

---

## **Democracy and Tribal Displacement: A Study of the Political Economy of Jharkhand**

**Vivek Kumar Hind**

*Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Guru Ghasi Das Vishwavidyalaya, Koni Bilaspur,  
Chhattisgarh*

### **ABSTRACT**

*Often we come to the newspaper headings that so and so development projects are going to displace this much people. So and so projects will have negative implications on the growth rate of tribal. We also see that several voices have been raised from different parts of the country. We often come to know about activist like Dayamani Barla and others. Question arises all have consensus that development will benefit all, than why these people are opposing development. Are there resistance genuine? Why few groups benefitted most from the neo-liberal agenda? These are the burning questions which I have analyzed in this paper.*

*Development is an ambiguous term. People define it according to their own compatible zone. Often it is defined in terms of political economic and social development. On the one hand development means moving towards better society. Material aspects are often emphasized. On the other hand development is also displacing people. They suffer pains of losing their lands and livelihoods. According to UN study richest 20 states increased their GDP per capita by nearly 300% between the year 1960 and 2002, poorest 20 achieved an increase of 20%. At the same time big nations like India and China are moving towards big economies by enhancing their economy. But these developments are perhaps not sustainable because maximum people are not accommodated under that.*

*India is one of the nations in world which is perhaps having the greatest number of displaced people. Tribal communities are at most vulnerable situation. Looking at the population of around 8% tribal is at greatest risks. According to one estimate in India development projects in the last 60 years are estimated to have displaced roughly 60 million peoples, most of who have never been settled. In future displacement is going to occur on a scale that will dwarf even this past horrendous experience.*

***Jharkhand** (lit. "Bush land" or a land of forests) is a state in eastern India carved out of the southern part of Bihar on 15 November 2000. The state shares its border with the states of Bihar to the north, Uttar Pradesh and Chhattisgarh to the west, Odisha to the south, and West Bengal to the east. It has an area of 79,710 km (30,778 sq mi). The industrial city of Ranchi is its capital and Dumka its sub capital. Jharkhand is a state which is rich in mineral resources. This is rightly termed as the mineral capital of the country. At the same time this is one of the most backward regions of the country. Before separation it was seen that development fruits were shared by North Bihar. Therefore peoples started to resist the domination of Bihar, resulting into a mass political movements started by Jharkhand Mukti Morcha under the leadership of Shibu Soren often called Dishom Guru. This movement was a revolt of Adivasi for their rights. They wanted to remove outsiders from the seat of power. They often led violent movements against state authorities. Others also joined their*

---

*movements. Finally Jharkhand was carved out from Bihar for the upliftment of the common people particularly the tribals of Jharkhand. But a question remains is this newly state a success? Has political leadership actually taken their people out from poverty line? Has in real terms Jharkhand tribals are being empowered? Does the identity of Jharkhand's have been formed?*

*This study on development and displacement cannot be theorized without the proper understanding of larger political economy of India. Hence interaction of democracy and development is the major issue in the context of state- society framework. There were broadly two type of argument that theorizes the necessity of a link between the state and democracy. The first was that without an effective state there can be no democracy, because the state alone can provide and sustain the necessary institutional frameworks. The second argument premised on the belief that it is states and not society which generally destroy democratic institutions. Therefore by this study I will also look at the development debates through legal and constitutional framework.*

*Marxists in their past were often adopting radical methods to the goals of revolutions and communism they wanted to establish a classless society through the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Modernization theorist of west championed democracy against communism, and many new classical economists today hold that free markets are capable of solving major societal problems. For a proper understanding of the political economy of India in general and Jharkhand in particular I will certainly include in my paper debates surrounding the approaches being used by Marxist in both variants radical and liberal left, Modernist theories and Neoliberal theories.*

*India is being considered by and large the most successful democracy of the world. Democracy has put down firm roots in India in terms of establishing political and administrative institutions, but the quality of government remains low. Over the years democracy has spread and mobilized groups in terms of their primordial identities, and they have demanded further redistribution of power.*

*A universal fact which is now established that No electoral democracy can long survive without protecting the interests of powerful, whether these are propertied groups, groups with high status, or groups with effective political organizations. Long term exclusion of weaker groups is also not healthy for democracy.*

*Post-colonial Indian state has broken the nerve and depressed the spirit of the once happy and free tribesman. First and foremost is the loss of land. The indolent and pleasure loving temperament of the tribesman has always rendered the man easy prey to the men of the educated cunning and intelligence of the men of plains. It I deplorable fact that it has been actually proposed as a measure of social uplift to bring the hill men down to the plains and thus expose them to these adventurers. Those more or less nomadic tribes who had lived by shifting cultivation lost all rights over the forests where they once freely roamed and many of them are today landless coolies. In the light of these theoretical debates, I confine myself to the study of developmental modalities which Indian states have adopted since long. The loopholes or rather the implement ability level seems to be problematic. Tribal state of Jharkhand which was the fundamental premise during demand for separate ethnic and political entity now faces challenges where millions of people in recent past have been displaced and the proper rehabilitation seems into a grim future. I do not wish to theorize*

---

*anything against the development. Jharkhand has got political autonomy but the Jharkhandi identity in terms of Jharkhandiness has to be constructed. Lack of 'Jharkhandiness' has created the existential threat to Jharkhand.*

**Key words:** Tribal, Displacement, Resettlement, Jharkhand, Identity,

## INTRODUCTION

Let me introduce Jaipal Singh Munda (3 January 1903 – 20 March 1970). He was a Muanda tribal man, who captained the Indian field hockey team to clinch gold in the 1928 Summer Olympics in Amsterdam. He is well known for his sportsmanship and political skills. He was the greatest tribal leader and a representative in Constituent Assembly later in parliament from Jharkhand, of 21<sup>st</sup> century once remarked in parliament 'If there is any group of Indian people that has been shabbily treated it is my people. They have been disgracefully treated, neglected for the last 6000 years....this resolution is not going to teach adivasi democracy. You cannot teach democracy to tribal people; you have to learn democratic ways from them. They are the most democratic people on earth. What my people require is not adequate safeguards...we do not ask for any special protection. We want to be treated like every Indian....the whole history of my people is one of continuous exploitation and dispossession by the non- aboriginals of India punctuated by rebellions and disorder, and yet I take Pandit Nehru at his word. I take all at your word we are going to start a new chapter, a new chapter of independent India where there is equality of opportunity, where no one would be neglected...' This is an answer to those people who wanted to promote modernization theories in toto. This is a radical response to those people who actually wanted to accommodate tribals in mainstream development. He always supported differential treatment of tribals. He always favoured tribals causes.

The Republic of India is one of the largest countries in the world, both in terms of size and in terms of its population, what in itself transports the idea of diversity as a genuine factor of Indian life. Within this context, India faces the challenge of becoming a so called modern nation with rule of law, secularism and democratic procedures of decision making, while reality is characterized by inequality, injustice and exclusion. Roughly, India follows a concept of development, which eventually disregards any alternative option to mainstream development emphasizing industrialization and information technologies at the expense of the underprivileged parts of India's society, and conducts this process to a large extent with brutality. It cannot be said that India's governments would have done enough to meet the challenges. Indeed, diversity can be stated by some basic statistical data: India hosts approximately 170 million members of the Scheduled Castes (Dalits) and about 100 million members of the hundreds of Scheduled Tribes (Adivasi).

'Scheduled' is a legal definition in terms of registration and entails constitutional rights for the rights holders. In reality, however, Dalits and Adivasi continue to face discrimination and social segregation in many aspects of public and private life. Dalits are victims of social ostracism, Adivasi are consistently discriminated against and suffer from socio-economic marginalization. Among the estimated 60 million persons displaced since 1947 in consequence of and in the name of national development, about two thirds belong to Adivasi communities; as e.g. Walter Fernandes has found in his various studies on displacement. It may not be surprising that beneath the surface, India is a country still burdened with deeply

rooted ethnic and religious conflicts, with an insufficient infrastructure and a majority of the population living in poverty. No doubt, efforts have been made to address such issues: Since the 1990s, the Indian central government has drawn up and implemented several policies and legal frameworks, which should have enhanced the social and political life of the poor people - in terms of decentralisation and democratisation of political power.

Concerning the Adivasi, the 1996 Panchayats (Extension to Scheduled Areas) Act (PESA) introduced the concept of local policy-making and partial self-determination. Obviously, such provisions can be misused and instrumentalised for alien purposes. Nevertheless, in some of the examples presented in this paper, the importance of PESA and the local assembly Gram Sabha is underscored as a fruitful means for Adivasi in order to insist in their interests more effectively.

## **UNDERSTANDING TRIBE**

The term tribe was used by the colonial government in India to categories a large number of groups who did not fit the categories of 'caste' or 'Hindu'. the term subsumed communities very different from one another in terms of demographic size, linguistic and cultural traits , ecological conditions, material conditions of living, but essentially 'primitive', backward and uncivilized in character. After independence the term scheduled tribe was used to denote tribes which were scheduled as such under the constitution of India, distinguished from other communities by relative isolation, cultural distinctiveness and low level of production and subsistence, not necessarily original inhabitants. Indian words like adivasi (first settlers), vanvasi (inhabitants of forests), vanyajati (forest communities), pahari (hill-dwellers), adimjat (original communities/ primitive people), janjati ( folk people), anusuchitjanjati (scheduled tribe) are also used.

## **INTERROGATING DEVELOPMENT**

While it may have as many meanings as people who invoke its name, development generally has positive, though perhaps ambiguous, connotations. Uneven development is a bad thing and sustainable development is a good thing but, for the most part, underdeveloped countries and communities seek to become more developed, whether that is through improving health and livelihoods, expanding educational opportunities, or building infrastructure.

Development does not benefit everyone equally and for some—indeed, for millions of people around the world— development has cost them their homes, their livelihoods, their health, and even their very lives. The suffering of those displaced by development projects can be as severe, and the numbers as large, as those displaced either internally or internationally by conflict and violence. What follows is an examination of the often-overlooked phenomenon of development-induced displacement, its causes, consequences and challenges for the international community.

Development is invariably a form of change, but not all forms of development of change can be termed as development. There are forms of change that may disadvantage communities and thus lead not to development, but deprivation. The communities' goes not to a higher level of well being, but to a lower level. This is the process of change that leads to deprivation, where dispossession, for instance ends up with the community, or its members,



being at a lower level of well being compared to their state before the process of change. In the language of social exclusion, this is a process of adverse inclusion, an inclusion that has largely negative results when compared to the state of largely negative results when compared to the state of exclusion. The study of Alex Ekka in his important studies argues that two types of adverse inclusion result from the loss of homelessness and livelihood for projects and the specific alien action of tribal lands. Violation of human rights on account of project induced displacement, Violation in terms of alienation of land and denial of rights.

Development-induced displacement is problematic at best, even when a state has the best interests of the entire population at heart. Such displacement can be catastrophic when it occurs in the midst of conflict or when a state targets a particular segment of the population—be they people in poverty; ethnic, racial, religious or political minorities; indigenous peoples; or other vulnerable groups—to bear a disproportional share of the costs of development and, either through neglect, malfeasance, or outright malice, denies them a proper share of the benefits. In these instances, and they are manifold, development-induced displacement constitutes a violation of human rights and humanitarian law and calls for a response from the international community. Such a response should incorporate the Guiding Principles of UNHRC as a normative framework and should build upon the policies and guidelines being developed by international financial institutions, UN and international agencies, and non-governmental organizations. The response, furthermore, should promote an approach to development—and to Development-induced displacement—that incorporates both an “assessment of risks” and “recognition of rights.” My study will be based on the problem of adivasi development in the relational context of the larger political economy of India and its regimes. Are exclusion and adverse inclusion the only alternatives before the Jharkhand adivasi? Exclusion / adverse inclusion analysis could go the way of dependency theory, if it were held that there is no alternative to adverse inclusion or to Andre Gunder Frank's famous idea ‘development of underdevelopment’.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW ON DEVELOPMENT-INDUCED DISPLACEMENT**

Forced population displacement is always crisis-prone, even when necessary as part of broad and beneficial development programs. It is a profound socioeconomic and cultural disruption for those affected. Dislocation breaks up living patterns and social continuity. It dismantles existing modes of production, disrupts social networks, causes the impoverishment of many of those uprooted, threatens their cultural identity, and increases the risks of epidemics and health problems. In the 1950s and 1960s, it may be said that the dominant view in development was informed by modernization theory, which, put crudely, saw development as transforming traditional, simple, Third World societies into modern, complex, and Westernized ones. Seen in this light, large-scale, capital-intensive development projects accelerated the pace toward a brighter and better future. If people were uprooted along the way, that was deemed a necessary evil or even an actual good, since it made them more susceptible to change. In recent decades, however, a “new development paradigm” has been articulated, one that promotes poverty reduction, environmental protection, social justice, and human rights. In this paradigm, development is seen as both bringing benefits and imposing costs. Among its greatest costs has been the involuntary displacement of millions of vulnerable people. Michael Cernea, a sociologist based at the World Bank who has

researched development induced displacement and resettlement for two decades, points out that being forcibly ousted from one's land and habitat carries with it the risk of becoming poorer than before displacement. Those displaced "are supposed to receive compensation of their lost assets, and effective assistance to re-establish them productively; yet this does not happen for a large portion of oustees."

Finally, displacement carries not only the risk of human rights violations at the hands of state authorities and security forces but also the risk of communal violence when new settlers move in amongst existing populations. The impoverishment risk and reconstruction model already has been used to analyze several situations of internal displacement. Lakshman Mahapatra applied the model to India, where he estimates that as many as 25 million people have been displaced by development projects from 1947- 1997.

Overall, Mahapatra concluded that "detailed examination of India's resettlement experiences confirms empirically and theoretically the validity of the conceptual model of risk and reconstruction as an analytical, explanatory, and strategic tool." Cernea's "impoverishment risk and reconstruction model" offers a valuable tool for the assessment of the many risks inherent in development-induced displacement. Balakrishnan Rajagopal of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology has noted "human rights challenges" that arise in relation to development-induced displacement:

The reality is unpalatable and the data speaks for itself. Compared to other sections of our society, the tribal population has the lowest human development index. The literacy rate of the scheduled tribes was 47.1 percent in 2011 census is far from below the national literacy rate of 74.2 percent. Tribal children suffer from high dropout rates and low female literacy rate. They also have high infant mortality rates (IMRS) and malnutrition's compared to other population groups. They suffer from geographical and social exclusion, high poverty rates, and lack of access to appropriate administrative and judicial mechanisms. Low level of infrastructural endowments and growing gap in infrastructure creation in tribal areas, as compared to rest of India, has further diminished prospects for progress.

## **UNDERSTANDING DEVELOPMENT: A STUDY FROM INDIA**

Roughly, India follows a concept of development, which eventually disregards any alternative option to mainstream development emphasizing industrialization and information technologies at the expense of the underprivileged parts of India's society, and conducts this process to a large extent with brutality. It cannot be said that India's governments would have done enough to meet the challenge. Indeed, diversity can be stated by some basic statistical data: India hosts approximately 170 million members of the Scheduled Castes (Dalits) and about 100 million members of the hundreds of Scheduled Tribes (Adivasi). 'Scheduled' is a legal definition in terms of registration and entails constitutional rights for the rights holders. In reality, however, Dalits and Adivasi continue to face discrimination and social segregation in many aspects of public and private life. Dalits are victims of social ostracism, Adivasi are consistently discriminated against and suffer from socio-economic marginalization. Among the estimated 60 million persons displaced since 1947 in consequence of and in the name of national development, about two thirds belong to Adivasi communities; as e.g. Walter Fernandes has found in his various studies on displacement.

Official data on all indicators of development reveal that India's tribal people are the worst off in terms of income, health, education, nutrition, infrastructure and governance. They have also been unfortunately at the receiving end of the injustices of the development process itself. Around 40 per cent of the 60 million people displaced following development projects in India are tribals, which is not a surprise given that 90 per cent of our coal and more than 50 per cent of most minerals and dam sites are mainly in tribal regions.

Indeed, contrary to what economic theory teaches, we find that many developed districts paradoxically include pockets of intense backwardness. Bakshi *et al* show that many districts include the most backward and most developed subdistricts of India; 92 districts have subdistricts that figure in the list of both the top 20 per cent and bottom 20 per cent of India's subdistricts. To give a few examples, "developed" districts like Thane, Vadodara, Ranchi, Visakhapatnam and Raipur have some of the most backward subdistricts. In Korba and Raigarh districts of Chhattisgarh, Valsad of Gujarat, Pashchimi Singhbhum and Purbi Singhbhum of Jharkhand, Kendujhar, Koraput and Mayurbhanj of Odisha, the most industrialized subdistricts are flanked by the most underdeveloped subdistricts. And invariably these backward subdistricts are overwhelmingly tribal. Clearly, the tribal people have not been included in or given the opportunity to benefit from development.

Inequality is important not only because of the acute perception of injustice it creates. Even economists at the traditionally free-market fundamentalist International Monetary Fund, Andrew G. Berg and Jonathan D. Ostry, have recently argued that "inequality can also be destructive to growth by amplifying the risk of crisis or making it difficult for the poor to invest in education". They conclude: "reduced inequality and sustained growth may thus be two sides of the same coin".

## **LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND CONTEXT OF SCHEDULED TRIBES: NATIONAL AND GLOBAL**

The Constitution of India is secular in character and recognizes the tremendous diversity in the country. In relation to Adivasi, special provisions have been made e.g. in Articles 15(4), 15(5), 16(4), 16(4A), 46 and in the provisions of the Fifth Schedule. Also, the Supreme Court very recently (beginning of 2011) has flayed the Executive and the bureaucracy, stating that they are denying the marginalized, the weak, and the scheduled castes and tribes their legitimate constitutional guarantees. The court made this harsh observation in a case involving a tribal woman, whose land in the State of Orissa had been acquired by the government for a railway project 19 years ago. Further rights related to Adivasi people and communities are the Chota Nagpur Tenancy Act 1908 and Santhal Pargana Tenancy Act 1949 which prohibit the sale and transfer of Adivasi land to non- Adivasi although in reality the land was illegally snatched away from them. In 1969, the Bihar Scheduled Areas Regulation Act was enforced for prevention and legalization of illegal transfer of Adivasi land. A special Area Regulation Court was established and the Deputy Commissioner was given special right regarding the sale and transfer of Adivasi land. Nevertheless, the cases of illegal land alienation are increasing rapidly, particularly in States like Jharkhand. It can be simply concluded, that the numerous laws made for protection of the Adivasi's rights have never been enacted honestly and with true spirit.

In addition to the national law architecture, India has also accepted and ratified a number of international human rights instruments. India is e.g. a party to the International Covenants on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. However, India has made a reservation to Article 1 of both these treaties, denying the application of the right to self-determination to ethnic groups. India has not ratified either the first optional protocol to the ICCPR, which would allow individuals to make a complaint to the international treaty body, called the Human Rights Committee. India has further ratified the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Convention for the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and the Convention on the Rights of the Child. In relation to indigenous peoples, India has ratified the International Labour Organization's Convention 107 (1957) on Indigenous and Tribal Population, but refused to ratify the revised ILO convention concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries. What is the reason or motive behind this attitude? ILO 107 treats indigenous and tribal peoples as being backward and, thus, subject to mainstream development, while ILO 169 recognizes the right of indigenous and tribal peoples to keep their own culture, values, local governments and, finally, their historically grown access to land and resources. Consequently, India denies meeting the challenges of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples of 2007. In addition to the existing legal framework, which is only partly functioning, there are also obvious flaws. The Government of India was unable till today to repeal the draconian Land Acquisition Act of 1894 or to present a law for the rehabilitation of people affected by 'relocation' or displacement. For more than 60 years, people have been displaced in the name of development without any proper rehabilitation. A next flaw deals with the fact, that there are barely any governmental statistics regarding the population and the families, which have been or are going to be affected by a "development" project. This aspect has been revealed by Bineet Mundu's study. Moreover, the authorities are frequently silent on important questions with reference to the exact social, environmental, territorial and cultural impacts of a planned development project.

These people feel betrayed in the name of 'development' and 'national 'or 'public interest'? Are it only and exclusively a matter of public order, when Adivasi recur to mass struggle in order to protect their land? Deeply disappointed are Adivasi in the State of Jharkhand, whose literally meaning is 'the land of forests' and which came into existence in 2000 with the expectations that Adivasi can practice their ownership rights over the natural resources, enjoy autonomy and rule themselves as earlier they used to. Until today, Jharkhand witnesses an unending struggle for mineral resources. Exploitation and injustice are prevalent; the political leaders of Adivasi continue signing Memoranda of Understanding (MoU) for establishing steel factories, power plants and mining industries, which require approximately 200,000 acres of land. This would mean the displacement of approximately one million people in the name of public interest.

#### **DISPLACEMENT AND PEOPLE'S RESISTANCE: EXAMPLES FROM JHARKHAND OF INDIA**

From Jharkhand Displacement for Adivasi means total dislocation from their lands including the specific ecological knowledge, resources, systems of agriculture, from their herding,



hunting and gathering grounds, from their cultural and religious environment, which forms an indispensable element of their survival and identity.

Adivasi people have witnessed encroachment of their lands by outsiders such as government, forest authorities, companies and non-Adivasi individuals. This encroachment of lands has had a devastating effect on the socio-political life of the Adivasi people. In some regions, it has also brought a change in the demography, making Adivasi a minority on their own land.

Jharkhand is a classic example where adivasi are migrating in large numbers. Continuously they are exploited, discriminated, dominated and despised. The process of land acquisition for development got accelerated in Jharkhand after independence, particularly because of the regions abundance of natural and mineral resources. A study on land acquisition for various development projects in Jharkhand from 1951-1995 was 625,889 hectares. This is divided into 852,033 acres of private land, 348,828 acres of common land, and 345,085 acres of forest land. This amounts to 7.96 percent of the total landmass of the region. Of this, 34 percent has been used for water resources schemes. Industries have used only 11.7 percent of the total land acquired. Much land was already acquired much before independence since industrialization was started before independence. .

When displacement happens, people cannot decide on their own rehabilitation. The administration will prepare a plan in consultation with them, and they will be given land “if it is available”. There is no assurance of jobs or any other economic support. Most benefits given to the displaced are in the form of subsidies, not permanent assets like land. The social impact assessment before taking a decision on land acquisition is limited to common property like schools, ponds and roads. Impacts such as impoverishment, social disruption, psychological trauma and cultural degradation are not focused upon. Rehabilitation in those terms is treated as welfare, not as a right.

Adivasi people oppose displacement by attacking the company’s officials and not allowing them to enter their villages. Consequently, the government is unable to execute the MoUs at the grassroots. In 2008, there has been turmoil against displacement in the State of Jharkhand. Villagers attacked the Kohinoor steel plant near Jamshedpur, seized 70 trucks and stopped the work. They alleged that after acquiring their agricultural land, the company neither compensated them nor gave them jobs as promised and that the company has also caused huge environmental damages in agriculture, water sources and public health. Therefore they would not allow the company to destroy their livelihoods. Other villagers attacked surveyors of Bhushan Steel, when they were conducting a land survey near Sarmanda River at Potka of East Singhbhum District. Similarly, villagers attacked Jupiter Cement Factory, beat the workers and stopped the factory by alleging the breaking of land related laws. The Indian officials of the steel giant Arcelor Mittal were not allowed to enter into the villages in Torpa-Kamdara region near Ranchi / Jharkhand several times. The people of Tontopasi in Saraikela-Kharsawan district of Jharkhand are not allowing Tata Steel to acquire land for its Greenfield Project. The Adivasi of Dumka District in Jharkhand have imposed a public curfew in Kathikund and Sikaripada Blocks with the slogan “We shall give up our lives but not land.” against the proposed power plant of CESC Limited. Subsequently police firing took place. The people’s resistances have forced Tata Steel, Arcelor Mittal Company, Jindal Steel, Esser Steel and CESC Limited to leave the proposed areas. The Adivasi’ struggle against displacement has spread across many states.

Thousands of Adivasi and local people participate, shout slogans and echo their voices, block roads and organise rallies. The message which they convey to the government and the investors or industrialists is as follows: We will not give up our land for development projects. Dayamani Barla, the convener of Adivasi Moolvasi Astitva Raksha Manch in Ranchi, the organisation fighting against the Arcelor Mittal at Torpa-Kamdara, says “The lands, which we cultivate, belong to our ancestors; therefore, we will not leave it.”

Why are Adivasi so reluctant to give their land for development projects? One aspect of the answer leads to the history of pains and sufferings of the displaced people like in Rourkela, where only a small part was rehabilitated, the rest betrayed in compensation and jobs. Another aspect relates to the numerous laws made for protection of Adivasi’s rights, while these laws were never enacted in a true spirit. A third aspect deals with the experience, that even when compensation happens, the money is quickly consumed while Adivasi will have lost the ownership rights to their natural resources forever. ‘Displacement is not just shifting people from one place to another, but it is destruction of their livelihood resources, culture and identity.’ Adivasi have lost faith in the state machinery, constitutional authorities and judiciary. Therefore they have firmly decided not to allow constructing the foundation of corporate development model over their graves.

Hence an important issue emerges that now tribals are conscious regarding their rights due to their political mobilization. Though I do not claim this is true for all adivasis.

Jharkhand’s mineral and forestry resources were of keen interest to the colonial economic enterprise and this situation has little changed in the post-colonial state. The region has seen a sustained campaign for autonomy in order to claim the rights of the tribal population of the region over land, water, forests and other resources. The State of Jharkhand was created in the year 2000 after a long and protracted demand for a separate State. Once created, the recognition of tribal rights to autonomy gained in importance. However, the original claim of a ‘Greater Jharkhand’ which was carved out from five States becomes apathetic politically. The larger tribal struggle was also therefore undermined. The longstanding demand for a separate State in Jharkhand has underlined the distinctive tribal heritage and culture of the region as the primary reason for alternative administrative and political arrangements. However, the question of a development-deficit in the region gradually became an important part of the discourse of autonomy in the Jharkhand region and occasionally, overshadowed the issue of tribal rights and autonomy.

The Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, 2013 (also Land Acquisition Act, 2013) is an Act of Indian Parliament that regulates land acquisition and provides lays down the procedure and rules for granting compensation, rehabilitation and resettlement to the affected persons in India. The Act has provisions to provide fair compensation to those whose land is taken away, brings transparency to the process of acquisition of land to set up factories or buildings, infrastructural projects and assures rehabilitation of those affected. The Act establishes regulations for land acquisition as a part of India's massive industrialization drive driven by public-private partnership. The Act replaced the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, a nearly 120-year-old law enacted during British rule.

The Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement Bill, 2011 was introduced in Lok Sabha on 7 September 2011. The bill was then passed by it on 29 August 2013 and by Rajya Sabha on 4 September 2013. The bill then received the assent of the President of

---

India, Pranab Mukherjee on 27 September 2013. The Act came into force from 1 January 2014.

An amendment bill was then introduced in Parliament to endorse the Ordinance. Lok Sabha passed the bill but the same is still lying for passage by the Rajya Sabha. On 30 May 2015, President of India promulgated the amendment ordinance for third time. Finally Prime Minister Modi had to pull this Bill back just because they did not enjoy majority in Upper House. Whole parliament session in the month of August could not take place. Just because people from opposition under the leadership of Congress Party could not make happen the passage the revised Bill. Therefore one thing is clear that people are now creating havoc and hence important issues are not presented before parliament for proper debates. In that question I come to the conclusion that political approach seems to be problematic in resolving all the conflicts. The big debate arises as what are the proper mechanism for acquiring land must be debated by academia and public at large. And those communities must be included in that framework who are going to be affected. Looking at the geospatial situation there is no doubt that tribals are the group which is going to be affected most.

## **CONCLUSION**

While coming to any conclusion one must keep in mind that development is a necessity but approaches what are necessary elements. Therefore while making policy on that inclusive growth must be kept in mind. What then are the elements of a vision of development much more inclusive and empowering of those left out? First, the overall direction of growth needs to change. We cannot continue with a pattern of jobless growth. It is clear that some models of growth are inherently more inclusive than others, which is why our focus should be not just on GDP growth itself, but on achieving a growth process that is as inclusive as possible. For example, faster growth for the segment will generate a much broader spread of employment and income earning opportunities and is, therefore, more inclusive than growth largely driven by extractive industries or the service sector. It is also clear that sustainability has to be at the core of our development strategy. This is because the poorest regions of India are also the most eco-fragile. If we truly want to build tribal incomes, we need to offer them a range of sustainable livelihoods, including non-pesticide managed agriculture, an imperative also for the health of Indian consumers, as well as for reducing the escalating financial and ecological costs of farming.

Huge income-generation and biodiversity conservation possibilities also exist if we can imaginatively utilise the vast unutilised potential of the Non-Timber Forest Products market, which is estimated to run into several thousands of crores, of which only a minuscule fraction accrues to the tribal communities. Of course, this requires careful attention being paid to the rights of the tribal people, as enshrined in the Forest Rights Act and a complete restructuring of their relationship with the Forest Department, historically seen by the tribal communities as standing in an adversarial relationship with them.

Participatory mechanism for displaced people will help. Participatory governance will help better representation for tribal communities in framing a better approach for their development modalities. Much better state capacities in regions of high poverty are also an urgent requirement. For these regions suffer not just from rampant market failure but also widespread government failure. A crucial reason why the poor are unable to take advantage

of the possibilities opened up by growth even within their districts is the absence of requisite health and education facilities. Globally, India spends among the lowest share of its national income on public provision of health and education. These are the sectors in most urgent need of government reform. We need to equip our most disadvantaged people with the skills demanded by a rapidly changing economy. Programmes meant for poverty elimination such as the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act do not work as they are meant to because the requisite human resources do not exist precisely where these programmes are most desperately required.

A key feature of the changing economy is growing market penetration. More than 80 per cent of India's cultivators are small and marginal farmers and they are invariably hapless victims of participation in the market economy. But this need not necessarily be so. Wherever farmers have come together to form powerful institutions to buy and sell, they have been able to compete on much fairer terms in the market.

Most of all, the excluded regions and people need better governance, which is much more participatory in nature, for only then will the slogan of cooperative federalism really acquire concrete substance. Panchayati raj institutions, including the gram sabha, need to be empowered and activated for this purpose. We need to learn to involve the "last citizens" in decisions that affect their lives, such as taking their consent while acquiring land for an avowed public purpose.

There is nothing automatic about a decline in inequality under capitalism. The Kuznets Curve remains a mere fantasy if the right programmes and policies are not in place. Inequality did decline when the appropriate policy framework was adopted in Europe and America during the so-called golden age of capitalism in the mid-20th century. These were the decades that saw the emergence of what economist, public official and diplomat John Kenneth Galbraith termed "countervailing power". And it is the unravelling of this balancing power and a shift towards free-market fundamentalism that led to the rise in inequality after 1980.

Indian policymakers must recognise the urgent need to redefine the very meaning of reforms so as to make them pro-poor, rather than merely pro-corporate. Without these reforms, inequality in India will continue to escalate and create dangerous tensions, threatening the very survival of the delicate fabric of Indian democracy.

For a proper understanding of the big debates on development and displacement one need to be aware as how policy are going to affect the tribals. There are many reasons for intermingling of the issue of tribal rights and a development-deficit oriented approach to the Jharkhand region. One of the main reasons was the appropriation of tribal land and resources for the 'modern' industry led development process. The fact that Jharkhand accounts for a majority of India's mineral resources is central to this question as tribal rights were marginalized in the quest for national development. Also important is the fact that under these very processes, the proportion of tribal population in the region compared with the total population gradually declined. By the 2011 Census, tribals accounted for a mere 26.3 percent of the population of Jharkhand. Hence state needs to seriously reconsider its development modalities. Existential threat has to be avoided at any cost for the adivasi of Jharkhand. And a sense of Jharkhandi identity has to be restored.

## REFERENCES

- i. Asha, Mishra, Paty Kumar Chittaranjan(edts). 2010, Tribal Movements In Jharkhand 1857-2007, New Delhi: Concept Publishing house pvt ltd
- ii. Kothari, S (1996). "Whose Nation? Displaced as Victims of Development", Economic
- iii. Munshi, Indra (edts). 2012, The Adivasi Question ,Issues of Land, Forest and Livelihood, EPW and Orient Blackswan
- iv. Natahn, Dev and Xaxa, Virginius: Social Exclusion and Adverse Inclusion, Development and Deprivation of Adiasi in India, OUP, Delhi, 2012
- v. Penz, P, Drydek, J & Bose, S Pablo (2011) Displacement by Developemnt, Cambridge University Press, London
- vi. Prakash, Amit 2001, Jharkhand, Politics of Development and Identity, New Delhi: orient Longman
- vii. Shah, Alpa 2010, In The Shadows of The State, Indigenous Politics, Environmentalism, and Insurgency in Jharkhand, India. New Delhi, oxford university press Washington, DC.
- viii. 1996, 'The New Forest Act: Conservation Orientation But Where are the People?' Mimeo for Resettling Displaced Population, Environment Department, The World Bank,
- ix. Balkrishnan, Rajiv. 2004, Jharkhand Matters, Essays on Ethnicity, Regionalism and Development, Delhi: Konark Publications
- x. Cernea, M.M (1995b). Eight Main Risks: Impoverishment and social Justice in Resettlement, The World Bank, Washington, D.C.
- xi. Cernea, M.M (1996a), "Public Policy Responses to Development Induced Population Displacements", Economic and Political Weekly, Vol. 31, No. 24, June, pp. 1515-1523.
- xii. Elvin, Verrier. 1944, The Aborigines, Bombay: Oxford University Press 6. Fernandes, Walter.
- xiii. Ghurye, G. S. 1963, The scheduled Tribes, 3rd edition, Bombay: popular prakashan
- xiv. Gupta Das Sanjukta, Basu Sekhar Raj 2012, Narratives From the Margins, Aspects of Adivasi History in India, New Delhi: Primus Books

## NEWSPAPER ARTICLES:

- i. Indian Express (1987). "Woes of Displaced Tribals", June 14, pp.7
- ii. <http://www.thehindu.com/opinion/lead/mihir-shah-writes-on-tribal-alienation-and-need-for-inclusive-growth/article7383721.ece>



**INTERNET SOURCES:**

- i. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Right\\_to\\_Fair\\_Compensation\\_and\\_Transparency\\_in\\_Land\\_Acquisition,\\_Rehabilitation\\_and\\_Resettlement\\_Act,\\_2013](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Right_to_Fair_Compensation_and_Transparency_in_Land_Acquisition,_Rehabilitation_and_Resettlement_Act,_2013)
- ii. <http://www.asiapacific.undp.org/content/rbap/en/home.html/practices/governance/a2j/docs/CaseStudy-06-India-Jharkhand.pdf>
- iii. [http://adivasi-koordination.de/dokumente/BM\\_text\\_complete.pdf](http://adivasi-koordination.de/dokumente/BM_text_complete.pdf)

www.ijmas.com