International Research Journal of Humanities, Language and Literature
ISSN: (2394-1642)
Impact Factor 5.401 Volume 7, Issue 3, March 2020
Association of Academic Researchers and Faculties (AARF)
Website-www.aarf.asia, Email : editor@aarf.asia , editoraarf@gmail.com

David Ludden's *A Brief History of Subalternity*: A Critical Sudy

Dr Jalil Uddin Ahmed
Assistant Professor in English
N. C College, Badarpur, Assam

Introduction

The Subaltern Studies project is one of the most important developments in modern South Asian history writing. It began in the early 1980s under the leadership of Ranajit Guha and a group of like-minded historians. Their goal was to correct the "elitist bias" in Indian historiography. Most earlier histories had focused on colonial rulers or nationalist leaders, while ordinary peasants, workers, and tribal groups remained invisible. Subaltern Studies sought to highlight the voices, experiences, and political actions of these marginalized groups.

As David Ludden explains in *A Brief History of Subalternity in South Asia*, the project changed over time. It started with a focus on peasant uprisings and mass politics, but later shifted towards issues of culture, discourse, and representation

Subaltern Studies became well known not only in India but also across the world, influencing scholarship in Latin America, Africa, and the United States. At the same time, it attracted criticism for creating a rigid divide between "elite" and "subaltern," and for sometimes neglecting economic realities.

This essay gives a critical overview of the origins, key ideas, transformations, and global reception of Subaltern Studies. It will also assess its strengths and weaknesses, and reflect on its continuing relevance.

Origins of Subaltern Studies

The idea of Subaltern Studies grew out of debates in the 1970s. At that time, two approaches dominated Indian history writing.

1. **The Cambridge School**: This group, based mainly at Cambridge University, wrote about Indian politics in terms of elites, cliques, and institutions. They argued that Indian nationalism was less about ideology and more about competition for power among local leaders. Critics said this approach ignored popular struggles and drained the radical spirit from Indian history.
2. **Marxist Histories**: Marxist historians gave more importance to class conflict and economic structures. They studied peasant revolts and working-class movements. However, their focus on class often overshadowed the independent role of other identities like caste, tribe, and gender.

Ranajit Guha and his colleagues wanted to go beyond both. Inspired by Antonio Gramsci's idea of the "subaltern" and by E.P. Thompson's *The Making of the English Working Class* (1963), they proposed to write "history from below" in a South Asian context. Guha's book *Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India* (1983) became the model. It argued that peasant uprisings had their own logic and should not be understood only through the lens of elite politics.

The first six volumes of *Subaltern Studies* (1982–1989) contained essays on peasant rebellions, colonial policing, tribal resistance, and popular protests. Historians like Shahid Amin, David Arnold, Dipesh Chakrabarty, Partha Chatterjee, David Hardiman, and Sumit Sarkar contributed. Their work challenged nationalist and colonial historians who had overlooked the role of the masses.

The Subaltern as a Concept

The word "subaltern" originally meant "inferior rank." In Subaltern Studies, it referred to groups who were outside elite circles: peasants, workers, tribes, women, Dalits, and others excluded from power. Guha argued that these groups had their own "autonomous domain" of politics, separate from both colonial rulers and nationalist leaders.

This was a powerful idea because it shifted attention to people who had been ignored. But it also created problems. The strict division between "elite" and "subaltern" made society look like two floors of a building, with little connection between them. In reality, the boundaries were more fluid: subaltern groups often interacted with elites, joined wider movements, or accepted leadership from above. Critics, especially Marxists writing in *Social Scientist*, argued that it was misleading to treat subaltern politics as completely independent (Singh et al. 1984).

Another issue was the relation to Gramsci. While the project borrowed the term "subaltern" from him, it moved away from his Marxist framework. Instead, it tried to create an Indian version of the concept. Ludden notes that this made subalternity appear new, even though earlier Indian historians had already written about peasants and popular struggles

Shifts in Focus: From Politics to Culture

By the mid-1980s, Subaltern Studies began to change direction. The early focus was on recording peasant revolts and mass movements. Later volumes turned towards culture, language, and representation. This reflected wider global trends in the humanities, such as the rise of poststructuralism and postcolonial theory.

The publication of *Selected Subaltern Studies* (1988), with a foreword by Edward Said and an introduction by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, marked this shift. Spivak's essay "Can the Subaltern Speak?" (1988) questioned whether the voices of the oppressed could ever be recovered directly, since historians and intellectuals inevitably speak on their behalf.

Dipesh Chakrabarty's writings also pushed the project towards theory. He argued that historians must think about how subaltern "consciousness" could be studied without reducing it to elite categories. Partha Chatterjee's *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World* (1986) analyzed how Indian nationalism was shaped by colonial discourses, showing that even anti-colonial leaders could not escape Western categories.

Ranajit Guha's later essay "Dominance Without Hegemony" (1997) presented colonialism as a system that ruled India by force rather than genuine consent. Together, these works moved the project closer to cultural history and discourse analysis. Subaltern Studies became less about

peasants in revolt and more about how colonial power was constructed and resisted in texts, institutions, and cultural practices.

Criticism and Dissent

The shift from politics to culture created tensions inside and outside the project.

- **Marxist Critiques**: Marxist historians accused Subaltern Studies of abandoning material analysis. They argued that focusing too much on discourse ignored issues like land, labor, and class struggle. Sumit Sarkar, who had once been a central member, eventually left the group. He criticized what he called its "Foucauldian turn" and warned that excessive focus on culture could depoliticize history (Sarkar 1997).
- **Feminist and Dalit Critiques**: Early volumes neglected women and caste oppression. Later, scholars like Susie Tharu, Tejaswini Niranjana, and Kamala Visweswaran brought gender into the discussion. Dalit scholars pointed out that caste was often treated as secondary to class or as part of a general "subaltern" category, which diluted its specific history.
- **Other Dissenters**: Ramachandra Guha criticized the rigid "elite–subaltern" divide and argued for more attention to environmental and ecological issues. Scholars like Vinay Bahl stressed the need to connect subalternity with global capitalism, rather than treating it only as a cultural problem.

Despite these criticisms, the project remained influential because it kept opening new debates and forcing historians to rethink assumptions.

Global Reception

Subaltern Studies quickly moved beyond India. By the 1990s, it had become a well-known intellectual trend worldwide.

- **In the United States**, it was read alongside postcolonial theory and cultural studies. Scholars used it to think about identity, difference, and representation.
- **In Latin America**, the Subaltern Studies model inspired the *Latin American Subaltern Studies Group* (1990s). Historians like Florencia Mallon tried to apply similar methods to Latin American peasants and indigenous groups (Mallon 1994).
- **In Africa**, historians such as Frederick Cooper engaged with subalternity in relation to labor and colonialism.

However, the meaning of subalternity changed across contexts. In India, it was tied to debates about nationalism, Marxism, and communalism. In the West, it often became a theoretical tool detached from local politics. Ludden points out that subalternity was not a fixed idea but something that shifted depending on where and how it was read.

Relevance Today

Subaltern Studies remains important, but its role has changed. On the positive side, it opened up Indian history to voices and perspectives that had long been ignored. It showed that peasants, workers, and marginalized groups had their own forms of politics and culture. It also connected South Asian history with global debates in postcolonial studies.

But its limitations are equally clear. The strict divide between elite and subaltern oversimplified reality. Later focus on discourse sometimes ignored economic struggles. Women, Dalits, and

indigenous groups were initially sidelined. And in today's context, the rise of Hindu nationalism (Hindutva) raises new questions. Subaltern Studies' global authority to "speak for India" can sometimes overshadow the diversity and contradictions within India itself (Sarkar 1997).

Many scholars now argue for combining the insights of Subaltern Studies with renewed attention to material issues: capitalism, globalization, ecological change, and state power.

Conclusion

Subaltern Studies was one of the boldest experiments in rewriting history in the late 20th century. It started as a challenge to colonial and nationalist elitism and gave new importance to the lives and struggles of ordinary people. Over time, it moved into cultural and postcolonial theory, reshaping not only South Asian studies but also global scholarship. Yet it was never free of problems. Its sharp division between elite and subaltern, its drift away from material analysis, and its neglect of certain groups limited its effectiveness. At the same time, these very debates kept the project alive and dynamic. As Ludden reminds us, there is no single intellectual history of subalternity. It is a "moveable feast" that takes different meanings in different place

The real legacy of Subaltern Studies lies not in a fixed theory but in its challenge to historians: to question dominant narratives, to search for hidden voices, and to write history that does justice to the diversity of human experience.

References:

- Guha, Ranajit. *Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Guha, Ranajit. "On Some Aspects of the Historiography of Colonial India." *Subaltern Studies I* (1982).
- Ludden, David. *A Brief History of Subalternity in South Asia*. In *Reading Subaltern Studies*, ed. D. Ludden. Delhi: Permanent Black, 2002.
- Sarkar, Sumit. *Writing Social History*. Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, eds. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988.
- Thompson, E. P. *The Making of the English Working Class*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1963.
- Chatterjee, Partha. *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse?* London: Zed Books, 1986.
- Mallon, Florencia. "The Promise and Dilemma of Subaltern Studies: Perspectives from Latin American History." *American Historical Review* 99, no. 5 (1994): 1491–1515.
- Singh, Sangeeta . "On the Historiography of Colonial India: A Critique." *Social Scientist* 12, no. 1 (1984): 3–27.