

**Sili Rout**

**ALIENATION AND RESTORATION OF TRIBAL  
LAND IN SCHEDULE V AREAS: A CASE OF  
HIGHLAND ODISHA**

This paper focuses on the endemic problem of land alienation in Schedule Areas of India, particularly in a tribal dominated district of Koraput of Odisha, by analyzing the historical roots of land alienation in these areas and the resultant unrest, leading to conflict – sometimes violent – between the tribes and the non-tribes, and between the tribes and the State. The paper has revealed that, how the state of ‘non-political’ unrest has transformed into ‘politically motivated’ organized movement for arresting the incidences of tribal land alienation and restoration of restored land under the umbrella organization of *Chasi Mulia Adivasi Sangh* (CMAS) with the tacit support of the *Lal Bahini* or the Red Army. Since the State did not do its bit in restoring and redistributing already restored land among the tribes, it lost the sympathy of the tribal people. Further the State coercion added fuel to the agony and frustration of the local tribes, aggravating the breach of trust between the people and the State. This paper is an ethnographic narrative, with the primary data been collected by qualitative ethnographic method, such as observation, interview and case studies. The secondary data, of course, has been collected from various Government records, NGO reports and Newspaper reporting.

Land has occupied a central position in tribal life. Verrier Elwin has very rightly noted that Land is not only the source of livelihood for the tribal communities; it is also connected deeply with their sense of history and it is a symbol of social prestige (Elwin, 1963). The tribal society heavily depends upon two major sources of production, those are, land and forest, which are described as ‘twin pillars of tribal economy’. Their relationship with land, is as old as the hills, it is something like their ‘philosophy of life’ (Rao, 1987). According to Gnanatha Patra<sup>1</sup> ‘the portion of forest land in hilly slopes, cleared by tribals by dint of their capacity and labour for cultivation, is called as tribal land’ (Upadhaya, 2014). The relationship can be defined as symbiotic. One depends on the other in such a way that if one is destroyed the other will also be destroyed. The same holds good for the relationship between forest and tribals.

---

**SILI ROUT**, Research Scholar, Department of Anthropology, Central University of Orissa, Koraput, Odisha *E-mail: sili.rout1990@gmail.com*

But the gradual dispossession and denial of land right of the tribals has left them on the edge of scarcity.

The problem relating to land alienation among tribals has always sought attention of planners, policy-makers, academicians and activists. The reason being, even after so many progressive and protective legislations, tribal people all over the country are continuously threatened over their land rights. In the contemporary context, the threat over land rights of tribals has taken a complex picture than ever due to the so called industrialization, urbanization, commercialization and infrastructure development.

In case of Orissa, this scenario is devastating and the tribals are the worst sufferers of land related issues. The tradition of being landless labourer is a totally new and alien concept among the tribal communities. The existence of this category among them at present is a sign of land alienation (Ambagudia, 2010). This process of land alienation has gained momentum over the years through different patterns and sources. These conflicts are nothing but the product of series of deprivation, marginalization and alienation, which has given rise to unrest among different communities and dissatisfaction with the State authorities. It presents a complex picture of contemporary violent community conflicts in Odisha.

Given the background the present paper shall discuss on the endemic problem of land alienation in Schedule Areas of India, particularly in a tribal dominated district of Koraput of Odisha, by analyzing the historical roots of land alienation in the Narayanpatna and Bandhugaon Block of Koraput<sup>2</sup> (comes under Fifth Scheduled Areas) and the resultant unrest leading to conflict – sometimes violent – between the tribes and the non-tribes, and between the tribes and the State.

This ethnographic field work was conducted during the year 2016-17 in the Narayanpatna and Bandhugaon block of Koraput district.

Primary data have been collected by qualitative ethnographic method, such as observation, interview and case studies. Secondary data, of course, have been collected from various Government records, NGO reports and Newspaper reporting.

Narayanpatna and Bandhugaon block of Koraput district have received a great attention due the unrest among the tribals to restore and reclaim their ancestral land that has been encroached by the non-tribals. This has not been the first tribal uprising in the history of Koraput, the district has witnessed several such kind of uprising and unrest in each decade but without any significant changes at the ground level. To understand the present land issue of the Narayanpatna and Bandhugaon blocks, it is essential to understand the history of the district (Koraput) as well as the blocks and its land revenue administration from the King and *Zamidar* period to the present political regime.

### **Historical Overview of Land Revenue Administration in Study Area**

Koraput is one of the southern districts of Odisha and famous for its mosaic of tribal life and distinctive tribal culture. The district takes its name from Koraput town which is the seat of the district administration. Koraput district was formed under the province of Orissa on 1st April 1936 when Orissa became a separate province<sup>3</sup>. Prior to separation, it was under the control of Madras Presidency. The entire District has been declared as a scheduled Area under the Presidential Scheduled Areas Order, 1950. The District is divided into two Revenue Sub-divisions (Koraput and Jeypore), 14 Tahasils and 14 Community Development Blocks, 01 Municipality and 03 Notification Area Councils. There are 226 Gram Panchayat 1985 Revenue villages in the district.

Land revenue administration during the king was of the ancient Feudal system. During that period the lands were controlled and administered by two major systems, *Roytwari*<sup>4</sup> system and *Mustajari*<sup>5</sup> system. In this type of system there was an agreement between the landlords and tenants; there was a register of each village and villagers were appointed by the estate as Per the revenue *Naik*. The office was hereditary and normally held by a dominant individual<sup>6</sup>, who was an influential person in the village. Due to the lack of written documents on land survey and land settlement in these areas, it is not possible to know what exactly the amount of land was held by each Royt. Generally, the amount was calculated in terms of yoke or seed capacity. The majority of the *Naiks* and *Mustajaris* appointed by the estate were non-tribals. There was exploitation by the *Naiks* and *Mustajaris* which forced many tribals to be displaced from their land. Tribal communities did not have a tradition of being landless labourers or tenants in their own field and this gave rise to the inhuman system of *Gotil Bethi*<sup>7</sup>.

During Pre-colonial period these areas were autonomous in terms of their own administration and ownership over land holdings. Practically, among the tribal communities, there is no concept of land right. According to them like water, air and sun, land is also a gift of God. These two sampled blocks are the bordering area to Andhra Pradesh. So Immigration started from the Kings period and there was a large scale immigration from the year 1932 following the opening of Raipur Vizianagaram railway line. It is very clear that the inflow of immigrants into the region from other area has increased the land issue in the area. Several business communities, like *sundhis*, *sahukars*, and liquor merchants heavily infiltrated the area and gradually eliminated tribals from their land and forcibly and illegally acquired their land (Interview with Gananatha Patra, 2016).

The Britishers first established a factory in the year 1682 at Vizagapatnam, which became an entry point for them to the Koraput region. Captain Richard Mathew entered into the Koraput region on January 15, 1775, and become the first European to penetrate into the hill country of Jeypore.

The only interest of the British was to collect revenue from *zamindars* / kings. In 1802, permanent settlement was introduced throughout the area but there was no direct administration until 1863. In the pretext of '*meriah*' and '*Sati*', misrule or anarchy, British took the direct administration and Lieutenant J. M. Smith was stationed at Jeypore in January, 1863 (Orissa District Gazetteer, Bell, 1945).

The British were only interested in collection of revenue from land and exploiting the forest resources. The inclusion of the tribals into the State and state administration by the British through the *zamindari* system was the beginning of dispossessing the tribal from their customary land rights. In order to increase the land revenue, they introduced many Acts but none of them were to simplify the land revenue system rather, such Acts put more pressure on the tribal tenants to pay more rent. Different land revenue Acts introduced by the British are given below:

**Madras Estate land Act**, which came into force in the district from July 1, 1908. This law was meant to govern the relationship between the land holder and the tenant but it was not at all helpful for the tenants. As far the rights over land was concerned, the British rule did not attempt to become the negotiator of any such rights, nor did it intend to set up any principles for their determination.

**The Agency Tracts Interest and Land Transfer Act** was one of the most important enactments that was introduced on August 14, 1917. This was the first step introduced by the British government to check and prevent the transfer of lands from tribal to non-tribal, which was taking place rapidly in the area.

The area was first treated as backward tract under the **Government of India, Act 1919** and in the **Government of India, Act 1935**, it was classified as a partially excluded area. In spite of all these Acts, the commercial despot and the imperialistic ambitions were prominent. As a result, the life of tribals became worse. For the first time in 1938, there was a survey and record of rights operations carried out in the district in small scale. The operation was suddenly suspended due to the World War of 1939 to 1945 and was later in 1947, but the priority was given to developing the area.

According to the final report on the major settlement operations in Koraput district from 1938 to 1964, 'people could not take advantage of the passing of this Act as they were uneducated and ignorant, even transfers were made after the date. The estate officials remained completely indifferent in the matter and muted the names of the transferees in the estate records. This left practically no documentary evidence for proving transfer of the lands of tribals to non-tribals. Further, this Act did not affect the relinquishment of land by tribals in favour of the land holder. So in several cases the Act was dodged by the tribals relinquishing his lands in favour of

Jeypore estate and the shrewd non-tribals transferees in obtaining the same from the estate employees’.

Some important land legislations<sup>8</sup> in Odisha are as follows:

**Orissa Estate Abolition Act, 1952:** No provision for protection of tenants. *Zamindars* were allowed to keep 33 acres of land for personal cultivation.

**Orissa Scheduled Area Transfer of Immovable Property (OSATIP) Regulation, 1956:** No monitoring.

**Orissa Survey and Settlement Act 1958:** Establishment of uniform through defective systems, rights of tenants not recorded during settlement operations.

**Orissa Land Reform Act, 1960 (Amended in 1965, 1973 and 1974):** By explicitly banning tenancy, the law is unable to address the problem of share-cropping. And no provisions were made to record concealed tenancies.

**Orissa Government Land Settlement Act, 1962:** 70 percent of the land the State holds is meant to be distributed among non-existence since economic reforms in 1991.

**Orissa Prevention of Land Encroachment Act (Amended in 1982) 1972:** Penalties too low to act as a disincentive to encroachers; massive scope for corruption.

**Odisha<sup>9</sup> Government Land Settlement (Amendment) Rules 2013:** No special provisions for STs.

Besides these land legislation, the Government of Odisha has also launched a number of projects related to land rights. With a view to restoring land to the beneficiaries, the State Government launched the *Mo Jami Mo Diha* (My Land My Homestead) campaign in 2007 to protect and ensure land rights of the poor, especially the SCs and STs, who were allotted lease of government lands earlier or to restore their lost land within the existing legal framework. The campaign aims to verify physical possession of ceiling surplus land, homestead land lease cases, wasteland distribution for agricultural purposes and has restored cases of Regulation 2 of 1956 and Section 23 of the Land Reforms Act. Consequently, by the end of March 2009, a total of 9, 27,711 applications were received from across the state out of which 5, 45,777 applications have been disposed off (Government of Odisha, 2009).

### **Alienated Land- Tribals in Struggle**

The Government created Tahasil at Narayanpatna on 04.08.1996 only to finalise the long pending land disputes with two revenue inspector circles, one at Narayanpatna and the other at Borigi, after bifurcation from Koraput Tahasil. Subsequently three more revenue inspector circles one in Bandhugaon,

the second one is in Almonda and the third one at Kumbhariput have been tagged to the Narayanpatna Tahasil. This Tahasil is spread over Narayanpatna and Bandhugaon blocks comprising of 21 Gram Panchayats with two hundred eighty revenue villages having 68 hamlets. The geographical area of this Tahasil is 11, 071 Square Kilometers having a population of 1, 42, 867 out of which 74 597 Scheduled Tribe, 58584 Scheduled Castes and 9686 others. The Tahasil is bounded by Parvatipuram of Andhra Pradesh in the east Lakhmipur Tahasil in the west, Rayagada Tahasil in the north and Pottangi Tahasil in South (interview with Sudhakar Pattanaik, 2017).

Narayanpatna and Bandhugaon blocks are immediately neighbouring to Parvatipuram of Andhra Pradesh, so immigration started from the king's period. Some business communities like *sundhis*, *sahukars* and liquor vendors heavily entered into the area under the pretext of business and gradually started exploiting tribals by making them addicted to cooked country liquor and grabbing their land.

With regards to the land issue in the study area, the Land Registration Act which was passed in 1885 came into effect in 1933. The Registration Act was not implemented in Narayanpatna and Bandhugaon. To check the massive scale of land transfer from tribals to non-tribals, the Orissa Scheduled Area Transfer of Immovable Property (by Scheduled Tribes) (OSATIP) Regulation, 1956, was passed. The OSATIP Regulation, 1956 was implemented by the late Nabakrushna Choudhury, former Chief Minister of Odisha. Unfortunately this Act has proven to be insufficient in Protecting tribal rights, as the law permitted the transfer of *patta* land from tribals to non-tribals after obtaining permission from the mandatory authority, but in such transactions, manipulation was high and innocent tribals often lost their land in dubious transfers. The basic demand of tribals in the study area is to implement act 2/56 and give them back to their original land. To achieve this demand, the tribals of Bandhugaon and Narayanpatna blocks are on struggle under the Banner of *Chasi Mulia Adivasi Sangha*. Over the periods they have learned through their experience that it is necessary to unite under an organisation and struggle to realise their demand. This is the phase marked as the state of 'non-political' unrest that has transformed into 'politically motivated' organized movement for arresting the incidences of tribal land alienation and restoration of restored land under the umbrella organization of *Chasi Mulia Adivasi Sangh* (CMAS) with the tacit support of the *Lal Bahini* or the Red Army.

This process of land alienation has gained momentum over the years through different patterns and sources. The emergence of land tensions enabled the tribals to form the *Chasi Mulia Adivasi Sangha* in this area. When the *Ryot Kuli Sangham* [Peasant Labourers Association] of Parvatipuram (Vizianagaram District of Andhra Pradesh), which had spread its roots in Narayanpatna and Bandhugaon area of Koraput District in the name of *Chasi Mulia Samiti*, was declared a banned organisation in 2006, it reincarnated

itself as the *Chasi Mulia Adivasi Sangha* (Peasants, Labourers and Tribals Association), under the leadership of Nachika Linga, Arjuna Kendruka, Nachika Chamara and Wadeka Singana while Gananath Patra acted as their advisor (Nayak, 2015).

The day of June 26, 2006 reckons with the struggle for land under the aegis of CMAS. On that single day 2000 tribals with their agricultural tools cum and traditional arms in hand had marched from village to village in Narayanapatna block and took into possession of 6 acres of land in Podapadar, 12 acres in Dekkapadu, 7 acres in Bachinaputti and 14 acres of dry land from the same village (Interview with Srikantha Mohanty, 2016). For this compelling land absorption from *sahukars*, the police arrested Comrades Nachika Linga and Shyamand who were charged under section 144 in the area. A public meeting of 4000 people was held at Narayanapatna condemning the state repression. The meeting of CMAS gave a lot of resurface to the tribal people. They held the lands firmly and brought them under cultivation. Even after Linga's arrest, the other members of the *sangha* shouldered the responsibility. The people occupied some more land in 2007. By the year 2008, the total extent of land under the enjoyment of the people was 118 Acss.

In the past, the *Sahukars* who went to Bandhugan from outside wrested the lands of tribals by force. A company, named Sterling Tree Magnum Ltd., about 12 years back, bought 200 acres of such lands from these *Sahukars*. The company erected a fence around the lands. It propagated that it will grow special Teak trees in the land and shareholders will get a huge return at the end of 20 years. They promised a share of Rs. 1800/- will ultimately deliver Rs. 1,00,000/-. So many people from plains bought the shares of STM Company. After bagging huge amount, the company abandoned the project, which is illegal in all aspects. After analysing these facts CMAS decided that the tribal people have every right to take back their lands.

Since the 8th of May, 2009, the Narayanpatna conflict fueled-up under the banner of the CMAS. The CMAS formed the *Lal Bahini* (Red Army) with the aim to collect information regarding the activities of the police and to protect the tribals. On the 15th of June, 2009, they forcefully occupied more than 1,500 acres of land in Narayanpatna block. On that day, the CMAS forcefully cultivated 500 acres of land in Narayanpatna headquarter, 100 acres in Bikrampur, 70 acres in Balipeta, 40 acres in Tentulipadar, 20 acres in Harikudia, 4 acres in Kanika village etc. (Dharitri, 17 June 2009). After occupying land on 15 June 2009, the CMAS organized a meeting in the Dumusil village of the Balipeta panchayat, where the Collector and the Superintendent of Police of Koraput district rushed to the spot and talked to the tribal leaders Nachika Linga and Pendruka Singana. During their dialogue, the tribals demanded their full rights on water, land, and forest. The Government Authorities assured them of delivering justice. In spite of the Government

assurance, on 6 July 2009, the CMAS started its next phase of restoring alienated land and on the very next day, i.e., 7 July, 2009, and occupied more than 400 acres of land. The reason was that the marginalized tribal communities had been listening to all types of rhetoric promises from the Government for too long; reality, however, seemed to tell a different story (Interview with Sudhakar Pattanaik, 2017).

The militant way the tribals wrested back their lands under the occupation of STM sent shivers through the spine of the non-tribal land grabber. So they came to the conclusion that they have no option but to give back the lands to the original owner- tribals. In Kattukapeta, 300 acres land is under the occupation of non-tribals. This land originally belongs to the tribals of Kaviti, Kesubhadra, Raghumeda, Yeseda, Sunapolamanda, Adugumvalasa, and Kattulpetta village. The *Sundhis*, *Sahukars*, and other non-tribals took away these lands from tribals by deception. In return, for lending 12 *Kunchalu* (kgs) grains in scarcity times, the *sahukars* snatched 12 acres of land from Raita Melleka (a villager of Kesubhadra). Bobbilaraju, a *sahukar*, used to go to that forest for hunting and gave some mutton to the tribals and in return for that, after a few years, he snatched away 30 acres. A garment trader from far away Nellor (a town in A.P.) had been selling garments on credit basis to the tribals of this area. Accusing the tribals that they were unable to clear the debt, the trader took hold of 15 acres in Almonda and 30 acres in Kattulpetta. The non-tribal landlords of Kattulpetta were enjoying the lands of tribals illegally and behaved adamantly for a long time. They tried to deceive the people. They declared to distribute the lands and also join *sangham*. But the tribals understood this nefarious design of the landlords and rejected the offer of the latter. On July 12, 2009, five thousand tribals marched into the lands and reoccupied 350 acres at Kattulpetta.

The impact of the reoccupation of STM company lands and the lands at Kattulpetta had a widespread impact in the entire district of Koraput. The tribals in other pockets of the district also started asserting their right to the land. But rumours spread that some anti-social forces would enter other pockets on July 15 to loot and ransack the house of tribals. The rumour became a reality with the entry of 600 new persons into the area. As 10,000 tribals entered into those pockets, the antisocial elements silently went away. After these, 10,000 people with traditional weapons in their hands marched towards Bandhugaon and up to Neelabadi crossing (a distance of 6 km). During the march, the tribals reoccupied 350 acres of land in Kattulpetta, 250 acres at Neelabadi, 5 acres at Yesada, 10 acres at Jagguguda and 12 acres at Dasini village.

In this community, conflicts between the tribals and non- tribals forced a large number of non-tribal families to leave their villages in both blocks, but this impact could be seen largely in the Narayanapatna block and created the fear of insecurity among the latter. All non-tribals, including the Dalits, were attacked and deemed as anti-tribals and exploiting groups. During the months



of May-June of 2009, in the both blocks, 500 families from 25 villages, which were Dalits and *Shundis*, had to leave their home and land to save their lives. Carrying their mission further, the CMAS indulged in restoring the alienated tribal land by force.

Many members of the CMAS members were arrested by the Narayanpatna police in response to increasing violent activities of the organisation. Nachika Linga, along with his follower Kendruka Singanna, Andru Nachika, Kumudini Behera and several villagers protested at the Narayanpatna Police station on November 20, 2009. During this protest, violent clashes took place between the Police and the members of the CMAS. Two important leaders of the *Chasi Mulia Adivasi Sangha*, Kendruka Singanna and Andru Nachika were killed in police firing. Many people were injured and police arrested 37 members of the organisation. Nachika Linga escaped from the scene and continues to be at large since then. The police have issued a non-bailable warrant against him.

#### **Aftermath of the 2009 agitation by CMAS**

While land restoration was carried out by the members of Sangha, side by side two prominent leaders, Nachika Linga from Narayanapatna and Arjuna Kendruka from Bandhugaon were preparing ground to contest from the Laxmipur Assembly constituency (Koraput District). By 2009, serious differences cropped up between Arjuna Kendruka, who led the Bandhugaon Block and Nachika Linga of the Narayanpatna Block. While Kendruka believed in a non-violent movement to secure land (by requests and donations) from the big land owners, Linga went on to grab land violently from these landlords. Linga also promoted people for violent movements to capture land from land lords, and to secure freedom from liquor and freedom from bonded labor. Difference also emerged over the utilization of CMAS funds. Kendruka could have managed to secure a ticket from the Communist Party of India-Marxist (CPI-M) to contest from the Laxmipur Assembly constituency (Koraput District), during the 2009 State Assembly Polls, with CMAS support, while Linga was interested in getting the ticket. Subsequent developments gradually brought a faction in CMAS-Narayanpatna and CMAS-Bandhugaon.

Linga, who headed CMAS-Narayanpatna, progressively engaged in more and more violent activities, while Kendruka, heading CMAS-Bandhugaon began to express opposition to these methods. Finding an opportunity to corner the support of the tribals, the Maoists also increased their influence among CMAS-Narayanpatna followers and the faction under Linga's leadership increasingly acted as a Maoist front organisation. However, unhappy with CMAS-Narayanpatna, the people of Laxmipur vowed to resist the organisation's attempts to expand its activities in the area. Further, a meeting attended by around 15,000 supporters at Laxmipur under the leadership of Kumuda Saunta (chairman of the Laxmipur Block) on September 11, 2009, demanded a ban on

CMAS-Narayanapatna for its recurrent violent activities (Nayak, 2015). Linga was declared as 'most wanted' by the Narayanapatna Police.

After the partition of CMAS, the land restoration was totally clogged for two years. From 2012, a large number of CMAS members and supporters surrendered before police. Even, Linga's close associates and supporters from his native village, as well as other villages, surrendered before the Police and pledged not to support the violent activities of *Sangha*. Odisha Police claimed that more than 2,400 CMAS supporters and sympathizers have surrendered. On March 11, 2014, Linga also eventually surrendered himself before police.

After Linga's surrender, CMAS Narayanapatna lost its base and strength; the *sangha* was lacking a strong personality who could shoulder the responsibility and carry forward the *sangha's* activities in Narayanapatna. Whereas, in Bandhugaon, *sangha* got support from the land activist and was able to continue its land restoration activities from non-tribals. According to U/S 3(B) of OSATIP (by S.Ts.) by regulation -2000, sub-collector or competent authority was directed to collect the non-filing 3(B) form within three months and if any non ST encroacher fails to provide this non-filing 3(B) form within the said period then such encroached land would automatically be considered as the STs land. So in this connection researcher asked for a RTI report on the transaction of land between STs and non STs.

It was shocking that out of 153 villages, data was available only for 18 villages. With regards to the cases, altogether only a total 87 cases have been identified, out of which decision on 18 cases have been declared. In these 18 cases only 7 cases are declared as genuine transactions and 11 cases were reverted, 69 cases were still pending. In the report it has also been mentioned that 96 Acres of land in study area is virtually in the hands of non tribals, but in recent period *Chasi Mulia Adivasi Sangha* of Bandhugaon have restored 21 acres in Nilabadi, 3 Acres in Kesubhadra and 18 Acres in Dandabadi.

Exploring the relationship between the CMAS and the course of land restoration further, one may wonder about the process of distribution of restored land. In this context, it is important to cite the interview of Gananath Patra, the adviser of the CMAS, who stressed on the process of land distribution. The CMAS gave utmost importance to three important principles of distribution of restored land (Upadhyaya, 2014). First, the priority was given to those who had lost their land through illegal transfers. The second priority was given to those tribals who did not have any land in their name. Third Priority was given those Dalits who were interested in cultivation but they were landless. While restoring the land and distribution among the landless, the CMAS ensured that they were not dispossessed again.

### Concluding Remarks

Even after 22 years of creation of Tahasil office at Narayanpatna no steps have been taken to identify as to which land belongs to whom, rather in most of the cases, permissions have been issued to the non-tribals for getting the lands on very low costs and pattas have been issued to them. In some cases the land owned by the tribals have been grabbed by the liquor traders (non tribals) who have also forced tribals to work under them on their own land as bonded labourers. The decades of injustice caused and compelled the fight for the justice which has been denied by the Government. The truth is that the 5th Schedule of the Constitution was specifically designed to address but which the government is unwilling to act upon the massive land grab by non-tribals, mostly liquor vendors and moneylenders. Instead of implementing laws against land alienation, the government has penalised and punished the CMAS when, they tired of waiting, had decided to reclaim their alienated land on its own. It is shocking that bonded labour was rampant in this area till CMAS intervened and freed hundreds of *gotis*. In spite of the alienation of tribal lands over a long period and in spite of the struggle of the tribals for the restoration of the land, the district administration did not respond. Instead, the administration restored the repression on the victim tribals. The tribal after being organised and made conscious of their rights, started taking back the lands themselves.

### NOTES

1. Gananatha Patra was a member of the Marxist Leninist group called United Centre of Communist Revolutionaries of India; (UCCRI-ML) he is also a legal advisor to *Chasi Mulia Adivasi Sangha* (CMAS) from its formation since 1994. Please see more at- <http://hotnhitnews.com/Odisha-Termining-CMAS-as-Maoist-frontal-organisation-is-conspiratory-Gananath-Patra-Interview-Hotnhitnews-175027092012.htm>
2. In exercise of powers conferred by sub-paragraph 6 of the Fifth Schedule to the Constitution of India, the revised Presidential Order titled “ The Scheduled Areas (states of Bihar, Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh & Odisha) Order 1977” has declared the full districts viz. Mayurbhanj, Sundargarh, **Koraput** (which now includes the districts of **Koraput**, Malkangiri, Nabarangapur and Rayagada) , Kuchinda tahasil of Sambalpur district, Keonjhar, Telkoi, Champua, Barbil tahasils of Keonjhar district, Khondamal, Balliguda and G.Udayagiri tahasil of Khondamal district, R.Udaygiri tahasil, Gumma and Rayagada block of Parlekhemundi tahasil in Parlakhemundi Sub-division and Suruda tahasil (excluding Gazalbadi and Gochha Gram Panchayats), of Ghumsur sub-division in Ganjam district, Thuamul Rampur and Lanjigarh blocks of Kalahandi district and Nilagiri block of Balasore district as Scheduled Areas of the state. After reorganisation of districts in the state, 7 districts fully and 6 districts partly are covered under the Scheduled Areas of the state (ST & SC Development, Minorities and Backward Classes Welfare Department, Govt of Odisha).
3. S.C. Bhatt (ed.), *The Encyclopaedic District Gazetteers of India*, New Delhi: Gyan publishing House, 1988, pp. 679-680.
4. Under the *Ryotwari* system the peasant, as owners of land paid revenue directly to the

state officials. There was no one who stood between them to claim rent. Yet revenue demand in the *Ryotwari* areas tended to be very high. The *Ryotwari* system was first introduced in Madras.

5. The *Mustajair* is an agent for the collection of rent who was paid either by a grant of land or percentage of the rents collected. The office was hereditary and normally held by an influential person in the village.
6. The concept of 'Dominant Individual' was developed by S C Dube In his paper entitled, 'Dominant Caste and Village Leadership' presented at a seminar on Trends of Change in Village India. Dube have disagreed over the concept of dominant caste proposed by M N Srinivas. He holds that the power remains concentrated in hands of a few individuals rather than diffused among the caste members. Please see more at- <http://www.yourarticlelibrary.com/sociology/biography-of-shyama-charan-dube-and-his-contribution-towards-sociology/35020>
7. *Bethi* System Another evil practice which more or less prevailed in all feudal economic systems was a system of *Bethi* or forced labour. Like *Goti* system it was a native to the soil of the hill districts of Koraput and Ganjam of South Odisha. The Ryot or tenants of the hill tracts of South Orissa would not condensed to labour for a daily wage. In fact, there was no such thing as a labouring class, in the sense of a class of people who voluntarily offered to work for wage. Please find details in the book 'Contractual Labour in Agricultural Sector' by S.N. Tripathy, Year-2000, Discovery Publishing House, New Delhi.
8. Sahu, S. K. (2011) Exploration of Land and Cultures: The Odisha Story and Beyond, *Social Change*, SAGE Publications 41(2), 251-270.
9. The name of the state was changed from Orissa to Odisha, and the name of its language from Oriya to Odia, in 2011, by the passage of the Orissa (Alteration of Name) Bill, 2010 and the Constitution (113th Amendment) Bill, 2010 in the Parliament. Therefore, the text of present study reflects both the words 'Orissa' and Odisha wherever required.

#### REFERENCES

- Ambagudia, J.  
2010 Tribal Rights, Dispossession and the State in Orissa, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 45, No. 33. pp. 60-67.
- Bhatt, S.C.  
1988 *The Encyclopaedic District Gazetteers of India*, New Delhi: Gyan Publishing House, pp. 679-680.
- Dash, S. G.  
1998 *Tribal Land Systems and Social and Protective Legislation in Orissa*. Cuttack: R K Enterprises.
- Dharitri, 17 June 2009.  
District *Gazetteer Koraput*, 1945, Bell, RCS.  
District *Gazetteer Koraput*, 1966, Senapati.

Elwin, V.

1963 *New Deal for Tribal India*, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, New Delhi.

Nayak, D. K.

2015 Odisha: Maoists: The Revolution in Retreat, *Indo-Canada Outlook*. (2015, January)

Patnaik, K. S.

2009 Narayanpatna, Malkangiri District slipping out of the hands of Naveen Government, *News web*.

Rao, B. J.

1987 *Land Alienation in Tribal Areas of Andhra Pradesh*. Warangal: Kakatiya University.

Sahu, S. K.

2011 Exploration of Land and Cultures: The Odisha Story and Beyond. *Social Change*, SAGE Publications, Vol. 41, No.2, pp. 251-270.

Upadhaya, B

2014 Narayanpatna Land Struggle: A Conversation with Gananath Patra. *Social Change*, SAGE Publications, Vol. 44, No.2, pp.291-300.

Interview with Gananatha Patra, 2016

(Note: Gananath Patra, the legal adviser to the *Chashi Mulia Adibasi Sangha*, was released from Koraput Jail in April 2012 and he is at his Rourkela residence, he is not keeping well. So the author had conducted a telephonic interview thrice.)

Interview with Sudhakar Pattanaik, 2017

(Note: Sudhakar Pattanaik, is a senior Journalist from Koraput. Author have conducted interview with him several times.)

Interview with Shrikant Mohanty, 2017

(Note: Shrikant Mohanty, is an activist from Puri, have worked intensively for the land right of the tribal people of Bandhugaon block. Author have conducted interview with him several times.)