

Chapter- 9: Riddle around Displacement and Resettlement

9.1 The exclusionary motif of LA Act:

The most puzzling and worrying aspect of any displacement study in India is that there are no authentic official records available about such bare facts as how many families or persons were displaced by a development project, what was their socio-economic background and where and how they settled afterwards. As a matter of fact, the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 that guided the administration in matters of land acquisition until very recent times was only concerned with the monetary compensation to be paid to the families/persons who owned land but had to lose it wholly or partially to a company or a Government agency intending to implement some sort of project or the other in the concerned area. As a result, there was no compulsion on the part of the administration to record the particulars of those families/persons whose source of livelihood might be lost or affected by the proposed project but didn't own any land in the concerned area. For instance, such categories of population as the share-croppers, wage-labourers, bonded labourers and artisans (say, mason, smith, quack, carpenter, weaver, milkman and domestic help etc.) who might not be owning any land but whose life and livelihood were very much interwoven with the area and its web of life that faced disintegration owing to land acquisition for this or that project under the LA Act or a similar law. Secondly, the LA Act did compensate only for privately owned land, but not common property resources e.g. a spring, a hill, forests or a grazing field which in official parlance is variously known as Government land, forest land, Anabadi, Gochar, Wasteland and the like. In fact since time immemorial down to the present day, such Government land is a substantial source of sustenance for the entire community in an Indian setting. Both landed and landless families substantially depend upon such CPRs in their day-to-day life. It has been noticed that in some cases bulk of the community members, say jhoom cultivators, food gatherers and collectors of forest produce, who don't own any land happen to absolutely depend upon such CPRs for their bare survival. But owing to the exclusive recognition by the LA Act of private land as the object of compensation, the administration of the State didn't have to record any information about how the landed or landless families depended upon CPRs and stood to lose owing to these CPRs getting acquired under LA Act. The next pertinent question that arises, who are these landless and CPR-dependent segments of population, which the LA Act bypassed? Any person who even is little aware about the overall sociology of Indian villages, knows for perfectly sure that these landless and CPR-dependent segments of population across India are very much the tribals (STs), dalits (SCs) and other backward classes (OBCs), who were not only economically poor but were socially the lowest, belong as they did to the bottom of the social hierarchy which was and still remains coloured by the considerations of caste and tribe.

9.2 Callousness of LA Act towards environmental concerns:

As is well known, when a project with its adverse implications for the quality of soil, air, water and vegetation is set up in an area, it continues to negatively affect the life and livelihood of those people who continue to live in the area because they are not as such displaced owing to land acquisition. Firstly, the LA Act leaves no space for compensating the incidental losses caused by such ecological factors and secondly, it so happens that the people whose land/homestead was not acquired for the project and who continue to reside in the concerned become with time passing compelled to leave the area under the exacerbated impact of ecological fall-out. It is therefore no wonder that the land acquisition authorities of the State were

least bothered about recording the facts about the aftermath conditions of left-out population and about their inevitable migration, if any to an uncertain destination. Except until the EIA (Environment Impact Assessment) Notification of 1994 came into vogue and the conduction of a public hearing of some sort became an official obligation, the administration didn't at all bother about the ecological adversity that a project might create for the population as a whole. Again, the mandatory convening of a public hearing over the EIA of a project, be it under the Notification of 1994 or under that of 2006 is invariably held prior to the commencement of the project, not after the project comes into operation. Needless to say, the ecological pinch of a project is gradually felt and pronounced as the time passes on with the project getting operationalised more and more fully. The families who were left-out from the ken of land acquisition and stayed on in the areas surrounding the project location come to gradually experience the brunt of ecological burdens, and unable to bear it further feel compelled sooner or later like the first batch of land losers, to leave their land/homestead for certain unknown destination. Frankly speaking, there is no mechanism in law or otherwise available with and binding on the environmental or revenue administration to address to the woes of ecological victims of a development project. It is therefore no wonder that there are no authentic official figures maintained at the level of administration at any level to show the plight of the affected residents/migrants in the aftermath of the commissioning of a project for which land was acquired under LA Act or a similar Act.

9.3 No law as yet mandating the right of a displaced citizen to resettlement:

As already indicated the LA Act was and still remains focused on monetarily compensating the private land acquired for a development project and that too at a 'market rate' determined by the Government on the basis of the cut-off date i.e. the date on which the first notification is made under Section 4 of the Act. The Act has absolutely no room for such considerations as where the displaced family migrated to and settled, what is the source of their livelihood and whether their condition has improved or worsened in the aftermath of displacement. Only after a chain of powerful anti-displacement agitations rocked the political establishment in mid-seventies, some sort of laws and policies, that too scrappy and anomalous on many counts, were announced by a few States and by some Central Govt undertakings to address to the intractable plight of the displaced and affected populations. Then only the issue of resettlement and rehabilitation as a subject-matter for policy making entered the official discourse. In Orissa, for instance, the Government's first talk of a resettlement and rehabilitation policy for the displaced families came on the scene early 70s when a strong wave of protest was raging across the State under the banner of Rengali Dam Oustees. It was followed by the formal announcement in mid-90s of an R&R policy for the families displaced by the irrigation projects. However, notwithstanding the bunch of R&R laws and sectoral R&R policies made by a few States and central undertakings, neither the Central Government nor the State Governments did genuinely address to the real need of resettling and rehabilitating the project-displaced families and persons in a manner satisfactory to the latter. For all their commissions and omissions which are often harped on by the agitating public and opposition politicians, the Government officials in charge of the R&R matters remained immune and unscathed, principally because type of R&R laws and policies that were in place were ridden with very many loopholes and contradictions providing thereby easy escape route to the corrupt, inefficient and defaulter officials. Thus, except until the emergence of the National R&R Policy-2007 in October 2007, there existed no clear-cut and binding direction to the Government to record detail information about a displaced/affected family on such matters as

the source of livelihood, house, job, family members, caste, education, health, access to public facilities and schemes and access to common property resources. And these matters, as is well known, do constitute the subject matter around which a law or a policy on R&R is framed. The National R&R Policy-2007 despite its wholesome intentions to ensure transparency and accountability, comprehensiveness and proactiveness benefiting thereby both project authorities and displaced people is still a policy, not a law. That is why, even after it has been properly notified on the official gazette several months back, few at the government level at Centre or in States are seen to be its takers in true sense of the term. In the light of these facts it is therefore no wonder as to why there are no reliably authentic records available with land acquisition authorities about the resettlement and rehabilitation status of the families and communities displaced or affected by any development project.

9.4 Absolute chaos rules the displacement scenario:

As already indicated, till date there is no legal instrument to bind any land acquisition authority to maintain a comprehensive and updated record of the numbers and profile of the families/persons displaced or otherwise affected by a development project, kinds of compensation paid to them other than the monetary compensation against the land acquired, resettlement and rehabilitation of all categories of displaced/affected families, aggravation of the plight of the left-out families living in the areas surrounding the project caused by environmental degradation and moreover current status of both displaced and non-displaced families. Thus, an absolute chaos runs supreme in matters relating to displacement and R&R status in respect of any development project for which land is acquired under L.A.Act or a similar law.

9.5 Arundhati Roy's projections:

This phenomenon was beautifully depicted by the writer-activist *Ms. Arundhati Roy in her book 'The Greater Common Good (April 1999)* thus, "According to a detailed study of 54 Large Dams done by the Indian Institute of Public Administration, the average number of people displaced by a Large Dam is 44,182. Admittedly, 54 dams out of 3,300 is not a big enough sample. But since it's all we have, let's try and do some rough arithmetic. A first draft. To err on the side of caution, let's halve the number of people. Or, let's err on the side of abundant caution and take an average of just 10,000 people per Large Dam. It's an improbably low figure, I know, but ...never mind. Whip out your calculators. $3,300 \times 10,000 = 33$ million. That's what it works out to. Thirty-three million people. Displaced by big dams alone in the last fifty years What about those that have been displaced by the thousands of other Development Projects? At a private lecture, N.C. Saxena, Secretary to the Planning Commission, said he thought the number was in the region of 50 million (of which 40 million were displaced by dams). We daren't say so, because it isn't official. It isn't official because we daren't say so. You have to murmur it for fear of being accused of hyperbole. You have to whisper it to yourself, because it really does sound unbelievable. It can't be, I've been telling myself. I must have got the zeroes muddled. It can't be true. I barely have the courage to say it aloud. To run the risk of sounding like a 'sixties hippie dropping acid ("It's the System, man!"), or a paranoid schizophrenic with a persecution complex. But it is the System, man. What else can it be?

Fifty million people.

Go on, Government, quibble. Bargain. Beat it down. Say something.

I feel like someone who's just stumbled on a mass grave.

Fifty million is more than the population of Gujarat. Almost three times the population of Australia. More than three times the number of refugees that Partition created in India. Ten times the number of Palestinian refugees. The Western world today is convulsed over the future of one million people who have fled from Kosovo. A huge percentage of the displaced are tribal people (57.6 per cent in the case of the Sardar Sarovar Dam). Include Dalits and the figure becomes obscene. According to the Commissioner for Scheduled Castes and Tribes, it's about 60 per cent. If you consider that tribal people account for only eight per cent, and Dalits fifteen per cent, of India's population, it opens up a whole other dimension to the story. The ethnic 'otherness' of their victims takes some of the pressure off the Nation Builders. It's like having an expense account. Someone else pays the bills. People from another country. Another world. India's poorest people are subsidising the lifestyles of her richest.

Did I hear someone say something about the world's biggest democracy?" (Source: *The Greater Common Good* by Ms. Arundhati Roy, April 1999).

Just another excerpt from Ms. Arundhati Roy, that succinctly lays bare the ironical silence of the State on the displacement statistics. "How can you measure Progress if you don't know what it costs and who paid for it? The Government of India has detailed figures for how many million tons of food grain or edible oils the country produces and how much more we produce now than we did in 1947. It can tell you how much bauxite is mined in a year or what the total surface area of the National Highways adds up to. It's possible to access minute-to-minute information about the stock exchange or the value of the rupee in the world market. We know how many cricket matches we've lost on a Friday in Sharjah. It's not hard to find out how many graduates India produced, or how many men had vasectomies in any given year. But the Government of India does not have a figure for the number of people that have been displaced by dams or sacrificed in other ways at the altars of 'National Progress.' Isn't this astounding?" (Source: *The Greater Common Good* by Ms. Arundhati Roy, April 1999).

Echoing a similar voice the veteran journalist of the country Mr. Kuldip Nayar said, "The story of oustees is sad and grim. More than 1.5 crore people have been uprooted since Independence and they are mostly tribal and rural poor. Most of them have been driven out forcibly. (Source: *Kuldip Nayar in 'The story of us', Indian Express, Tuesday, January 2, 2001*)

9.6 Smithu Kothari on officials' neglect in maintaining displacement statistics:

Smithu Kothari a contemporary scholar-activist also thinks that the post-independence officialdom like their colonial predecessors deliberately closed their eyes to the need for maintaining proper statistics about the people who were displaced and affected by development projects, simply because they were guided by an abstract concept of development that had least

concern for the well-being of the people as such. In a monograph entitled “DEVELOPMENT DISPLACEMENT: WHOSE NATION IS IT?” (1995) Mr. Kothari elucidates the peculiar mindset the post-independence regime harboured on the issue of development and displacement thus: “As far back as the mid-19th century of people in India's tribal areas organized protests and rebellions against British colonial laws such as the Forest Act of 1876, which prevented their use of the forest lands on which their way of life depended. Though India gained its independence in 1950, the displacement once associated with colonialism continues in the name of development..... In the post-Independence period, progress, national self-sufficiency, industrialism, and large development projects were seen as synonymous. Carried by the euphoria of nation building, most "sacrifices" sought by the rulers were widely seen as legitimate, justified as being for the "national good. Given the number of displacements and the plight suffered by the displaced, many are now asking: whose nation is it? Whose good is being served?”

On the magnitude of displacement Mr. Kothari reflects thus: “Since Independence, development projects under India's Five-Year plans have displaced about 500,000 persons each year- evicted from their lands by direct administrative actions of government. This figure does not include those deprived of their livelihoods by the expansion of large estate monoculture production, or those deprived of their livelihoods by project related natural resource extraction, urban evictions, or by the relocation of other displacement victims. Estimates of the total number of those displaced by "development" since independence reaches as high 40 million people. .. Hydroelectric and irrigation projects are the largest source of displacement and destruction of habitat. Other major sources are mines, thermal and nuclear power plants, industrial complexes, military installations, weapons testing grounds, railways, roads, and the expansion of reserved forest areas, sanctuaries and parks”.

On the wider damage that the displacement brings to the land and its people Mr.Kothari observes, “Displacement results in dismantling production systems, severing trade and market links, desecrating ancestral sacred zones, graves, and temples, scattering kinship groups and extended families, and weakening cultural systems of self-management and control. The consequences are especially severe for women. They lose access to the fuel, fodder and food they traditionally collected for their households from common lands. They thus face increased pauperization and are thrust into the margins of the labor market”.

On the plight and vulnerability of tribals facing displacement Mr. Kothari says, “Though India's tribal people make up roughly 7.5 percent of the population, over 40 percent of those displaced from 1950 to 1990 were from tribal communities. Since 1990 the figure has risen to 50 percent. Planners and administrators invariably capitalize on and manipulate the relatively weaker socio-economic and political position of most of the people facing displacement. Their numbers are underestimated, they are treated indifferently and only minimal cash compensation, if at all, is paid. They are rarely granted security of tenure on alternative developed land sites. All too often after a painful and traumatic period of establishing a new lifestyle, they are informed they must move again to make way for yet another project. Despite the scale of the displacement and the efforts of some governmental and independent groups, resettlement efforts continue to be shoddy and grossly inadequate”.

That the neglect shown by the ruling class towards the displaced and oustees was an in-built feature of the post-independence regime has been argued out by Mr.Kothari thus: “A common question from people facing displacement is that while precise details exist regarding the technical and economic aspects of the projects, backed by scores of professionals, why is there never a plan for them? Why are they never consulted? Even where government does attempt to address its responsibility to the displaced, there is an underlying assumption that since displacement is inevitable, the need is to "deal" with the trauma, not to question the project, much less the development model, that is causing the displacement. No one considers that perhaps the current pattern of economic development invoked to justify the forced evictions of people is itself incompatible with the goals of equity and social security”.

In view of such a disconcerting situation surrounding displacement Mr.Kothari advises, “It is time to recognize that the projects in which massive public investments are being made involve not only the harnessing of natural resources such as land, water, minerals, and forests, they also alter the existing distribution, use, access to, and control over natural resources among different sections of society. This raises vital issues concerning fairness, equity and justice. An improvement in the lives of those whom a project otherwise imposes severe costs in order to create benefits for others should be considered an entitlement, not an act of reluctant generosity-- a basic test of project benefit. While the first goal should be to find alternatives that cause minimal displacement, in those instances where displacement is inevitable, it is imperative that the full costs of rehabilitation be internalized into the project cost.” (*Smitu Kothari in Lokayan Bulletin, March-April 1995, Delhi 110054*)

9.6 N.C.Saxena on displacement:

A former bureaucrat of Government of India, who was Secretary to Planning Commission before his retirement and presently a member of National Advisory Council headed by Mrs.Sonia Gandhi admits that land acquisition in the name of national development has led to pauperization and immiserisation for the displaced populations and it has hit hardest the tribal communities. In his paper *‘Policies for Tribal Development: Analysis and Suggestions’ prepared for NAC Mr.Saxena writes*, “It is estimated that some 50 million persons have been displaced since 1950 on account of various development projects, of which more than 40 per cent are tribals. These projects include large irrigation dams, hydroelectric projects, open cast and underground coal mines, super thermal power plants and mineral-based industrial units. In the name of development, tribals are displaced from their traditional habitats and livelihoods with little or no rehabilitation, and are rendered destitute, bewildered and pauperised by the development process. They are pushed into a vortex of increasing assetlessness, unemployment, debt bondage and hunger due to loss of access to traditional sources of livelihood viz.,land, forests, rivers, pastures, cattle etc. In these large development projects, tribals lose their land not only to the project authorities, but even to non-tribal outsiders who converge into these areas and corner both the land and the new economic opportunities in commerce and petty industry. Even wage employment to local tribals is rare. In Chotanagpur area, though the tribals constitute more than 50 per cent of the total population, there are not more than 5 per cent of them in the industrial working force. In some of the large firms like TISCO, Jamshedpur and Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Dhanbad, the tribals employed are less than 5 per cent. Development for the nation has meant displacement, pauperisation, or, at its very best, peonage for the tribals”. (*Source: ‘Policies for Tribal Development: Analysis and Suggestions’ prepared for NAC by Mr.N.C. Saxena*)

9.7 Planning Commission on Tribal Displacement:

A Steering Committee on the Empowerment of Scheduled Tribes in Tenth Five Year Plan (2002-2007) was set up by Planning Commission. The Committee submitted its Report in October 2001, which inter alia dealt at length with the plight of the displaced tribals. Relying on the estimates made by Mr. Walter Fernandes the Report observed, "Since Independence, tribals displaced by development projects or industries have not been rehabilitated to date. Research shows that the number of displaced tribals till 1990 is about 85.39 lakhs (55.16% of total displaced) of whom 64.23% are yet to be rehabilitated. Although accurate figures of displacement vary it is clear that majority of those displaced have not been rehabilitated. Those displaced have been forced to migrate to new areas and most often have encroached on to forest lands and are, on record, considered illegal. It is a known fact that displacement has led to far reaching negative social and economic consequences, not to mention the simmering disturbances and extremism in most of the tribal pockets. Economic planning cannot turn a blind eye to these consequences in the light of displacement". The Report further mentioned that the State induced land alienation negates the very Fifth Schedule of the Constitution and also stands to question the control and ownership of land and natural resources, which is so essential to tribal way of life. Alienation of land also leads to alienation of the surrounding livelihood resources, which the tribals depend on. While setting up industries and other projects these connecting impacts have never been taken into account or compensated. This cannot be any longer ignored. While on the one side, tribals were alienated from their lands, there has not been any remarkable progress on health, education or infrastructure development. It has been a myth that industrialization would lead to a corresponding improvement in these sectors among the local tribals. It has only proved that they have been further marginalized from whatever rights and resources earlier enjoyed by them. There has been no attempt to improve the skills of the tribals to compete with the mainstream societies in taking up any responsible positions in the industries set up in their areas. All projects in tribal areas were considered 'public purpose' even for private mining industries. This is the biggest fallacy of our development paradigms in tribal areas. Extremism, terrorism and political disturbances in the tribal areas are a result of either exploitation or neglect of these areas and the degradation is further exploited by these militant groups. Hence, it is the first primary duty of the state to address the actual socioeconomic problems of the tribal people and not deal with it as an adhoc law and order problem. Ruling the regions with armed forces as in the Sixth Schedule areas or pouring in squads of police battalions cannot solve the problem of violence or unrest in these areas. It is repeatedly emphasized that political will to provide justice to tribals, ensure rights over their lands and forest resources, stop taking up any projects that would displace tribals is a pre-requisite to putting an end to the violence and unrest in these areas".

At another place the Report went on, "Rehabilitation of the Displaced Tribals is a serious problem which is yet to receive due attention. As per the information readily available, Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Gujarat, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Orissa alone, a total population of 21.3 million have been displaced during 1951-90. Of whom, 8.54 million (40%) are tribals and of those only 2.12 million (24.8%) tribals could be resettled so far. As documented by various research studies, only a small percentage of tribal oustees could get the benefit of rehabilitation facilities. A vast majority of tribal people displaced by big projects are pushed into a vortex of increasing assetlessness, unemployment, debt-bondage and destitution. Women and children among them are the worst affected. The payment of compensation in cash

directly disempowers tribals as the exploiters in the area exhaust their money through various unproductive expenditure and fraudulent practices. Any loss of access to traditional sources of livelihood viz - land, forest, water, river, pasture, etc. marginalizes women more than men in the labour market. It is only when land and other sources are regained the tribals in general and tribal women in particular be empowered. [Source: *Report of Steering Committee on the Empowerment of Scheduled Tribes in Tenth Five Year Plan (2002-2007)*, Planning Commission, New Delhi, October 2001]

9.8 Walter Fernandes on magnitude of displacement:

As is well known, an oft-quoted scholar Mr. Walter Fernandes is accepted in both official and non-official circles as an authority on the subject of post-independence displacement. He is quoted by various think-tank bodies starting from Planning Commission to NGOs in respect of displacement figures pertaining to various sectors and regions of the country for the period 1950 to 1995. In initial years he worked intensively to grapple with the displacement figures in such mine-rich States as undivided Bihar (now Bihar and Jharkhand), undivided Madhya Pradesh (now Madhya Pradesh and Chhattisgarh), Andhra Pradesh and Orissa. Presently he focuses his study on issues around development and displacement in north-east region of the country.

As per his admission, one can't find any reliable statistics on the magnitude of displacement from any official source. It is worthwhile to quote Mr. Fernandes at length on the kind of muddle that the displacement statistics presents and his strenuous but abortive efforts to steer clear of it. In an article entitled 'Displacement and the Land Acquisition Act 1894: why are tribal areas not considered a part of our history?' published in *Combat Law (Vol 1 Issue 1 March - April 2002)* Mr. Fernandes observes, "The debate on numbers highlights the fact that India does not have an official database on them. So some like Arundhati Roy, speak of 56 million displaced by large dams, while others give a ridiculously low figure, based on the average worked out by the Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA). I too began with an estimate based on secondary data, and came to a figure of 213 lakh DPs / PAPs of all the projects from 1951-1990. We have now completed data-based studies of all displacement (1951-1995) in Andhra Pradesh (AP), Goa, Jharkhand, Kerala and Orissa, and have preliminary data from three other states. Based on them, I realize that mine is an underestimate. I came to a figure of 164 lakh DPs / PAPs of dams. Our studies show that AP, Orissa, Jharkhand and West Bengal have together deprived around 100 lakh of people of their livelihood from 1951-1995. This does not include high-displacement states like Chhattisgarh".

Then on sector-wise displacement Mr. Fernandes writes, "Over 50 lakh of these 100 lakh DPs / PAPs are displaced by dams. For every 10 DPs, dams deprive six more of their livelihood without displacing them (PAPs). Their situation is often worse because they get meagre compensation for patta land (land for which one has legal documents), but none for the Common Property Resources (CPRs). I tend to put the number of dam DPs / PAPs all over India at about 40 million – some 25 million of them are DPs, and 15 million are PAPs. We came to a figure of 12.5 lakhs deprived by industry. AP and Orissa account for half that number. We put the DPs / PAPs of wildlife sanctuaries at 600,000. Jharkhand, Orissa and AP together exceed this figure. We put the transport and communication DPs / PAPs at 5,00,000. AP and Orissa together account for that number. Our figure for mines was 23.5 lakhs. AP, Orissa and Jharkhand account for more than 10 lakhs. So I would put the total number of DPs / PAPs of all projects between 1951-1995 at not less than 50 million".

Disputing the method used by Ms.Arundhati Roy to arrive at the figures of dam-displaced persons, Mr.Fernandes continues, “The main reason for this difference is that IIPA and others like Arundhati Roy, take all the ‘large dams’ above 15 metres together, instead of dividing them into major and medium according to their Irrigation Potential (IP). Displacement is linked to land and IP is based on the land submerged. Fewer than 300 of India’s 4,200 large dams are major. They affect 25,000 to 2,50,000 people each, and at least 15 have displaced more than a lakh each. The rest are medium-sized and affect 400 to 6,000 persons each. So one cannot accept the IIPA average or the 1,360 per large dam arrived at by Surjit Bhallaii”.

However, all said and done including his own efforts to develop a data base on the displacement figures, Mr.Fernandes admits the quintessential fact that there is no official data base till date on the displacement, which is indispensable for carrying out any R&R policy worth the name. Soon after the first ever National R&R Policy for Project Affected Families-2003 came out by the Central Government, Mr.Fernandes reacted thus in his article *‘Rehabilitation Policy for the Displaced’ published in ‘Economic and Political Weekly March 20, 2004’*, “One can see it also from the fact that, the policy has been formulated without a proper database on the DPs and PAPs. It is not possible to plan resettlement without knowing their number and type”.

Then Mr.Fernandes comments on how the officials in their eagerness to manufacture a data base overnight just for cosmetic purposes resort dishonestly to stealing from non-official sources, “Without acknowledging the source, the 1993 draft had referred to the present author’s outdated estimate of 185 lakh DPs and PAPs 1951-1985. By that time we had come to an estimate of 213 lakh till 1990, fewer than a third of them resettled..... Studies on displacement 1951-1995 completed in six states and other research show that their real number 1947-2000 is probably around 50 millions. Orissa, West Bengal, Jharkhand and AP have together caused more than 100 lakh DPs, or 50 per cent of 213 lakh, over half of them by dams. They do not include high displacement states like Chhattisgarh. Studies indicate that, around 20 million ha of land have been acquired by all the development projects 1951-1995 all over India, including 7 million ha of forests and six million ha of other CPRs (Common Property Resources). Two thirds of the massive land area dams use is CPRs, against 40 per cent by other projects. That explains why for every ten DPs they cause six PAPs.Based on these studies, we would revise our earlier estimate of water resource DPs/PAPs from 164 lakh 1951-1995 to 40 million 1947-2000, 25 million of them DPs and 15 million PAPs. Their number was underestimated mainly because of the exclusion of the CPR dependants from the list of DPs. For example, by official count the Hirakud dam in Orissa displaced 1,10,000 but researchers put their number at 1,80,000 because the project had excluded the CPR dependants. Two thirds of the 70,000 acres that Nagarjunasagar in AP submerged were CPRs. No wonder, it claims to have displaced only 30,000. This trend continues even today. For example, according to the project authorities the proposed Pagladia dam in the Nalbari district of Assam will displace only 3,271 families but in reality their number is close to 20,000 mainly because of the predominance of the CPRs. [Source: *‘Rehabilitation Policy for the Displaced’ published in ‘Economic and Political Weekly March 20, 2004’*]

On the status of resettlement and rehabilitation Mr.Fernandes deplores the big mess that is noticed all across the country. For instance he says, “As for rehabilitation, Orissa has resettled 32% of its DPs from 1951-1995. AP resettled around 27% and Goa 42%. Kerala and West Bengal, which claim to be high on human development, have together resettled the DPs of fewer than 25 projects. In most cases, the quality of rehabilitation is poor. This record is not surprising,

because around 40% of the victims are tribals, 20% Dalits and a similar number are from other rural poor categories like fish workers and stone-cutters. The fact that around 80% of the displaced belong to the powerless classes may explain the absence of a national rehabilitation policy even 50 years after the formation of the Republic. Misery is its consequence. For example, some 30,000 of the 1,50,000 construction workers of the Asiad facilities in 1982 were bonded labourers from Orissa and Chattisgarh, brought to Delhi by labour contractors with the promise of a job in Baghdad. Once in Delhi, they were kept in concentration-camp-like conditions with no hope of ever returning home. They had been displaced by the Hirakud dam and other projects. Impoverished, they followed the labour contractor. Such people form a substantial proportion of brick, kiln and construction labour today. Child labour is rampant among them”.

Thus from the above account it is now clear that in absence of reliable official data, whatever data have been generated by the civil society groups in respect of displacement were themselves subject to repeated revision and highly subjective and controversial in nature and are therefore utterly unreliable from the perspective of undertaking a practical intervention at resettling and rehabilitating the displaced and affected populations.

9.9 Fernandes’ method of computation, its relevance and limitation:

In a situation where the officials were completely averse to maintaining any data base on displacement or resettlement, the scholars like Mr.Fernandes have exerted themselves to developing some sort of data base on this critical but neglected aspect of national development. Their contributions, especially the estimates despite being tentative in nature have been immensely significant in advancing the advocacy campaign by the civil society groups to press the concerned public authorities to mete out proper justice to the hapless displacees and oustees. Besides they have provided an invisible push to the chief wings of the State- judiciary, legislative and executive- to engage themselves in the discourse on R&R policy or amendment of L.A.Act involving at times the civil society groups and representatives of displaced and affected communities. But for their intellectual exercises coupled with the ever intensifying agitation by the displaced and affected groups at ground level we wouldn’t have seen such novel dispensations of the State as a national resettlement and rehabilitation policy, the LA Amendment Bill or Forest Rights Act.

But one needs to know how these independent scholars could arrive at the aggregate figures of the displaced or resettled for a State, or a region or for the country. As admitted by these scholars, their method has been one of sampling coupled with extrapolation. For instance, let us see what method Mr.Fernandes adopted to arrive at the total figures of the displaced in the country for the period 1951-95:

“The study involves three phases. The first is to look at all the land acquisition notifications from 1951-1995, to know the extent of land acquired under the various laws. Land is acquired not merely under the LAQ, but also under other State and Central laws. In the second phase we go through land records in the collectorates of all the districts. When possible, we also go to the project offices to study all the projects (1951-1995). That gives us details of the type of land acquired, the number and types of DPs or PAPs, the compensation paid, the number and type resettled, etc., and some details on the cost and capacity of projects. For the third phase, we interview a representative sample of DPs /PAPs from a representative

sample of projects in different districts for qualitative data. The study in Orissa was done in two parts, where we interviewed 800 DPs / PAPs from a sample of 11 projects in 1991-92, with 40% females and 35% tribals. In Goa, we interviewed 90 people from 4 projects in 1997-98. The Kerala study was done in 1999-2000, with 700 people from 15 projects. In AP, 635 people from 14 projects were interviewed from 1996-98. In Jharkhand, 800 people from 18 projects were interviewed from 1997-99.... In West Bengal, we have completed all the phases with 724 people from 13 projects, and are writing the report. As for the representative set of projects, they were chosen according to their age (more than 25 years since displacement, 11 to 25 years, 1 to 10 years – ongoing and future), district (advanced, medium and backward) and type (water, industries, mines, transport, human resource development, tourism, etc.). [Source: *'Displacement and the Land Acquisition Act 1894: why are tribal areas not considered a part of our history?'* by Mr. Walter Fernandes published in *Combat Law (Vol 1 Issue 1 March - April 2002)*]

Thus, if there are 16 Mega Hydro-electric projects built in a State within the timeframe of say 45 years (1951 to 95), he would take one or two samples from them, and multiply the displaced figures of the that one or two by 16 times or 8 times as the case may be to arrive at the total figure for the State for that particular Hydel sector. Again, how does he arrive at the total figure of displaced population of a particular project, where say 200 villages have been displaced. He would take say 10 sample villages and pool together the available or freshly collected data from them and then multiply the total by 20 times to arrive at the grand total for 200 villages. As Fernandes has admitted, in initial years his group were using data from second hand sources (official or non-official reports already existing), but subsequently resorted to a fresh collection of data through a dedicated team of activists or surveyors. In any case, sampling and extrapolation would remain as the principal method to reach to the aggregate. Not only Mr. Fernandes but Ms. Arundhati Roy or for that matter IIPA (Indian Institute of Public Administration) whose findings spurred Ms. Roy on to make her classic observation used to employ the method of sampling followed by extrapolation. The only reason as to why Mr. Fernandes criticized Ms. Roy was that Ms. Roy while totaling the figures of dam-displaced populations by way of extrapolation clubbed medium projects with large projects. The difference between them was not one of method, but of a technical concern.

On a critical scrutiny it would be found that the sample and extrapolation method gives only a tentative idea about the magnitude of displacement, but can't provide a reliable tool for tackling the far-too-complex issue of displacement to the satisfaction of the displacees themselves. Displacement is not like a consumer's consumption index, which is measured and monitored through Weekly NSS (National Sample Survey) exercises. Development-induced involuntary displacement creates a topsy-turvy situation for the person displaced and it affects the multiple layers of human existence- physical, familial, psychological, social, economic and emotional. Displacement forcibly uproots a person from the milieu of his age-old environ and it leaves him nonplussed. To address to the situation of disarray in which a displaced person/family finds pushed to, an exact and holistic documentation of his state of being is required. A rough-shod method of sample and extrapolation won't do. Moreover, projects involving displacement differ from one another. The owners of the project are also different. The displaced communities are different not only economically but anthropologically and sociologically. Among the displaced community the attitude and coping ability of some members differ from that of others. So what is required from the standpoint of the resettlement and rehabilitation is a discrete and exhaustive documentation of the situation of each family and also each member of a family who is likely to

be displaced and it must be ensured before any resettlement and rehabilitation work is undertaken. The data base on displacement can be likened to the survey of losses which is undertaken by the revenue authorities in the wake of a disaster like flood, cyclone or earth quake, and based upon which the relief and rehabilitation measures are planned and executed. In such type of survey the exact situation of each family in regard to house, occupation, health, children's needs and standing crop if any is recorded and measures of relief and rehabilitation adopted accordingly. In the immediate wake of the disaster when the detail house-to-house survey might not be possible for a variety of reasons, the public authorities may, to start with, initiate their rehab work based upon a tentative assessment of the damage arrived at through various short-cut methods such as sampling and extrapolation, eye survey and aerial survey etc. But one can't rely upon the tentative assessment to complete the job of rehabilitation to a finish. Sooner or later we shall require a detailed house-to-house situational profile of the affected area to deliver the needful to each affected family. Comparing between the natural disaster and involuntary displacement we find the latter to be more multi-dimensional and permanent in its impact than the former. Thus an exhaustive assessment based upon house-to-house and person-to-person survey of the families displaced or affected by land acquisition is an indispensable requirement, which the sampling-cum-extrapolation can't substitute. Looked at from another angle, just as the technical aspects of a project are minutely attended to before the functioning of the project is commissioned, similarly the condition of the persons/families likely to be displaced needs to be appraised and correspondingly addressed to before the actual displacement in physical sense of the term takes place. In a way, the National Policy for Rehabilitation and Resettlement 2007 has accorded recognition to this principle and mandates its implementation by the concerned public authorities by way of taking the informed consent of the displaced communities. Technologically it is also now possible to develop an exhaustive database on displacement in a particular area within a reasonable timeframe.

9.8 Official Figures on Displacement in India:

The government of India admitted that 15.5 million persons were displaced during the 4 decades 1950-90. This admission came for the first time when in 1994 it drafted a national rehabilitation policy. The admission also noted that 74.52 percent of the displaced people were still awaiting rehabilitation.

Table 9.1 Sector-wise Displacement, Rehabilitation and Backlog during 1950-90

Type of Project	Number Displaced	Number Rehabilitated	Backlog
Coal and Other Mines	17,00,000	4,50,000	12,50,000
Dams and Canals	1,10,00,000	27,50,000	82,50,000
Industries	10,00,000	3,00,000	7,00,000
Sancturies and Parks	6,00,000	1,50,000	4,50,000
Others	12,00,000	3,00,000	9,00,000
Total	1,55,00,000	39,50,000	1,15,50,000

[Source: GOI quoted by S. Bhakthavatsala Bharati in "Human Rights and Development Projects in India", *The PRP Journal of Human Rights*, Oct-Dec., Vol. 3, No. 4, 1999]

9.9 Data on Resettlement and Rehabilitation not available too:

Not only the figures on displacement are in a bad shape, but also systematic information on resettlement and rehabilitation of the displaced and affected populations is conspicuous by its absence. In fact until the latest National R&R Policy-2007 made it mandatory for the transparency of the exhaustively documented displacement and R&R related information, there existed no national level legal instrument to bind the public authorities to undertake documentation and dissemination of such information. As Mr. Walter Fernandes recounts, in 1985 a committee of the Ministry of Welfare that prepared a policy for the displaced tribals suggested that a national policy be prepared for all the displaced, that rehabilitation be integral to every project above a certain size in the public as well as the private sectors and that the policy should be binding on the Government and the implementing authority. It took eight years for the Ministry of Rural Development to formulate a policy draft in 1993. It was revised in 1994. In 1994-95 more than 1,500 activist groups joined thousands of displaced and affected people in reflecting on it and preparing an alternative to it and an amendment to the Land Acquisition Act. They presented them to the Secretary, Rural Development, GOI in October 1995. The Ministry concerned did not even acknowledge it. However, two years later in November 1997 the Committee of Secretaries, Government of India approved a new draft. It had many good points and shortcomings, most of the former taken from the above alternative draft but it does not question the main thrust of the 1993 and 1994 drafts that more land acquisition is integral to liberalisation. The 1994 draft began by stating "With the advent of the New Economic Policy, it is expected that there will be large scale investments, both on account of internal generation of capital and increased inflow of foreign investments, thereby creating an enhanced demand for land to be provided within a shorter time-span in an increasingly competitive market ruled economic structure". Thus even the draft rehabilitation policies support the idea of acquiring more land and turn rehabilitation into a palliative. (Source: Mr. Walter Fernandes *DEVELOPMENT DISPLACED AND THE RIGHT TO LIFE: IMPLICATIONS FOR THE NORTHEAST*, Keynote Address, Workshop on Development-induced Displacement, Department of Political Science, Assam University, Silchar, Assam, March 27, 2002). After 1997 came the National R&R Policy for Project Affected Persons-2003 announced in 2004. But it came under serious criticism by both civil society groups and some quarters associated with the new UPA-led Central Govt. Following a debate through discussions in the media and meetings by civil society groups, the Policy of 2003 was jettisoned and a new national policy-2007 was notified. Though there was no national, comprehensive R&R Policy as such up to the year 2003, such sectoral agencies as National Thermal Power Corporation (NTPC) and Coal India Limited (CIL), both as Public Sector Undertakings of Central Government, had their own R&R policies prepared in 1993 and 1994 respectively for the rehabilitation of displaced people due to the execution of their projects. There also existed Modified Draft National Policy for Resettlement and Rehabilitation of Persons Affected by Reservoir Project, 1994. However, in the absence of a central law or even central policy, the R&R of the displaced people in the past have been based on ad hoc plans, resolutions and orders, adopted for specific States or even projects as and when the need arose. Thus, R&R in the past has been ad hoc and piecemeal. Different State governments have formulated different R&R policies too. Even in most of the States there is no uniform policy on R&R even for different kinds of development projects. Maharashtra and Karnataka had legislations on R&R for the displaced people for all kinds of projects. Madhya Pradesh has legislation on resettlement and rehabilitation for the people displaced due to irrigation projects only and the law may be applicable to other projects at the discretion of the Government. There are also reasons to believe that except the Maharashtra Act, the other documents were formulated under pressure from the World Bank. When something is done under pressure, those who implement it are not committed to it. Orissa had a sectoral R&R policy for the water resource projects since 1994. Gujarat have passed several Government Orders for the R&R of the displaced people of Sardar Sarovar Project but the State is yet to come out with a comprehensive R&R policy for the displaced people of various development projects. Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and Rajasthan have passed several Government Orders for R&R of the

displaced people, but most of the concerned projects are funded by the World Bank. Other states have either in Government Orders or in the shape of policy announced R&R packages for the displaced people only in the context of particular categories of development projects. But none of such sectoral or State policies including Orissa R&R Policy 2006 has mandated the obligation on the part of public authorities to maintain systematic database on R&R status of the displaced and affected populations. It explains why it is well nigh impossible now to gather a nearly accurate picture about the status of resettlement and rehabilitation of any past project major, medium or minor. (Source: *Balaji Pandey and Binaya Kumar Rout in 'DEVELOPMENT INDUCED DISPLACEMENT IN INDIA : IMPACT ON WOMEN' a study sponsored by National Commission for Women, New Delhi, December 2004*)

9.8 Displacement and Resettlement in Orissa 1951-95

Based upon extrapolation methods as explained above, a joint study by Mr. Walter Fernandes and Mohd. Asif provides the following figures on the overall status of displacement and rehabilitation in Orissa pertaining to the 45 year period 1951-95:-

Table 9.2

Scale of Displacement in Orissa between 1951-1995

	Projects	No of people displaced	No of People Rehabilitated	%	No of people who have not been rehabilitated	%
1	Irrigation	325000	90000	27.69	235000	72.31
2	Factories	71794	27300	38.03	44494	61.97
3	Mines	100000	60000	60.00	40000	40.00
4	Others	50000	15540	31.08	34460	68.92
	Total	546794	192840	35.27	353954	64.73

Source: Development Induced Displacement and Rehabilitation in Orissa 1951 to 1995 by Dr. Walter Fernandes and Md. Asif

The authors of the above study admit, they excluded the numbers of DPs of wildlife sanctuaries from the above computation of the total numbers, 'since we could not get any information on their resettlement. Documents were not easily available'. Further they say, 'We have intentionally made a very conservative estimate of displacement in Orissa..... To this should be added the PAPs (*Project Affected Persons, who are not displaced from their homestead as such but lose away their livelihood fully or partially in the process of acquisition of their agricultural land or common property resources- Italics by C.Behera*). Their number is higher than that of the DPs. ... About a quarter of them seem to have got the benefits of the projects'.

Table 9.3 Total Land Acquisition for Development in Orissa 1951-1995 (in Acres)

No.	Project	Private	Common	Forest	Total
01	Dams Percentage	803549.63 (52.07)	423436.85 (27.44)	316341.77 (20.50)	1543328.25 (65.33)
02	Industries Percentage	62936.07 (59.02)	34521.65 (32.38)	9168.82 (08.60)	106626.54 (04.14)
03	Mines Percentage	68328.86 (16.66)	166638.76 (40.63)	175169.62 (42.71)	410137.24 (17.36)

04	Misc, Percentage	52837.29 (17.49)	36493.68 (12.08)	212769.03 (70.43)	302100.00 (12.79)
	Total Percentage	987651.85 (41.81)	661090.94 (27.99)	713449.24 (30.20)	2362192.03 (100.00)

[Source: Fernandes, Walter , Asif Mohammed, *Development Induced Displacement and Rehabilitation in Orissa, 1951 to 1995, A Study Funded by ICSSR, Indian Social Institute, New Delhi, March 1997*]

As seen from the above Table the total land acquired in Orissa during 1951-95 was 23,62,192 Acres, out of which dams alone claimed 65.33 % followed by Mines (17.36%), Misc. (12.79%) and Industries (4.14%). Out of the total land acquired, private land was highest (41.81%) followed by Forest land (30.20%) and Common land (27.99%).

It is interesting to note that Mr.A.K.Dalua a scholar on displacement published a compilation on behalf of Irrigation Department of Orissa in 1993 where some basic figures relating to displacement during 1950-93 were mentioned.

Table 9.4 Displacement due to various development projects in Orissa (1950-93)

Sl. No.	Type of project	No of villages displaced/ affected	No of families displaced/ affected	Total land acquired (in hectare)
1	Mines	79	3143	2427.03
2	Industries	113	10704	21963
3	Thermal power	73	2426	3155.31
4	Irrigation and hydel power (dams)	1181	64903	595918.6
	Total	1446	81176	623463.94

(Source: A.K Dalua, *Irrigation Department, Orissa 1993, quoted in 'Development Policies and Rural Poverty in Orissa: Macro Analysis and Case Studies, A Study' by Vasundhara, Bhubaneswar, with support from Planning Commission, March, 2005, Revised: December, 2005*)

As seen from the above table, during 43 years (1950-93) a total of about 623464 ha. of land were acquired for various developmental projects, displacing thereby 1446 villages and 81176 families. Irrigation projects alone affected as many as 1181 villages followed by industries 113 villages, mines 79 and thermal power 73 villages. These estimates didn't include the land and families affected by wildlife parks and sanctuaries.

However, there has remained endless controversy as to how many persons/families were displaced by a development project. For instance, According to Ms.Manipadma Jena, out of all the development projects, the Hirakud dam caused the biggest displacement. When it was being built between 1948 and 1957, it affected 285 villages of which 249 were in Orissa. Due to displacement, the livelihood of 22,141 families consisting of 1,10,000 persons was disrupted. Around 4,744 families all belonging to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes were

displaced forcibly with the help of the police. Only 2,185 families were resettled in 17 rehabilitation camps. Intergenerational impoverishment has been the inevitable effect. [Source: *Jena Manipdma in Economic and Political Weekly*, quoted by Ramanathan Usha, 2006 in 'Creating dispensable citizens' *The Hindu*, Friday April 14 2006]. But a group of scholars in their joint work 'A Socio-Economic and Legal Study of Scheduled Tribes' Land in Orissa' (2005) supported By World Bank held the above claim of the State Government an underestimation and put the number as more than 180,000 quoting other studies. Their study further pointed out that as per one estimate 1.5 million people were displaced by development projects in Orissa between 1951 and 1995, whereas A.B.Ota estimated that till 2000, about 2 million people in Orissa were directly affected by development projects in varying degrees. (Source: *Kundan Kumar, Pranab Ranjan Choudhary with VASUNDHARA Team Soumendra Sarangi, Pradeep Mishra, Sricharan Behera, Bhubaneswar, 'A Socio-Economic and Legal Study of Scheduled Tribes' Land in Orissa' 2005 Supported By World Bank, Washington*).

To take another instance, several studies on scale of land acquisition and displacement have been conducted on Rourkela Steel Plant. Establishment of this large-scale industrial project led to acquisition of 7917.84 Hectare of land for the main factory site at Rourkela and mining site at Barsuan. The project affected 2444 families, out of which 50.37% were Tribal and 30% were from Scheduled Castes. But the figures put forth by other studies reveal different figures, i.e. the RSP displaced 4251 families from 30 villages and acquired 13185 ha. of land. (Source: *Development Policies and Rural Poverty in Orissa: Macro Analysis and Case Studies, A Study by Vasundhara, Bhubaneswar, with support from Planning Commission, March, 2005, Revised: December, 2005*)

9.9 Land Acquisition and Displacement in Orissa from 1996 onwards:

Lack of a reliable database on land acquired, people displaced and rehabilitation made in Orissa is as much true for the period from 1996 onwards as for earlier decades. Mr.Akhil B.Ota a scholar from Orissa who has made a few studies on some selected mega projects of Orissa articulates his assessment of overall situation thus:

“Statistical figures indicate that till 2000, about 20 lakh people have been directly affected by Development Projects in varying degrees out of which about 5 lakh have been physically displaced losing their home & hearth from their original habitat. Statistical figures further indicate that while Dam/Irrigation Projects alone have displaced nearly 3.5 lakh people which is roughly 70% of the total displaced persons, Industrial Projects have displaced about 60,000 people which is 12% of the total displaced whereas the Mining Projects, Urban Development Projects, thermal Projects & Wild Life Sanctuaries have displaced 3.37%, 12.86%, 2.60% & 0.5% of the total displaced people in the State of Orissa. Although the above referred figures account for the already completed projects, there are a host of other projects which are either ongoing or are in the pipeline in which about 2 lakh more people are expected to be displaced. As it is widely known, displacement is very traumatic as it not only physically displaces the people, but also causes environmental, social, economic & cultural loses to the people which are immeasurable and which is very hard to compensate & restore in the post-displacement stage. It is however, the prime duty of the implementing agency (Government, if the Project is a Government sponsored one and Private/Public Sector if it is set up by the Private/Public Sector undertaking) to take all precautionary measures in such a manner so that the Displaced Persons restore back their pre-displaced living condition at the minimum. Looking at the magnitude of displacement in various Development Projects in the State of Orissa, it is therefore very important to examine & assess whether or not the Displaced Persons of Development Projects

have been able to reconstruct their former living standards and if not the reasons thereto”.
[Source: Reconstructing Livelihood of the Displaced Families in Development Projects: Causes of Failure and Room for Reconstruction by Akhil B. Ota, at the Conference Livelihoods and Poverty Reduction: Lessons From Eastern India, 25-27 September 2001 (http://www.anthrobase.com/txt/O/Ota_A_02.htm.)]

9.10 Alienation of Forest area for development projects:

Majority of districts of Orissa have forests and tribal populations. Needless to say, there exists a symbiotic relation between the two. The tribal populations still consider forests to be their natural habitation. But due to various development projects vast tracts of forest land were alienated under Land Acquisition and similar laws.

Table : 9.5
Forest Area Diverted to Non-Forest Sectors in Orissa between 1982 and 2001-02

	No. of Proposals	Forest Area Diverted (ha)	Share of Total Area Diverted (%)
Irrigation	57	6002	22.18
Industry	05	2406	8.89
Mining	73	9406	34.77
Transmission Lines	41	2661	9.83
Road, Bridge	23	194	0.72
Railway Lines	05	1965	7.26
De-Forestation, Human Habitation & Others	33	4421	16.34
Total	237	27,055	100

Source: Economic Survey of Orissa, 2002-03, Principal Chief Conservator of Forests, Orissa, Bhubaneswar

As seen from the above Table furnished by the Office of PCCF, Orissa, during the 20 year period 1982-2002, a total of 27,055 ha. of forest land was diverted for non-forest purposes. It happened despite the restrictive provisions contained in Forest Conservation Act 1980. Out of the total, mining claimed the highest i.e. 9406 acres (34.77%) followed by 6002 ha. for irrigation projects (22.18%). On account of deforestation, human habitation and other purposes, 4421 ha. was acquired (16.34%). Electric Transmission lines required diversion of 2661 ha. (9.83%) followed by 2406 ha. for Industry (8.89%) and 1965 ha. for Railway lines(7.26%). Road and Bridge claimed the lowest i.e. 194 ha. (0.72% only). A total of 237 projects belonging to above categories and involving diversion of forest land were implemented during the period 1982-2002.

9.11 Villages affected in Orissa by land acquisition by 2006

A study group from Orissa assisted by World Bank has furnished the Table below showing the area of land and nos. of villages affected due to land acquisition for 6 types of developmental projects.

Table: 9.6

Area acquired and villages affected by development and conservation projects in Orissa			
Serial No	Projects	Area acquired or affected (ha.)	No of villages affected
1	Irrigation- Dam projects (Major) Completed.	200423	900
2	Irrigation – Dam projects (Medium) Completed	14403	118
3	Irrigation – Dam projects (Medium) Ongoing	12160	92
4	Irrigation – Dam Projects (Major) Proposed	30233	113
6	Industries (All Types of Industries)	45358	176
7	Mines (All types of mine leases given out)	101947	NA
8	Wild life Sanctuaries and National Parks	811155	771
	Total	1215679	2170

[Source: Kundan Kumar, Pranab Ranjan Choudhary, Soumendra Sarangi, Pradeep Mishra, Sricharan Behera, 'A Socio-Economic and Legal Study of Scheduled Tribes' Land in Orissa, supported by World Bank, 2006]

From the above Table it is seen that by 2006 a total of 1215679 ha. of land was acquired in Orissa and as a result 2170 villages have been affected. The highest number of villages (900) was affected by major dams involving 200423 ha. followed by 771 villages affected due to wildlife sanctuaries and national parks involving 811155 ha. of land. Then come the mines that claimed acquisition of 101947 ha. of land. Industries affected 176 villages involving 45358 ha. of land. The study group however admits that the above table only gives a conservative estimate of the land acquired, saying, “we have not included in the total the 1828121.45 acres of the National Parks and Sanctuaries in which people do not have access to the NTFP.” Analysing the trends in land acquisition process, they point out inter alia that, “in the tribal and forest areas, most land taken over is CPRs (common property resources) on which their communities depend. The tribals depend upon CPRs and Dalits on labour or other forms of service to the village as a community. As such, land owned by others is their livelihood. But neither group has a legal title to it... At this stage it suffices to point out that they have been deprived of their livelihood”.

[Source: Kundan Kumar, Pranab Ranjan Choudhary, Soumendra Sarangi, Pradeep Mishra, Sricharan Behera, 'A Socio-Economic and Legal Study of Scheduled Tribes' Land in Orissa, supported by World Bank, 2006]

Moreover this World Bank-supported study noted, “The casualness with which displacements of tribals have been treated is evident by the fact that out of 13 major dam projects, no data is available on ST families displaced in projects. Similarly out of 10 major industrial projects, no data on proportion of STs displaced is available for seven projects”.*(Ibid)*

9.12 Present Trends of Displacement

Since the era of liberalization began in early 90s a new trend, so to say, a mega trend is noticeable in respect of land acquisition by public authorities and that too for facilitating private investment on a massive scale from domestic and foreign sources. Writing about this trend in

Economic and Political Weekly, 20 March 2004 under the caption 'Rehabilitation Policy for the Displaced' Walter Fernandes comments that Orissa had acquired 40,000 ha for industries during 1951-1995 but plans to acquire 100,000 ha in a decade. Similarly the AP has acquired in five years half as much land for industry as it did in 45 years. Similar magnitudes of land are being acquired in Jharkhand for mines that foreign companies are eyeing. Goa had acquired 3.5 per cent of the state's landmass 1965-1995 and plans to acquire 7.2 per cent of it during a decade. The proposed interlinking of rivers goes in the same direction so far the prospective land acquisition is concerned. Very little technical data are available on the rivers inter-linking project. It will probably displace 1.5 million persons. The center is pursuing it despite lack of technical or social data on it. If it happens to this scheme, its final cost will be higher than India's GDP. To get this amount, India will have to sell the rivers to Indian and foreign private companies. One sees the thrust towards the privatization of rivers also in the plans for the north-east that is one of the world's 25 mega-biodiversity zones and one of 18 biodiversity hotspots. [*'Rehabilitation Policy for the Displaced'* by Walter Fernandes in *Economic and Political Weekly*, 20 March 2004].

Sources Consulted:

- *The Greater Common Good* by Ms. Arundhati Roy, April 1999
- 'The story of us', *Indian Express*, Tuesday, January 2, 2001 by Kuldip Nayar
- Smitu Kothari in *Lokayan Bulletin*, March-April 1995, Delhi 110054
- 'Policies for Tribal Development: Analysis and Suggestions' prepared for NAC by Mr.N.C. Saxena
- *Report of Steering Committee on the Empowerment of Scheduled Tribes in Tenth Five Year Plan (2002-2007)*, Planning Commission, New Delhi, October 2001
- 'Rehabilitation Policy for the Displaced' by Walter Fernandes published in 'Economic and Political Weekly March 20, 2004
- 'Displacement and the Land Acquisition Act 1894: why are tribal areas not considered a part of our history?' by Walter Fernandes published in *Combat Law* (Vol 1 Issue 1 March - April 2002)
- S. Bhakthavatsala Bharati in "Human Rights and Development Projects in India", *The PRP Journal of Human Rights*, Oct-Dec., Vol. 3, No. 4, 1999
- *DEVELOPMENT DISPLACED AND THE RIGHT TO LIFE: IMPLICATIONS FOR THE NORTHEAST*, Keynote Address by Mr.Walter Fernandes in the Workshop on Development-induced Displacement, Department of Political Science, Assam University, Silchar, Assam, March 27, 2002)
- Balaji Pandey and Binaya Kumar Rout in 'DEVELOPMENT INDUCED DISPLACEMENT IN INDIA : IMPACT ON WOMEN' a study sponsored by National Commission for Women, New Delhi, December 2004
- *Development Induced Displacement and Rehabilitation in Orissa 1951-95*
- A.K.Dalua, *Irrigation Department, Orissa 1993*
- 'Development Policies and Rural Poverty in Orissa: Macro Analysis and Case Studies, A Study' by Vasundhara, Bhubaneswar, with support from Planning Commission, March, 2005, Revised: December, 2005

- Jena Manipdma in *Economic and Political Weekly*, quoted by Ramanathan Usha, 2006 in 'Creating dispensable citizens' *The Hindu*, **Friday April 14 2006**

- Kundan Kumar, Pranab Ranjan Choudhary with VASUNDHARA Team Soumendhra Sarangi, Pradeep Mishra, Sricharan Behera, Bhubaneswar in 'A Socio-Economic and Legal Study of Scheduled Tribes' Land in Orissa' 2005 Supported By World Bank, Washington

- *Development Policies and Rural Poverty in Orissa: Macro Analysis and Case Studies, A Study by Vasundhara, Bhubaneswar, with support from Planning Commission, March, 2005, Revised: December, 2005*

- *Reconstructing Livelihood of the Displaced Families in Development Projects: Causes of Failure and Room for Reconstruction by Akhil B. Ota at the Conference **Livelihoods and Poverty Reduction: Lessons From Eastern India**, 25-27 September 2001*

- Principal Chief Conservator of Forests, Orissa quoted in *Economic Survey of Orissa, 2002-03*

- 'Rehabilitation Policy for the Displaced' by Walter Fernandes in *Economic and Political Weekly*, 20 March 2004

Tables:

Table 9.1: Sector-wise Displacement, Rehabilitation and Backlog during 1950-90

Table 9.2: Scale of Displacement in Orissa between 1951-95

Table 9.3: Total Land Acquisition for Development in Orissa 1951-1995

Table 9.4 Displacement due to various development projects in Orissa (1950-93)

Table : 9.5: Forest Area Diverted to Non-Forest Sectors in Orissa between 1982 and 2001-02

Table 9.6: Area acquired and Villages affected by development and conservation projects in Orissa