

Development induced displacement and rehabilitation with reference to three states – Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh and West Bengal

Pankaj Rajak
& M. Yasin

“If you are to suffer, you should suffer in the interest of the country.”

--Jawaharlal Nehru

Abstract

The essay contends that the economic liberalization in India is virtually depriving the tribal and other agricultural dependent people of their traditional means of livelihood by promoting all sorts of ‘so called’ developmental projects. Such development serves the interests of the elites while it impoverishes the tribal and poor people who are dependent on the life sustaining resources of the ecosystems in which they live. The very nature of the present development paradigm does not provide for the absorption of these poor people by either developing their skills or by providing them with technical education. In light of the above statement, to understand the problem of development-induced displacement and rehabilitation in India due to several developmental projects, a study of three states has been made.

Key words: development, displacement, resettlement, rehabilitation, compensation.

1. Introduction

Change is an inherent characteristic of any development process. Every change involves friction, a friction of ideas, values and sentiments. Since independence, a large number of people in India have been displaced by several development projects such as irrigation dams, heavy and large scale industries, power plants etc. Displacement and rehabilitation have drawn the attention of people all over India in recent times. This is due to the concern shown by the environmental activists, academicians, the social concern of the organizations which aid the projects, and finally by the government. This is a recurring problem all over the world and it is more so with the developing countries like India. This is because of rapid expansion of industries after independence to meet the socio-economic requirements of the huge population of a country like ours. Every year, many heavy industries, irrigation dams and plants are established. Every developmental activity involves displacement of people.

Consequently, the shifting of population from their original place to other places is bound to happen.

Land is one of the prominent features, and alteration of any dimension in this regard affects people socially, economically and culturally, to a high degree. It is evident that most of the land oustees are tribal and rural people and most among them belong to SCs, STs, and BCs. The problem of land acquisition and those of the people shifted seem to be similar, but they vary according to various socio-economic and cultural backgrounds. In India, informal estimates of involuntary resettlement are estimated to be around 50 million people over the last five decades, and three-fourths of those displaced still face an uncertain future. There is evidence of development-induced displacement already from the era of the Gupta's from the 3rd to the 6th century A.D. It seems to have continued to some extent in the Mughal Age and picked up momentum under the British. The post-independence measures have resulted in much more displacement than in the colonial times with the difference that now it is in the name of national development (Satyanarayana, 1999).

2.1 Displacement: Emerging Issues and Debates

While discussing the concept of displacement we can note the following things which are stated as under:

- Displacement is seen as the result of a model of development that enforces certain technical and economic choices without giving any serious consideration to those options that would involve the least social and environmental costs.
- Most displacement has been involuntary. There has been very little meaningful participation of affected people in the planning and implementation of the dam project, including the resettlement and rehabilitation aspects.
- There have been instances of the submergence of land and other property, and of displacement without prior and sufficient warning. The displacement literature bears testimony to traumatic forced and delayed relocation, and to the denial of development opportunity for years and often decades due to a long and uncoordinated displacement and resettlement process.
- The numbers of both directly and indirectly affected people have frequently been underestimated, and there has been an inadequate understanding of the exact nature and extent of the negative effects involved. The State and other project proponents, largely viewing displacement from the standpoint of its causes, consistently maintain that displacement is

justified in the larger national interest. It is argued that while some displacement may be inevitable in large development projects, the long term good these projects will bring merits the sacrifice of a few in favour of the larger good (Bartolome et. al, 2000).

The notion of displacement as 'sacrifice' has influenced thinking on displacement considerably. It has stripped displacement of its political content, i.e., the fact that displacement involves the loss of people's rights to land and resources. This has also led to a perception of resettlement and rehabilitation as a "reward" for the sacrifice rather than as a basic right or entitlement.

The meaning of displacement has come to be more or less taken for granted, particularly in most academic literature. It is very important to understand that displacement is a multidimensional phenomenon of which physical relocation is only one of the most significant outcomes. The question of displacement is very often reduced to one of effective relocation. At best the displaced are viewed as a group of people who are in need of rehabilitation, not empowerment, for there is no recognition of their disenfranchisement.

The displaced people's movement have challenged this view of displacement with physical relocation at its centre and instead has as its core the historical experience of millions of displaced people. This understanding of displacement highlights (i) the alienation of the individual and community legal and customary rights and dislocation of the social and economic organization, and (ii) the politics of legal and policy instruments that sanctions such disenfranchisement. The focus is thus on the experience as well as the structures of displacement. In this context displacement refers not only to those who are forced to physically relocate in order to make way for the project and its related aspects but also includes those who are displaced from their resource base and livelihoods. When people are induced to move—that is, when they are displaced—even if it is by development schemes, then what is occurring can be termed forced migration, using Nicholas Van Hear's definition of forced migration in reference to *"individuals or communities compelled, obliged, or induced to move when otherwise they would choose to stay put; the force involved may be direct, overt and focused, or indirect, covert, and diffuse."* (Robinson, 2003: 5)

The World Bank Environment Department defined development-induced displacement as *"the forcing of communities and individuals out of their homes, often also their homelands, for the purposes of economic development."* (Dhru, 2010: 12)

Several issues have emerged out of the conflicts and policy deliberations regarding development induced displacement, most important of which among others have been discussed as under:

2.2.1 Issues Related to Displacement: Compensation

When people get displaced due to developmental projects the question of compensation of the displaced people forms an integral part of it, but one's entitlement to compensation has varied from place to place and from project to project. Therefore, in the following lines an attempt has been made to understand the same.

- Compensation has largely been understood to refer to specific measures intended to make good the losses suffered by people displaced and/or negatively affected by the dam.
- The losses incurred by people affected by the creation of infrastructure such as project offices and township, canals, transmission lines, and other activities are not usually properly accounted for and so these losses have not been adequately compensated.
- Compensation is most often awarded only to persons in possession of undisputed legal title. Tenants, sharecroppers, wage-labourers, artisans and encroachers are rarely considered eligible for compensation, whereas they are paradoxically the most vulnerable and in need of support.
- Community assets and common resources like grazing grounds and forests, which again may be critical for the livelihood of the poorest, are not compensated for under the acquisition process.
- The limited provisions in law to challenge the rate of compensation are, in practice, inaccessible to the negatively affected persons, because they may not be aware of the legal nuances or else cannot afford the expensive remedy of courts.
- Many studies have recorded how cash compensation is depleted by negatively affected persons in short periods, by fraud, for repayment of old debts, in liquor and conspicuous consumption. A lifetime of livelihood security or shelter is squandered in months, sometimes weeks, condemning displaced persons to assured and irrevocable destitution. Compensation has primarily addressed the loss of assets and property and not rights. The basis of compensation has thus been (i) legal ownership and (ii) individual claim. The general practice is to pay compensation for lost fixed assets like agricultural land at the prevailing market rate, calculated as an average of registered sales prices of land of similar quality and location in the recent past. It is value in exchange rather than value of replacement that is the basis of compensation (Bartolome et. al, 2000).

2.2.2 Resettlement and Rehabilitation

Resettlement programmes have predominantly focused on the process of physical relocation rather than on the economic and social development of the displaced and other negatively affected people. This has severely eroded the development effectiveness of resettlement and rehabilitation programmes and heightened the impoverishment risk of the resettlers. According to Cernea (1998) risks to adversely affected people are not a component of conventional project analysis. The key economic risks to affected people are from the loss of livelihood and income sources such as arable land, CPRs such as forests, grazing land, and surface water, fisheries, etc and changed access to and control of productive resources. The loss of economic power with the breakdown of complex livelihood systems results in temporary or permanent, often irreversible, decline in living standards leading to marginalization. Higher risks and uncertainties are introduced when diversified livelihood sources are lost. Loss of livelihood and disruption of agricultural activity can adversely affect household food security, leading to under-nourishment. Higher incidence of diseases associated with deteriorating water quality can result in increased morbidity and mortality. As Cernea notes (1998), forced displacement tears apart the existing social fabric, leading to socio-cultural disarticulation.

- Most projects have long planning horizons and the actual physical relocation comes a long time after the initial notifications. The interim period is one full of uncertainties and enormous psycho-social anxieties for the to-be-relocated communities.
- The costs of the resettlement programme have invariably been underestimated and under-financed.
- Institutional weaknesses, marked by confusions between various departments and the lack of capacity as well as continuity, have been major problems in ensuring effective resettlement.
- In the absence of policy and legal instruments and an effective mechanism to monitor compliance, even well-structured institutions with trained staff have failed in consistent implementation of effective resettlement.
- Generally, participation of the affected people has been superficial or treated as unimportant by those responsible for the project.
- Resettlement sites are invariably selected without reference to availability of livelihood opportunities, or the preferences of displaced persons themselves.

- The question of livelihoods is a major issue in resettlement and rehabilitation policy. There is reluctance on the part of governments and lending agencies to adopt and make operational policies requiring that the loss of agricultural land be compensated with alternative land, especially in the face of increasing pressure on land and the limited availability of arable land as well as its high price.
- Forced relocation usually results in people being transplanted from a social ecology in which they were primary actors to one in which they are aliens; they are not only very vulnerable but also end up in most cases as an underclass in their new socio-cultural milieu.
- Resettlement sites have been under-prepared in terms of basic amenities and essential infrastructure such as health, schooling, and credit.
- Generally, displacement as a result of acquisition is legally sanctioned while, with few exceptions, there is no legal framework that governs the process of displacement itself.
- Both in the case of national laws and international agency policies, there has been a wide gap between the laws and policies and their actual implementation. Cases include the Sardar Sarovar Project and the Three Gorges Project in China (Bartolome et. al, 2000).

In many cases the focus of resettlement programmes is simply to get people to move “out of the way” to the resettlement sites as quickly and smoothly as possible. A number of submissions and cases in the WCD’s review highlighted the exercise of intimidation, violence, and even murder to compel communities to move. Once people are relocated/shifted out the resettlement programme usually fizzles out/loses momentum, with the displaced people now at their most vulnerable. The resettled people are most vulnerable to be forgotten once the physical relocation is complete, referred to as “developer’s fatigue” (Argentina Report, 1999).

Resettlement of displaced people is thus a process that is acknowledged as entailing several risks. Cernea identifies the risks as landlessness, joblessness, homelessness, marginalisation, increased morbidity and mortality, food insecurity, loss of access to common property and services, and social disarticulation. These risks render resettlement inherently problematic, and indeed impoverishment and disempowerment have been the rule than the exception with respect to resettled people around the world. Simply restoring the status quo ante in terms of material assets will thus leave people worse off than before. Therefore the main objective of a resettlement programme must be to improve the standard of living and not just restoration of pre-relocation standards of living.

2.2.3 Rehabilitation and Development

Rehabilitation can be envisioned as a process that would reverse the risks of resettlement. M.M. Cernea suggests a risk and reconstruction model of rehabilitation that would be marked by a series of transitions from:

- Landlessness to land-based resettlement;
- Joblessness to re-employment;
- Food insecurity to safe nutrition;
- Homelessness to house reconstruction;
- Increased morbidity and mortality to improved health and well being, and
- Social disarticulation and deprivation of common property resources to community reconstruction and social inclusion (Cernea, 1998).

“Rehabilitation is only possible where development takes place. Thus resettlement must be planned as an integral part of the comprehensive development project”. In this sense rehabilitation is really an outcome of resettlement that is conceived not as physical relocation or mere restoration of incomes but as development. This brings us to the question of development in the context of resettlement and rehabilitation.

One useful way of understanding development in the context of resettlement and rehabilitation of negatively affected people is, “in terms of the real freedoms that the citizens enjoy, to pursue the objectives they have reason to value, and in this sense the expansion of human capability can be, broadly, seen as the central feature of the process of development” (Dreze, & Sen, 1996: 10).

A resettlement programme in order to qualify as development must therefore centre around: (i) enhancement of capabilities; and (ii) expansion of social opportunities by addressing the social and personal constraints that restrict peoples choices. This would mean that resettlement with development entails questions of resources and rights that would affect the quality of life of the people. “The success of development programmes cannot be judged merely in terms of their effects on incomes and outputs, and must, at a basic level, focus on the lives that people can lead” (ibid: 13). This would mean (i) tangible benefits like lower morbidity and mortality, an increasing level of education, increasing incomes through opportunities for employment and livelihood; and (ii) empowering the displaced people through building capacities by their participation in the entire decision-making process of the development project and resettlement.

One overarching issue is the need to move from a context where “forced evictions” or ‘involuntary resettlement’ is assumed to be the norm, to one where displacement becomes voluntary and takes place on the basis of negotiated agreements between developers and affected people.

3.1 Development-Induced Displacement in India: Land Acquisition Act of India

Highlighting the lacunae of Land Acquisition Act of India, Fernandes says: “Land oustees do not own individual land but depend upon Common Property Resources (CPRs) for their survival. The legal system, on the contrary, recognizes only individual property. The Land Acquisition Act, 1984 makes provision only for landowners. Its criteria for compensation are market value. These criteria are irrelevant to communities depending on CPRs and other whose livelihood depends on services rendered to the village as a community....A study of the Land Acquisition Act and the rest of the existing legislation show that the present legal system favours the state and the industrialists, and ignores the livelihood of the people who depend on the CPRs. Hence, the DPs of these regions are unable to begin a new life from the little compensation they get for it. ” (Verma, 2004: 41)

Mridul Singh et al says: “In the absence of a Central Act on Displacement and Rehabilitation, the whole process of dealing with the issue of displacement remains ad-hoc and piecemeal, even today.” (ibid: 40) Debashish Mukherji adds to this: “The Land Acquisition Act, 1894 is the single piece of legislation that governs the takeover of land for projects. Activists opined that this law remains heavily biased in favour of the state, allowing it to acquire land anywhere and everywhere, ‘in the public interest’ providing only cash compensation. The compensation amounts to just the white money! It is impossible to purchase alternative land elsewhere with the meager sum they get. With Nehru’s emphasis on factories and dams, those who question the need to acquire land, of the extent of compensation given, were made to feel that they were traitors. The attitude of policy makers is that since the project is in the interest of the nation, those affected should be willing to sacrifice. Since the law provides for only cash compensation, the project affected people should be grateful for whatever they are given in addition!” (ibid: 45)

However, recently, a new Land Acquisition law entitled The Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Bill was introduced in 2012 and passed in 2013, thereby replacing the existing Land Acquisition Act 1894.

The proposed land acquisition law defines the public purpose so as to prevent arbitrary acquisition of land. Social impact assessment and establishment of public purpose has been

made mandatory through participatory processes. Banning of excessive land being acquired for public purpose. The compensation for the acquired lands is proposed to be four times the prevailing market rate in rural areas and two times in urban areas. However, the model of development followed by India, particularly after 1991 has led to several debates among the scholars. One of the important debates following the policy in the recent time is one between the celebrated scholars like Amartya Sen and Jagdish Bhagwati. The insipid have called it the 'redistribution vs growth' debate or worse, a debate between the "economic ideologies" of Rahul Gandhi and Narendra Modi. Sen is accused of favouring "redistribution" over growth, of being anti-market, and thus endorsing a food security bill that is statist, fiscally responsible and apparently does little to meet its objective. Bhagwati, on the other hand, is condemned (or celebrated?) for falling for the Modi- mania, and being neo-liberal 'market fundamentalist' (for details see, Amartya Sen vs Jagdish Bhagwati debate).

In order to understand the problem of development-induced displacement in India and related resettlement and rehabilitation policy, I have discussed three case studies which will not only give us insight to the meaning and nature of development, displacement and rehabilitation but also give us an idea for the need of better resettlement and rehabilitation policies and acts safeguarding the interest of the people displaced.

3.2.1 Jharkhand

The tribal states of Jharkhand and Chhattisgarh on the Chotanagpur plateau region have been affected by the globalized market forces that threaten the livelihood of the tribal peoples and poor peasants who are dependent on subsistence agriculture. On 2nd February 2001, the tribal people of Topkara in Jharkhand demanded the scrapping of the Koel Karo hydro-electric project. The project would have displaced thousands of tribal families. The police resorted to an unprovoked shooting, killing 10 tribals and injuring many more. Such police brutality against minorities in the name of which the new state had been formed, sparked off anger not only in Jharkhand, but all over the country (Bhatia, 2001).

The tribal people displaced by the coal mines of Jharkhand have been subjected to livelihood insecurity notwithstanding adequate cash compensation and provision of one job to each of the displaced family members in the mines operated by Coal India Limited (CIL) in the region. The sleepy hamlets around Punkhri-Barwadih in Jharkhand have witnessed violent resistance to the prospect of losing their fertile farmland to an industrial venture. The NTPC, the largest power utility in the country, had a joint venture agreement with CIL, one of the world's largest coals producing company. Apart from the loss of over 10,000 acres of well-

irrigated farmland and dense forests, NTPC's planned opencast coalmine will obliterate, or at the very least damage irreparably, Punkhri-Barwadih's megaliths. Punkhri-Barwadih project at a total cost of Rs 40,000 million was scheduled to commence operations in December 2007. The project would displace some 14,000 families. In November 2006, a mob of thousands of farmers tore down NTPC's project-site office at Barkagaon. The villagers in the remote hamlets reorganized themselves for a stronger assault before the process of land acquisition by the government was stopped. In order to show their resentments against the land acquisition by the project the affected villagers had formed the anti-land acquisition organization Karanpura Bachao Sangharsh Samiti (KBSS) and the Karanpura Bisthapita Morcha (KBM).

The NTPC faced with coal shortages for its power plants expected to mine 15 million tons of coal a year from opencast mine. The government had planned to acquire land under Coal Bearing Area Acquisition and Development Act of 1957, which is exclusive and binding for India's coal-bearing areas. The company had planned to acquire a total of nearly 40,000 acres for the three projects together. In the wake of acquisition, those set to lose their homes, farmlands and forest-based livelihoods have been largely small farmers in the area. Rivulets crisscrossing the agricultural landscape around the villages supply enough water to produce three crops every year, while the forests – consisting mostly of Saal (*Shorea Robusta*) trees – provide ample sustenance with their leaves and myriad fruits. In such a rich ecological base, it is natural and obvious that people would strongly resent this public sector company depriving many of them of the source of their sustainable living and their dispossession from the land. The protesters pledge to die fighting for their land then give it away to NTPC or any other company while alive. Much of the land which is to be acquired falls under the Gair Mazurwa (GM) category. This means that the land is owned by the government but has either been officially granted to some villagers to cultivate or has been in their illegal possession for many decades and is being used for residential or agricultural purposes. In this situation, very few among the tribal people to be displaced would be compensated adequately by the NTPC, although all those affected have been enjoying usufruct rights to the land since time immemorial (Das, 2007).

The many protests and demonstrations of the tribals in Jharkhand reveal that they are completely disillusioned and apprehensive of the present development efforts of the state that encourages growth of mines and industries in the name of developing the income earning capability of the poor tribals and the revenue generating capacity of the government.

3.2.2 Chhattisgarh

Similarly, the tribal people of Chhattisgarh are losing their sustainable means of subsistence due to the opening of mines and setting up of many mineral-based industries in the state. Chhattisgarh has 28 varieties of major minerals. The state has one-fifth of the country's iron ore deposits and one of the best quality iron ore deposits in the world in the Bailadila mines. The state also has the only deposit of tin ore in the country. Like Jharkhand and Orissa, it has huge deposits of coals, bauxite, limestone, dolomite and corundum. Since the government reforms stimulating economic liberalization have been enacted, all doors for private investment are open in Chhattisgarh. The State's Mineral Policy 2001 has facilitated large-scale private sector investment in the mining sector and this has had its fall out effects on the tribal people and other subsistence farmers. In the coal bearing zones of Sarguja, Raigarh and Bilaspur districts, more than 72,000 acres of land have been granted on lease to South Eastern Coal Fields Limited (SECL), a subsidiary of CIL. Similarly, in Bastar and Durg districts more than 20,000 acres of land have been occupied for mining of iron ores in Bailadila and Dalli Rajhara areas of these two districts respectively. Apart from these areas, the state has reportedly given on lease 18,652 acres for various mining purposes and 26,410 acres for the setting up of various industries such as cement, steel, Ferro-alloys, re-rolling mills and rice mills. This means all total 137,062 acres of land have been leased by the state for mining and mineral-based industries (George, 2004). This land could have sustained at least 34,265 families or around 180,000 people with an average distribution of four acres of land per family.

However, in this state there is a low level of literacy among the tribals and the Scheduled Castes categories of the population and the industries and mines with high level of mechanization require technically skilled workers for their operations. As a result, very few among the land-affected families will benefit from such development. The employment level of the nearby giant public sector steel plant at Bhilai in recent years has declined from around 64,000 in 1980s to around 33,000 in 2007 due to increasing automation and mechanization. In a similar manner, the employment opportunities provided by the mines and mineral-based industries in the past have declined considerably. In this context, people displaced by the mines and mineral-based industries are likely to have a very difficult time sustaining themselves in the future, unless they are properly rehabilitated and skilled to earn their living in the non-agriculture based manufacturing and service sector economy of the region.

In August 2008, Mr. Pravin Patel, Director of the Tribal Welfare Society in Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh reported that the displaced tribals of HINDALCO's bauxite mines at Samri in

Sarguja district of Chhattisgarh were leading a very pathetic life after losing their land and forest. The livelihoods of thousands of tribals were destroyed by the state to satisfy the greed of private corporations. According to him, HINDALCO by virtue of an agreement signed with the state of Madhya Pradesh in May 1997 had obtained mining leases for bauxite mining in Samri of Sarguja district. Although the entire Sarguja district is a Schedule Five area that supposedly protects the interests of tribal population, not a single village council meeting had been held to consult tribals and other villagers about the opening of mines, the selling of their lands or the granting of mining leases. The land of over 200 farmers most of whom are tribals have been coercively purchased or acquired since 1997. The process is continuing each year with more and more land going for bauxite mining to HINDALCO.

According to Patel over 1,400 workers are presently working in the mines of HINDALCO in Samri. But none has any employment security. They do not get any medical or sick leave, and no paid holidays. Also, they are not provided with any safety gear and equipment in the work place. Those who are working as loaders for the transport contractors have a very miserable life. The average monthly income of such workers is around Rs 500 to Rs 600 only. The rates fixed for loading a truck with nine metric tons of bauxite ore is Rs 200 only and that is shared by a group of six to eight persons. Much of the time, they sit idle and only get half a day's work. When their services are not required, they return home empty handed, as their work is paid on a piece rate basis. So far, the company has done very little for the welfare of the project-affected people. Rather it has thrown the tribals into a state of livelihood uncertainty. And many members of the most vulnerable section of population like widows and old people are living in desperate conditions after losing their land to HINDALCO.

3.2.3 West Bengal

The West Bengal Government offered a highly attractive compensation package to the Singur farmers including both registered and unregistered tenants for 997 acres of farm land to be used by a plant by Tata Motors to manufacture low priced motor cars at Rs 100 thousand. Added to that, the Tata Company promised to offer each displaced family a regular salaried job in its proposed automobile plant. Nonetheless, the agriculture dependent people were apprehensive of the livelihood security of their offspring and future generation in the wake of loss of agricultural land. The fight for a better compensation package for all including the unregistered tenants and other project-affected people went on for quite some time till September 2008. The protesters with the active political support of the Trinamool Congress

Party and its leader Mamata Banerjee finally succeeded in stalling the project mid-way, and the House of Tata finally decided to shift the project from West Bengal to Gujarat.

Similarly, in January 2007, when efforts were made by the Government of West Bengal to acquire 10,000 acres of land for the Special Economic Zone (SEZ) in Nadigram, violence erupted resulting in the death of four protestors and severe injury of more than 20 persons. The violent clashes in Nandigram reportedly involved members of the local Krishjami Raksha Committee (Save Farmland Committee) and persons linked to the Communist Party of India-Marxist (CPI-M), which lead West Bengal's Left Front government that was seeking to industrialize the state for rapid economic growth. This was followed by the ransacking of the CPI-M Party Offices at several places and incidents of violence and arson at the residence of several local leaders of the CPI-M. The agitators also damaged many bridges and culverts and dug up several roads as a result of which the movement of vehicles became impossible. This was followed in March 2007, with violent clashes between the armed people of the Bhumi Uchhed Pratirodh Committee and others owing allegiance to the ruling Left Front. These clashes resulted in the death of 14 persons shot by the police. All efforts by the police to control the unruly protestors by lobbying tear gas shells and rubber bullets could not bring the situation under control. Here, the state had to yield to the will of the agriculture dependent people by closing the SEZ project (Rediff News, 2007).

4. Conclusion

After looking at all the cases we can say that, development as a concept should encompass, the progressive improvement in the quality of human life in terms of clothing, food and shelter and the conditions for a healthy living with increasing longevity of life and happiness. However, the Liberalization, Privatization and Globalization (LPG) model of development in India reveals the symptoms and effects of widening inequalities between the 'haves' and 'have-nots' and the increasing deprivation of the poor and marginalized sectors of the population. There are very little trickle down effects of the economic growth associated with this model of development as evident in case of Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh and West Bengal. Despite India's higher economic growth in recent years, poverty continues to persist almost among one-third of the country's population (Bhaduri, 2005).

In this scenario of development, if mines and mineral-based industries are allowed to proliferate in the mineral rich tribal regions of the country like Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh and West Bengal and continue to displace the indigenous people who live in these regions in order to enrich the affluent elites, the inequalities and poverty in these regions will be aggravated

further. The industries and mines using high technology for higher productivity and profits do not provide opportunities for adequate living and employment for the land-dependent people as evident in case of the states discussed above thereby displacing them. If land and other natural resources like water and forests that belong to the state or the local communities are acquired for industrial use or lost to development projects like river dams, the people who depend upon such resources become the direct and immediate victims of these projects. Impoverishment arising from such loss of resources cannot be prevented unless those who are affected are adequately compensated with alternative resources to sustain themselves.

In populous countries like India, development based on high technology that minimizes the employment of human labour and puts a strain on natural resources does not serve the interests of the poor and marginalized sectors of the population as evident in case of Chhattisgarh. It is not necessary for a country like India to promote large capital-intensive iron, steel and alumina plants by exploiting its mineral deposits from the tribal regions and thereby turning the poor tribals into wandering unemployed workers in their traditional homeland. The mineral-based industries have been encouraged for facilitating the investments of MNCs and ICHs by the state government in Jharkhand. But they only benefit the privileged sections of society in terms of jobs, access to new gazettes, consumer durables and the like.

For the development of India's poor and half-starved people it is necessary, to develop health care facilities, skill-based education as well as a sustainable food supply to improve their quality of life. These needs can be fulfilled by pursuing a sustainable development model that ensures 'growth with equity' and provides employment for all though there is high pressure of increasing population on the land and that the surplus labour force is disguisedly employed in the primary sector economy with very marginal and low rate of returns. This surplus labour force needs to be employed in highly productive jobs in other sectors of the economy. Unless the skills and knowledge of these people are developed in the non-farm sector economy with improved living standards, their human development cannot be improved. By using intermediate technology that employs a resource for the future generation and at the same time can ensure an improved standard of living for its poor and marginalized people at the same time. There is no need to invest in mega development projects by displacing poor and marginalized people from their lands and homes. Such development only contributes to the consumerist culture of the India's upper and middle class families who aspire to affluent living like their counterparts in western societies. Moreover, in a country like India, an energy intensive development model that warrants massive burning of fossil fuels generates more greenhouse gases and environmental degradation problems which threaten the survival of

such a large heterogeneous population. Therefore, the present development model needs to be recast to make it all inclusive and consensual in order to bridge the development gap between the rich and poor and end the deprivation of the latter. The development projects should be planned and ensure that the developmental projects obtain the legal mandate and support of the people who are affected and that in return for giving up their land and homes they receive priority if not exclusive rights to the benefits emanating from these projects.

REFERENCES

- Argentina Report (1999), *Danklemaier: Displacement, Resettlement, Rehabilitation, Reparation and Development*, WCD Report, Argentina, Bartolome, J.L. and Mohha, C..
- Bartolome. et. al. (2000), *Displacement, Resettlement, Rehabilitation, Reparation, and Development*, South Africa, WCD.
- Bhatia, Bela (2001), *Resistance and Repression*, *Frontline* 18(5)
[<http://www.thehindu.com/fline/fl1805/18050430.htm>]
- Bhaduri, Amit (2005), *Development with Dignity: A Case for Full Employment*. New Delhi, India: National Book Trust.
- Cernea M.M. (1998), *Impoverishment or Social Justice? A Model for Planning Resettlement*, In Mathur, H.M. and Marsden, D. (ed.) *Development Projects and Impoverishment Risks*.
- Das, Anand, S.T. (2007), *Public Sector Displacement: A Singur in the Making*.
[<http://www.tehelka.com>]
- Dhru, Kelly A. (2010), *Acquisition of Land for 'development' projects in India: The Road Ahead*, Research Foundation for Governance: in India Publication.
- Draeze, Jean & Sen, Amartya (1996), *India: Economic Development and Social Opportunity*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press.
- George, Goldy, M. (2004), *Mining to Destruction and Hijacking Their Rights to Submission*.
[<http://www.countercurrent.org>]
- Murickan Jose, M.K. George, K.A. Emmanuel, Jose Boban and Prakash Pillai R. (2003), *Development-Induced Displacement*, Jaipur and New Delhi, Rawat Publications.
- Rediff News (2007), What Buddhadeb Says on Nandigram Violence, Rediff News.
[<http://www.rediff.com/news/mar/15nandi.htm>]
- Robinson, W. Courtland (2003), *Risks and Rights: The Causes, Consequences and Challenges of Development-Induced Displacement*, The Brookings Institution, Washington DC.

Satyanarayana, G. (1999), *Development Displacement and Rehabilitation*, Jaipur and New Delhi, Rawat Publications.

Murickan Jose, M.K. George, K.A. Emmanuel, Jose Boban and Prakash Pillai R. (2003), *Development-Induced Displacement*, Jaipur and New Delhi, Rawat Publications.

Verma, Manish Kumar (2004), *Development, Displacement and Resettlement*, Jaipur and New Delhi, Rawat Publications.

www.governancenow.com

Authors:

MPhil Student, Department of Political Science, University of North Bengal

Professor, Department of Political Science, University of North Bengal