portion of the community is still depending on hunting and gathering for the survival. The Chenchus living in the interior areas of the forest are practicing semi-nomadism but all other Chenchus are leading a more or less settled life. The major reason behind transition is the increasing contact with neighbouring Hindu caste groups. As a result, in the Nallamalai region which is the principle abode of the Chenchus, they co-exist with several other communities. It is believed that majority of those communities are migrants. Each of these communities has their own ethno-history of origin and migration.

MIGRATION OF CHENCHUS

Migration is an age-old phenomenon among the Chenchus. For instance Haimendorf, (1943: 300) discussed the migration of Chenchus of Mahabubnagar district of Telangana. “The position of the Chenchus on the fringe of the plains near Lingal and Achampet, however, is slightly different. For there can be little doubt that the majority of these Chenchus were once inhabitants of the adjacent hilly country and have only come down to the plains in comparatively recent times. This emigration is not yet ceased and many Chenchus of Boramcheruvu, Pullaipalli, Irla Penta and other jungle villages have near relatives who live in lowland settlements, while on the other hand a few Chenchus from the plains have resettled on the upper plateau in such villages as Rampur and Baikit Penta. There have been also movements of the population on the eastern side of the plateau; for which the abandonment of such villages as Elpamachena and Tatigundal many Chenchus left the upper plateau for villages on the lower edge like Upnotla and Tirmalapur, where other hamlets of the Chenchus already existed.” Similar movements of Chenchus are persistent. Therefore, there is uncertainty over the membership of the village too.

Migration is an important force and process of cultural change. It has made a significant contribution to the change among the Chenchus. Migration in the Nallamalai region can be divided into two types, they are; inside to outside and outside to inside. The *inside to outside* migration means the movement of people from the core parts of the Nallamalai forest to fringe, foothills or nearby multi-ethnic settlements and faraway towns. The *outside to inside* migration is the movement of the non-Chenchus from

nearby villages of Nallamalai forest to fringe, foothills, and multi-ethnic settlements closer to forest terrain or even movement into the hamlets in the core area of the forest. The pattern of migration among the Chenchus can be called as inside to outside migration. They migrate from core territories to fringe, from fringe to multi-ethnic villages, and from multi-ethnic villages to towns and cities. However, this is not such a linearly ordered process.

For example, the Chenchus of core settlements such as Appapuram, Bourapuram, and Rampuram of Mahabubnagar district have migrated to fringe and multi-ethnic settlements near foot hills such as Billakallu and Appaipally of the same district. Few families are even migrated to Achempeta, a town close to forest vicinity. Similarly, few Chenchu families from Peddamantanala and Garapenta of the core area of Prakasam district have migrated to Dornala, a small town in the same district. The Chenchus have migrated voluntarily in all these cases. Multiple factors including the establishment of marital relations with the people from other territories, frequent conflicts in the original settlements, in search of new opportunities and resources, employment in government or private sector establishments, and/or naxalite activities in the forest were responsible for their migration. For example, Chenchus have migrated to nearby towns to seek employment opportunities and economic well-being. But those who have migrated from core settlements to Billakallu village of Mahabubnagar district cited resource scarcity in the old settlements, opportunities at Billakallu, and marital relations as the reasons for their migration. The Chenchu families migrated from Appapuram to Appaipally cited naxalism as the main reason for migration, few others cited marital relations as the main reason and rest of the families migrated because of resource scarcity at the old settlement.

Migration to cities for construction work is popular among the Chenchus of Mahabubnagar. It is because of the opportunities in construction industry as well as pattern of migration among other communities of same district. The strong network of contractors in this draught prone district is another important reason. Similarly, construction industry too mainly depends on migrant labour (Vaijanyanta, 1998). The consistent migration of the Chenchus of Appaipally to towns and cities for work is a new phenomenon that began almost 20 years ago. The place of migration depends on the contractor.

Even though it is voluntary, they are compelled for that because of their continuous debt to contractors. Most of the contractors are non-Chenchus. It is a trap in the name of better livelihood. The contractor offers an attractive amount of 15,000 to 20,000 rupees at the time of some festival (usually at the time of Vijaya Dasami). After fifteen days, the contractor asks the concerned family to join for the work. He may take them to any city. A family has to spend a year with the same contractor and should go to the work assigned by him. He provides food and shelter at the work place. He also gives

20-30 rupees per day to each member. He deducts major portion of the wage towards the advance given to Chenchu family. It is a form of bonded labour for Chenchus.

CONTRACTOR SYSTEM

The tradition of migration is known as *gumpukattuta* (grouping). Many *Gumpumestrilu* (contractors) are actively working in this regard. Majority of these contractors are mediators (agents) to main contractors. They usually select the villages that are going through a drought period and where illiteracy is high. They entice Chenchus of those villages by offering advance. These contractors are also opening an account in a liquor shop in the village for the benefit of their clients. Any client may go to the liquor shop at any time to consume liquor without paying money. But this will be deducted from their wages. The place of migration is popularly known as *desam* (country). Many of the migrant Chenchus do not know where they are going. The contractors take them to different cities across the country including Hyderabad, Visakhapatnam, Vijayawada, Chennai, Bangalore, Mumbai, Cuttack, Bhubaneswar, and Bhopal. The Chenchus cannot go back on their own to their native place. They wait for the year end when the contractor sends them back to their villages for a period of 15 days with the help of village level recruiter. The Chenchus can stay back in the village if they are not willing to join for the next year. But they often have to go back for work because of the debts. The contractor cannot enforce them in case if they clear debts. But as most of the Chenchus complain, the contractor always maintains some debt at least in the form of liquor account. Therefore, it is compulsion to most of them to go back in the next season. A continuous cycle of indebtedness operates between a Chenchu man or the family and the contractor.

The contractor system is operating at three levels. The main contractor or the primary contractor stays in the city and workers do not have any relation with him. Neither the contractor nor the worker is responsible or accountable to each other. He is not aware of the community of the worker. He maintains a relation with a sub-contractor. The sub-contractor maintains a direct relation with the worker. He knows the community of the worker. But he does not directly recruit the worker. He assigns the duty to an influential person of the village by providing commission based on the number of workers he/she recruits. The workers are more familiar with village level recruiter. He/she remains the most influential person till their contract terminates as he/she has to provide liquor or any other financial help at the time of requirement. Once the worker moves from the village, nothing will be in his/her control. The village level recruiter does not maintain any communication with the worker. Everything will be decided by the secondary contractor till the end of their contract. According to ML, a Chenchu *Gumpu Mestri* from Appaipally village of Mahabubnagar district, "The Chenchus of this village and nearby villages are always ready to go for construction work wherever they get more money. It is an attractive option for them because they

are not getting anything in the nearby forest and they are not interested in cultivation. I am not forcing anybody but I am helping them to get some work. I help them for safe passage to workplace and back to village. I will maintain their work accounts and disburse money when they ask for it. I will get some commission from the main contractor in the town.” He took Chenchus to Hyderabad and Guntur on the request of the major contactors as well as Chenchus. The extreme dimension of migration of Chenchus in recent years is their temporary migration to Meghalaya during 2005-06. It has revealed the serious consequences of the migration encouraged by greedy contractors. About 600 Chenchus were taken to Meghalaya for labour work in a power plant. It is reported in all leading national newspapers that they are working under critical conditions. Many of them were failed to adjust to the food and environment and suffered from serious health problems. The issue was mentioned in Rajya Sabha on 24th February 2006 by the then MP (Rajya Sabha) of Mahabubnagar, R. Chandra Sekhar Reddy. As a result, ITDA has taken some measures to bring them back. Some Chenchus were dead before reaching their village. The government has given a compensation of 20000 to 50000 rupees depends on the loss for the family.

MIGRATION OF NON-CHENCHUS

The inside to outside migration is not observed among the non-Chenchus because they have never lived in the interior forest except in very few cases such as Palutla of Prakasam district and Pechcheruvu of Kurnool district. Apart from this, there are no evidences for non-Chenchus habitations in the core territories of the forest. The non-Chenchus have migrated to Nallamalai region not only from nearby but also from far reaching villages. The Lambada tribe and Boya caste are the only communities which have reached even to core territories of the forest. For example, the Lambadas are living along with Chenchus in Palutla of Prakasam district which is in the core region of the forest. The Boyas lived with the Chenchus in Pechcheruvu of Kurnool district till their displacement to Kottalacheruvu along with their Chenchu neighbours of Pechcheruvu in 1985.

All other non-Chenchu communities have settled in the fringe or foothills or outside the forest but in close vicinity. The presence of non-Chenchus at foot hills seems to be rapidly increasing in the last half century. Appaipally, Sri Rangapuram of Lingalmandal; Vatverlapally, Sarlapalli of Amarabadmandal from Mahabubnagar district and Rollapenta of Dornalamandal from Prakasam district are good examples for the migration of non-Chenchus into Chenchu territories. Many settlements close to forest have experienced the inflow of non-Chenchus. The process of migration has led to the contact not only with the Chenchus of different territorial groups but also with different groups of non-Chenchus. Therefore, migration has a deep influence on all aspects of Chenchu life and extensively contributed to cultural diversity and change among the Chenchus.

IMPACT ON CHENCHUS

Change is predominant among the Chenchus migrated to multi-ethnic villages and towns. In fact, the formation of few multi-ethnic villages explains the pattern of migration and resultant change. For example, Appaipally of Mahabubnagar district was a small Chenchu settlement with 5-10 Chenchu families, which developed into a multi-ethnic village of 20 castes and 3 tribal groups in last 60-70 years. Lack of resistance from the forest department as well as from the Chenchus for deforestation and cultivation led to the flow of non-Chenchus over a period of time. The village is still attracting non-Chenchus for business activities because it is the locus for five settlements with huge population. However, all these developments made Chenchus part of a multi-ethnic village. Such developments brought changes in the cultural practices of the Chenchus of this cluster.

This cluster includes Appaipally, Sri Rangapuram, Errapenta, Devu Cheruvu, and Mullem Cheruvu. Out of these settlements, Appaipally is a typical multi-ethnic settlement, Errapenta is entirely a Chenchu settlement, Sri Rangapuram is a multi-ethnic settlement but predominantly inhabited by Chenchus and Lambadas, with very few families of caste groups. Devu Cheruvu and Mullem Cheruvu are entirely Lambadahamlets. All the hamlets are in 2-3 km distance from Appaipally except Errapenta which is approximately 5 km away from it. Errapenta is said to be the oldest settlement among all which falls under the fringe area because of its geographical placement. The Chenchus of Errapenta are carrying forward the traditional practices such as using the arrow in the marriage ceremony to identify auspicious time to tie the *taali*. But such tradition disappeared in Appaipally with the disappearance of bow and arrow culture in other villages.

In other cases, the Chenchus of one hamlet moved as a whole from an interior place to fringe area. For example, the Chenchus of Pathuru of Lingalmandal of Mahabubnagar district belongs to only two *kulams*. They have migrated four decades ago from an interior hill settlement Gattupenta to fringe of the forest. But they haven't merged in any other settlement, instead; they found a new settlement. However, they have never tried to name the settlement. The government has implemented a rehabilitation plan for these people during the years 1999-2000. Few families have moved to Dhararam, a village approximately 3 km away. Since then, they have started calling the old settlement as Pathuru (old village). There are many such cases as they had semi nomadic lifestyle. Many hamlets in the interior areas have changed their locations over a period of time. Some are continuing in the close vicinity of the old hamlets but others have moved for few kilometres. Similar case identified in Prakasam district. *Gandhinagarpena* of Yerragondapalemmandal changed its location many times in last 30 years and recently stabilized with the construction of the houses by the ITDA.

Migration has brought the permutations and combinations of different social groups in multi-ethnic setting. It has facilitated the contact with wide variety of social and

cultural groups. The migrant Chenchus gradually adapted to the practices of the Chenchus at the new place and also certain practices of non-Chenchus of those villages. *Peerlu* (Muharram) festival is an appropriate example in this regard. The Chenchu families migrated from Appapuram to Appaipally are either celebrating or participating in the festival.

The festival of an entirely different tradition adopted in last 30 years. They are following the rules and prescriptions of the festival. They have adopted the concept of '*halal*' too, according to which they consume meat of animals only when they are killed by cutting the throat by a Muslim man. For example, MS, a 48 years old man was migrated from Appapuram to Appaipally 25 years ago. He has never participated in the *Peerlu* festival while he was living in Appapuram. He was aware of the festival but not its procedures and Islamic symbols. But, now he is celebrating the festival and his house is adorned with Islamic symbols such as green flags, half-moon, and photographs of saints of Islamic tradition. He is an active participant in the festival along with his kin members. The migrants have also adapted certain other practices of the Chenchus of the village. For example, they never offered prayers to the Goddess Maisamma in Appapuram. Instead, they worship Goddess Peddamma. But the family of MS offer prayers to Maisamma after migrating to Appaipally. They visit a popular shrine of Maisamma at Nayanapally at least once in a year, which is 30 km away from Appaipally.

Migration has brought changes in the mode of celebration of rituals of childbirth, puberty, marriage, and death. The period of pollution enhanced in the case of puberty, menstruation, and death. The bride-price is gradually replaced by dowry in case of Chenchus living in towns and multi-ethnic villages. The bride-price is being taken by the parents of the bride instead of maternal uncle. Migration has brought changes in the dress patterns too. They are celebrating birthdays of children. New Year day has become an important occasion and they prefer to wear new dresses on that day. They are celebrating festivals in a large scale. The *Peerlu* festival and *Vinayaka Chaviti* are better examples for that. Migration to towns and cities helped them to acquire skills pertaining to building construction.

There are many experts from Chenchu community in building construction from the Appaipally village. This is a rare occupation among the Chenchus. Few Chenchu children are into English medium education because of their engagement in building construction in cities. There are around 30 percent of the Chenchu families of the village regularly migrating to urban centres for wage labour. But none of these families are settled in an urban centre. They usually come to the village once or twice in a year. Everybody comes back at the time of *Dasara* festival and also prefers to attend *Peerlu* (Muharram) festival. The Chenchus who have migrated from the core territory to fringe or multi-ethnic villages are becoming wage labourers and occasionally cultivators. For example, the Chenchu families who have shifted from Appapuram to Appaipally

became wage labourers and few members of these families are migrating to cities for work. Few others who migrated from Bourapuram to Billakallu are practicing cultivation.

The large-scale migration for work may be attributed to the displacement of Chenchus from their natural habitat. The establishment of the Rajeev Gandhi National Park (Project Tiger) is a major factor in this regard. Some Chenchus were forcibly shifted from the forest and some others shifted due to the increasing attacks by the wild animals. Some others were moved away from the forest due to the Naxalite movement. The attacks by the police as well as by Naxalites made them homeless. They have not only lost the home but also lost their livelihood. The government provided them with small plots of cultivable land without any training. As they are not accustomed to agriculture they left the lands fallow. They have also abandoned the indigenous making of liquor due to the restrictions from the Excise Department of Government of Andhra Pradesh. As the habit is most prevalent across all age groups of both the gender, their dependence on outsiders has increased in this regard. Unlike in olden days, they are in need of money for getting liquor. Their dependence on currency increased not only for liquor but for many other needs. In such circumstances, they are compelled to engage in the activities which give some money. Gradually, they have entered into agricultural labour and construction labour. This helped the contractors to trap them easily by offering huge amount as an advance. But, this amount was never saved by any Chenchu in bank or in some other institution. The amount ruthlessly spent on liquor and celebration of ceremonies and festivals. As a result, they are neither acquiring assets nor leading a comfortable life.

The migration from rural areas to urban centres is very popular than any other kind of migration. But this kind of migration is two types. One is the migration for wage labour to distant territories in search of livelihood and the other is the migration due to the availability of better opportunities (employment) and betterment in the financial condition. The first type of migrants never settles in an urban centre whereas, the second type of migrants settles in an urban centre in course of time. The first category are mere wage labourers and live in the temporary huts erected in the slums of urban centres whereas the second category of migrants are government or private employees drawing good salary and live in a better house located in hygienic places in towns. The intra-community and inter-community interaction of both the groups varies in its basic nature and depends on various interacting groups in a given situation. The output of interaction of non-settled migrants never crystallized and often expressed in overt behaviour whereas, the behavioural patterns are usually internalized among the urban settlers. The destinations for non-settled migrants are major cities of the country far away from Nallamalai which include Hyderabad, Visakhapatnam, Guntur, Vijayawada, Rajahmundry, Bhubaneswar, Bhopal, Bangalore, Chennai, Mumbai etc. In the course of migration, the Chenchus come across different people despite their failure to communicate with them in several cases. Interaction with different groups at different

places influenced and reflected in their behaviour at their hamlet. The migrant settlers usually settle in an urban centre which is relatively close to their original habitation. The new home is usually not farer than 50km from their natal hamlet. For example, the employed Chenchus of Lingal and Balmoormadals of Mahabubnagar district are usually settling in the nearest town Achempet. The Chenchus of Amarabadmandal are settling in Amarabad or Mannanur of the same district. The Chenchus of Kollapurmandal prefer to settle in Kollapur town of the Mahabubnagar district. In the same way, the employed Chenchus of Kurnool district prefers to settle in Srisailam and Atmakur towns of the same district.

Few Chenchus of Srisailam town are said to be original inhabitants. However, most of the settlers came from closest *pentas* and people from other communities are also migrants. The Chenchus of Prakasam district prefer to settle in towns like Dornala, Markapur, and Yerragondapalem. The Chenchus of Guntur district prefer to settle in Macherla town of the same district. The Chenchus settled in urban centres are not facing much difficulty because of their experience of having regular communication with town's people either for educational purposes or any other kind of needs. The women are also adjusting to the new environment. However, they are finding it difficult to communicate with outsiders in a town.

CONCLUSION

The movement of people from one territory to other may create culture shock among the new arrivals in the first instance but they gradually adjust and accommodate to the new order of life. Migration brings different new groups together and they may involve in cultural exchange over a period of time. The out-migration of the Chenchus and the in-migration of the non-Chenchus led to cultural exchange among different ethnic groups. The occupational choices of Chenchus have been expanded. Those changes have significant impact on the social and economic life. The family is becoming neo-local.

But, they are not establishing permanent residence at the work place because a person may be given work at different places every year. There are changes in the celebration of ceremonies. The incidence of polygyny reduced. The educational levels of the Chenchus are improving. Voluntary migration to cities is sometimes helpful in creating awareness about health and other aspects. The acceptability to development interventions is getting increased. The 'digging stick culture' or 'bow and arrow culture' is gradually disappearing. The concept of savings is gradually developing. They are slowly moving from 'lack of an economic system' to 'consumer based market economy'. But, it is not the case with forced migrations. In fact, migration due to displacement from the natural environs has resulted in negative consequences to the community. For instance, once the masters over their work have become servants to

other because of their dependency for work. At the same time, occupational diversification is mostly toward wage labour which has not led to the development of skill set required to practice a consistent and sustainable occupation. Alternate capacity building programmes need to be devised in order to avoid the livelihood crisis of the community which may also relieve them from the psychological subjugation. Their culture has to be taken into consideration while doing this. Only then it will be possible to address the problems of tribal communities due to involuntary migration.

REFERENCES

- Aiyappan, A. 1948. *Report on the Socio-economic Conditions of the Aboriginal Tribes of the Province of Madras*. Madras: Government Press.
- Bates, C. and Carter, M. 1992. Tribal Migration in India and Beyond. In G. Prakash (ed.). *The World of the Rural Labour in Colonial India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, pp. 205-245.
- Bhowmick, P.K. 1992. *Chenchus of the Forest and Plateaux: A Hunting-Gathering Tribe in Transition*. Calcutta: ISRAA.
- Bird, K. and Deshingkar, P. 2009. *Circular Migration in India*. Policy Brief No. 4, Prepared for the World Development Report 2009.
- Buchanan, F. 1807. *A Journey from Madras Through the Countries of Mysore, Canara, and Malabar*. Vol. 1. London: Cadell and W. Davies.
- Chetty, G. 1886. *Andhra Pradesh District Gazetteers: A Manual of the Kurnool District in the Presidency of Madras*. Madras: Government Press.
- Dayal, H. and Karan, A.K. 2003. *Labour Migration from Jharkhand*. New Delhi: Institute for Human Development.
- Deshingkar, P. and Start, D. 2003. Seasonal Migration for Livelihoods in India: Coping, Accumulation and Exclusion. ODI Working Paper, 220.
- Dwivedi, R. 2012. Migration: An Overview and Relevant Issues. *Management Insight*, **8**(2): 25-33.
- Fargues, P. 2011. International Migration and the Demographic Transition: A Two-Way Interaction. *International Migration Review*, **45**(3): 588-614.
- Gupta, S.S. 2002. Migration and Ethnic Issues in North-East India. In G. Phukon (Ed.) *Ethnicity and Polity in South Asia*. New Delhi: South Asian Publishers, pp. 258-266.
- Haberfeld, Y., Menaria, R.K., Sahoo, B.B. and Vyas, R.N. 1999. Seasonal migration of rural labour in India. *Population Research and Policy Review*, **18**(6): 471-87.
- Haimendorf, C.V.F. 1943. *The Chenchus: Jungle Folk of Deccan*. London: Macmillan.
- Haimendorf, C.V.F. 1948. Culture Strata in the Deccan. *Man*, **48**: 87-90.
- Hodson, T.C. 1922. *The Primitive Culture of India*. Vol.1. London: The Royal Asiatic Society.

- Menon, G. 1995. The Impact of Migration on the Work and Status of Tribal Women in Orissa. In L Schenk-Sandbergen (Ed.) *Women and Seasonal Migration*. New Delhi: Sage.
- Mosse, D., Gupta, S., Mehta, M., Shah, V. and Rees, J. 1997. Seasonal labour migration in Tribal (Bhil) Western India. Report to DFID-India, New Delhi. KRIBP Working Paper, Centre for Development Studies University of Wales, Swansea.
- Mosse, D., Gupta, S., Mehta, M., Shah, V., Rees, J. and KRIBP Team. 2002. Brokered livelihoods: Debt, labour migration and development in tribal western India. *Journal of Development Studies*, **38**(5): 59–88.
- Pandey, D. 1998. Migrant Labour, Employment and Gender Dimension. *Indian Journal of Social Work*, **59**(3): 743-765.
- Perruchoud, R. 2004. *Glossary on Migration*. Geneva: International Organization for Migration.
- Rao, L.S., Deshingkar, P. and Farrington, J. 2006. From Survival to Strategy: Population Growth and Migration in Semi-Arid Andhra Pradesh, India. Written Evidence for the UK All Party Parliamentary Group on *Population Growth: Impact on the Millennium Development Goals*.
- Rao, L.S., Deshingkar, P. and Farrington, J. 2007. Tribal Land Alienation in Andhra Pradesh: Processes, Impacts and Policy Concerns. *Economic and Political Weekly*, **41**(52): 5401-5407.
- Reddy, B. 2002. *Drought-Proneness and Labour Migration: Socio-Economic Impact in a Telangana Village*. MPhil Dissertation, University of Hyderabad, India.
- Reddy, N.D. 2003. Economic Reforms and Travails of Circulating Labour of Dry Regions: A Case Study of Palamur Labour in Andhra Pradesh. *Labour and Development*, **9**(2): 137-54.
- Samal, C.K. 2006. Remittances and Sustainable Livelihoods in Semi-Arid Areas. *Asia-Pacific Development Journal*, **13**(2): 73-92.
- Scott, J. 1794. *History of Dekkan*. Vol. 2. London: Shrewsbury.
- Sinha, V.N.P. and Ataulloh, Md. 1987. *Migration: An Interdisciplinary Approach*. Delhi: Seema Publications.
- Society for Regional Research and Analysis. 2010. Migration of Tribal Women: Its Socio-economic Effects – An In-depth study of Chattisgarh, Jharkhand, M.P. and Orissa. A Report Submitted to Planning Commission, Government of India.
- Srivastava, R. and Sasikumar, S.K. 2003. An Overview of Migration in India, Its Impact and Key Issues. Paper presented at the Regional Conference on Migration, Development and Pro-Poor Policy Choices in Asia, Dhaka, Bangladesh, 22-24 June 2003.
- Srivastava, V.K. 2008. On Tribal Economy and Society. *The Eastern Anthropologist*, **61**(4): 534-548.

- Taylor, W. 1862. *Catalogue Raisonné of Oriental Manuscripts in the Government Library*. Vol. 3. Madras: Graves, Cookson and Co.
- Thurston, E. 1909. *Castes and Tribes of South India*. Madras: Government Press.
- Vaijanyanta, A. 1998. Advocating for the Rights of Construction Workers: Nirman's Experience. *Indian Journal of Social Work*, **59**(3): 847-863.
- Venkateswarlu, D. 2004. Child Labour in Hybrid Cottonseed Production in Gujarat and Karnataka. Retrieved from http://www.indianet.nl/Guj-Karn_cottonseed.doc (accessed March 15, 2014).
- Vijay, K. 2011. Labour Migration in Mahabubnagar: Nature and Characteristics. *Economic Political Weekly*, **XLVI**(2): 67-70.

