

Tribal Displacement and Human Rights Violation in Orissa

Sarbeswar Sahoo*

Introduction

India, during the post-colonial period, was engaged in a nation-building process. Nation building was equated with modernization and fast development of infrastructure and economic conditions of the people and the country as a whole. The debate on development has always been centered around people, market forces and the state. The central issue is whether to accept the prevailing definition of development as provided by the market and the state or to look for alternatives emerging out of people's struggles and human rights movements. In other words, whether development should mean profit for capitalists or protection of the rights of the people (indigenous) and the prosperity or greater good for the larger numbers?

This led to another question, which tries to deconstruct the whole logic of capitalist development that why the nation building process and development paradigm has not yet emphasized on the larger interests of the people? The pursuit of development adversely affected the marginalized sections causing deprivation, displacement and devastation, and drastically altered the relationship of the tribes with the natural environment and the resources lying there in, which invariably led to the '*disempowerment of the tribes*' (Xaxa, 2001: 206). This again raises some unpleasant questions: development for whom, development for what and at what social cost (Baboo, 2001:195)? Thus, while the 'core' of the 'nation' developed, it was at the cost of the marginals. Decided on the interests of the dominant majority, they consistently excluded marginal sections of the people, signaling an exclusionary process. Nations are thus not just oppressive to others; they can be brutal to their own people. The project of nation-building is constantly shedding portions of its own people from the purview and thereby creating its outsiders (Nag, 2001: 4757). This is the background logic where the whole issue of human rights violation takes place in various parts of the country as a result of development undertakings. Thus, the tribal regions of Orissa are not exception of it.

Social Composition of Tribals

The tribals are the indigenous people living in the hilly parts of the state. According to the 2001 Census the tribals, commonly characterized as the Scheduled Tribes (STs) by the constitution of India constitute 8.2 percent (about 84.3 million) of India's population. They are found in 2001 in the greatest numbers in Chhattisgarh (6.6 million, or 31.8 percent of the state's population), Jharkhand (7 million, or 26.3 percent), and Orissa (8.1

* Research Scholar, Centre for the Study of Social Systems, Jawaharlal Nehru University; Email: sarbeswarjnu@yahoo.co.in. This paper was published as "Tribal Displacement and Human Rights Violations in Orissa", *Social Action: A Quarterly Review of Social Trends*, April-June, 2005, Vol. 55, No. 2

million, or 22.1 percent). In Orissa, the tribal population is 22.1 percent of the total population in the state which is the third highest among the states in the country. Although in Madhya Pradesh 20 percent of the state's population are tribal, but in absolute numbers it accommodates the highest tribal population (12 millions). Except from the Northeast, Orissa occupies a unique position among the states in India for the highest concentration of Scheduled Tribes next to Chhattisgarh and Jharkhand.

Out of 414 principal tribes found in the country, as many as 62 ethnic groups are found in the old nine hilly inland districts of Orissa. The inland districts are mostly inhabited by scheduled tribes and scheduled castes, which together constitute around 50 percent of their population. According to the 1991 Census, *Kondhs* are the largest tribe in Orissa. In fact, 90 percent of *Kondhs* of India live in Orissa and they form 16.72 percent of Orissa's population. The other major tribes are *Santhal* (8.97 percent), *Saura and Sabara* (together 6.25 percent), *Mundas* (5.75 percent), *Paraja* (4.51 percent), *Bhottada* (4.18percent) etc (Mohanty, 1998:84). They are primarily concentrated in the districts of Koraput, Kalahandi, Phulbani, Ganjam, Keonjhar, Sundargarh, Mayurbhanj, etc. which happen to be the bauxite and other mineral reserve plateau in the state.

Negligence of the Center and the Entry of Market Forces

Economically, colonial Orissa was one of the poorest and most backward of Indian states. It has always been suffering from 'extreme poverty' and 'central neglect' in terms of economic sphere due to the unequal allocation of resources. According to the estimation the poverty ratio for the state in 1999-2000 is 47.15 percent. The state has also been a subject of 'administrative apathy' and 'exclusion' and denied of 'fair deal' in provincial autonomy and central subsidies right from the colonial period. In this context, liberalization gives the historically neglected Oriyas for the first time an opportunity to look beyond the state and, in a sense, globalize the question of their development. In his eagerness to bring development to Orissa the then chief minister, Biju Patnaik openly endorsed the Center's new economic policy and invited investment from the country and overseas to set up steel plants, power plants, and refineries for which he was accused of going beyond Rao's policies and bartering away the state's interest to MNCs (Sengupta, 2001:184). Thus, in the mid-1990s, especially, Orissa increasingly usurped the corporate lore about the putative industry-friendliness of states in western and southern India and projected itself as a dynamically enterprising, liberalizing, privatizing state.

According to a study, Orissa, by virtue of its cheap labour and low transportation costs attracted the largest amount of private sector investment during 1995-96, followed by Gujarat, Karnataka, and Maharastra, and emerged as one of the major economic power in the Asia-Pacific region. During 1995-96 alone, the state firmed up concrete proposals for investment of over Rs.60000 crore in industrial projects alone, excluding sectors like power and mining. Business executives and industry representatives attributed this transformation to a progressive bureaucracy backed by progressive chief ministers down the years (Sengupta, 2001:190-91).

Recently, in an interview with the "*Business Today* (November 21, 2004)", chief minister Navin Patnaik, son of Biju Patnaik, invited the corporate bodies to get the mining rights on massive iron and bauxite reserves of the state if they can set up plants to manufacture

the end products. The report says that Orissa can optimistically expect a Rs. 1,00,000 crore bonanza over the next five-to-seven years, which is highest in comparison to any of the Indian states. Most of the proposed investments are in the minerals and metals sector. Steel and aluminium companies – among them Tata Steel, Essar, Sterlite and Hindalco – have together committed or proposed investments of about Rs. 40,000 crore. The figure could almost double if the Posco-BHP combine finally selects Orissa for its \$8 billion (approx. Rs. 38,000 crore), 10 million tonne Greenfield steel plant. The state also proposes to build two more ports in Dhamra (L&T and Tata Steel) and Gopalpur (global bid on build-own-operate-transfer terms) to provide investors with a gateway to international trade. The chief minister claims that the potential is there; it just needs to be exploited. Thus, Orissa is fast emerging as a major site of foreign direct investment and multinational development projects, which violates the rights of the indigenous population in the hill districts and mineral reserve areas of Orissa.

This indiscriminate exploitation of natural resources and the environment reminds the path-breaking book of Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* in 1962 which emphasized the shortcomings of Western rationalism in so far it perceived nature as "external" to society and encourages the belief that nature is an infinitely exploitable domain (McMichael, 1996: 215).

Magnitude of Displacement

During the last two decades of the previous century, the magnitude of forced population displacements caused by development programmes was in order of 10 million people each year, or some 200 million people globally during that period (Cernea, 2000:3659). The increasing construction of development projects consistently displaced a massive number of tribal, poor and weaker sections. Sajal Nag (2001: 4758) states that between 1951 and 1990 at least 21.3 million people were deprived of their sustenance by development. These development projects include dams (16.4 millions) mines (2.55 millions) industrial establishments and parks (0.6 millions) of which 25 percent have been resettled partially. Forty percent of these displaced persons and projects affected persons were tribals and another 20 percent were dalits. In fact, one in every seven Indian tribal is a displaced person. The government of India admits that 15.5 million displaced persons when it drafted a national rehabilitation policy in 1994. The draft noted that 74.52 percent displaced people were still awaiting rehabilitation (see Table: 1).

Table: 1: Persons Displaced and Rehabilitated by Various Projects in last 40 Years

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
Sanctuaries 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: S. Bhakthavatsala Bharati, 1999, p. 20

Orissa is one of the most resource rich states in the country characterized by poverty amidst plenty. Realizing this, Government has taken up a very large number of development projects in the state ever since independence to bring economic prosperity for the people who lead a very sordid life – majority of whom live below the poverty line (47.15 percent). Besides Government, a good number of business houses also have been attracted to this State because of its bountiful natural and mineral resources for harnessing them and in the process have established development projects in different regions.

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 and 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 and wild life sanctuaries have displaced 3.37%, 12.86%, 2.60% and 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. Mining in Orissa has created "an estimated 50,000 environmental refugees," according to news reports. On the whole, 1.4 million people, mostly adivasis have been displaced by developmental projects in Orissa alone (Ota, 2001).

In the case of Utkal Alumina, it is estimated that 1,750 hectares of land will be required for mining, the plant site, a township, and dumping spots. Apart from this, a stretch of land approximately 20 km. long and 50 meters wide will be required for conveyer and corridor maintenance. Ore would be mined from plateau tops in the areas. Just one plateau, Baphilimali in Kashipur block, has bauxite deposits in an area of about 10 sq. km. (Patnaik, 2001). More than 2100 families in two dozen villages stand to lose their land, including 370 families who would lose all their lands. More than 2800 hectares have already been acquired by the Government for the company. Estimates of the people negatively affected by the Utkal project range from 750 (Hydro's estimate), to 3500 (Utkal's estimate) to 60,000 (Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation estimate).

Rights of the Indigenous Communities

Rights Related to Land and Resources

The rights of land ownership is guaranteed in the ILO *Indigenous and Tribal Populations Convention No. 107 of 1957* concerning the protection and integration of indigenous and Semi-Tribal populations in independent countries, revised ILO *Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries Convention No.169 of 1989*, and *UN Draft Declaration on Indigenous Rights*. All these recognizes the ownership rights of tribal people, protection of natural resources and the right of the indigenous peoples to participate and give their consent in the use, management and conservation of these resources and consultation in the exploration and exploitation of such resources and in the benefits from them. It urges the government to respect the cultures and spiritual values of the peoples

concerned of their relationship with the lands and territories. It also makes the provision of adequate penalties for unauthorized intrusion upon or use of lands of the peoples.

Rights Related to Culture

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948 recognizes the “right to culture” and the Article 15 of the *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights 1966* also recognizes the right of everyone to take part in the cultural life. Article 27 of the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights 1966* recognizes the cultural rights of minorities, which is more relevant for indigenous peoples. *The Declaration of the Principles of International Cultural Cooperation 1966*, *Declaration on Race and Racial Prejudice 1978*, *ILO Convention No. 169* and many other laws states that each culture has a dignity which must be respected and preserved.

Rights to Education

The *ILO Convention No. 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples 1989*, the *UN Draft Declaration on Indigenous Rights* recognizes and advocates for the right to education of indigenous peoples.

Rights Related to Development

The *Declaration on Right to Development 1986* states right to development as an inalienable human right and the *ILO Convention No. 169* declares that the peoples concerned shall have the right to decide their own priorities for the process of development as it affects their lives, beliefs, institutions and spiritual well-being and the lands they occupy or other wise use, and to exercise control, to the extent possible, over their economic, social and cultural development.

The Politics of Resistance to Capitalist Development Projects

The choices made by the Independent Indian state to follow a capitalist mode of profit oriented development and modern industrial growth has been based on two interrelated process: one unchecked use of earth’s natural resources and the transformation of the people, often against their will, into a dispossessed working class. The earth’s impoverishment has meant that communities who depend on natural base for sustenance have been deprived of their resources and caused not only alienation, and loss of material livelihood but also most profoundly a wider loss of cultural autonomy, knowledge and power (Baviskar, 1995: 36).

In the name of development, people have been pushed off the land; their forests and water have been taken over by the state and the market, so that they have been deprived of everything except their labour power. The coercive aspect of the state power has impoverished the people through their ecological, economic, cultural and political marginalization, which prepares the ground for a resistance and discontent movements at the grassroots against these modernizing and developmental projects. Resistance is seen mainly as a reflex action prompted by being driven over the edge by economic and political deprivation. Martinez-Alier points out that social (resistance) movements of the poor are very often the struggles of livelihood and ecology. McMichael (1996: 216-224) says it is a response to the marginalization of indigenous cultures and they are distinguished by their attempts to protect existing cultural practices. Thus, the attempts of

the elites to exploit in the name of development have been challenged and collectively resisted by the very people they sought to marginalize and the in the process the indigenous people have become an embodiment of resistance (Baviskar, 1995:37-44).

In 1993, the state government of Orissa entered into a contract with a private company Utkal Alumina International Ltd. (UAIL) by handing over some of the most precious lands in Orissa in return for taxes and royalties without any form of consent from the people living there. This action by the Orissa government is clearly an attempt to subvert the constitutional guarantees given to the indigenous people.

Over the centuries, adivasis have constantly fought an unequal battle against outside oppressors – the state and the market. In a collective show of defiance, the affected villages in Orissa have been resisting this mining project which threatens to displace them and completely ruin their livelihood. People organized themselves to participate in rallies, road blockades and demonstrations in front of local government offices. To discourage such attempts, the state came down hard on them resorting to violence instead of dialogue. The conflict between the people and the pro-company forces culminated in the firing at Maikanch village on 16 December 2000. Around 4000 people were in a meeting to discuss their next road blockade when armed police descended upon them and opened fire. The local police killed three unarmed innocent adivasis and wounded several more. Almost a year before this incident, on 30th December 1999, eight innocent adivasis, including one woman, were also killed by the police in a nearby village. Over the last few years, we have witnessed a continued use of force and suppression of the rights (through firing) of the adivasis and dalits from the poorest communities in Orissa. These killings have further antagonized the locals who see the use of force as a violation of their basic human rights (Letter to the CM).

Human Rights Violation and the Tribals in Orissa

The welfare state, after fifty-five years of guarantee to protect the rights and improve the situation of the people has not been able to fulfill its pledge. Even some cases, due to the advent of liberalized force the state is trying to make a shift from its welfarist model to a purely capitalistic path of development and moulding all its policies of development in consonance with the needs of the market forces. New kinds of legislation are forcing the indigenous people to leave their traditional rights of community (common property) resources and minor forest produces. In course of time, their lands and forests became the property of the state. In other words, nature turned into property. As a result, their livelihood is under threat. The state, which took the responsibility of protecting the rights of the common people after independence, now pitching in and advocating for the interests of the multinational market forces. Instead of the interest of the people, protection of the interest of the multinationals and profit occupied the central place in every move of progress by the state.

The past few decades have witnessed rapid economic growth in the country and the process forms a part of 'planned development', manifested through the setting up of large-scale development projects. This entails large-scale land acquisition and even demolition of homesteads. Majority of the affected persons have become relatively landless, homeless and in most of the cases affected persons have lost access to common

property resources, social disarticulation has taken place, job opportunities have shrunk making them jobless and most of them have become marginalized. Instead of improving the socio-economic conditions of these indigenous and poor groups, the government has worsened their conditions, displaced them from their natural habitation and destroyed the whole bondage social cohesion and togetherness. They have been destituted and deprived of their rights to life and livelihood.

The UN document entitled '*The Practice of Forced Eviction: Comprehensive Human Rights Guidelines on Development based Displacement*' states that evictions constitute prima facie violation of a wide range of internationally recognized human rights. In 1990, the *Global Constitution on the Realization of the Right to Development as a Human Right* underlined that the most destructive and prevalent abuses of indigenous rights are a direct consequence of development strategies that fail to respect the fundamental rights of self-determination. The result has been the elimination and removal of natural resources, waters, wild life, forests and food supplies from indigenous lands either through commercial exploitation or incompatible land use; the degradation of natural environment; removal of indigenous people's from their lands; and their displacement or preemption from the use of their lands by outsiders (Das, 2001: 86).

Violation of Constitutional Provisions

The state, which had been acting as the managing agent of the corporate giants, is deliberately flouting the constitutional provisions of the Panchayats Extension to the Scheduled Areas (PESA) Act, 1996. The Act applies to the areas covered under the fifth schedule of the Constitution of India. The Act clearly prohibits the state to make any law, which would not be in consonance 'with the customary law, social and religious practices, and traditional management practices of community resources'. It further mandates that 'gram sabha or the panchayats at the appropriate level shall be consulted before making the acquisition of land into the scheduled areas for development projects and before resettling or rehabilitating persons affected by such projects in the scheduled areas' (Bandopadhyaya, 2004: 409).

PESA seeks to provide significant protection to the tribals in the scheduled areas against arbitrary, discretionary, and motivated action by the state relating to land acquisition and resettlement and rehabilitation package for the project affected people (PAPs). As per the data 75 per cent displaced people were still awaiting for rehabilitation. It has to be mentioned that rehabilitation is not considered a 'right' by the constitution of India (Nag, 2001:4758). The tribal people have no say in the legitimacy of setting up development projects. The state never consults on the type of development people desire, thus violating the right to decide their own priorities as a part of right to development as an inalienable human right (Das, 2001:92). The obvious question here comes is that if democracy is of the people, by the people and for the people; all development projects should have the consent of the people (Pinto, 1999: 240). The study group of the CSD in 1999 found that there is no evidence of consultation of gram sabha by the state related to land acquisition and R and R package. The local administration in the region in league with the company does not seem to have any respect for and commitment to the rule of law, which it is supposed to uphold (Bandopadhyaya, 2004: 409).

The CSD also reported that, the governor of Orissa, under the Constitution of India, has special responsibility for the 'welfare and advancement of scheduled tribe' and for 'peace and good government' in the areas under fifth schedule, so declared by the president of India. It is apparent that the successive governors of Orissa since the mid-1990s have failed in discharging their Constitutional duty to protect the tribals in the fifth schedule area (Ibid.) Thus, primarily due to the inaction in the higher echelons of constitutional authorities and mockery of the rule of law by the local administration, the tribals have been subject to various kinds of exploitation and violence.

Land Alienation and Human rights

Due to large-scale industrial and infrastructural projects, the tribals are displaced from their productive assets (particularly land, forest) and homes. The Land Acquisition Act of 1894 (now amended in 1984) empowers the government to acquire private lands and properties in 'public interest'. This 'sovereign domain' of government alienates people from their traditional sources of sustenance (such as lands, forests, and village habitats), livelihood and social networks and causes untold hardships and miseries (Sharma, 2003:907).

Expropriation of tribal land for development has removed the main foundation on which the productive systems, commercial activities and livelihoods are constructed. Cernea says that this is the principal form of decapitalisation and pauperization of the displaced tribals through loss of both physical and man made capital. Because of the acquisition of these lands, the displaced people lost very precious land, but could not either get replacement of such land nor could get any compensation whatsoever for these land as there was no record of right over such encroached land. *"We are not interested in the compensation offered by the bauxite companies; we want to continue as farmers on this land which has sustained us for centuries," says Bidu Lata Huika, one of the conveners of the Orissa Tribal People's Forum.* Thus, in a broader cultural sense, homelessness is also placelessness, loss of a group's cultural space and identity, or cultural impoverishment.

Environment, Forests and Human Rights

The Forest Act 1878, which classified forests into three categories: Reserve, Protected and Village forests makes available only a small portion, i.e. the village forests to the tribals and the National Forest Policy 1894 which declared the forests on the slope of the hills as protected, ultimately led to the process of shrinking tribal access to minor forest produce. Establishing industrial projects, felling trees to supply timber for laying railway tracks, building towns and collecting raw material for industries gave birth to a process of deforestation. This has unleashed a situation where more and more people are being displaced from their communities and traditional ways of life and resulted in an insecure livelihood for the tribal and indigenous communities in the hilly areas and tribal belts of Orissa. No amount of compensation could be adequate for the loss of the natural habitat and the cultural milieu of the tribals. This process can be characterized as a process of – *disentitlement* – a process where by the tribals are gradually denied access to the support system of their livelihood. It meant loss of rights enjoyed earlier by the tribal community over the forest and land sources around them (Mohanty, 1998: 81).

Down To Earth states, "the forested areas, needless to say, will face severe threats from the heavy construction and mining activities... Simultaneously, forest loss would also

mean the loss of habitat for the region's wildlife including bears, jackals, wolves, sambars (a deer-like animal), spotted deer, leopard cats and the occasional tiger. Alumina smelting is one of the most energy-intensive operations, and a significant source of greenhouse gas emissions, sulphur dioxides, and fluoride. The emission of fluorides presents a particularly alarming problem in a region where a large number of indigenous people have already been affected by fluorosis (a debilitating dystrophy of the bones caused due to fluoride deposits). One of the causes: Increased fluoride content in drinking water due to emissions from aluminum smelters. The smelting of aluminium is one of the most energy intensive industries, and releases potent global warming gases; and using India's low quality, high ash-content coal to do so creates enormous problems – from resettlement of communities for open pit mining, to improper ash disposal that destroys waterways to, of course, climate change (Chakraborty, 1999:180).

Social Disarticulation

Displacement dismantles the existing socio-cultural fabric and economic base of the displaced families, which has been built over several centuries and generations. It disperses and fragments communities, dismantles patterns of social organization and interpersonal ties; kinship groups becomes scattered as well. The inter-family dependence, and cooperation and social and political organizations which existed in the affected villages amongst the displaced communities have broken down. Life sustaining informal networks of reciprocal help, local voluntary associations, and self-organized mutual services are disrupted. This is a net loss of valuable 'social capital' that compounds the loss of natural, physical and human capital.

Employment and Education

Displacement reduces the employment opportunities for the tribal population and causes impoverishment, thus denying them from their right to employment, work and livelihood. It has increased the drop out rates and caused a wider loss to the children of the displaced tribals and denied their basic right to education and literacy.

Displacement of the Dependents

There are project dependent people besides the project affected. In a village setting, the productive land is a collective source of livelihood not only to its owners but also but also to the village as a whole. Displacement not only evicts the owner from the land and destroys his livelihood and employment opportunities but also affects the families like the agricultural labourers, village servants (blacksmiths, carpenter, cobbler, and so on). These are primarily who work as labourers, milkmen, tillers, harvesters, cow and sheep rearers, and flower and vegetable vendors. As a result of the sale of the land their lives are affected. They are not at all a category in the rehabilitation package (Pinto, 1999: 237). These groups of people who were dependent on land indirectly lose also their right to life or existence, security, employment and livelihood opportunities as a part of their basic human rights.

Displacement of tribal population from their habitat is only one part of the story. There has been large-scale movement of non-tribals into the development project areas, as work contractors, shopkeepers, transporters, labourers etc. Many of them over a period of time have got permanently settled in the project sites and at times places beyond, which are in the midst of vast tracts of tribal habitation (Pillai, 1999:161). Thus, these tribals have

been subject to various kinds of socio-economic exploitation by these settlers in their own land.

Displacement and Insecurity (Risks) of Tribals

The Human Rights Declaration states that everyone has the right to life, liberty and security. Under the heading of economic, social and cultural rights, all governments are expected to try progressively to improve the living conditions of their citizens. But the forced displacements have created major socio-economic risks. Giddens uses the sociological concept of risk to indicate the possibility that a certain course of action will trigger future injurious effects – losses and destruction. The concept of ‘risk’ is posited as a counter-concept to ‘security’. The higher the risks, the lower the security of the displaced populations. Cernea developed his eight-point impoverishment risk for the involuntary displaced persons caused by the development process. These are: (1) landlessness, (2) joblessness, (3) homelessness, (4) marginalization, (5) increased morbidity and mortality, (6) food insecurity, (7) loss of access to common property, and (8) social discrimination. To this list Courtland-Robinson (2003) added two more: (9) loss of access to community services, (10) violation of human rights. A.K. Mahapatra (1996) added the eleventh point: (11) loss of educational opportunities (Bandopadhyaya, 2004: 410).

Marginalizing Citizenship

Marginalization occurs when families lose economic power and spiral on a downward mobility path. Many individuals cannot use their earlier acquired skills in the new location; human capital is lost or rendered inactive or obsolete. Economic marginalisation is often accompanied by social and psychological marginalization expressed in a drop in social status, in resettler’s loss of confidence in society and in themselves, a feeling of injustice, and deepened vulnerability. The coerciveness of displacement and the victimization of resettlers tend to depreciate resettlers’ self image and they are often perceived by host communities as a socially degrading stigma (Cernea, 2000:3664). The minorities and peripheral people who are granted ‘marginal citizenship’ lose their ability to challenge the state as they are going to be the prospective ‘sacrificial goat’ at the altar of development. The marginal citizens, who are external to the development process as well as the nation state, are denied the right to dissent, object or protest.

Towards Conclusion

In the global march of development, the wealth of the earth is being appropriated by elites, impoverishing nature as well as the vast human masses who depend on natural resources for sustenance. The profit (capitalist) oriented and market-friendly approach to development as followed by the Orissa government with a desire to bring national development has not only worsened the conditions of the tribal populations and caused a great damage to the environment, and social networking of the people but also denied their (human) rights to livelihood and sustenance, culture, land, common property resources, employment and participation. Their survival is at stake under the New Economic Policy regime and accompanying process of privatization and globalization.

The state, whose prime duty is the welfare and protection of the citizens, is now using sovereign powers to protect the MNCs and TNCs to crush the citizens. While the citizens

are turned into refugees and aliens in their own country, the ‘foreigners’ and ‘aliens’ because of the capital they possess are treated more than citizens. The socio-economically marginalized citizens are asked to quit their habitation and livelihoods and the capitalists from the out side land are provided all the facilities to grab all resources at the expense of the people, specially the poor is both denial of sovereignty and betrayal of peoples right over their lives and land (Pinto, 1999: 241). It is observed that such a model of development creates or adds to widespread inequalities in society, erodes traditional sources of livelihood, uproots people from their community way of life into atomized individuals pitted against each other in an opportunistic economic system, creates a consumer culture resulting in a depletion of natural resources, increases economic dependence on outside financial/technological organizations, and reduces political autonomy of host society.

The acquisition of tribal land for bauxite production has evicted them from their homestead and deprived them of a decent living, which can be marked by the widespread poverty, high incidence of hunger and starvation death, increasing migration of the people to the neighbouring states in search of a minimum livelihood. Thus, development projects have impoverished and brutally violated the basic human rights of the people in the areas. The Orissa government did not initiate any conciliatory move to build confidence between the project affected peoples (PAPs) and the government. Instead, it had been acting as the managing agent of the corporate giants who are setting up bauxite mines and alumina plants. In order to protect the interest of the private companies, it has unleashed firing on the innocent tribal people. This total lack of trust and good faith compounded an already complex problem.

As Kothari points out that the current patterns of economic development, which have been constantly invoked to justify the forced eviction of people all over the country, are themselves incompatible with the goals of creating wider conditions of equity and social security. Despite constitutional mandates and an emphasis on favouring the underprivileged, national and regional interest transgress from or violate the interest of politically and economically weaker groups and individuals (Quoted in Sharma, 2003:909). Thus, post-independent development discourse in India, although tried to bring about socio-economic upliftment of the people, never tried to make it compatible with the humanistic goals.

References

1. Sengupta, Jayanta. 2001. ‘State, market and democracy in the 1990s: Liberalization and the politics of Oriya identity’ in Jayal, Niraja Gopal and Sudha Pai. *Democratic Governance in India: Challenges of Poverty, Development, and Identity*, New Delhi: Sage Publication.
2. Gupta, V.S. 2004. *Communication, Development and Civil Society*, New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company, Pp. 175-191
3. Mohanty, Manoranjan. 1998. ‘Orissa’s Tribal People: Politics of Disentitlement’ in Raj, Sebesti. L (eds.) *Contemporary Social Movements in India: Achievements and Hurdles*, New Delhi: Indian Social Institute.
4. Patnaik, A.K. 2001. ‘Profits over People’, *Frontline*, The Hindu, Vol. 18, Issue. 01, Jan. 06 – 19

5. Stanley William. 2002. 'Land does not belong to us – we belong to the land: Mining in Orissa, India', *ECHOES*, Issue. 21.
6. Raj, Ranjit Dev. 1999. 'Environment India: Bauxite TNCs grab Tribal land with impunity', *World News*: Inter Press Service, June.
7. Sharma, R.N. 2003. 'Involuntary Displacement: A Few Encounters', *Economic and Political Weekly*, March 1.
8. Nag, Sajal. 2001. 'Nationhood and Displacement in Indian Subcontinent', *Economic and Political Weekly*, December 22.
9. Cernea, M. 2000. 'Risks, Safeguards, and Reconstruction: A Model for Population Displacement and Resettlement', *Economic and Political Weekly*, October 7.
10. Bandopadhyaya, D. 2004. 'Rayagada Story Retold: Destitutes of Development', *Economic and Political Weekly*, January 31, Vol. XXXIX, No. 5.
11. Education of Tribal Children in India:
http://www.education.nic.in/htmlweb/ssa/education_tribal_children.pdf
12. Ota, Akhil. B. 2001. 'Reconstruction Livelihood of the Displaced Families in Development Projects: Causes of Failure and Room for Reconstruction'
http://www.anthrobase.com/Txt/O/Ota_A_02.htm
13. Jayaraman, Nityananda. 2001. 'Norsk Hydro: Global Compact Violator':
http://www.fsa.ulaval.ca/personnel/vernag/EH/F/cause/lectures/norsk_hydro.htm
14. Basu, Salil and Gautam K. Kshatriya. 1997. 'Fertility and mortality trends in the Kharia tribals of Orissa', *Social Change*, March-June, 27(1 & 2)
<http://www.hsph.harvard.edu/Organizations/healthnet/SAsia/suchana/0416/basu.html>
15. Violation of Right to Livelihood, Human Rights and Constitutional Rights of the Indigenous People of Orissa, India': <http://www.petitiononline.com/OrissaHR/petition.html>
16. Mitra, Arnab, Ashish Gupta and Nitya Varadarajan. 2004. "The Hot New States for Business", *Business Today*, November 21, Pp. 120-128
17. Cullet, Philippe. 2001. "Human Rights vs. Displacement: The Indian Supreme Court Decision on Sardar Sarovar in International Perspective", *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, No. 50, Part. 4, October, Pp. 982-987
18. Chakraborty, Somen. 1999. "Human Rights and Environment", *State of Human Rights in India 1998*, New Delhi: Indian Social Institute, Pp. 178-180.
19. Pillai, R.V. 1999. "Developmental Issues in Human Rights with reference to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes" in Vijapur, A.P and Kumar Suresh (eds.) *Perspectives on Human Rights*, New Delhi: Manak Publication, p.161.
20. Pinto, Ambrose. 1999. "Development Induced Displacements: Violation of Human Rights" in Vijapur, A.P and Kumar Suresh (eds.), *Op cit.*, p.237
21. Baviskar, Amita. 1995. *In the Belly of the River: Tribal Conflicts over Development in the Narmada Valley*, New Delhi: Oxford Publication.
22. McMichael, Philip. 1996. *Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective*, New Delhi: Pine Forge Press, p. 215
23. Das, J.K. 2001. *Human Rights and Indigenous Peoples*, New Delhi: A.P.H Publishing House, Pp. 58-93
24. Baboo, Balgivind. 2002. "Dams, Displacement and Violation of Human Rights: Case of Hirakud Dam in Orissa" in Katare, P.M and B.C Barik (eds.) *Development, Deprivation and Human Rights Violation*, New Delhi: Rawat Publication, p.195
25. Census of India 2001: Total Population, Population of SCs and STs and their proportion to total population: http://www.censusindia.net/t_00_005.html
26. Xaxa, Virginius. 2001. "Empowerment of Tribes" in SinghaRoy, Debal K (ed.) *Social Development and the Empowerment of the Marginalized Groups: Perspectives and Strategies*, New Delhi: Sage Publication, p. 205
27. S. Bhakthavatsala Bharati, 1999. "Human Rights and Development Projects in India", *The PRP Journal of Human Rights*, Oct-Dec., Vol. 3, No. 4, p. 20