The Plural Temporality of the Notion of the Primitive

Text: Johanna Maj Schmidt

1st slide *Santhal Family* is a large-scale open air sculpture made by Ramkinkar Baij at Santiniketan in 1938 in what is today West Bengal. The group portrait represents a family from the Santhal tribe[1], composed of a mother, a father, a child, and a dog. It is widely considered to be the first modernist sculpture in India. When the artist made *Santhal Family*, he gave expression to something that was gaining ground on a global and on a local level: in those days, *primitivism* was held in high esteem on the global scene. At the same time, the intellectual elite that lived at Santiniketan sought to establish contact with the region's rural and Adivasi[2] population. For this reason, Rabindranath Tagore, who had founded the intellectual centre, invited two groups of Santhal to live at Santiniketan. Hence, in contrast to the romanticizing image of "the primitive", which dominated the distanced perspective of European modernists, the artists at Santiniketan encountered the Santhal on a daily basis.

2 The description of the Santiniketan art movement as "Contextual Modernism"[3] seems to be true of the artists' conviction that their modernism was constituted by the historical and physical context. The fact that Ramkinkar Baij (the artist who made *Santhal Family*) became part of the art world further enhanced the connection between folk-art and Indian modernist art, as he himself was from a rural background, being raised in a barber family and having spent his childhood among craftsmen. Up to that point, only educated people from the upper and middle classes had developed interest in folk-art, either in reaction to new trends in the West or to the valorization of self-reliance

1 As David Hardiman (1987: 13) demonstrates, the notion of the "tribe" appears to be contrived in India, not having any equivalent in Indian languages. Moreover, it has "strong evolutionist connotations" (ibid.: 14). Hence, he argues that the term Adivasi, which means "original inhabitant" seems preferable, suggesting relative freedom in precolonial India (ibid.: 11-12) and also because it is used by Adivasi themselves (ibid.: 16).

2 In this paper, I will use the term Adivasi due to the reasons that are mentioned above (2nd footnote).

3 This description refers to an exhibition, entitled "Santiniketan: The Making of a Contextual Modernism" (Kumar 1997), which was held at the National Gallery of Modern Art, New Delhi on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of Indian Independence. The exhibition was comprised of works of Nandalal Bose, Ramkinkar Baij, Benodebehari Mukherjee, and Rabindranath Tagore and curated by Siva R. Kumar (2013).

and village crafts, which had taken over the national movement. With Ramkinkar Baij's outdoor sculptures, which represented the life of rural and Adivasi people, subaltern subjects came into focus. As S. Santosh points out, the Santhal in Baij's sculptures are not represented according to "the primitive ideal". Rather, Baij "looks at modernity from a subaltern's point of view". In a sketch that his teacher, Nandanal Bose[4], made of Baij's *Santhal Family*, his work is presented in its natural environment at Santiniketan – a Santhal family passes by the heroic sculpture. Such was the liaison between modernism and tradition that defined Contextual modernism in India: "while the folk-idiom provides our modern artist with plenty of raw material for originality, he in turn gives it a universality which it never possessed in its traditional confines".

3 Already in the context of its origin, the colonial encounter, the idea of "the primitive" had multiple dimensions: On the one hand, it was constitutive of the hierarchical colonial relationship, aiming at distinguishing the "progressive" West from "primitive" societies that were regarded to be frozen in time. On the other hand, it inspired Western modernist artists to question the Euroethnic self, to critically respond to the dominant rational, objectified, scientific gaze and the anonymity of urban life. If the idea of "the primitive" had been constitutive of the colonial relationship, and the discourse about the appropriation of foreign sources kept on reenforcing the hierarchy between the centre and the periphery[5], the modernists in the periphery related to "the primitive" differently: While the colonial rulers were occupied with establishing and maintaining the basis of their rule, justifying it in civilizational terms, the colonized intellectuals had to pose questions about their collective identity. This self-questioning evoked "a new consciousness out of a subtle mixture of the old and new". As a result, the constant discursive repositioning of tradition and modernity gave rise not only to "alternative modernities" but also to "alternative modernisms". While *Western* modernists were appropriating the visual ideas of what were defined as "primitive" societies, *Indian*

4 Nandalal Bose led the art school Kala Bhavan Tagore had founded at Santiniketan. Bose also rejected the miniaturization that was promoted by the Bengal School (Kumar 1999: 16). However, Bose has been called the "most nationalist of Indian painters" (ibid.). His most famous pupils were Ramkinkar Baij and Benodebehari Mukherjee (Kumar 2013).

5 Partha Mitter (2008: 544) sees this ignorance towards non-Western modernisms as a result of the "monolithic, linear narrative of an art history that does not allow for difference".

artists, in turn, were inspired by the modernist style of the West. For them, the engagement with "the primitive" had subversive potential, given that traditional forms were still alive. On one side, the appropriation of modernism allowed Indian artists to form a (universal) modernist identity. On the other side, the modernist gesture towards "the primitive" "encouraged them to reconsider their own traditional antecedents". Hence, in reconciling Western modernism and traditional heritage with their own reality, Indian artists were seeking individuality. The revolutionary language of modernism and the very ambiguities within "primitivism" enabled them to "produce a counter modern discourse of resistance" by turning the West's outward gaze back to Europe. Thus, in contrast to Western primitivists, who were primarily concerned with the dilemmas of urban existence, for Indian artists "primitivism" proved to be an "effective method of politicizing culture" or, even, a "weapon against colonial culture". As Geeta Kapur postulates, Indian modernism resonated with debates over a national style, "occuring in tandem with anti-colonial struggles". The universalizing approach to tradition expressed itself differently in the context of the Swadeshi movement, e.g. in the self-essentializing Orientalism of the Bengal School, which Rabindranath Tagore accused for its mimicry of Western nationalism, as well as in the Contextual Modernism that he established at Santiniketan.

4 The intellectual centre at Santiniketan was marked by a cosmopolitan openness towards other cultures and, at the same time, by a sense of rootedness in the local environment. When Tagore established his school at Santiniketan in 1901, he described the experiment as "an indigenous attempt in adapting modern methods of education in a truly Indian cultural environment". Twenty years after the founding of the school, the institution was expanded to include the "world university" Visva-Bharati. Its motto could be translated as "where the world finds its nest". What did that mean in concrete terms? At Santiniketan, Tagore wanted to enhance cultural understanding at two levels: firstly, between the rural and urban, and secondly, between India and the West. Hence, at Visva-Bharati, he established a Centre for Rural Reconstruction as well as a Centre for

Advanced Study in Cultures. So, as much as Santiniketan was grounded on a sense of locality it was defined by a cosmopolitan openness towards other cultures.

So, the time in which *Santhal Family* was made was defined by the tensions between the traditional, the modern, the local, and the global – which found artistic expression in Indian modernism. 5 This context-specific perspective on the sculpture can, however, reveal only one of its possible meanings, at a certain moment in history: While the historiographical perspective enables us to interpret symbolic exchanges and power relations in past societies, it is blind to the symbolic value the work might have *beyond* the historical context of its creation. What gets lost in this approach is the art work's "ability to symbolize realities unknown to its own makers". As Alexander Nagel and Christopher Wood state in "The Plural Temporality of the Work of Art",

> the artwork is made [...] at some moment, but it also points away from that moment, backward to a remote, ancestral origin, perhaps, or to a prior artefact, or to an origin outside of time, in divinity. At the same time it points forward to all its future recipients who will activate and reactivate it as a meaningful event.

Having focussed on the historical context and the immediate environment, in which *Santhal Family* was created, I will now turn towards more abstract questions that it opens up in relation to a different spatio-temporal context. Based on the idea of the "plural temporality of the work of art", I want to catapult the sculpture out of its original place, confronting it with the supposed boundlessness of today's globalizing world. So, whereas the first part explored the specific relation of Indian modernism to "the primitive", what follows will be an elaboration on the question what "the primitive" might mean in the context of globalisation.

6 Today, the outdated notion of "the primitive" seems to stand in tension with the spatio-temporal

structure of the globalising world, in which the access to power is not primarily based on territorial hegemony. This analysis already anticipates the tensions that go along with the very conceptualization of the spatio-temporal nature of the present time. As Anthony Giddens famously put it, “globalisation has to do with the *thesis* that we now all live in one world”. This thesis has provoked different responses: while some have questioned the disruptive impact of “globalisation” as a neoliberal ideology, others, emphasising the loss of national sovereignty, have argued that the consequences of globalisation can be felt all around the globe. On the basis of Zygmunt Bauman's claim that the mastery of instantaneity constitutes the new source of power, the confrontation of “the global” with “the primitive” might unveil uneven concentrations of power that remain hidden behind the neoliberal ideology of a unified globe: What is excluded from the global “network”? What is rendered invisible under the premiss of “globality”? To put it bluntly, while Tagore, in his time, was concerned about the visible growth of inequalities between the urban and the rural and he tried to counter this development by destabilizing this clear devision, today we might have to begin by challenging the presumed globality of the village. This questioning proves necessary in order to render nevertheless existing divisions and time-lags visible. In other words, in light of “globalisation” the outdated notion of “the primitive” might remind us of the *unevenness* that only seems to be erased on the surface of the globalised world.

7 Furthermore, the subversive aspect the notion of “the primitive” had might raise questions in relation to the localizing tendencies (nationalism and fundamentalism) that go along with globalisation: To what extent are we able to live in a detraditionalising society that suspends justifications for actions based on the internal truth-claims of tradition? This question already inspired the Contextual Modernism at Santiniketan, which sought to establish a close connection with traditional life-worlds. Against the backdrop of a globalising world, the retreat of tradition can easily be associated with the growing pressure to “live in a more open and reflective way”.

8 But does the detraditionalising character of the globalising world enhance our level of consciousness at any rate? As Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak emphasises, along with globalisation processes we are facing new *epistemological* challenges that have to be taken seriously. Taking place in capital and data only, globalisation privileges a quantified, statisticalized approach that fails to recognize any "specificity at the metropolitan end". According to Spivak, the understanding of this new situation that is defined by a process of uniformization, engendered by global data and capital movement, requires a shift from the postcolonial to the global: With regard to the contemporaneity, associated with globalisation, she claims that methodologies based on modernity-tradition and colonial-postcolonial dichotomies have lost their applicability. Hence, the shift from the postcolonial to the global implies the demand for a new *way* of knowing.

Precisely because the "only apparently accessible contemporaneity [...] can no longer be interpreted by such nice polarities", Spivak makes a plea for an *aesthetic education* as a preparation for the cultural challenge of globalisation. By aesthetic education she means everything that trains "the imagination for epistemological performance of a different kind". – Wherein lies the potential or necessity of epistemological shifting? Spivak regards it as a continuous preparation that enables an "interruptive emergence of the ethical". This effort opens space for the uncertainty, on which all just societies are grounded, that cannot be sustained if the strategic, political calculus becomes the means and the end. Conceptualizing the ethical not as event but as task, she does not claim that an aesthetic education by itself is able to "save the world". Neither does she say that anything has such a capacity or that the idea of saving the world is meaningful. Quite in contrast, in *An Aesthetic Education in the Era of Globalization* Spivak aims at "sabotaging" Schiller, accusing him for his mistake to "turn the desire inscribed in philosophy into the possibility of its fulfilment". To make it clear, Spivak rejects the Schillerian view of "art as a balancing act that will save society". Nevertheless, she claims that an aesthetic education is needed in order to *supplement* the dominant logics of global capitalism, according to which the world is regarded as quantifiable, as merely

rational. In her view, an aesthetic education has the potential to raise to the surface the unevenness that exists despite the dominant impression of a uniformized globe.

9 At first glance, Spivak's emphasis on the importance of the aesthetic gaze as a supplement to the rationalization that is defining the processes of globalisation can be seen as reminiscent of the European modernists' desire to transcend the rational character of the Euroethnic self. However, while the European modernist engagement with the “primitive” art of the colonized presupposed a clear idea of the Other, the supposed oneness of the globalising world complicates the notion of alterity: How can the Other of “the global” be defined? Spivak's claim that an aesthetic education is needed as a supplement in the era of globalisation seems to point exactly to this question: Does the aesthetic by itself, rather than real people(s) (as the notion of “the primitive” suggested), become the Other of a globalising self that is, first and foremost, constituted by data and capital movement? If that is the case, in what sense might an aesthetic education respond to the cultural task of globalisation? In Spivak's view, the under-appreciated humanities help “to prepare the readerly imagination to receive the literary and thus go beyond the self-identity of nationalism toward the complex textuality of the international”. Spivak argues that the “play of language(s)” has the potential to put into question truth-claims based on national identity and, thus, it might help to decouple the “nation” from the nation-state. In her opinion, the civil society of a state has to be kept clear of nationalism, which loses its purpose in the context of globalised postcoloniality[6]. In this respect, Spivak stresses the democratic value of a comparativist perspective, as it “rids the mind of the narrowness of believing in one thing and not in other things”, seeking to undermine the “isolationist expansionism of mere nationalism”. Thus, for Spivak, epistemological engagement becomes a systemic task.

How can the “complex textuality of the international” be approached, in spite of the fact that the occurrence of “the global” is primarily based on the uniform language of data and capital? How and

6 Spivak argues that nationalism “sounds bad right after liberation” (2012: 291).

by whom is this textuality woven? What remains the unmapped territory of an imaginary that exceeds the boundaries of national identification? – Against the backdrop of these questions, the role of cultural custodianship in “guarding the secret” of what cannot be directly deciphered has to be taken into consideration. Spivak, who has been called the “doorkeeper” of Mahasweta Devi's fiction, which often deals with Adivasi life-worlds, repudiates any romanticization of the “tribal” and rejects the idea of keeping them “in a state of excluded cultural conformity”. In her role as translator, Spivak tries to reveal that “Mahasweta's work creates an alternative, subaltern discourse that undermines the authority of nationalist constructions of a unified, democratic India abroad”. But can positions of subalternity be depicted, without romanticizing or essentializing them? In *Imaginary Maps*, custodianship does not appear in terms of visible representation, materialized by image or sign. It can rather be traced in the weaving of the text, the secret of the narration: “there is always a sense that something has not got across”. As Filippo Menozzi points out, the ethics of custodianship can be understood as a

> call to transmit marginal experiences in their aliveness, a refusal to mourn the destruction of tribal cultures in a context where the life of these peoples is subjected to the neocolonial effects of “development” plans: economic exploitation and cultural annihilation.

1 0 This relation is defined by an “ethical singularity”, given that “the tribals remain largely spectators”. Spivak, who teaches in small villages in West Bengal, describes her students from the rural communities as “too subaltern to attack the indigenous knowledge or population control”. Due to the fact that their obedience is masked as self-help, they do not revolt against their wretchedness but accept it as normality. So, as the artists and intellectuals in Santiniketan did, Spivak seeks the contact with rural and Adivasi people. Drawing on the Gramscian attempt to epistemologize Marx' project, her teaching practice in Bengal is inspired by the idea of the subaltern intellectual as she aims at providing subaltern subjects a “chance at hegemony”. In resemblance to Rabindranath

Tagore, she stresses the importance of education in the mother-tongue, to which marginalized people should have access. In contrast, she does not primarily aim at consolidating polarities, such as the rural with the urban, or a sense of locality with a cosmopolitan openness. Grounded on her suggested move from the postcolonial to the global, she makes a claim for the ethical value of *epistemological* shifting that might disrupt the "computation of the globe into the abstract as such" – not least because such an abstraction renders invisible what cannot directly be expressed.

11 To sum up, in light of a globalising world the question of the Other, rather than referring to real people(s) – as the notion of "the primitive" suggested –, is concerning epistemological alterity. Hence, an aesthetic education might counter the reduction of globalisation to data and capital movement by confronting the hegemony of the arithmeticalizable flow of "signs" with the more ambiguous field of "traces" that symbolizes the cultural face of globalisation. Thereby, it might open space for the *imagining* of a global self with all its unevenness: Spivak's emphasis on an aesthetic awareness of nuances within, and differences between, language(s) as a preparation for the understanding of the "complex textuality of the international" suggests that it might enable the weaving of cultural nets that go beyond the boundaries produced by nationalism. In other words, an aesthetic education might offer a sense of cultural grounding in a globalising world that does not result in nationalist isolationism. Moreover, with regard to the secret aspects of "traditional" life-worlds, the aesthetic might be a means to approach what can neither be explicitly stated, nor statisticalized. To put it differently, in a detraditionalizing, globalising society that tends to translate "traces" into "signs", the marginalized "traditional" can only be guarded if its secrets are kept alive. Thus, Spivak's aesthetic education seeks to avoid both the merely rationalising force of globalisation as well as the seduction of new nationalisms "by training […] the mind for 12 epistemological freedom". Regarding the humanities as an important supplement to globalisation, Spivak is resolutely against their marginalization. Can we speak of a colonization of the mind, a primitivization of the trace in favour of the sign, in the context of "the global"?

From the beginning, the notion of "the primitive" stood in for a relationship of identities, as it sought to distinguish the collectivity of the colonizers from the colonized. Precisely because "the global" suggests a unified oneness, it is worthwhile to ask which us-and-them structures exist despite of, or because of, globalisation. 13 As Daniel Miller has argued, "the non-Us is an inevitable concomitant of social self-definition and the further we can push the images away from real peoples on to science, fiction, art, or fantasy the better". In a time, in which even the discourse of cultural difference is "packaged for transnational consumption"[7], the ability to *conceive* in different ways remains a refuge. The valorization of perceptiveness is, however, not limited to the era of globalisation. Already in the beginning of the 20th century, Victor Segalen highlighted in his "Essay on Exoticism" that

> the finer the difference, the more difficult it is to discern, the greater the awakening and stimulation of the feeling for Diversity. Red and green? Not at all! Red and reddish, then red and another red with an infinite number of gradations.

1 4 To be able to recognize a multiplicity of nuances of what appears to be one and the same requires practice. As Ramkinkar Baij, the maker of *Santhal Family,* put it, "You know what learning means? To know how to see [...]. This doesn't happen in a day either. It requires daily practice. Time...time".

---

7 The engagement with what was once called 'primitive' art has become "notorious for fetishizing traditional cultures" (Thomas 1999: 197). Nevertheless, the "preference for traditionalist work remains alive among wide audiences, for whom indigenous art styles have a freshness and distinctiveness that much postmodernist art lacks" (ibid.).

Literature

Ahuja, Naman P. (2007): Ramkinkar Through the Eyes of Devi Prasad. New Delhi: The School of Arts and Aesthetics.

Archarya, Poromesh (1997): Educational Ideals of Tagore and Gandhi A Comparative Study. In: *Economic and Political Weekly*, 32 (12), 601-606.

Archer, William (1959): India and Modern Art. London: Allen & Unwin Ltd.

Bandyopadhyay, Somendranath (2012): My Days with Ramkinkar Baij. New Delhi: Niyogi Books.

Bauman, Zygmunt (2012): Liquid Modernity. Cambridge: Polity Press.

BBC (2015): Charlie Hebdo Attack: Three Days of Terror, 14 January 2015. [14 August 2015]. Available from: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-30708237.

Bhattacharya, Malini (2003): The Long Quest for Modernity. In: Datta, P. K. (ed.), Rabindranath Tagore's The Home and the World. A Critical Companion, 127-142. Delhi: Permanent Black.

Blake, William (2008): The Complete Poetry and Prose of William Blake. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Blakeney Williams, Louise (2007): Overcoming the “Contagion of Mimicry”: The Cosmopolitan Nationalism and Modernist History of Rabindranath Tagore and W. B. Yeats. In: *The American Historical Review*, 112 (1), 69-100.

Chaudhuri, Supriya (2010): Modernisms in India. In: Brooker, Peter et al. (eds.), The Oxford Handbook of Modernisms. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 942-960.

Chopra, Suneet (1990): The Folk in Modern Art. In: *India International Centre Quarterly*, 17 (2), 63-81.

Clifford, James (1981): On Ethnographic Surrealism. In: *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 23 (4), 539-564.

Cohn, Bernhard S. (1996): Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge. The British in India.

Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Das Gupta, Uma (2002-2003): In Pursuit of a Different Freedom: Tagore's world university at Santiniketan. In: *India International Centre Quarterly*, 29 (3/4), 25-38.

Das Gupta, Uma (2009): Introduction. In: Das Gupta, Uma (ed.), The Oxford India Tagore. Selected Writings on Education and Nationalism. Oxford: Oxford University Press, xix-xxxvi.

Dasgupta, Anshuman (2008): Ramkinkar and Modernity. In: Dasgupta, Anshuman et al. (eds.), Santhal Family, Positions Around an Indian Sculpture. Antwerpen: Museum van Hedendaagse Kunst Antwerpen, 20-33.

Datta, Pradip Kumar (2003): Introduction. In: Datta, Pradip Kumar (ed.), Rabindranath Tagore's The Home and the World. A Critical Companion, 1-26. Delhi: Permanent Black.

Dossal, Mariam (2010): Theatre of Conflict, City of Hope. Mumbai. 1660 to Present Time. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fusco, Maria (2008): Santhal Family. [13 August 2015]. Available from: http://www.frieze.com/issue/print_back/santhal_family/.

Giddens, Anthony (2002): Runaway World. How Globalisation is Reshaping our Lives. London: Profile Books Ltd.

Goldwater, Robert (1986): Primitivism in Modern Art. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Goonatilake, Susantha (1995): The Self Wandering Between Cultural Localization and Globalization. In: Nederveen Pieterse, Jan/Parekh, Bhikhu (eds.), The Decolonization of Imagination. Culture, Knowledge and Power. London: Zed Books Ltd., 225- 239.

Groom, Amelia (2013): Introduction//We're Five Hundred Years Before the Man We Just Robbed Was Born. In: Groom, Amelia (ed.), Time. Documents of Contemporary Art. London: The MIT Press, 12-25.

Guha-Thakurta, Tapati (1992): The Making of a New “Indian” Art. Artists, Aesthetics and Nationalism in Bengal, c. 1850-1920. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hardiman, David (1987): The Coming of the Devi: Adivasi Assertion in Western India. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harvey, David (2009): Cosmopolitanism and the Geographies of Freedom. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hiller, Susan (1991): Editor's Foreword. In: Hiller, Susan (ed.), The Myth of Primitivism. London: Routledge, 1-4.

Kapur, Geeta (2000): When Was Modernism. Essays on Contemporary Cultural Practice in India. New Delhi: Tulika Books.

Keane, Webb (2007): Christian Moderns. Freedom & Fetish in the Mission Encounter. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kumar, Siva R. (1997): Santiniketan: The Making of a Contextual Modernism. New Delhi: National Gallery of Modern Art.

Kumar, Siva R. (1999): Modern Indian Art: A Brief Overview. In: *Art Journal*, 58 (3), 14-21.

Kumar, Siva R. (2013): All the Shared Experiences of the Lived World II. Concluding Part of the Conversation Between Siva R. Kumar and Parvez Kabir on Art Practice an its History. [13 August 2015]. Available from: http://humanitiesunderground.org/all-the-shared-experiences-of-the-lived-world-ii/.

Lawton, Thomas (1993): Dr. Stella Kramrisch May 29, 1898-August 31, 1993. In: *Artibus Asiae*, 53 (3/4), 499-500.

Mahmood, Saba (2009): Religious Reason and Secular Affect: An Incommensurable Divide? In: Asad, Talal [et al.] (eds.), Is Critique Secular? Blasphemy, Injury, and Free Speech. Berkeley: University of California Press, 64-100.

Menozzi, Filippo (2014): Postcolonial Custodianship. Cultural and Literary Inheritance. New York: Routledge.

Miller, Daniel (1991): Primitive Art and the Necessity of Primitivism to Art. In: Hiller, Susan (ed.), The Myth of Primitivism. London: Routledge, 35-52.

Mitchell, W. J. T. (2005): What Do Pictures Want? The Lives and Loves of Images. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Mitter, Partha (2007): The Triumph of Modernism: India's Artists and the Avant-garde 1922-1947. London: Reaction Books Ltd.

Mitter, Partha (2008): Decentering Modernism: Art History and Avant-Garde Art from the Periphery. In: *The Art Bulletin*, 90 (4), 531-548.

Nagel, Alexander/Wood, Christopher (2010): The Plural Temporality of the Work of Art, Anachronic Renaissance. New York: Zone Books.

Nandy, Ashis (1994): The Illegitimacy of Nationalism. Rabindranath Tagore and the Politics of Self. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Nederveen Pieterse, Jan/Parekh, Bhikhu (1995): Shifting Imaginaries: Decolonization, Internal Decolonization, Postcoloniality. In: Nederveen Pieterse, Jan/Parekh, Bhikhu (eds.), The Decolonization of Imagination. Culture, Knowledge and Power. London: Zed Books Ltd, 1-19.

Picasso (2003): Discovery of African Art. 1906-1907. In: Flam, Jack/Deutch, Miriam (eds.), Primitivism and Twentieth-century Art. A Documentary History. Berkeley: University of California Press, 33-34.

Piper, Adrian (1993): The Logic of Modernism. In: *Callaloo*, 16 (3), 574-578.

Radhakrishna, Meena (2001): Dishonoured by History. 'Criminal Tribes' and British Colonial Policy. New Delhi: Orient Longman Limited.

Rao, Rahul (2010): Third World Protest: Between Home and the World. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rhodes, Colin (1997): Primitivism and Modern Art. London: Thames and Hudson.

Robertson, Roland (1995): Glocalization. Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity. In: Featherstone, Mike/Lash, Scott/Robertson, Roland (eds.), Global Modernities. London: Sage Publications, 25-44.

Rosa, Hartmut/Scheuerman, William E. (2009): Introduction. In: Rosa, Hartmut/Scheuerman, William E. (eds.), High-Speed Society. Social Acceleration, Power, and Modernity. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1-29.

Russo, Alessandra (2010): Roundtable: The Global Before Globalisation. In: *October*, 133 (Summer), 3-19.

Rycroft, Daniel (2012): Geeta Kapur, 'When Was Modernism in Indian Art?' (1995). In: Newall, Diana/Pooke, Grant (eds.), Fifty Key Texts in Art History. New York: Routledge, 206-210.

Sakar, Sumit (2010): The Swadeshi Movement in Bengal. 1903-1908. Ranikhet: Permanent Black.

Salgado, Minoli (2000): Tribal Stories, Scribal Worlds: Mahasweta Devi and the Unreliable Translator. In: *Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, 35 (1), 131-145.

Santosh, S. (2012): What Was Modernism (in Indian Art)? In: *Social Scientist*, 40 (5/6), 59-75.

Segalen, Victor (2002): Essay on Exoticim. An Aesthetics of Diversity. Durham: Duke University.

Seth, Sanjay (2007): Subject Lessons. The Western Education of Colonial India. Durham: Duke University Press.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (1996): Translator's Preface and Afterword to Mahashweta Devi, Imaginary Maps. In: Landry, Donna/Maclean, Gerald (eds.), The Spivak Reader. New York: Routledge, 267-286.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (2012): An Aesthetic Education in the Era of Globalization. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Sprinker, Michael (2003): Homeboys: Nationalism, Colonialism, and Gender in The Home and the World. In: Datta, Pradip Kumar (ed.), Rabindranath Tagore's The Home and the World. A Critical Companion. Delhi: Permanent Black, 107-126.

Tagore, Rabindranath (2008): The Home and the World. Radford: Wilder Publications.

Tagore, Rabindranath (2010): Nationalism. London: Penguin Books.

Thomas, Nicholas (1999): Possessions. Indigenous Art/Colonial Culture. London: Thames and Hudson Ltd.

Watson, Grant (2008): Introduction. In: Dasgupta, Anshuman et al. (eds.), Santhal Family. Positions Around an Indian Sculpture. Antwerpen: Museum van Hedendaagse Kunst Antwerpen, 3-7.

Woods, Christopher (2010): Roundtable: The Global Before Globalisation. In: *October*, 133 (Summer), 3-19.

Appendix

Ramkinkar Baij, *Santhal Family,* 1938, direct cement concrete. Image: *frieze*, 115 (May 2008).
Available from: http://www.frieze.com/issue/review/santhal_family/.

Nadalal Bose, *Santhal Family*. Image: Chopra 1999: 72.

Ramkinkar Baij, *Mill Call*, 1956, direct cement. Image: Frontline 2012, 29(5).
Available from: http://www.frontline.in/static/html/fl2905/stories/20120323290506400.html.