



Communication and Culture Review

2021, Vol. 4, No.1&2, 19-30

ISSN: 2582-2829

Nurturing Linguistic Diversity in Grassroots: Possibilities of Community Media in the International Decade of Indigenous Languages

Hazeena T

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the ways in which community media in India engages with the languages of indigenous communities and reasserts the case for leveraging its potential to nurture those tongues in the International Decade of Indigenous Languages. In doing so, it presents a case study of Radio Kotagiri, a community radio in the Nilgiris district in the Southern state of Tamil Nadu. The paper draws its data from a broader ethnographic study conducted in 2021. To situate the arguments, the paper also comes into a dialogue with scholarship on language attrition, community media, media anthropology and minority media studies. Through three thematic sub-sections in the discussion, the paper demonstrates the community media practices in relation to indigenous languages in the local context and the implications of such practices for its stakeholders.

Keywords: Community Media, Indigenous Languages, Adivasi Communities, The Nilgiris.

Introduction

The United Nations general assembly announced the decade 2022-2032 as the International Decade of Indigenous Languages to emphasise the vulnerable state of languages of many indigenous communities worldwide and called for mobilising resources to revitalise and promote those tongues. It is primarily an outcome of the activities as part of the 2019 International Year of Indigenous Languages, especially the Los Pinos declaration. This action plan was put together by participants from 50 countries in a high-level event collaboratively organised by UNESCO and Mexico in February 2020. The preamble of the Los Pinos Declaration foregrounds the importance of language diversity in a spectrum of domains such as knowledge production, understanding human relations with nature, social cohesion, and co-existence. It also reaffirms the right provisions in various other international declarations, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, the United Nations Declaration of Rights of Indigenous People in 2007, and the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights in 1966 concerning languages.

Furthermore, human rights and sustainable development frameworks are repeatedly invoked in the Los Pinos Declaration to situate the action plan. It also invited UNESCO to be the lead agency for the proposed decade-long project. Even though the objective of reversing the critical condition of indigenous languages by the end of this plan seems far-fetched, a global-scale intervention stressing the indigenous language vulnerability is highly demanded by many quarters of society. The declaration stresses appropriating technologies, media and the digital in its points listed from 36 to 40 as tools to aid the larger goals of indigenous language empowerment.

It is relevant here to recall that by the end of the 20th century, indigenous people in Australia, North America and Latin America pioneered using media technologies to address their interests which Ginsburg (2008) refers to as cultural activism. Writing on Inuit television, Ginsburg (2002) observes that,

For them, these media practices are part of their broader project of constituting a cultural future in which their traditions and contemporary technologies are combined in ways that can give new vitality to Inuit life. (p. 43)

Thus, integrating the possibilities of media technologies is a strategic move indigenous people adopt to expand their broader struggles concerning territory, culture, language, knowledge, dignity and sovereignty (Belotti, 2022; Ginsburg, 2002; Prins, 2002). The arguments put forth by scholars regarding media democratisation also address the right of people to communicate in their languages using media tools owned and managed by local communities as a response to the dominant capitalistic media order. Given this background, this paper offers an account of community media in India foregrounding its engagements with indigenous languages through discussing a case study of Radio Kotagiri. By doing so, the paper reaffirms the possibilities that exist in community media in the realm of supporting indigenous languages. Qualitative data for the present paper is drawn from a broader ethnographic study conducted by the author in 2021.

Before moving forward, this paper must acknowledge the ambiguities that exist in universally defining indigenous people. A comprehensive analysis of discourses about it is beyond the scope of this paper. Nevertheless, as scholars demonstrated, it is critical to realise that conversations around indigeness encompass the provisions of pursuing a set of aspirations or grievances by groups (Kingsbury, 1998) and more that have immediate consequences on their

lives. This paper uses the term indigenous interchangeably with Adivasis, officially categorised as scheduled tribes in India. The next section of the paper presents a brief overview of the literature on community media.

Locating Community Media

It is difficult to pinpoint one comprehensive definition of community media because of the various ways it has been theorised and practised worldwide. My use of community media in this paper encompasses an umbrella of terms such as citizens' media, alternative media, grassroots media, indigenous media, ethnic media and radical media used by various scholars to refer to the employment of media technologies by lay people and marginalised groups who often lack access to communication infrastructures otherwise. Appropriation of mass media technologies by communities reflects a broad spectrum of objectives, historical trajectories, functioning models and so forth (Raghunath, 2020). Raghunath (2020) writes that some common characteristics of community media include ownership and management by a geographically or otherwise defined community, primarily working as a third tier of media outside the public and private, non-profit model of functioning, and facilitating communities' right to communicate.

During the late 20th century, substantial global disparities in international communication became a hot topic of debate, especially after the MacBride report in 1980. The democratisation of communicative structures through different means was proposed by many to lessen this inequality in a growing globalised world (Rodriguez, 2001). Debates spearheaded by countries known as the third world then suggested New World Information and Communication Order (NWICO) as a political project to claim their communicative rights in the international arena. Even though NWICO failed afterwards, it invigorated people to find ways to confront and transform communicative disparities suffered by the poor and marginalised nations and groups. In addition to the failure of the international community to intervene in the unbalanced structure, 'third world' countries succumbed to the modernising pressure whereby they opened their doors to privatising media and communication.

Rodriguez (2001) notes that it is the defeat of both international agencies and national governments that made scholars think about a different route, and "the new perspective visualised social movements and grassroots organisations and their alternative media as the new key players in the processes of democratisation of communication" (p. 14). This alternative communicative infrastructure was about alternative content (contextual/local/community's interest/ignored issues by national and private media) and alternative ways of existing (community participation/non-profit making/horizontal communication).

In this sense, community media was envisioned as platforms that hold the principles of democracy and diversity against the homogenisation tendencies of globalisation. Scholars in the field also locate community media within the framework of communicative rights, where these infrastructures become sites for the marginalised and poor to raise their voices and concerns (Raghunath, 2020). In addition, community media also received much attention within the development discourse, in which it was anticipated to aid the development interests of the states and international agencies. Community media in social change communication also came to life to counter the diffusion models of development communication premised on behavioural changes (Pavarala & Malik, 2007). Among the many forms of media, radio became quite popular in the community media scene worldwide because of its flexibility and affordability. What we now recognise as the earliest community media experiments were done with radio (O'Conner, 1990).

In India, media was the monopoly of the state up until the 1990s. The Indian broadcasting sector has been influenced by its historical relations to colonialism. The state broadcaster All India Radio (AIR) was set up by the British colonial rulers in 1930. And it remained the only broadcaster in the country until the late 1990s. Following independence, AIR was used to promote the national government's development agendas for modernising the country (Backhaus, 2019). In 1999, the Indian government opened the radio spectrum to private players amidst many communities, activists and civil society organisations advocating for the rights of communities to own and operate radios (Pavarala & Malik, 2007). Nearly a decade after the historic ruling by the apex court of India declaring airwaves as public property in 1995, the union government allowed established educational institutions to run community radios. It received criticism from community radio advocates in the country for diluting community radio's philosophy. The persistent effort by various stakeholders continued campaigning for communities' rights to communication. In 2006 the union cabinet approved the policy draft allowing civil society organisations to apply for licences for community radios in India. According to the Indian Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, 290 community radios are operational across India, catering to diverse communities. The real-world operations of community radio in India are far from the perfect picture because of many reasons, mainly political and economic. There are scholars whose works offer a critical look at the practice of community radio in India (Backhaus, 2022; Pavarala, 2020). Nonetheless, it remains relevant for many marginalised communities as a medium that carries their voice, however limited it might be.

Language Attrition; Causes and Consequences

Among all the languages identified so far, 4000 are spoken by indigenous people worldwide. It is remarkable considering the fact that the indigenous population amounts to just six per cent of the global population. Toth (2022), writing on the death of indigenous languages, notes that we live in a time of mass extinction of languages, particularly indigenous languages that are vanishing at a rate of one every two weeks. Some predictions anticipate the disappearance of half of the identified languages by 2100 and 95 per cent by the end of the century (Toth, 2022). Inuit languages spoken in the Arctic region and aboriginal languages in Australia are examples of languages on the verge of disappearance (Moseley, 2007; Toth, 2022). While facing this grim reality, we must pursue some basic questions to understand why we should be bothered about language attrition. In human societies, language is not only a communication tool but also part of their distinctive group identities, culture and knowledge about the world around them (Toth, 2022). It is through the languages communities pass their knowledge about their habitats and kinships among others from one generation to another. People have written about indigenous languages and their close relations with the knowledge of the communities' natural habitats; thus, language attrition significantly affects ecological knowledge embedded in specific languages (LaPier, 2018; Nations, 2015; Sax, 2019).

...speakers of languages indigenous to a particular area tend to have a unique and intimate knowledge of the flora and fauna and the natural resources of their own habitat, one which often outstrips the widespread Western languages in its ability to divide up and classify the natural world. This would be reason enough for their preservation if language was just the business of naming things; but language is much more than that. It also reflects man's affective relation to the perceived cosmos... (Moseley, 2007, p. xii)

Another critical question is how languages are disappearing, and there has been considerable growth in scholarly interest in this question. Understanding the phenomenon of language attrition became necessary because of the unprecedented rate at which languages have

been disappearing in the last couple of decades. Janson (2002), illustrating the history of languages, writes that languages are not stable entities but constantly emerging and shifting ones. Minor languages face enormous pressures from the dominant languages, and the death of a language means people change from one language to another, not the elimination of communities in most cases (Janson, 2002). There are times when natural calamities and outbreaks of epidemics severely affect already low-populated communities, thereby, their languages too (Moseley, 2007). Reasons for the diminishing state of an indigenous language can mostly be a combination of causes than just one. In the *Encyclopaedia of World's Endangered Languages*, Moseley (2007) argues that the immediate reason for language attrition is "knowledge of the language as a tool of everyday communication is not being passed from one generation to another" (p. viii). In other words, it loses currency as a means of communication over generations and gradually ceases to exist in the practical realm of mundane life. Another reason he cites is the nationalist projects which are always carried out at the cost of many minority languages. In such situations, a handful of dominant languages receive patronage from the state, which puts tremendous pressure on other languages. Unlike the direct prohibition we witnessed in colonial times, the state weakens minor languages by excluding them in education, media, official proceedings and so forth (Moseley, 2007). It gets complicated when in some countries such as Mali and Nigeria a few major indigenous languages are embraced as part of the nationalist vision while the state turns its back on other indigenous languages. And then there are what Devy (2014) calls mega-languages, one or a few globally dominant languages taught in schools countrywide, such as English in the Indian context. Writing on language decline, Devy (2014) notes that,

Sub-national languages or the 'regional languages', in turn, have learnt to expect the migration of yet smaller language communities within their fold as a natural result of 'development', while they themselves feel uneasy in the face of the increasing influence of the 'mega-languages' and the 'national languages.' Thus, quite a hierarchy of fears and anxieties seems to have besieged languages all over the world. (p.31)

The language was always on the list of first casualties whenever a group wanted to dominate others. Colonialism is widely critiqued for its efforts in stripping people from their relations with their cultural and communal life, which the coloniser considered savage. Veronelli (2015), writing on the coloniality of language, argues that by reducing colonised to a less than human being status, they were also relegated as people without any "complex form of communication, that means language" (p. 113). Settler colonialism in Canada is an appropriate example that shows how indigenous communities are systematically alienated from their cultural life, including languages, at the pretence of the welfare of those communities. Toth (2022) writes that, through the structure of residential schools for more than one and half centuries starting from 1831, the Canadian government separated indigenous kids from their parents and communities, disabling them from participating in their cultures and learning from them. Consequences of this displacement included trauma, illness, death, cultural alienation, and loss of languages. Fontaine (2010), a former chief of Sagkeeng First Nation, recalls his residential school years in his autobiographical book *Broken Circle: The Dark Legacy of Indian Residential Schools* and writes that,

The system was designed by the federal government to eliminate First Nations people from the face of our land and country, to rob the world of a people simply because our values and beliefs did not fit theirs. The system was racist and based on the assumption that we were not human but rather part animal, to be desavaged and moulded into something we could never become-white. (p. 20)

In contemporary times, small communities who face enormous pressures to find means to survive often shift to dominant languages, which they see as a possible way out from their precarious conditions. In the Indian context, Devy (2014) observes that there is a social pressure to increase engagements with ‘mega-language’ (English) and major official language (Hindi) at the cost of other languages to ensure livelihood, and it is felt by both ‘small’ languages as well as some major regional languages with well-established literary traditions. Only languages with the script were counted when India formed linguistic states post-independence. It was followed by these languages being implemented in educational structures of schools and colleges. With the 1971 Indian census, the authorities stopped listing languages spoken by less than 10000 people in the national census and put all such languages under a single category named ‘Others’ (Devy, 2008). Many of the languages that are lumped under this category belong to Adivasi communities in India. According to the 2011 census, 41 languages are on the verge of extinction, and many others are endangered.

Furthermore, the penetration of urbanisation and market economy drastically transformed the lives of Adivasi communities along with their land, language, and culture. Their languages, being small fishes in the vast sea, started losing their grip because of different combinations of reasons in each case of language attrition. As Devy (2008) writes,

The communities that are already marginalised within their local or national contexts, the ones that are already a minority within their cultural contexts, the ones that have already been dispossessed of their ability to voice their concerns, are obviously placed at the frontline of the phonocide. (para. 8)

Considering the vulnerable state of many Adivasi languages, civil society organisations and right-based groups are actively working on language sustenance and preservation through several means, including the formation of scripts (Devy, 2008).

The Multilingual Context of Radio Kotagiri

Radio Kotagiri, located in the Nilgiris (meaning Blue Mountains) is a community radio launched in 2013 by Keystone Foundation, a non-profit organisation primarily working in the Nilgiri Biosphere Reserve region. According to the 2019-20 annual report of the parent organisation, the objectives of their community media unit include strengthening the agency of communities in and through media and supporting storytelling via various mediums. The Nilgiris district, where the radio is situated, is part of the Western Ghats mountain chain, making it an ecologically rich and vulnerable geography. In addition to its environmental significance, it inhabits several Adivasi communities that come under the official category of Particularly Vulnerable Tribal Groups. Apart from those, Badagas, the largest ethnolinguistic community, have historically co-existed with Adivasis in the upper elevations of the Blue Mountains. Their presence makes Badaga an important local language in the region. The place witnessed large-scale migration from the plains following the British occupancy of the hills. Hence, one would find a bouquet of languages being spoken by various groups currently residing here, including Malayalam and Kannada.

The parent organisation of Radio Kotagiri has several decade-long interactions with Irula, Kurumba^[1], Toda and Kota Adivasi communities in the hills. All of these communities have their own languages belonging to the Dravidian family, which do not have scripts.

Because of the small population of these communities, their tongues are currently spoken by only a few thousand people. For instance, according to the 2010-11 survey of the Tribal Research Center, Ooty, 1370 is the Toda population, excluding a small number converted to Christianity (Sathyanarayanan, 2011). Toda, Kota, Kurumba and Irula languages are listed as endangered by various institutions and projects, including the Encyclopaedia of World's Endangered Languages (Moseley, 2007). Even when expressing strong optimism regarding their language survival, these communities are also aware of the intergenerational changes happening to their languages. Loss of language is looked at with great concern because most of them consider language as an essential part of their community identity. In conversations, the declining use of tongues in everyday practice is often mentioned by community members as a worrisome pattern. Knowing multiple languages is an essential skill for the Adivasi communities here due to the inevitable inter-community exchanges that take place on a day-to-day basis.

Thus, Tamil, the dominant vernacular language becomes the link language in this geography. Tamil or English is the medium available for schooling consequently kids from these communities achieve competency in these languages through their schooling. Achieving proficiency in these dominant languages is important for people to enter job markets or other public domains. Moreover, from a very young age, they are exposed to media content in Tamil and other languages while they have rare or no option of media in their own languages. Therefore, most often the Adivasi languages have currency only within their villages/communities. According to several community members, social changes such as migration to urban areas and transformations in their relationship with the surrounding ecology also contribute to linguistic changes. While having a strong practical approach to multilingualism, community members do feel uneasiness about the transformations at the cost of their language.

Radio Kotagiri was started as an addition to the community media facilitated by the parent organisation, such as a newsletter run by Adivasi communities in the hills. It has a radius of 15 kilometres around Kotagiri town, covering a few Adivasi settlements. As a community radio situated in a multilingual geography, it engages with more than half a dozen languages, including Tamil, Badaga, Toda, Kota, Irula, and Kurumba. In its initial days, they used to broadcast a considerable share of their programs about Adivasi communities, including their songs, stories, music, interviews and so on.

However, the limited reach of the radio in the surrounding Adivasi villages turned out to be an issue. Even though the team tried narrowcasting to circumvent this limitation, it did not see anticipated success due to insufficient human and material resources. Over the years, the radio expanded its scope to a broad spectrum of themes, including biodiversity, organic agriculture and health, while remaining committed to giving room for content in Adivasi languages and communities. For example, to date, they broadcast folk songs and music in Adivasi and other local languages instead of cine songs. The team now uses a few social media to expand their reach to interested audiences beyond 15 kilometres. Even though the team running the radio kept changing throughout these years, broadcasters from the Adivasi communities always have been part of its operations along with other locals. In the current team, the most experienced broadcaster of Radio Kotagiri belongs to the Irula community.

Discussion

The following thematic sections attempt to capture the ways in which everyday practices of Radio Kotagiri involve interactions with multiple Adivasi languages in their context and how it is being experienced by different participants. The discussion is spread out into three subsections

through which the paper illustrates the potential of community media in supporting indigenous languages in their local contexts.

Media Making in Indigenous Languages

When you get into the station of Radio Kotagiri, you see many things on its wall, pasted or hung. It includes a few accolades won by the radio for its programming over the years. There are two laminated certificates hung on top of the adjacent sides of the door opening to the recording room. When I saw it for the first time, I immediately noted in my mind that I should ask about what those are, and later I got a chance to listen to its story from one of the broadcasters. It was an award from Commonwealth Educational Media Center for Asia for their programs on Kota pottery in 2016. It was done by a Kota broadcaster in their language, discussing the various issues about the sustenance of their traditional craft with a brief introduction in Tamil by another broadcaster. For its production, the broadcaster interviewed his community members, recording their voices regarding the matter. It is one example of many similar programmes the radio has been doing since its inception. In doing so, the radio allowed indigenous communities in the context to make media content in their languages about themes that matter to them. As Pietikäinen (2008) argued,

Participatory programs in endangered languages create a vibrant Indigenous-language domain where one's own language can be used and heard: a public proof that one's own language is good and vital enough to be used in the media context and by new generations of speakers. (p.209)

To locate the relevance of such media making in indigenous languages in India, we have to look at the larger media environment in the country. Like many other minoritized languages across the world, Adivasi languages hardly find any space in dominant media in India, even when their population, as per the last census data, is 104 million (Dutta, 2016). Dutta's (2016) paper on Adivasi media in India illustrates the marginal presence of Adivasi-led/based media operating across forms. However, in the same article, he comments about the role of community media in foregrounding the issues of several Adivasi communities. He attributes a part of the credit to its participatory nature. His observations agree with Pavarala and Malik (2007), who wrote about the nurturing capacity of community radio concerning local languages and culture. Continuing the conversation, the recent article of Belavadi and Jena (2022) demonstrates how Radio Dhimsa in Koraput of the Eastern Indian state of Odisha safeguards the cultural and linguistic interests of the Desia-speaking community.

In many ways, safeguarding linguistic diversity was conceptualised as a function of community media from its early days. For instance, discussing the rights-based approach to communication, Pavarala and Malik (2007) note that all such articulations share the view that state or private entities should not monopolise communicative infrastructures such as mass media; instead, they should serve the communities and their plural and diverse cultures and languages. Pastapur Declaration of 2000, one of the earliest documents on community radio advocacy in India, recites the Milan Declaration on Communicative and Human Rights which asserts the media's responsibility to sustain the diversity of languages. Along the same lines, the definition of World Association of Community Radio Broadcasters (AMARC Asia-Pacific) also foregrounds community radio's role in mediating communication in local languages.

In the case of Radio Kotagiri, observations from the field also suggest that it actively welcomes creative expressions in Adivasi languages, which seldom find a place in any other media. For instance, there was a song about Corona in the Toda language made by the

community members that got broadcasted on Radio Kotagiri during the crisis. Such actions spotlight the creative capabilities of Adivasi languages and invigorate the community to indulge in many more of those. Apart from these, the music and songs of the Adivasis in the hills sourced from the communities are frequently played on this radio. It also facilitates storytelling in these indigenous tongues by the communities as well. By doing so, these languages find a space of engagement beyond the boundaries of the villages and communities.

Radio Kotagiri also supports a Wi-Fi radio named Kwol Radio facilitated by Keystone Foundation formed from its collaborations with several other actors. It operates in an Irula village in the Nilgiris and broadcasts in the Irula language managed entirely by the young people from the village for their consumption. By providing assistance to Kwol Radio's operations, Radio Kotagiri takes part in the decentralisation of communication technologies that allow communities to customise media in their language to act on their interests. Given all these, it is fair to interpret the engagements of Radio Kotagiri about the content in indigenous languages as a form of cultural activism (Ginsburg, 2008), whereby the languages are exposed to enhanced communication possibilities.

Amplifying the Linguistic Diversity

Responding to my question regarding the benefits of having a community radio, a listener said that it allowed him to learn that people in the hills speak different languages. Adding to that, he also mentioned how listening to Radio Kotagiri made him realise that all natives of Tamil Nadu do not speak Tamil as their first language. This particular listener from the neighbouring district happened to get Radio Kotagiri accidentally and liked listening to it, and later became a participant. Similarly, for several listeners of Radio Kotagiri, it is a space that allows them to get to know and appreciate the linguistic diversity of the hills. According to them, their exposure to cultural expressions in indigenous languages is scarce due to the lack of avenues. Therefore, Radio Kotagiri broadcasting in indigenous languages bridges this gap through which non-indigenous people in and around the place get exposure to those tongues. Furthermore, it also reinforces the pride in the rich cultural and linguistic diversity of a place like Nilgiris in its inhabitants. In other words, it builds a sense of community that embraces the diversity that exists within it.

Talking about the feedback from the audience, one broadcaster explained how he received positive responses from listeners regarding the music they play in local languages and how the audience demands its continuation. Even when a section of the audience wants film songs to be broadcasted, the radio team double downs on its stand on playing folk and indigenous music because they believe that community radio must prioritise local cultures and, thus, local languages. In this way, it expands the scope of everyday engagements with indigenous languages in a sense where these languages become part of the listener's mundane media experience, both indigenous and non-indigenous people.

The Language Reservoir

Pietikäinen (2008) discusses the concept of language reservoir in connection with the implications of Sami media that turns into a site of remembrance in practice. By becoming a language reservoir, Sami media enables the 'reliving and transmitting' of everything that is braided in the Sami language. Drawing on that metaphor, here I suggest that Radio Kotagiri also acts as a language reservoir of Adivasi languages in its specific context. Over the years, Radio Kotagiri has accumulated a large pool of audio materials resourced from Adivasi communities, both in Adivasi languages and not. Hence, it becomes a space where these communities can come back

and listen to those recordings. In addition to that, the radio team was also open to communities utilising the infrastructure to record whatever communities wanted for themselves. In other words, it extends support to make community repositories of content in their languages.

Before moving into the conclusion, I would like to acknowledge the scarce resources with which Radio Kotagiri runs its day-to-day operations, like most community media out there. It limits what can be done through the medium in many ways. For example, one of the broadcasters I interviewed was very much interested in the multilingual production of programs which is not feasible at the moment due to financial constraints. Even when the possibilities of engagements concerning diverse languages exist, financial resources to actualise the ideas seem out of reach in the community media scene. It certainly demands more attention from concerned institutions, groups, and policy bodies.

Conclusion

In this paper, I demonstrate how community media engages with indigenous languages in the Indian context by presenting a case study of Radio Kotagiri from the Southern Indian state of Tamil Nadu. In doing so, it showed how mundane practices in community media create positive effects on Adivasi languages. Although not a panacea for the linguistic vulnerabilities experienced by indigenous languages, the discussed case study reasserts the possibilities of leveraging community media spaces to support indigenous languages in India. The International Decade of Indigenous Languages seems a promising time to pay more attention to this possibility.

Even though the paper only discusses the case study of a radio community media is more than that in practice. Marginalised communities committed to cultural and linguistic causes have been using various mediums to aid their struggles. One recent example from India would be Asur Adivasi Mobile Radio, established in 2010 in the Eastern Indian state of Jharkhand. The objective of the initiative was to put media to address the diminishing state of the culture and language of Asurs, a particularly vulnerable tribal group in the state. The objectives of this radio include popularising the language and culture of the tribal community and preserving it for the coming generations. Its team records programs and broadcasts them through loudspeakers in public places. The exponential rise of digital penetration in India will only add more to the opportunities in the community media landscape.

Notes

- [1] Even though official machineries treat Kurumba as a single community, it consists of different Kurumba groups such as Alu Kurumba, Jenu Kurumba and Bettu Kurumba. Much of the Kurumba community members that work with Keystone Foundation belong to Alu Kurumba (field observation).

References

- Backhaus, B. (2021). *Polyphony: Listening to the Listeners of Community Radio*. Routledge.
- Barik, S. (2020, February 15). Radio Aids Revival of Dying Tribal Language. *The Hindu*. Retrieved November 2022, from <https://www.thehindu.com/news/national/other-states/radio-aids-revival-of-dying-tribal-language/article30831074.ece>
- Belavadi, V., & Jena, A. (2022). Reinforcing Desia Culture Through Community Radio: A Cultural Analysis of Radio Dhimsa in Koraput, Odisha. In A. Kaushik & A. Suchiang (Eds.), *Narratives and New Voices from India* (Vol. 8, Ser. Communication, Culture and Change in Asia, pp. 73–83). Springer.
- Belhiah, H., Majdoubi, M., & Safwate, M. (2020). Language revitalisation through the media: A case study of Amazigh in Morocco. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*,

2020(266), 121–141. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2020-2114>

Belotti, F. (2022). *Indigenous Media Activism in Argentina*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Cassels, M. (2019). Indigenous languages in new media: Opportunities and challenges for language revitalisation. *Working Papers of the Linguistics Circle of the University of Victoria*, 29(1), 25–43.

Chikaipa, V., & Gunde, A. M. (2020). The Role of Community Radio in Promotion of Indigenous Minority Languages and Cultures in Malawi. *Journal of Radio & Audio Media*, 28(2), 327–343. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19376529.2020.1751633>

Cormack, M. (2007). The Media and Language Maintenance. In M. Cormack & N. Hourigan (Eds.), *Minority Language Media: Concepts, Critiques and Case Studies* (pp. 52–68). essay, *Multilingual Matters*.

Devy, G. N. (2008, October). Indigenous Languages. Retrieved November 2022, from https://www.india-seminar.com/2009/601/601_ganesh_n_devy.htm

Devy, G. N. (2014). *The being of Bhasha: A General Introduction*. Orient Blackswan Private Limited.

Dutta, U. (2016). Adivasi Media in India: Relevance in Representing Marginalised Voices. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, (3), 213–231.

Fontaine, T. (2010). The Menage. In *Broken Circle: The Dark Legacy of Indian Residential Schools: a Memoir* (pp. 13–20). Heritage House.

Fraser, C., & Estrada, S. R. (2001). *Community Radio Handbook*. UNESCO.

Ginsburg, F. D. (2002). Screen Memories: Resignifying the Traditional in Indigenous Media. In F. D. Ginsburg, L. Abu-Lughod, & B. Larkin (Eds.), *Media worlds: Anthropology on New Terrain* (pp. 39–57). The University of California Press.

Ginsburg, F. (2008). Rethinking the Digital Age. In P. Wilson & M. Stewart (Eds.), *Global Indigenous Media: Cultures, Poetics, and Politics* (pp. 287–305). Duke University Press.

Janson, T. (2013). How Languages Disappear. In *Speak a short history of languages* (pp. 232–250). Oxford University Press.

Kingsbury, B. (1998). “Indigenous Peoples” in International Law: A Constructivist Approach to the Asian Controversy. *American Journal of International Law*, 92(3), 414–457. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2997916>

LaPier, R. R. (2018, October 5). How the Loss of Native American Languages Affects Our Understanding of the Natural World. *The Conversation*. Retrieved November 2022, from <https://theconversation.com/how-the-loss-of-native-american-languages-affects-our-understanding-of-the-natural-world-103984>

Lhawa, Y. (2019). Language Revitalisation, Video, and Mobile Social Media: A Case Study from the Khroskyabs Language amongst Tibetans in China. *Language Documentation & Conservation*, 13, 564–579. Retrieved 2022, from <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/24902>.

Los Pinos Declaration [chapoltepek] lays the foundations for global planning for the International Decade of Indigenous Languages. UNESCO. (2020, July 21). Retrieved November 2022, from <https://en.unesco.org/news/pinos-declaration-chapoltepek-lays-foundations-global-planning-international-decade-indigenous>

Moseley, C. (2007). General Introduction. In *Encyclopedia of the World’s Endangered Languages* (pp. vii-xvi). Routledge.

Nations, J. D. (2015). Naming the Dragonfly | Why Indigenous Languages Matter in the

21st Century. *Langscape Magazine*. Retrieved 2022, from <https://medium.com/langscape-magazine/naming-the-dragonfly-why-indigenous-languages-matter-in-the-21st-century-885025c8cbc1>.

O'Connor, A. (1990). The Miners' Radio Stations in Bolivia: A Culture of Resistance. *Journal of Communication*, 40(1), 102–110. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1990.tb02254.x>

Pavarala, V., & Malik, K. K. (2007). *Other voices: The Struggle for Community Radio in India*. Sage Publications.

Pavarala, V. (2020). Beyond the Development Trap: NGOisation of Community Radio in India. In K. K. Malik & V. Pavarala (Eds.), *Community Radio in South Asia: Reclaiming the Airwaves* (pp. 103–116). Routledge.

Pietikäinen, S. (2008). “To Breathe Two Airs”: Empowering Indigenous Sámi Media. In P. Wilson & M. Stewart (Eds.), *Global Indigenous Media: Cultures, Poetics, and Politics* (pp. 197–213). Duke University Press.

Prins, H. E. L. (2002). Visual Media and the Primitivist Perplex: Colonial Fantasies, Indigenous Imagination, and Advocacy in North America. In F. D. Ginsburg, L. Abu-Lughod, & B. Larkin (Eds.), *Media worlds: Anthropology on new terrain* (pp. 58–74). The University of California Press.

Raghunath, P. (2020). Media Policy Studies and Community Media. In *Community Radio Policies in South Asia* (pp. 1–46). Palgrave Macmillan.

Rodriguez, C. (2001). From Alternative Media to Citizens' Media. In *Fissures in the Mediascape: An International Study of Citizens' Media* (pp. 1-39). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Sathyanarayanan, C. R. (2011). (rep.). *Scheduled Tribes of Nilgiris District*. Tribal Research Centre.

Sax, S. (2019, July 2). For Ecuador's Sápara, saving the forest means saving their language. *Mongabay Environmental News*. Retrieved November 2022, from <https://news.mongabay.com/2019/07/for-ecuadors-sapara-saving-the-forest-means-saving-their-language/>

Toth, K. (2022, January 19). The Death and Revival of Indigenous Languages. *Harvard International Review*. Retrieved November 2022, from <https://hir.harvard.edu/the-death-and-revival-of-indigenous-languages/>

Veronelli, G. A. (2015). The Coloniality of Language: Race, Expressivity, Power, and the Darker Side of Modernity. *Wagadu*, 13, 108–134.

Notes on the Contributor

Hazeena is a PhD Fellow in the Department of Communication at University of Hyderabad, Hyderabad, India.