

Lullaby 3

Khaghi kichimi ye aqha kumtsu no ale lakhi ye kumo, ikemu anga muzu puzu kiu le acheni ipikiu kiqui ye inapu inalimi no khuno phu lo kulau kela paghi mighimi shi kulaighi. Ikemua kimi no anipu atianuli ghili muthano paye ashou thono akibo ghili muthano anipu no imea kiu mutha. Anipu ye anga anike kea nga ghi ghoshi masa akumla ghi shimasa tilehino anga no qauve ani. Anga pinimula kelauno anga ghi heghi aza no ishi anga muzupu zu cheni

*Ningau aza ye Inalimi ipukuhai zakuha,
Opu kughapesu ipushini izashiniye
Ikemu opunono akivishi ikujo tuchamoke
Ike aza no kugho no ani shinikeno ash iotsunani, akha otsunani,
aza no alokiu otsunan ike tighenguno azakimiye no qhatsukelo,
Ipi aza ghi anhezu iqhighi tishi ang amuzu ghi tishino akumla shiche.*

Tishi aye anga ghi ithiakeshi aza no tishi kimiye kiutsa pikiu,
Anga ghi aza tsa inipesu no zuhuveche.

Tishi no aza ye amlolikihi shi inapu inali shipu paye mla ithano kinimi shighi, tishino ajuaje kivishi quniye pukaputsa ghi anga muzu ghi ale pheachene.

Translation

During early days, the lullabies that were sung were of different genres which were performed according to the context. One certain type was of the woman who married off to a man from a faraway place and hence she had to abandoned all her relatives and had to settle off in her in-law's place as the society is a patrilocal one. Often the husband was unaware of the plight of the family at home for he was mainly concerned with the work and life outside the home. The wife had to deal with all the household chores and at the same time nurse the little child and so many times. The mother would be overwhelmed. In such situations the mother would well up and in tears would break into a lullaby

**O my little one. Mum is an alien and a hapless orphan
I expected your father to be even my mother and father
But your father is none of that.
When its *tuluni*, mother will feed you fish and meat aplenty
Mother will feed you the best so do not cry my little one.**

And as if the child understood the lyrics to the lullaby, at length would stop crying and would slumber off to sleep. And the mother would be relieved and would continue her chores.

Analysis

The song reveals many imperative details about the life and the status of women in the traditional Sumi society. The routine of a typical housewife is very hectic and when she is also a mother her plights is heightened by the demand for additional nursing to her children. Here the importance of family is also highlighted and marriage village exogamy is also portrayed. When a woman is married within or nearby her parents' house, her family members plays a significant helping hand to her both emotionally, psychological and also in the household chores physically.

But when she is married faraway outside her village she is all alone, and only expects her husband to fill the loneliness in her life, by also taking the role of her parents too. As the man of the family spends most of his time outside the house in search of bread for the family, she remains secluded and lonely with all her problems. The mention of Tuluni festival here represents the present status of poverty in the family where they may not always afford to have fish and meat, the festival also signifies happiness which is an occasional reality for her. Hence this lullaby reveals the story of a typical Sumi woman who is lonely, unhappy, tired, sad, despondent and her only ray of solace is her child and a hope for a better life for her child.

Conclusion

Performing lullabies within the concealment of the household permits women to express their private feelings, which are mostly silent and the forbidden. As they enjoy their privacy only when they are with the child, here only they can release their grievances and anguishes only to their baby. We can see here that the Sumi lullabies let women to ventilate their angst and longings over the lost people, homeland and happy family. In this context, lullabies might be observed as the most intimate revelation ventilated by repressed women in a typically patriarchal society.

Monologue of mother with her child is one of the most imperative refrains accessible by the mother in the form of lullabies. The analysis of this verbal art forms comprises numerous vital aspects. Regardless of the optimistic purposes of discourse which aids the mother to get respite from mental tension and stress, the melodies of lullabies in monologues also portrays the stifled feeling of the mother. These lullabies are the unwritten and oral expression of mother's suppressed feeling which she has chosen to convey to her children only. These suppressed feelings are related to mother's loneliness, pain, anxiety, disparity and also her dreams. Conceivably, the core purpose of opening such repressed feeling in front of children can be accredited to the fact that in a typical Sumi family, the woman has no choice or opportunity for free discussion and communication with members in the family. Hence, the gender inequality in the family leads to a situation where the woman is forced to unilaterally express her suppressed feelings to her children.

References

- Brakeley, Theresa 1950: "Lullaby." In Maria Leach (ed.) Dictionary of folklore, mythology and legend, pp. 653-4. New York: Funk and Wagnalls. Ebeogu,
- Farber, Walter 1990: "Magic at the cradle. Babylonian and Assyrian lullabies." *Anthropos* 85:139-48.
- Giudice Del, Luisa 1988: "Ninna-nanna-nonsense? Fears, dreams, and falling in the Italian lullaby." *Oral Tradition* 3:270-93.
- Ikegami, Yoshihiko 1986: "The lullaby as magic: a textual analysis of traditional Japanese children's songs." In Tokumaru Yoshihiko and Yamaguti Osamu (eds) *The oral and the literate in music*, pp. 96-109. Tokyo: Academia Music Ltd.
- Kartomi, Margaret 1984: "Delineation of lullaby song style in three areas of Aboriginal Australia." In Jamie C. Kassler and Jill Stubington (eds) *Problems and solutions. Occasional essays in musicology presented to Alice M. Moyle*. pp. 59-93. Sydney: Hale and Iremonger
- Manasseh, Sara 1991: "A song to heal your wounds: traditional lullabies of the Jews of Iraq." *Musica Judaica* 12:1-29.
- Masuyama, Erick Eiichi 1989: "Desire and discontent in Japanese lullabies." *Western folklore* 48.2:144-8.
- Moyle, Alice M. 1974: *North Australian music. A taxonomic approach to the study of Aboriginal song performances*. PhD thesis, Monash University.
- Moyle, Richard 1997: *Balgo. The musical life of a desert community*. Perth: Callaway International Resource Centre for Music Education.
- Music for dreaming: Aboriginal lullabies in the Yanyuwa community at Borroloola, Northern Territory Elizabeth Mackinlay 31 May 2008 To cite this article: Elizabeth Mackinlay 1999: *Music for dreaming: Aboriginal lullabies in the Yanyuwa community at Borroloola, Northern Territory*, *British Journal of Ethnomusicology*, 8:1, 97-111, DOI: 10.1080/09681229908567282).

ISSN NO. 0972-9445

Emerging Trends in Development Research

Vol. 29, No. 1&2, 2022, 19-23

www.grefiglobal.org/journals

Sustainable Development: Concept, Goals and Trajectory in India

Manju Singh

Abstract

The concept of Sustainable Development emerged in the 1980s as a response to the negative social and environmental effects of the prevailing approach to economic growth. The major emphasis was on the maintenance of ecological processes, the sustainable use of resources, and the maintenance of genetic diversity. Since the Brundtland Commission Report, a number of events and initiatives have brought us to the wide-ranging interpretation of Sustainable Development, which set the agenda of the Sustainable Development discourse both in developed and developing countries. As a result of a proliferation of sustainable development strategies and policies etc., innovative technologies, scientific and educational initiatives, and new legislative regimes and initiatives have emerged. In 2000, the General Assembly of the United Nations in the Millennium Summit passed the 'Millennium Development Goals (MDG)' and set the agenda to achieve these goals by 2015. However, these MDGs could not be achieved to the level of satisfaction. Therefore, a new strategy for sustainable development was formulated and 17 sustainable development goals were set to be achieved by 2030. The present paper is aimed to analyze the concept, goals and trajectory of sustainable development in India on the basis of the performance of different states and UTs of India from 2018-19 to 2020-21. The data indicate that there is substantive progress in cases of some states. However, some states are either stagnant or lagging behind.

Keywords: Sustainable Development; Climate Change; Environment, Poverty; Gender Inequality

The concept of Sustainable Development emerged in the 1980s as a response to the negative social and environmental effects of the prevailing approach to economic growth. The major emphasis was on the maintenance of ecological processes, the sustainable use of resources, and the maintenance of genetic diversity. Since the Brundtland Commission Report, a number of events and initiatives have brought us to the wide-ranging interpretation of Sustainable Development, which set the agenda of the Sustainable Development discourse both in developed and developing countries. As a result of a proliferation of sustainable development strategies and policies etc., innovative technologies, scientific and educational initiatives, and new legislative regimes and initiatives have emerged. In 2000, the General Assembly of the United Nations in the Millennium Summit passed the 'Millennium Development Goals (MDG)' and set the agenda to achieve these goals by 2015. However, these MDGs could not be achieved to the level of satisfaction. Therefore, a new strategy for sustainable development was formulated and 17 sustainable development goals were set to be

Manju Singh is Associate Professor, Department of Zoology, Raghunath Girls PG College Meerut-250001, India

achieved by 2030. These goals are: End poverty in all its forms everywhere; Ensure healthy lives and promote; End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture; well-being for all at all ages; Ensure inclusive and quality education for all and promote lifelong learning; Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls; Ensure access to water and sanitation for all; Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all; Promote inclusive and sustainable economic growth, employment and decent work for all; Build resilient infrastructure, promote sustainable industrialization and foster innovation; Reduce inequality within and among countries; Make cities inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable; Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns; Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts; Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas, and marine resources; Sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, halt and reverse land degradation, halt biodiversity loss; Promote just, peaceful and inclusive societies; Revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development.

The present paper is aimed to analyze the concept, goals and trajectory of sustainable development in India on the basis of the performance of different states and UTs of India from 2018-19 to 2020-21. The data indicate that there is substantive progress in cases of some states. However, some states are either stagnant or lagging behind.

Methodology

The SDGs have 169 targets and 306 national indicators. However, in the Baseline report SDG 12, 13, 14 are not included as the detailed comparable data across the state and UTs on SDG 12, 13, 14 are not available. SDG 17 is also excluded on the ground that indicators for this goal have not been identified by NIF. But over a period of time, in the 2019 report SDG 12 and 13 were also measured and SDG 14 and 17 are not measured as indicators are not worked out till now. The data was taken from the various reports of NITI Ayog and analyzed afresh in a comparative approach over time i.e., between 2018 and 2021 on the one hand, and between different states and UTs on the other. For the analytical purpose, the scale used by NITI Ayog was as follows: *100 would be called an Achiever since the State would have achieved all the targets outlined by the SDGs. Any State with 65 or more progress would be classified as a Front Runner as the States are nearing the target versus the others. States above 50 are Performers. States that are yet to achieve even 50 of the distance to the target are classified as Aspirants.* However, for the purpose of the present analysis, it was modified and a new category of poor performance for a state/SDG was added in the cases where the score was below 35. Thus, we have analyzed the performance on a five-point scale as follows: 1. Achiever (Score 100); front runner (65-99); Performer (50-64); Aspirant (35-49); and Poor (below 35). These five categories were abbreviated as AC, FR, PE, AS, and PO respectively.

National Level Composite SDG Score of India

The composite SDG score for India for 2018, 2019 and 2020 is presented below in table 1. The data indicate that In **2018**, out of 17 SDGs India was **Front Runner** in four **SDGs (8,10,15,16)- Sustainable Economic Development; Reduction in Inequality; Sustainable Management of forests, rejuvenation of Land and Biodiversity Maintenance; and Societal Processes; Performer in five SDG 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7- Eradication of poverty; Health Issues; Inclusive and Quality Education; Water & Sanitation Access; and Sustainable Energy. In four SDG 2, 5, 9, and 11- Hunger, Food Security, Nutrition and Agricultural Growth; women equality and empowerment; Infrastructural Development, Sustainable Industrialization, and Innovation; and Sustainable Urban Development** India was **an Aspirant**.

In 2019, India's performance in the direction of achieving SDGs improved to some extent as India became a front runner in five SDGs (6, 7, 9, 15, and 16) with a slight drop out in the score of SDGs 8 and 10 (from 65 and 71 to 64 in each case and thereby became a performer from a front

runner in these cases, however, India's position as a performer upgraded as in eight SDGs scores was between 50 and 64. Although, in SDG 2 and SDG 6 India remains as an underperformer with a score of 35 and 42 respectively. In the case of SDG 14 and 17, the data remains unavailable for analysis.

In 2020, there is a significant improvement in SDGs as India consolidated sustainable development goals score further and achieved the position of the front runner for the first time with a consolidated score of 66. As far as individual SDGs are concerned, India also became a front-runner in 8 SDGs (3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 15, and 16) despite a drop in the score of SDG 9 (from 65 in 2019 to 55)- *Infrastructural Development, Sustainable Industrialization, and Innovation*. This may be because of the three months of complete lockdown in 2020 and other many problems caused by the Pandemic Covid-19 in India and throughout the world. Despite this drawback, the overall performance of India can be said satisfactorily.

These findings suggest that the problem of hunger, food security, nutrition and agricultural growth on the one hand and the social problems like gender inequality and women empowerment on the other, are the major problems of Indian society in its path of sustainable development.

A comparative analysis of Composite Sustainable Development Goals (CSDG) score for different states and union territories (UTs) suggests that CSDG score varies significantly from India's average SDG score of India.

Among 29 states in 2018, only three states, namely, Himachal Pradesh and Kerala (69 each) and Tamil Nâdu (66) were front runners. While as many as 23 states were in the performers (between 50 and 64). Among them, 6 states (Andhra Pradesh (64), Goa (64), Gujarat (64), Karnataka (64), Maharashtra (64), and Telangana (61) were having high CSDG score i.e., above 60 but less than 65. Seven states, namely, Punjab (60), Uttarakhand (60), Manipur (59), Mizoram (59), Rajasthan (59), Chhattisgarh (58), and Sikkim (58) had a CSDG score higher than the national average of 57. The state of West Bengal (56), Haryana & Tripura (55 each), J&K (53), Madhya Pradesh and Meghalaya (52 each), Arunachal Pradesh, Nagaland and Odisha (51 each) and Jharkhand (50) were having CSDG score less than national average and can be called lower performers. However, three Indian states, namely, Assam (49), Bihar (48) and Uttar Pradesh (42) were fall in the category of Aspirants or under performers.

The data indicate that

In **2018**, out of 17 SDGs India was **Front Runner** in four **SDGs (8,10,15,16)**- *Sustainable Economic Development; Reduction in Inequality; Sustainable Management of forests, rejuvenation of Land and Biodiversity Maintenance; and Societal Processes*; **Performer** in **five SDG 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7**- *Eradication of poverty; Health Issues; Inclusive and Quality Education; Water & Sanitation Access; and Sustainable Energy*. In **four SDG 2, 5, 9, and 11**- *Hunger, Food Security, Nutrition and Agricultural Growth; women equality and empowerment; Infrastructural Development, Sustainable Industrialization, and Innovation; and Sustainable Urban Development* India was **an Aspirant**.

In 2019, India's performance in the direction of achieving SDGs improved to some extent as India became a front runner in five SDGs (6, 7, 9, 15, and 16) with a slight drop out in the score of SDGs 8 and 10 (from 65 and 71 to 64 in each case and thereby became a performer from a front runner in these cases. however, India's position as a performer upgraded as in eight SDGs scores was between 50 and 64. Although, in SDG 2 and SDG 6 India remains as an underperformer with a score of 35 and 42 respectively. In the case of SDG 14 and 17, the data remains unavailable for analysis.

In 2020, there is a significant improvement in SDGs as India consolidated sustainable development goals score further and achieved the position of the front runner for the first time with a consolidated score of 66. As far as individual SDGs are concerned, India also became a front-

Goal	Related to	Index Score			Target
		2018	2019	2020	
SDG 1:	End poverty in all its forms everywhere	54 PE	50 PE	60 PE	100
SDG 2:	End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture	48 AS	35 AS	47AS	100
SDG 3	Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages	52 PE	61 PE	74 FR	100
SDG 4:	Ensure inclusive and quality education for all and promote lifelong learning	58 PE	58 PE	57 PE	100
SDG 5:	Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls	36 AS	42 AS	48AS	100
SDG 6:	Ensure access to water and sanitation for all	63 PE	88 FR	83 FR	100
SDG 7:	Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all	51 PE	70 FR	92 FR	100
SDG 8:	Promote inclusive and sustainable economic growth, employment and decent work for all	65 FR	64 PE	63 PE	100
SDG 9:	Build resilient infrastructure, promote sustainable industrialization and foster innovation	44 AS	65 FR	55 PE	100
SDG 10:	Reduce inequality within and among countries	71 FR	64 PE	67 FR	100
SDG 11:	Make cities inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable	39 AS	53 PE	79 FR	100
SDG 12:	Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns	Null	55 PE	74 FR	Null
SDG 13:	Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts	Null	60 PE	54 PE	Null
SDG 14:	Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources	Null	Null	Null	Null
SDG 15:	Sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, halt and reverse land degradation, halt biodiversity loss	90 FR	66 FR	66FR	100
SDG 16:	Promote just, peaceful and inclusive societies	71 FR	72 FR	74 FR	100
SDG 17:	Revitalize the global partnership for sustainable development.	Null	Null	Null	100
Total		57 PE	60 PE	66 FR	100

runner in 8 SDGs (3, 6,7,10, 11, 12, 15, and 16) despite a drop in the score of SDG 9 (from 65 in 2019 to 55)- *Infrastructural Development, Sustainable Industrialization, and Innovation*. This may be because of the three months of complete lockdown in 2020 and other many problems caused by the Pandemic Covid-19 in India and throughout the world. Despite this drawback, the overall performance of India can be said satisfactorily.

These findings suggest that the problem of hunger, food security, nutrition and agricultural growth on the one hand and the social problems like gender inequality and women empowerment on the other, are the major problems of Indian society in its path of sustainable development.

A comparative analysis of Composite Sustainable Development Goals (CSDG) score for different states and union territories (UTs) suggests that CSDG score varies significantly from India's average SDG score of India.

Among 29 states in 2018, only three states, namely, Himachal Pradesh and Kerala (69 each) and Tamil Nâdu (66) were front runners. While as many as 23 states were in the performers (between 50 and 64). Among them, 6 states (Andhra Pradesh (64), Goa (64), Gujarat (64), Karnataka (64), Maharashtra (64), and Telangana (61) were having high CSDG score i.e., above 60 but less than 65. Seven states, namely, Punjab (60), Uttarakhand (60), Manipur (59), Mizoram (59), Rajasthan (59), Chhattisgarh (58), and Sikkim (58) had a CSDG score higher than the national average of 57. The state of West Bengal (56), Haryana & Tripura (55 each), J&K (53), Madhya Pradesh and Meghalaya (52 each), Arunachal Pradesh, Nagaland and Odisha (51 each) and Jharkhand (50) were having CSDG score less than national average and can be called lower performers. However, three Indian states, namely, Assam (49), Bihar (48) and Uttar Pradesh (42) were fall in the category of Aspirants or under performers.

Among the seven union territories, Chandigarh (68) and Puducherry (65) were front runners, while Daman and Diu (63), Delhi and Lakshadweep (62 each) Andaman and Nicobar Islands (58) and Dadra and Nagar Haveli (57) can be termed as good performers. However, no UTs fall in the category of underperformers.

After two years i.e., in 2020, we find a significant change in the position of individual states and UTs. Among 28 states, as many as 16 states became front runners as shown in table 2. While the remaining 12 states either remain in the category of performers or moved away from the category of underperformers. Among front runners, Chhattisgarh (58 to 79), Kerala (75), Himachal Pradesh (74), Tamil Nadu (74), Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Uttarakhand and Goa (72 each), Sikkim (71), Maharashtra (70), Gujarat and Telangana (69 each), Punjab and Mizoram (68 each), Haryana (67) can be termed as high performer (score more than India's national average of 66). While Tripura (65), Manipur (64), Madhya Pradesh and West Bengal (62 each), Nagaland, Odisha (61 each) and Uttar Pradesh (60) can be said as average performers while Assam (57), Odisha (56) and Bihar (52) can be termed as lower performers.

Among the present 9 UTs, Chandigarh is at the top rank with a CSDG score of 79, All other UTs have a CSDG score between the range of 62-68 and therefore can be said, good performers. Thus, there is a significant improvement in the CSDG score of all the states and UTs in a very short span of two years. A cursory view of detailed SDG scores of states and UT indicates that there are very significant variations among the various states as well as in the performance of the state in terms of individual SDG scores. For example, the state of Kerala has significant variation in its performance of different SDGs.

Conclusion

To conclude, it can be said that the development of agriculture and industrialization are two major economic problems of the country even today. Gender inequality and the problem of women's empowerment are major social problems in Indian Society that require significant measures from the side of the government and more and more awareness of gender issues and modern education for the girl child in our society. Another, important point that has to be noted is that we don't have data to measure the issues related to SDGs 14 and 17, which are importance for environmental development both at the local and global levels.

Note: This paper was presented in World Environment Summit 2022 held at New Delhi (October 15-16, 2022) organized by ESDA India.

References

Govt. of India, Niti Yayog Report, 2018.