

NEOLIBERAL DEVELOPMENT, DISPLACEMENT AND RESISTANCE MOVEMENT: THE CASE OF KALINGA NAGAR INTEGRATED INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX, ODISHA, INDIA

Dinabandhu Sahoo* and Niharrajan Mishra**

Abstract: Heropnam or relaps is the incidence of clients with mental disorders who go back into hospital care. The average number of heropnam clients recorded in Dadi Regional Hospital, has increases from 34.64% (2010) to 68.39% (2014). The purpose of this study is to analyze the effects of family participation, the influence of adherence to medication regimens, and the influence of social stigma of heropnam and the effort to prevent heropnam. This research is quantitative method with a sample of 88 people. The result showed that the factors of family participation, medication regimen adherence, and the presence of societal stigma influenced of heropnam. The discussion explores the maintenance of each component of reproduction in the structure of the living environment requires three actions that are integrated (the trinity of humanistic actions).

Keywords: Heropnam, family participation, medication regimen adherence, societal stigma.

INTRODUCTION

A process has been emerged after the neoliberal development that has been initiated since 1980s throughout the world and in India particularly after 1991 which variously dubbed as accumulation by dispossession (Harvey, 2003), accumulation through encroachment (Patnaik, 2008), primitive accumulation of capital (Karl Marx), global land grab (Borger, 2008; Borrás et. al., 2012; Cotula et. al., 2009), developmental terrorism (Bhaduri, 2007), involuntary resettlement (Cernea, 1988), displacement (Fernandes, 1991), commodity frontier (Moore, 2000), investment forced displacement (Padel, 2015), internal colonialism (McMichael, 2004). The terminology whatever currency in the academic literature have unleashed a process of development where vast majority of the population have either been pushed to join the increasing 'planet of slums' (Davis, 2006) where sometimes they may further experience 'gentrification' (Smith, 1996) and they are forced to contest in the urban struggle for space in the city or face a 'double absence' (Sayad, 2004) or they assimilate in a structure of society where they subject heightened inequality, jobless growth, deprivation, marginalization and cultural genocide (Padel and Das, 2008), de-tribalization or re/de-peasantization (Baviskar, 2005; Prasad, 2004). The process results dissent and discontent that development dislocates fight back to protect their livelihoods and subsistence base structure which they want not to turn

* PhD Scholar, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, NIT Rourkela, Odisha-769008.
Email: sahoo.dinabandhu16@gmail.com

** Assistant Professor, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, NIT Rourkela, Odisha-769008. Email: niharhcu@gmail.com

into capital for the industries. This movement is variously called as ‘new social movement’ (Cohen, 1985; Melucci, 1980, 1985; Touraine, 1977, 1981), ‘collective action’ (Dwivedi, 2006), Subaltern social Movements (Kapoor, 2011), struggles in India today (Baviskar, 2005; Oliver-Smith, 2010) have raised the issues of livelihood (Dwivedi, 2001), dignity (Bhaduri, 2008), basic human rights violation (Katara & Barik, 2002), identity (Oommen, 2010), equity and security (Oommen, 2010) where the development dislocates and civil societies have sought alternative development (Bhaduri, 2008) or non-intervention as the solution of the problem.

Neoliberal development has accelerated the process of land acquisition, dislocation, dispossession and social resistance. According to an authentic estimate the scale of displacement due to development over the past twenty-five years has been truly enormous, in the order of 10 million people per year throughout the world since the 1980s which is the beginning of neoliberalism (Cernea & McDowell, 2000). In the last decade, the magnitude of displacement of peasant communities in Africa, Latin America, Central Asia, South Asia including India and China has really been unbelievable (Cotula et. al., 2009 and Pearce, 2012). One recent report mentions that the number of reported deals concluded worldwide between 2000 and 2011 at around 2000 covering 203 million hectares of land. Africa accounted for 948 acquisitions covering 134 million hectares of land- an area larger than France, Germany and the UK combined (Africa Progress Panel, 2012). In India during the last 6 decades following Independence (i.e. 1947-2004) 60 million people have been paid the costs of development and modernization constituting of 25 million hectares of land including 7 million hectares of forest land and 6 million hectares of common property resources (CPRs) (Fernandes, 2008:91). There is no data base on how many have been indirectly affected by development projects such as land degradation, climate change caused by industrial pollutants that lead displacement of population (Ganguly Thukral, 1999). Among the development dispossessed in India 40 per cent are adivasis while they constitute 8.6 per cent population in the country (Fernandes, 2011:305) and 20 per cent are dalits (Mahapatra, 1999a). While Odisha constitutes 22 per cent adivasis of the state it has dislocated 40.38 per cent of them (Fernandes, 2008:92). So it is apt to say that subalterns have born the cost of development more in India. And they are the one who have resisted most to the development projects. During the same period Odisha alone account for 3 million displaced people. In India the resettlement and rehabilitation situation is so distressing that time and again it ushers unrest. India in an average has resettled 17.94 per cent of its displaced population (Table 3) where as Odisha has resettled 35.27 per cent of its dislocated families during 1951 to 1995 (Fernandes, 2011:306). A data source shows that out of 266,000 displaced families in Odisha only 9,000 have provided employment (Ibid:313). Many times resettlement programmes are undertaken as a result of the organized protest by the displaced and civil societies.

Odisha, along with some mineral rich states in India has been undergone a path of development since 1991, in the form of extractive industrialization attracting various investment through Transnational Corporations (TNCs) and Multi-National Corporations (MNCs) to invest in the state. Between 2002 and 2008, Odisha signed 49 Memorandum of Understandings (MoUs) to produce 75.66 MTPA steels and other metal industries consisting of Rs 198,149 crores of investments (Department of Steel and Mines Government of Odisha, 2016). As an initiation Kalinga Nagar Industrial Complex (KNIC) was planned. Presently it houses 12 steel industries and some others have signed MoUs to establish their plants in the near future. Odisha government has sent a proposal to central government to declare KNIC a NIMZ (National Investment and Manufacturing Zone). However, whole issue of development is often rationalised in terms of 'poverty reduction' (Mosse, 2007), while it is a clear fact that development induced dispossession have turns many people impoverished (Cernea, 1990; 1995) and marginalized the indigenous people, women, peasants, farmers and industrial workers and a reduction in labour, social and environmental conditions on a global basis- what Brecher and Costello (1994) called 'the race to the bottom' or 'global pillage'. Based on these contexts of development, displacement, conflict and resistance the paper follows the perspectives of political economy and new social movement to explore the political economy of development, dispossession and resistance movement in Kalinga Nagar Industrial Complex, the causes of conflict and resistance movement and collective mobilization and demands and strategies of protest in Kalinga Nagar resistance movement. We explore these processes with the methodological canvas of ethnographic fieldwork. The data for this paper was collected primarily as a part of my PhD research using ethnographic fieldwork. The fieldwork was carried out in a whole year from August 2014 to August 2015 in two phases. Interviews and group discussions were conducted during the fieldwork with the leaders and activists and other members involved in the movement.

The second section of the paper explains the political economy of development and dispossession in Odisha particularly focusing on Kalinga Nagar. The third part deals with the causes of conflict and resistance movement while the fourth section expounds the process of collective mobilization and demands and strategies of resistance movement formations.

POLITICAL ECONOMY OF DEVELOPMENT AND DISPOSSESSION IN KALINGA NAGAR INTEGRATED INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX (KNIIC)

The idea of Kalinga Nagar industrial complex was conceived in the early 1990s on the onset of neoliberal globalization. Kalinga Nagar is situated in the confluence of Sukinda and Danagadi blocks of Jajpur district in Odisha. Sukinda is a resource rich region. The chrome reserve of Sukinda is estimated to be about 90 per cent

of the country's total chrome reserves. All the nickel reserves (92 per cent) in the country are at Sukinda. The state also possesses large manganese reserves. Odisha possesses 3120 MTs (one-third) of hematite ore as compared to 10,000 MTs reserve of India. Iron ore is found in the nearby mines of Tamka, Joda, Barbil and Daitari. All of them are essential inputs of steel making which can be supplied from Sukinda, Daitari, Joda, Tamka and Barbil mines that located near KNIIC. The Talcher coalfields are about 100 KMs away from Kalinga Nagar well connected by roads. Bhitarkanika and Duburi sub-station is established for ease power supply to the industries. For transport South-Eastern Railway runs near Jakhapura having a railhead. The Sukinda-Angul and Talcher rail route is under construction which will link Jakhapura. Daitari-Paradeep Express highway runs near KNIIC which links Paradeep port in the Bay of Bengal and it is also well connected with NH5. The second largest river of the state *Brahmani* flows near 5 KMs away and will make a steady supply of water, both to steel plants and the township for domestic consumption (Sinha, 2008).

In addition to resource richness the area was also historically significant for industrialization.

In 1964 the Government of Odisha had written a memorandum to the central government to establish the second steel plant in the state. The memorandum identified three most suitable sites- one coastal area of Paradeep and the other two are inland based near Bonai of Sundargarh district and Nayagarh of Keonjhar district. It rated the latter choice better. The memorandum emphasised a careful details of economic factors regarding the locations and by no means was political. It mentioned location wise details of the raw material availability, transport facilities, access to important inputs like water, power, site land and even land for resettlement and rehabilitation of the displaced people. It also suggested possible related industries that could be promoted in the regions. It also invited a team of experts to visit the relevant places for detailed surveys and feasibility studies before taking any financial decision on the location of the new integrated iron and steel plant, so as to be able to assess the relative advantages of each one of these locations vis-à-vis other locations in the country (Das, 1992).

In 1965 M N Dastur and Company (hereafter Dastur Committee) made a detailed study and submitted a five volume Report to the Central Government for the establishment of pig iron plants which was based on techno-economic feasibility aspects of 28 major locations in various regions of the country. The report also delved into the techno-economic aspects of establishment of integrated iron and steel companies in the country. The consulting engineers were suggested as well to recommend sites in the order of priority with reference to the costs of the raw material assembly, production and distribution and to indicate locations which could be developed into steel work sites later. The Dastur committee examined 28 sites in the country and suggested Bonai in Sundargarh district and Nayagarh in Keonjhar

district in Odisha to be the best locations in the country for the setting up of steel complexes. Dastur Committee submitted its report in 1965 and it was examined by the British American Steelworks for India Consortium (BASIC) (Das, 1997).

In 1970 there was demand in the Parliament by Odia parliamentarians (MPs) to set up second steel plant in Odisha due to techno economic feasibility study favouring the state and backwardness of the state (Lok Sabha Deb.(1970) col. 242 and (Das 1992)). In the meantime in 1970 Ispat Karakhana Sangram Samiti (IKSM, an Organization for the Establishment of Steel Plant) also demanded the establishment of second steel plant in Odisha during the fourth plan period. IKSM called a state wise *bandh*(a formal strike) for the establishment of 2nd steel plant in the state and even some of its leaders were arrested for demanding the steel plant. However, the establishment of 2nd steel plant could not be realised in the state because of ‘regional pulls’ ground of the federal government and political ad hocism (Balasundaram, 1973). The steel plants later established in South India with lower capacity instead of Odisha.

Although Kalinga Nagar and its surrounding areas possess abundance resources but the significant section of the population are comprised up poor tribals and Dalits who are designated as underdeveloped in many aspects. The Table 1 shows the socio-economic indicator of development of Sukinda region. This phenomenon explains the *resource curse thesis* introduced by Richard Auty. Auty (1993) writes “new evidence that not only may resource-rich countries fail to benefit from the favourable endowment, they may actually perform worse than less well-endowed countries”. Jeffrey Sachs who popularizes the thesis believes that the natural resource curse has resonated through history (Jones, O’Brien and Steven, 2014).

**TABLE 1: SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROFILE OF SUKINDA
SUB-DISTRICT OF JAJPUR DISTRICT, ODISHA**

No. of Households	28,562	28,562	Non-workers	97,167
Total Population	1,42,812		Average Household Size	5.0
Rural Population	1,42,812		Proportion of Urban Population	0
Urban Population	0		Sex Ration	946
SC Population	16,932		Proportion of SC Population (%)	12.0
ST Population	48,445		Proportion of ST Population (%)	34.0
Literates	69,975		Literacy Rate (%)	58.0
Illiterates	72,837		Worker Participation Rate (%)	32.0
Total Workers	45,645		Main Worker (%)	23.0
Main Workers	32,859		Marginal Workers (%)	9.0
Marginal Workers	12,786		Non-workers (%)	68.0

Source: Census 2001

According to Census 2001 the two blocks i.e. Sukinda and Danagadi under which Kalinga Nagar falls have 34.00 per cent and 28.19 per cent tribes and 12.00 per cent and 22.31 per cent dalits (scheduled castes) population respectively. However the adivasis population of the acquired area is much higher than the block average. The adivasis of the area are mainly of Ho and Santal communities. The literacy rate is very low (Dash & Samal, 2008).

The tribals of Kalinga Nagar have been migrated from different districts of Chotanagpur in the last part of 19th century and early 20th century. Lack of irrigation facilities and frequent drought in tribal areas of Chotanagpur region left no option for the tribals but to migrate to other places like tea gardens of Assam and Coal fields in the nearby area (Miri, 1993). The shortage of labour in the tea gardens of Assam during colonial times particularly in the 2nd half of the 19th century caused a large scale migration of the Santhals, Munda, Oraons and Hos from the villages of Chotanagpur and Santhal Pargana to Assam. Similarly, the establishment of industries in these areas led to a large scale displacement of tribals resulting into their alienation from land (Prasad, 1988:78). Land alienation due to different purposes like hydro-electric project, administration, industrial and mining projects, reservation and conservation of forests, business and other institutions like schools, colleges and technical training institutions etc. in Chotanagpur in colonial and post-colonial period pushed the adivasis of the region to migrate to other areas (Prasad, 1988:77-99). The mining industries near Chotanagpur also attracted the Hos as well as other tribes as labour force. In a similar vein in 1877 due to severe drought in Saraikala region (Present day Jharkhand), people migrated to Sukinda valley (Near the present day Kalinga Nagar Industrial Complex) (Sahu, 2007).

Similarly an adivasis of Kalinga Nagar Mansingh Purty (age about 74) vehemently stated the other cause of Adivasi migration to Kalinga Nagar area:

“We are strong and industrious people. Our forefathers came here from Ranchi areas as contractual labour by the colonial British ruler to construct the Rail road in Eastern Odisha in the last half of 19th century. Since then we are living in this region. The then Sukinda king (Zamindar) permitted us to live here and make land by cutting forests and cultivate it. He gave some people *patta* and we were giving *Khajana* (Tax) in the form of Gotti (bonded labour) to the king”. (Interview 15.12.2014)

In fact it can be concluded that environmental degradation and climate change not only induced tribal migration but also economic opportunity acted as a pull factor for tribal migration to Sukinda/Kalinga Nagar area.

The topography of the area was also suitable for tribal settlement. The topography of the area consists of undulating landmass with small hills and forests. Small streams, low waste lands and *Pattas* (a large pond) were the main source of

water supply to the area. Streams and *Pattas* provide a large quantity of varieties of fishes and crab to the local people. In Khapuria-Kumbhiragadia area there was a large grazing land which supports hundreds of milkman families for cattle rearing. The main livelihood of the local adivasis consists of agriculture, especially rain-fed agriculture i.e. paddy cultivation. After harvesting rice, some people grow pulses like black and green gram, Khesari, maize, kulthi and vegetables. The nearby forests and hills play an important role of supplying firewood and minor forest products like ground nuts, kendu fruits, mango, tamarind, jack fruits, various kinds of leafy vegetables and besides meats of various wild animals and birds. These provided health and wellbeing of the tribal populations in the area. Some rare species of medicinal herbs were found in the nearby hills. Besides these economic values, forests and hills also had religious and aesthetic values for the local tribals. Some people in the area also worked as agricultural or other wage labourers in the nearby mines and quarries.

CAUSES OF CONFLICT AND RESISTANCE MOVEMENT

The third part of the paper discusses the causes of conflict and protest movement in the area. As explained in the section II, the local tribals of Kalinga Nagar migrated from different districts of Chotanagpur regions in the last part of nineteenth century in several phases due to severe drought and famine, economic opportunity and exploitation in the region (Damodaran, 1995; Misra, 1987:11; Sahu, 2007). Damodaran (1995) writes that land alienation of tribals and the general collapse of their economies was an important reason for the migration of tribals to other regions. By the end of the nineteenth century the migration of the tribals from Ranchi district had increased enormously although population of the district was increased. The practice of migration by the poorest and most vulnerable tribal population was one of the common survival strategies adopted in the time of drought and famine (Ibid). Census survey of 1877 also reveals that due to drought in Saraikala of Chotanagpur region, adivasis migrated to Sukindagad (Present day Sukinda in Jajpur District. Kalinga Nagar Comes under Sukinda) region. During that period Sukindagad was a colonial Zamindari estate. The rulers of Sukindagad settled the tribals in the region. Later the independent Orissa administration promised the tribals of Kalinga Nagar to give *patta* (land title). Some influential adivasis got land deeds from the Sukinda rulers which presently are in the names of their forefathers. However due to innocence, ignorance and illiteracy, most of the tribes could not get *patta* (Sahu, 2007) and deprived of formal land rights. The adivasis of the region were still cultivating the lands without any legal title.

Biren Jamuda, an adivasi activist of *Bistapita Parivar Unnayan Parishad* (thereafter BPUP, it is a pro-industry organisation operating in Kalinga Nagar for the development of displaced families) says that:

“Since most of the adivasis in Kalinga Nagar area had no *patta* of the lands they were cultivating since generations, we had organised two public meetings in the ‘Chandia’ playground and called Kalinga Nagar ADM (Additional District Magistrate) to be present in the meetings and look into this problem. In both the meetings most of the local adivasis were present, but ADM could not come although he gave consent to come. In the last gathering people vowed not to vacate their land till this problem could not be solved. This was happened before Tate Steel coming to Kalinga Nagar.” (Interview 01.02.2015)

The last land settlement in the area was conducted in 1917-18 in colonial times. Most of the adivasis except some influential ones were deprived of land settlement. Local adivasis were unaware of any further revisions to these settlements. However some tribals have land titles in the names of their ancestors (Sahu, 2007). The land settlement of 1980s left out most regions of Sukinda for settlement because of future industrial prospect. This fuelled resistance later.

The conventional practice was that even the welfare state could not guarantee sufficient safety measures to avoid risks (Cernea, 2000) of livelihoods lost due to displacement. Risk refers to any action which can generate future dangers. Giddens views risk as closely related to danger but they are not the same. What risk presumes is precisely danger. Risk and danger are experienced in relation to ontological security (Giddens, 1991). Beck (1992:4) defined it as the probabilities of physical harm due to given technological or other processes. There are many instances in India where the state could not adequately counter the livelihood risks of displaced people that resulted impoverishment (Cernea, 2000). Fernandes (1991) and Cernea (2000) reveals that the development programmes in India have dispossessed roughly about 20 million people during the four decades following independence, but 75 per cent of these people have not been rehabilitated. Their livelihoods have not been reconstructed and among them the vast majority have been impoverished (Mahapatra, 1999b). Most of the times livelihoods cannot be reconstructed due to the institutionalised attitude of neglect towards displaced people (Fernandes, 2008) and the glaring discrepancy between policy and promises that made by officials for resettlement and rehabilitation (Padel & Das, 2008), where there emerge livelihood risks and *cultural genocide* (Padel and Das, 2011) that many times backfires for social resistance.

For Kalinga Nagar Complex the Government of Odisha drafted two guidelines for the rehabilitation and resettlement of displaced persons one in 1997 and the other in 2005. In both the guidelines there were provisions such as eligible family to get rehabilitation benefits, determination of number of displaced families, definition of displaced family, provision of identity card for displaced family, preferential employment or self-employment and training to the displaced family, homestead

land to the displaced family, model colony as rehabilitation site, equal benefit of encroached family living before 1980 etc. In spite of the provision NilachalIspat Nigam Limited (NINL), a public sector undertaking in the Kalinga Nagar industrial complex had displaced 639 families, but provided only 182 direct employments, gave 131 families homestead land in Gobarghati Colony and provided cash compensation to 508 displaced families. It could not consider encroachment land for compensation although government had policy guide lines. NINL could not compensate other livelihood resources that people in the regions get livelihood access throughout their generation. Similar was the case of other industries like MESCO, Jindal, Visa, and Rohit steel plant those established since 2005. The Table 2 shows the resettlement and rehabilitation of displaced people in KNIIC till 2006. The resettlement and rehabilitation practice of the industries and unable to generate alternative livelihood, there emerged vulnerabilities and *livelihood insecurities* (Fernandes, 2004) and *livelihood risks* (Giddens, 1991; Beck, 1992:4) of majority of the displaced population in Kalinga Nagar. As a result many displaced adivasis of the area have migrated to other places in search of livelihood security. Mishra (2006) well documented these cases and claims that hundreds of families in Kalinga Nagar have been displaced and many more are expected to be dislocated in the near future. There were 700 families out of which 250 are living there. There is no news of the rest 450 families. So what has happened to those 450 families?

TABLE 2: RESETTLEMENT AND REHABILITATION IN KNIIC

<i>Name of Company</i>	<i>Displaced so far</i>	<i>Provided 10 decimal land</i>	<i>Provided with cash compensation of ₹50,000 (not available homestead land)</i>	<i>Direct employment</i>
NINL	639	131	508	182
MESCO	53	53	–	47
Jindal	60	51	8	Nil
Visa	23	3	20	Nil
Rohit	12	Nil	12	Nil
Common Corridor	28	Nil	28	Nil
Total	815	238	576	229

Source: 1. ADM Office Kalinga Nagar
 2. People's Union for Civil Liberties (2006)
 3. Dash and Samal (2008)

The interview with a village community leader provides the answer that “NINL has displaced 639 families out of which 115 families migrated to different districts of Odisha. 30, 20 and 15 families each migrated to Dhenkanal (Kankadahad block), Keonjhar (Baranga Researved Forest) and Balasore (Manjuri) districts of Odisha. However around 50 families migrated and settled in the same district. Studies

conducted by Walter Fernandes (2008) reveals similar fate of displaced people in India. He writes that only 17.94 per cent of the displaced persons have been resettled in India. Odisha and Goa have resettled only one third of the displaced people while Gujarat and West Bengal resettled only 23.82 per cent and 11.18 per cent respectively. Others have either impoverished or perished. Table 3 shows the status of resettlement in some states.

TABLE 3: NUMBER OF DISPLACED PERSONS (DPS) AND NUMBER RESETTLED

<i>State</i>	<i>DPS</i>	<i>Resettled</i>	<i>% Resettled</i>
Andhra	1,526,813	440,090	28.82
Assam	307,024	11,000	03.59
Goa	15,950	5,375	33.63
Gujarat	690,322	164,498	23.82
Kerala	219,633	30,036	13.68
Orissa	548,794	192,840	35.27
W. Bengal	3,634,271	400,000	11.18
Total	6,942,807	1,243,839	17.94

Source: Fernandes 2008

Rabindra Jarika, the secretary of Bistapan Birodhi Jan Manch (BBJM) Sukinda has questioned the injustice done by the Indian state in rehabilitation and resettlement of the displaced persons in the past as well as the neoliberal state in the present. He says

‘NINL promised to keep the *bisthapitaloka* (displaced people) in developed colony and give all the displaced people employment. The company forcefully displaced the people. They destroyed the houses with Bulldozer while women were cooking inside the houses. Police arrested the menfolks. Women were taken away forcefully to the dozer padia³ (Gobarghati colony) and kept there. There was no infrastructure like primary school, health centre, water supply, drainage system, pucca road at that time. After staying there some days some people could not get food to eat. Some migrated to other places. Some people started begging. Some people were saved by doing manual labour in the nearby stone crushing units. Some people who were well off before became poor’. (Interview 08.06.2015).

This phenomenon reveals the *uneven development* (Smith, 1984) that reproduces injustice in the capitalist state. Lyotard (1988) argues that postmodernism ‘speaks the language of justice’ while undermines justice ontologically.

Development is alluded as violence, that is, as a process involving the physical or material destruction of nature and dispossession of native population, which Shiv Vishvanathan (1987) referred to as *development triage*. There are similar analysis

given by Escobar (2004), Kothari and Harcourt (2004) and Vishvanathan (1987). In Kalinga Nagar there are many such incidents of violence. There are more than 60 police cases pending on each of the frontline leaders of BBJM. All the leaders of BBJM faced death threats from the corporate goons. There were many cases of beating and torture by the police to the displaced people who protested land acquisition. On 9th May 2005, due to *lathi* (Canning by police force) charge in the Maharashtra Seamless steel *Bhoomipuja* protest tribal men fled to the nearby forests and 25 women were arrested in the midnight of the same day. Due to lack of care and extreme heat of summer 3 people including two children died. In Kalinga Nagar one leading activist was murdered and another was killed in the POSCO area. Amin Banara was gunned down on 1st May 2008 by goons who approached him near the Tata Plant site. Later gangster Arvind Singh was arrested for his allegedly involvement. A month before this incidence, another activist, Jogendra Jamuda, was shot in the back while driving his mother and wife on a motorbike near the Kalinga Nagar police station.

CONFLICT, COLLECTIVE MOBILIZATION AND MOVEMENT DEMANDS AND STRATEGIES

In KNIIC land was acquired in 1992-93 by Industrial Development Corporation of Odisha (IDCO). IDCO, a nodal agency of government of Odisha, was established in 1981 to develop industrial infrastructure in the state such as industrial sites, construct factory sheds, and provide water, power, and communication and housing facilities for industries. IDCO also provides land to large projects which cannot come up in the Industrial Estate and Areas. It oversees to obtain/acquire land for all such projects in any location of the state. Its main role is to mediate between people and industry in land acquisition. The compensation for land was paid at the rate of ₹35,000 and ₹37,000 per acre of the land categorised as *sarada* (Kharif which is best suited for the low lands subject to flooding) and *Biali* (land slightly elevated and free from flooding) respectively in 1993-94. Although land was acquired only officially, no person was physically displaced. People had access to livelihood as usual. However, the villagers have shown their dissatisfaction towards the compensation they received. Their demand for getting rupees 1.5 lakhs per acre instead of rupees 35/37 thousand per acre as compensation was ignored by the authority. However, while an amount of rupees 35/37 thousand per acre is being paid to them as part compensation, the same land sold by IDCO to industries at the rate of 3.5 lakhs/acre. This reflects a clear-cut apathy of the State towards the marginal communities. These conflicts of interest add some fuel to lead resistance in future. In addition to this the payment of compensation only to the oustees who had land deeds, created a sense of livelihood insecurity in the minds of non-*patta* (Land having no record of right) holder. And they became a major stakeholder in the process of resistance. Apart from individual land the Adivasis in the area also had access to local hills and forests and Common Property Resources (CPRs). Since

centuries they protected some forests and hills like *Kasi Huri*, *Bainshipur Huri*, *Badasuli* hill and forest, *Chandia* forest and *Gobarghati Huri*. The destruction of these resources due to relentless industrialization has not only destroyed the livelihood resources of these poor communities but also ruined their culture and identity. It forced these marginal communities to join hands in the resistance. This was first reflected in 1996 when Bhusan Steel plant came and performed ground levelling works on the agricultural lands near Gadpur and Chandia villages. Adivasis people in the nearby villages led by their village leaders demanded alternative livelihoods and reiterated the demand of compensation for non-patta lands. However, their demands were not properly addressed by the authority which intensified the conflict among the adivasis. People strongly protested and demanded halt of the ground levelling work. Adivasis gathered on the sites engaged in stone pelting and drove out Bhusan Steel from KNIIC. Later Bhusan Steel shifted to Dhenkanal and Jharsuguda district in the state. However, there was no movement organization and leadership in this protest. Again people started cultivation of their land as usual. In course of time lots of movement were organised to protect the interest of the marginal communities in this area.

Sukinda *Mahameli* (a forum of displaced/affected people in Sukinda region of Kalinga Nagar Industrial Complex) was formed in September 27, 2004 on the leadership of Mayadhar Nayak, a trade union leader. Mayadhar Nayak became the president of Mahameli while Hari Charan Haibru (a tribal leader in Sukinda region) became its secretary. The organisation constitutes of thousands of Adivasi and dalit people of about 100 villages in Kalinga Nagar area. Mahameli formed various executive committees in every villages and conducted discussions and study classes in every village. Village leaders were given training and they were given awareness teaching about displacement. These leaders organized village meeting and made discussion in their village regarding displacement. People were mobilised through meetings and discussions. They were made members in the forum. On 15th October 2004 Mahameliorganised an open public meeting in the football playground of Ramthenga village near Duburi. Thousands of people gathered in the meeting. In this meeting Mahameli declared its 9 point demands with huge public support. The main motto of the organization was “*We welcome the industries, but the displaced and affected communities should be paid the cost of their sacrifice*”. The demands are:

1. The displaced/affected people who lost their land should be paid compensation at the rate of 2.5 lakh per acre for barren land, 5 lakh per acre for *Biali* land, 7.5 lakh per acre for *sarada* land and 12.5 lakh per acre for homestead land.
2. Those who are living in the *anabadi* (Government land without patta) land before 1990 they should be given title of the land along with compensation of the land.

3. Compensation should be paid for the well, ponds and trees that located in the homestead premises of the displaced family.
4. Identify the dislocated people and give them employment in the company. Consider separate family those who have crossed 18 years of age if he is a male, 25 years of age if she is a woman or a widow or a deserted women or mental or physically disabled. They should be considered as separate family and provided rehabilitation and resettlement benefits. Nominated member of each displaced family should be provided employment. Those who have passed at least matriculation should be given training to enhance their employability skills. Those displaced people who are under matriculation standard should given technical jobs at the construction of the project under the supervision of the contractors. Those displaced family who will not like direct or indirect employment in the project should be given cash-in-lieu of employment but in a single instalment.
5. Local youths ought to be provided employment in priority basis. Dislocated family should be given a monthly allowance of Rs. 1000.
6. Resettlement and Rehabilitation (R and R) policy should be implemented taking in view of the changing circumstances. Let the government Provide 20 decimal homestead land to all the displaced family. Those displaced/ affected families who lost all or $2/3^{\text{rd}}$ of their homestead or agricultural land should given an amount of 2 lakh as an honorarium. And those who lost less than $2/3^{\text{rd}}$ and others should be given 1 lakh as honorarium. Those displaced family who will not live in the resettlement colony should paid 2 lakh for house construction and 1 lakh for homestead land.
7. All the people in Kalinga Nagar should be given health insurance cover to cure the disease that will come up due to environmental pollution.
8. Those who are engaged in government employment if they will be displaced should be equally treated while extending R and R benefits.
9. In order to successfully implement the compensation, resettlement and rehabilitation and employment programmes 50 per cent representatives should be from displaced family in the advisory committee of R and R. R and R should be monitor regularly.

Mahameli raised these issues. It organised a big protest march. Around 10,000 local people participated in the rally which marched from the Duburi square to ADM office Jajpur Road. Mahamelimobilised the local people raising these issues relating to displacement. It successfully mobilized the tribal and dalits who have already been affected and those going to be affected in the Sukinda region. On 26th November 2004, Mahameli called a press conference in the state capital Bhubaneswar where it highlighted its 9 point demands. In addition to this the conference also raised the compensation issue of Karana Badara. Karana Badara was a tribal old man

who took care of his only disabled daughter. His daughter was disabled as she was attacked by a bear in her childhood. Karana Badara was died falling in the Jindal Steel pit while he was returning from the market at night. He could not know about the pit. Mahameli demanded 2 lakh compensation for his disabled daughter. Further Mahameli proclaimed how Jindal Steel plant have encroached the livelihood sources of the adivasis of the four villages of Bainshipur, Hudisahi, Gadpur and Bandar Gadia. In the press conference Nayak articulated that a severe situation will emerge in KNIIC if the sacrifice of the displaced/affected people will not be paid.

On 8th December 2004 Mahameliorganised a public meeting in the Chandia playground where nearly 4000 people in the Sukinda region attended. There was a discussion about the next course of action of the forum. The forum planned to gherao state assembly along with Sukinda Upatuaka Mines Workers' Union on the call of congress party. Although Sukinda Mahameli could not succeed in achieving its demands, it articulated various issues related to displacement in a well organised manner. It succeeded in bringing unity, solidarity and consciousness among adivasis and dalits in Kalinga Nagar industrial complex. While Mahameli was weakening, another organization emerged which is popularly known as 'Sukinda Upatyaka Adivasi Harijan Ekta O Surakshya Parishad (shortly Surakshya Parishad). While Mahameli was based on the principle of '*we welcome the industries, but the displaced and affected communities should be paid the cost of their sacrifice*', Surakshya Parishad established on the principle of 'Jamin Surakshya' (Protection of Land from acquisition). It mobilized adivasis and dalits of Sukinda region on the basis of common ethnicity and common history. In the first part of the paper we mentioned that adivasis in the area have migrated from Chotanagpur region in different phases to Kalinga Nagar. Before the arrival of the adivasis to Sukinda, only Sabara tribes and *Pana* (a dalit caste) were living in the area. Surakshya Parishad spread over more than 20 villages in Kalinga Nagar area. Soon after its' formation it sent an open letter to chief minister of Odisha in which it raised the issues of:-

1. Improper implementation of land settlement in the area and demanded land and forest rights to the adivasis and dalits living in the area before 1980.
2. Better compensation, resettlement and rehabilitation.
3. End of forceful land acquisition and Police atrocities in land acquisition.
4. Land for land as compensation and one job for each displaced family.

Besides, it initiated a political dialogue with state politicians for better resettlement and rehabilitation. The frontline leaders of the movement are local affected adivasis and members of the then ruling political party, Biju Janata Dal (BJD). However, this organisation did not sustain for longer period. As some of the frontline leaders became so opportunistic and withdraw themselves with their groups from the movement after getting some financial and political assurance from the ruling party of the State. The voice of other emerging leaders was suppressed

by the use of State machinery. Even some of them were threatened to death and booked under IPC107.

BBJM, Sukinda was formed in April 2005 in a gathering called by local tribals in Kalinga Nagar. One elder adivasis from the local Gobarghati GP named Chakradhar Haibruwas elected as its secretary. Rabindra Jarika, a post graduate from Utkal University, a local tribal youth of *Chandia* village was elected as its secretary. People of more than 50 affected villages and two Gram Panchayats (GP) namely *Gobarghati* and *Chandia* which was listed for acquisition by Tata Steel were its participants. Two GPs were the centre of resistance. Tribals of the Sukinda regions provided sympathy and solidarity to the movement. The organization formed various hamlet and village committees with a village youth in each village/hamlet as its head. All the people of the hamlet or village remained its members. BBJM had its organizational core committee consisting of 8 members. It made ad hoc alliance with various movement organizations and political parties like Lok Shakti Abhijan, a people's organisation fighting against globalisation and for the right to livelihood, Odisha unit, Kashipur Andolankari, Lower Suktel Ekta Manch, Sambalpur Chashi Sanghthan, Posco Pratirodh Sangram Samiti, CPI (ML) New Democracy, CPI (ML) Liberation, CPI (M) and CPI (Maoist), CPI (Janshakti). It performed village and core committee meetings and discussed the issues of displacement related problems in the area. It made aware of the problems of displacement and the plight of dislocated people displaced by NINL, MESCO, Jindal Steel in the area and to a larger extent of the displaced people of Hirakud and Rengali Dam and Rourkela Steel plant. With this discussions and debates BBJM came to the conclusion that in the contemporary political structure and development model practised by the state it is impossible by the state to provide a just resettlement and rehabilitation to the dislocated people. BBJM demanded the state government to give a 'White paper of all development projects undertaken after 1996 in Odisha'. The main motto of BBJM was '*Ame Jamin Chadibu Nahin*' (We won't let our land for acquisition). It demanded no further displacement in the area and resisted the acquisition of land by Tata Steel. During 2005, the BBJM resisted all kinds of activities like land survey, *bhumipuja*, levelling, boundary wall construction, etc., relating to setting up of industries in the Kalinganagar Complex. It is necessary to highlight some events that intensified conflict.

On 9th May 2005 Maharashtra Seamless Steel Limited was performing its *Bhoomi Pooja* (Worship of Land) near Gadpur and Bandargadia Village to establish its steel plant. The local tribals violently resisted the event and reiterated their demands. The police resorted to *lathi-charge* (Caning) and women were obstructed on the ground. People broke the police van. The *bhoomipooja* was abandoned.

On 23rd July 2005 Tata Steel performed *Bhoomi Pooja* with the presence of the then District Collector and Superintendent of Police (SP). Around 3000 adavasis and dalits protested and police lodged cases against the leaders of BBJM. The *Bhoomi*

Pooja was postponed. But Tata Steel went ahead with the project with assurance from authorities in spite of the violent protests.

On 27th July a notice was served to the people of the area by the state administration to attend a public hearing in Jajpur Road.

On 7th October 2005 adivasis resisted against the performance of *Bhoomi Pooja* again on the same land by the Tata officials even if accompanied by police force and district administration officials. A constable was reportedly beaten up by the protestors and according to police, protesters snatched away his gun.

On 25th October 2005 Rabindra Jarika, the secretary was arrested by the Jajpur police while he was returning from attending a tribal conference in Bhubaneswar, the state capital. On his arrest, various organisations including PUCL (People's Union for Civil Liberty) protested against the government on its attempt to suppress the movement of the people.

On October 27 2005, BBJM and its alliances gheraoed Kalinga Nagar police station protesting against the arrest. The police reported by trying to arrest the other local leaders of that organization.

On 17th November 2005 in the face of strong resistance by BBJM, the Maharashtra Seamless Steel Limited had suspended its construction work and later its project was abandoned from Kalinga Nagar.

On 2nd January 2006 Tata Steel started the levelling of land early in the morning in the area with the help of state administrative officials like District Collector, SP, and 12 platoons of police force. About 300-400 tribals with traditional weapons like bows and arrows, axes gathered in the area sent a delegate of four members for a dialogue with the officials. When the delegates were marching ahead police resorted tear gas cells. The tribals retaliated by throwing back these tear gas cells. Tear gas cell followed by indiscriminate firing killing 12 tribals and wounding 41 tribals. This incident intensified conflict in the area. Soon after this the adivasis blocked the Express Highway that runs through the area sat on a *dharna* at Madhuban Chhaka.

On 4th January district administration returned the dead bodies to the tribals. They found that the wrists, breasts and genitals of some of the dead bodies have been mutilated. The event further accelerated the discontent among the tribals. On that day the tribals collectively cremated the dead bodies and vowed in the funeral pyres of the *sahids* (martyrs) not to vacate the lands. In a public meeting near Duburi, BBJM and attended by its alliance organizations articulated a seven point demand:

1. Put an end to displacement. Five acres of land be given to families who have already been displaced.
2. The Chief Minister, the finance minister, Minister of Mines, Industry, Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe Welfare Minister be removed from

ministry, and the Minister of Finance and chief minister be booked for murder charge.

3. The Home Secretary and DGP be suspended and SP and Collector of Jajpur District and ADM, Kalinga Nagar be suspended and booked under IPC 302.
4. Declare ₹20 lakhs compensation for the family of each dead and ₹10 lakhs to the family of each injured.
5. MNCs and monopoly companies be driven out from the soil of Odisha.
6. Adivasis be given the rights over mineral resources, land, water, forests and industry in tribal areas.
7. Unconditional release of leaders and activities of the movement and withdrawal of all cases pending against them.

BBJM Sukinda articulating these demands, organised various rallies, campaign and public meetings in each villages of Sukinda and Danagadi blocks for public sympathy and support.

The tribals and dalits from both the blocks, particularly Sukinda supported the demands of Kalinga Nagar movement. From March 2 to 9 BBJM convened a cycle rally which BBJM called as *Sukinda Sangram Yatra*, (Movement Rally in Sukinda). Organising various public meeting, cycle rally in various villages of Sukinda BBJM successfully organised a big movement conference on March 11, near Ambagadia hamlet. Many political parties and grassroots movement organizations fighting for displacement and injustice attended the conference.

Similar conferences, rallies and demonstrations were organised in Kalinga Nagar industrial complex and in the state capital to justify the demands of the movements. The movement was able to sustain about 6 years, i.e. from 2005 to 2011. The movement was declined due to the dynamics of state violence and repression, movement fragmentation, consciousness of opportunity of the leaders, internal differentiation both among the adivasis and non-adivasis. How state violence and repression lead to the decline of a movement? There are scholars who theorised 'development as violence'- that is a process involving the physical or material destruction of nature and dispossession of native population, which Shiv Vishvanathan (1987) referred to as *development triage*. There are similar explanation given by Escobar (2004), Kothari and Harcourt (2004) and Vishvanathan (1987). In Kalinga Nagar there are many such incidents of violence and repression are seen. There are more than 60 police cases pending on each of the frontline leaders of BBJM. All the leaders of BBJM faced death threats from the corporate goons. There were many cases of beating and torture by the police to the displaced people. In addition of the killing of 12 tribals and wounding about 41 tribals in 2nd January 2006, in Kalinga Nagar one leading activist was murdered and another was killed in the POSCO area. Amin Banara was gunned down on 1st May 2008 by goons

who approached him near the Tata Plant site. Later gangster Arvind Singh was arrested for his allegedly involvement. A month before this incidence, another activist, Jogendra Jamuda, was shot in the back while driving his mother and wife on a motorbike near the Kalinga Nagar police station.

Another factor responsible for the decline of the movement is involvement of what Chakrabarty and Kujur (2009) called 'ultra-left wing extremists' and 'Naxalites' in academic literature. BBJM in its public meetings and pamphlets proclaimed that 'we'll support any political and movement organizations who will support our cause'. Even the Naxalite groups like Gopi Mishra group and Anna Reddy Group were involved in the movement. They formed a 'Kalinga Nagar Regiment' for the cause of displacement in Kalinga Nagar. They able to influence some leaders of the BBJM and even trained them how to fight with police. They trapped some leaders and poor young tribals in the area particularly Baligotha village. Later police arrested Anna Reddy in a hospital from Bhubaneswar and Nanika, a young woman leader influenced by Anna Reddy working in the area. Some youths of the area went with Naxalites and later some were still missing and some returned to the area. Three youths were killed by police encounter in Sukinda who were trained by Naxalites. Naxalites had a ideological influence on the movement. However their involvement was turned a bane as it became easy for the government to label the movement as Naxalite movement. Due to fear some people were withdrawn from the movement. Later it became easy for police to arrest the leaders and people which was one of the cause of decline of the movement. Due to the involvement of Naxalite organizations some local tribals and other caste people in the nearby area withdrew their support to the movement.

BPUP was emerged from the very organization BBJM from its fragmentation during the middle of 2007. The main role of the organization was to persuade/force people to displace and resettle in the R and R colony and support Tata steel. BPUP having corporate and state nexus resisted the activities of BBJM and always raised disagreements and disputes with its leaders. Many times BPUP and BBJM involved in open fight with each other which frustrated the adivasis as both resembled the same ethnicity. The leaders of the movement were conscious of their opportunity and Tata steel provides them various types of opportunities. Apart from differentiation and fragmentation from the local people, the movement also fragmented from the outside villages.

In Kalinga Nagar area 20 villages particularly dominated by Hinduised caste people united and formed an organization called Bisthapita Kshatigrasta Parishad (BKP- a Forum of Affected People) in 2008. People belongs to the villages of Pankapal, Manoharpur, Mantira, Kendudipi, Masamania, Ravana, Dakharapada, Marutikar, Kumbhiragadia, Khapuriapada, Chakua, Marthapur, Rachhipur, Jakhapura, Balungabandi, Telibahali, Chhatrakana, Tikar, Baragadiaetc were active supporters of the organization. This organization manufactured support

for the establishment of Tata Steel in the area and many time they fought with BBJM activists. Gradually people resisting the project assimilated in the process of development.

CONCLUSION

This paper examines the political economy of development in Kalinga Nagar that focuses on the production of mineral wealth to generate a growth rate which additionally benefits a particular class. Side by side this process of development deprives majority of the commons from their earlier mode of existence-indigenous mode of livelihood and produce a question of cultural survival. The whole process of capitalist expansion results movement and resistance. The movement and resistance is a dialect between the economy of survival and economy of market. Without articulating the cultural identity of the commons we have been documented the historicity of the capitalist expansion in Kalinga Nagar region. Examining the historicity of the movement and capitalist expansion is a subject matter of the political economy which varied and matters through time and space. Likewise, we also try to show how corporate capitalism and developmental agencies of the State imposed the neoliberal agenda of development that induces movement and people's resistance towards the neoliberal hegemony of the State. The people's responses and action shows the developmental politics over the resources. And also it questioned that the way mainstream developmental agencies produces discourses about the improvement of the commons often brought dispossession and livelihood alienation. The price of such industrial development often come about too worryingly on the commons. Additionally, it also induces inequality and power asymmetry compelling the ecosystem people for forceful inclusion in the mainstream development politics.

Notes: Gobarghati colony is called by this name since it was made flat by bulldozer.

References

- Africa Progress Panel. (2012). Africa Progress Report 2012:Jobs, Justice and Equity; Seizing Opportunities in Times of Global Change.Geneva, Switzerland: Africa Progress Panel.
- Auty, R.M. (1993). Sustaining development in mineral economies: the resource curse thesis. London: Routledge.
- Balasundaram, S. N. (1973). 'Centre-State Relations', in Jag Mohan (ed.), Twenty-Five Years of Indian Independence, New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.
- Baviskar, A. (2005). 'Red in tooth and claw? Looking for class in struggles over nature', in Raka, Ray, and Mary Fainsod Katzenstein, (eds.), Social movements in India: Poverty, power and politics, pp. 161-178.Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Beck, U. (1992). Risk society: Towards a new modernity. Sage Publication.
- Bhaduri, A. (2007). 'Development or developmental terrorism?', Economic and Political Weekly, 42(7): 552-553.

- Bhaduri, A. (2008). 'Predatory Growth', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 43(16): 10-14.
- Borger, J. (2008). 'Rich countries launch great land grab to safeguard food supply', *The Guardian*, 22, 1.
- Borras, S. M., Franco, J. C., Gómez, S., Kay, C., & Spoor, M. (2012). 'Land grabbing in Latin America and the Caribbean', *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 39(3/4): 845-872.
- Brecher, J., & Costello, T. (1994). *Global village or global pillage: Economic restructuring from the bottom up*. Boston, MA: South End.
- Cernea, M. M. (1988). *Involuntary resettlement in development projects: Policy guidelines in World Bank-financed projects*. (Vol. 80). World Bank Publications.
- Cernea, M. M. (1990). 'Internal refugee flows and development-induced population Displacement', *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 3(4): 320-339.
- Cernea, M. M. (1995). 'Understanding and preventing impoverishment from displacement: Reflections on the state of knowledge', *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 8(3): 245-264.
- Cernea, M. M. (2000). 'Risks, safeguards and reconstruction: A model for population displacement and resettlement', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 3659-3678.
- Cernea, M. M., & McDowell, C. (2000). *Risks and reconstruction: Experiences of resettlers and refugees*. World Bank Publications.
- Chakrabarty, B., & Kujur, R. K. (2009). *Maoism in India: Reincarnation of ultra-left wing extremism in the twenty-first century*. New Delhi: Routledge.
- Cohen, J. L. (1985). 'Strategy or identity: New theoretical paradigms and contemporary social Movements', *Social research*, 663-716.
- Cotula, L., Vermeulen, S., Leonard, R., & Keeley, J. (2009). *Land Grab or Development Opportunity? Agricultural Investment and International Land Transactions in Africa*, IIED/FAO/IFAD: London.
- Damodaran, V. (1995). 'Famine in a forest tract: ecological change and the causes of the 1897 famine in Chotanagpur, Northern India', *Environment and History*, 1(2): 129-158.
- Das, K. (1992). *Uneven Development, Indian Planning and the Strategy of Industrialisation: Case of Odisha*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi.
- Das, K. (1997). 'Politics of Industrial Location: Indian Federalism and Development Decisions', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 32(51): 3268-74.
- Dash, K. C., & Samal, K. C. (2008). 'New mega projects in Orissa: Protests by potential displaced persons', *Social Change*, 38(4): 627-644.
- Davis, Mike. (2006). *Planet of Slums*. London and New York: Verso.
- Department of Steel and Mines Government of Odisha. (2016) Retrieved April 10, 2016, from: http://www.orissaminerals.gov.in/website/MOUs_next2.aspx?GL=indst&PL=3
- Dwivedi, R. (2001). 'Environmental Movements in the Global South Issues of Livelihood and Beyond', *International Sociology*, 16(1): 11-31.
- Dwivedi, R. (2006). *Conflict and collective action: the Sardar Sarovar Project in India*. New Delhi: Routledge.
- Escobar, A. (2004). 'Development, violence and the new imperial order', *Development*, 47(1): 15-21.
- Fernandes, W. (1991). 'Power and powerlessness: Development projects and displacement of Tribals', *Social Action*, 41(3): 243-270.
- Fernandes, W. (2004). 'Rehabilitation Policy for the Displaced', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 39(12): 1191-1193.

- Fernandes, W. (2008). 'Sixty years of development-induced displacement in India', in H. M. Mathur (ed.), *India social development report*, pp.89-102. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Fernandes, W. (2011). 'Development-induced Displacement in the era of Privatisation', in H.M. Mathur (ed.), *Resettling Displaced People: Policy and practice in India*, pp.301-316. New Delhi: Routledge.
- Ganguly Thukral, E. (1999). 'Bottom-up', *Humanscape*, 10-12.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Stanford University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2003). *The new imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jones, Bruce., O'Brien, Emily., and Steven, David. (2014). 'The Risk Pivot: Great Powers, International Security, and the Energy Revolution', Washington DC: The Brookings Institutions. Retrieved January 22, 2016, from Google Books Database.
- Kapoor, D. (2011). 'Subaltern Social Movement (SSM) post-mortems of development in India: Locating trans-local activism and radicalism', *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 46(2): 130-148.
- Katara, P.M., & Barik, B.C. (eds.). (2002). *Development, deprivation and human rights violation*. New Delhi: Rawat Publications.
- Kothari, S. & Harcourt, W. (2004). 'Introduction: The violence of development', *Development*, 47(1): 3-7.
- Lok Sabha Debate in Indian Parliament. (1970) *Steel Plant Location in the Country: LS Deb. Col. 242*.
- Lyotard, J.F. (1988). 'The postmodern condition', in K. Baynes, J. Bohman & T. McCarthy (eds.), *After philosophy: end of transformation?*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Mahapatra, L. K. (1999a). *Resettlement, impoverishment, and reconstruction in India: Development for the deprived*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Private.
- Mahapatra, L. K. (1999b). 'Reconstruction Model on India's Resettlement Experiences', in M. Cernea (ed.), *The economics of involuntary resettlement: Questions and challenges*, pp. 189-230. World Bank Publications.
- McMichael, P. (2004). *Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective: A Global Perspective*. London: Pine Forge Press.
- Melucci, A. (1980). 'The new social movements: A theoretical approach', *Social science information*, 19(2): 199-226.
- Melucci, A. (1985). 'The symbolic challenge of contemporary movements', *Social Research*, 52(4): 789-816.
- Miri, M. (1993). *Continuity and change in tribal society (Vol. 43)*. Shimla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study.
- Mishra, B. (2006). 'People's Movement at Kalinga Nagar: An Epitaph or an Epitome?', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 41(7): 551-554.
- Misra, K. K. (1987). *Social Structure and Change among the Ho of Orissa*. New Delhi: Gyan Publishing House.
- Moore, J. W. (2000). 'Sugar and the expansion of the early modern world-economy: Commodity frontiers, ecological transformation, and industrialization', *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)*, 409-433.

- Mosse, D. (2007). Power and the durability of poverty: a critical exploration of the links between culture, marginality and chronic poverty. Chronic Poverty Research Centre Working Paper, (107).
- Oliver-Smith, A. (2010). *Defying Displacement: Grassroots Resistance and the Critique of Development*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Oommen, T.K. (2010). *Social Movements I: Issues of Identity*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Oommen, T.K. (2010). *Social Movements II: Concerns of equity and security*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Padel, F. (2015). 'India's grassroots movements against investment-forced Displacement', *Global Implications of Development, Disasters and Climate Change: Responses to Displacement from Asia Pacific*, 108.
- Padel, F., & Das, S. (2008). 'Cultural genocide: the real impact of development-induced Displacement', in H. M. Mathur (ed.), *India social development report*, pp103-115. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Padel, F., & Das, S. (2011). 'Resettlement realities: The gulf between policy and practice', in H. M. Mathur (ed.), *Resettling Displaced People: Policy and Practice in India*, pp. 143-180. New Delhi: Routledge.
- Patnaik, P. (2008). 'The accumulation process in the period of globalisation', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 43(26/27): 108-113.
- Pearce, Fred. (2012). *The Land Grabbers: The New Fight over Who Owns the Earth*. Boston, MD: Beacon Press.
- People's Union for Civil Liberty. (2006). *A PUCL Report 2006: Police Firing at Kalinganagar: A Report by PUCL Orissa. Cuttack and Dhenkanal Unit, PUCL*.
- Prasad, A. (2004). *Environmentalism and the Left: Contemporary Debates and Future Agendas in Tribal Areas*. New Delhi: Left Word Press.
- Prasad, R. (1988). *Tribes, a study in cultural ecology and tribal dynamics*. Amar Prakashan.
- Sahu, B. (2007). 'Defying the Juggernaut', in R. Kalshian (ed.), *Caterpillar and the mahua flower: Tremors in India's mining fields*, New Delhi: Panos South Asia.
- Sayad, A. (2004). *The Suffering of the Immigrant*. UK: Polity.
- Sinha, B.N. (2008). *Geography of Orissa*. New Delhi: National Book Trust. Smith, N. (1984). *Uneven Development: Nature. Capital and the Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Smith, N. (1996). *The new urban frontier: gentrification and the revanchist city*. London: Routledge.
- Touraine, A. (1977). *The Self-Production of Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Touraine, A. (1981). *The voice and the eye: An analysis of social movements*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vishvanathan, S. (1987). 'From the annals of the laboratory state', in A. Nandy (ed.), *Science, Hegemony and Violence*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- White, B., Borrás Jr, S. M., Hall, R., Scoones, I., & Wolford, W. (2012). 'The new enclosures: critical perspectives on corporate land deals'. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 39(3-4): 619-647.