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Development- Induced Displacement and Rehabilitation and Resettlement: An Overview
DEVELOPMENT INDUCED DISPLACEMENT AND REHABILITATION AND RESETTLEMENT: AN OVERVIEW

Displacement Consequences- A Theoretical Overview

The development project causing displacement has now become more controversial all over the world and it has failed to emerge as a consensual development model. While one group approves displacement and resettlement because it brings prosperity to them, the other disapproves it because it brings adversity to them. The study of China’s Shuikou and Yantan dam projects by Wicklin and Rice (2001) and World Food Programme (WFP) report (1996) on Guatemala’s Chixoy Dam project in 1970 better qualify this argument. While the former study shows about the improved standard of living of the displacees the latter study reports about massacre of hundreds of MayaAchi Indians by government armed force due to development-induced displacement projects. Except some case studies, there are no serious studies being done on the effects of development-induced displacement and resettlement (DIDR) worldwide. Since there is hardly any study available on the positive effects of DIDR, it is very difficult to compare its positive and negative effects. But theoretical discourse and debates on DIDR are widely available. Mostly Scudder and Colson’s model and Cernea’s Impoverishment Risks and Reconstruction (IRR) model are important at the global level. Prior to these models in 1960s, Chambers (1969) evolved general models for the land settlement schemes in Africa and Nelson (1973) confirmed this pattern in a synthesis of other experiences with new land settlement in Latin America (Cernea, 2000:15). Both of them explained the experiences of voluntary settlers and the institutional and organizational dimensions of land settlement. Latter building upon these earlier concepts, Scudder and Colson formulated a diachronic framework on the stages of resettlement in 1982. In this model the dynamics of settlement process can best be understood through four stage analysis: Stage one includes planning, initial infrastructural development and settlers’ recruitment where policy makers and developers induce development and resettlement often without informing affected population. Stage two includes transition period when people have to worry about their future displacement that includes the level of stress experienced and potential development to occur only
after physical relocation. Stage three includes economic and social development when displacees begin to rebuild their economy and social networks and Stage four includes handing over and incorporation which refers to the handing over of local productive system and community leadership to a second generation of resettlers that make them feel an identity at home in the community.

This model focuses on the differential behavioural tendencies that resettlers have to pass through all stages. Primarily, it was a model to explain the stages of voluntary settlement and was later applied to those cases of involuntary resettlements which were successfully passed through all stages. Like unfamiliar and unsuccessful application of growth theory of Rostow (in economic theory for developmental growth) in third world countries, this resettlement stage model was failed to be applied in all involuntary resettlement schemes during 1980s and 1990s. In this context a new theory was required not only to predict but also to reconstruct the risks of DIDR impoverishments. After Scudder and Colson's model debate on displacement, impoverishment risk and reconstruction has been initiated worldwide. The earlier models did not define and predict the cumulative impacts of displacement (Brenchin, West, Associates, 1991:17). Therefore, Brenchin, West and Associates (1991) strongly argued for a comprehensive theoretical model on displacement and resettlement. According to Merton (Cernea, 2006) forced displacement processes are strategic research sites for risk analysis. Risk is defined as the probability of an injurious effect due to hazard (Kaplan and Garrick, 1981). According to Beck (1990) modern society itself is a risk society. The term "risk and danger" or "hazard and danger" or "hazard and risk" have been frequently used as interchangeable and overlapping. The sociologists like Giddens (1990) explicitly reject the distinction between risk and danger. However, sociologically the concept "risk" indicates the possibility that a certain course of action will trigger future injurious effects such as losses, destructions, functionally counter productive impacts, deprivation of future generations and so on (Cernea, 2000).

Michael M. Cernea as a senior advisor to the World Bank had worked with displacement problems for many years (1994, 1998). He then developed his well known Impoverishment Risk and Reconstruction model (IRR) and presented it in a keynote address in the Refugee Studies Programme of Oxford (1996, 1997). The
IRR model has been developed in a series of his studies (Cernea, 1990, 1997, 1999, 2000 and World Bank 1994/1996). Later on he published a volume on the experiences of resettlers and refugees (2000) in this model form. Like Scudder and Colson's model Cernea did not develop a series of resettlement stages and unlike them he developed different types of impoverishment risks as well as of their reconstructions. As compared to earlier models the IRR model builds upon and advances further. It is an empirical model because it was based on the factual findings and reviews of almost 200 projects of World Bank in 1993-1994 (World Bank, 1994). It is also theoretical like a NGO state of art for guiding policy, planning and implementing development programme to counteract the displacement risks (Cernea, 2000).

Cernea's IRR model deconstructs the overall impoverishment risks in eight distinct impoverishment components and illuminates their interconnection. The IRR model rests on three basic concepts such as risk, impoverishment and reconstruction. This impoverishment risk analysis has been helping and guiding the displacement specialists and stakeholders to capture better the displacement's nature, effects and actuality. It not only visualizes the potential risks in displacement but also develops the counter risk strategies and reconstruction plans. The IRR framework has functional importance for the research as well as for operation and implementation of developmental projects. Most importantly, it has got four functions such as predictive function which helps to anticipate the risks in the process of displacement and resettlement, diagnostic function in the field which guides operational research on assessing the presence and likely intensity of each impoverishment risk, a problem resolution and planning function that helps design project actions to prevent or mitigate each identified risks and a research methodology function which informs scientific research in organizing the study of displacement, in generating hypothesis and in interpreting and conceptualizing the findings (Cernea, 2006:8). The IRR model not only deconstructs displacement into eight distinct risks discussed in the introduction chapter such as landlessness, joblessness, homelessness, marginalization, increased morbidity and mortality, food insecurity, loss of access to common property resources and services and social disarticulation but also explains risks reversal reconstructive and pro-poor support activities (ibid, 8-9). The risks reversal reconstructive and pro-poor support
activities lead from landlessness to land based resettlement, from joblessness to reemployment, from homelessness to house reconstruction, from marginalization to social inclusion, from increased morbidity to improved health care, from food insecurity to adequate nutrition, from loss of access to restoration of community asset and services and from social disarticulation to rebuilding network and communities (ibid, 2006:9). Since the host population is also not free from the risks of impoverishment, they should also be taken care of.

However, it has been found that all of IRR processes neither occur universally nor affect equally to all displaced population in each case of development-induced displacement and resettlement (DIDR) or mining-induced displacement and resettlement (MIDR). Still it has been used by many displacement specialists for better understanding of displacement and resettlement process.

The IRR model developed by Cernea (Cernea, 1996, 1999, 2000, World Bank, 1994) has been elaborated, tested and revised by many displacement specialists all over the world (Mahapatra, 1999; Pandey 1998a, 1998b; Downing 1996, 1998; Mathur and Marsden, 1998; Agarwal, 1998; Mathur, 1999). Some of them also proposed for the correction in the analysis of the risks of impoverishment. For instance, Sonnenburg and Muster (2001) proposed the correction of three entrenched flows that account for the current neglect of the risks of impoverishment such as flaws in conventional risk methodology, flows in cost benefit analysis and lack of genuine community participation. The flexibility and adaptability of IRR model has been proved since several other scholars expanded the scope of IRR model by including other risk variables and losses that includes the loss of access to public services (Mathur, 1998, 1999), loss of civil rights (Downing, 1996) and temporary loss of access to schooling (Mahapatra, 1999b; Cernea, 2000: 53). Besides, the IRR's eight risks model of Cernea, worldwide academic research added additional two risks: the loss of civil and human rights (Downing, 1998) and the disruption of formal educational activities and loss of access to basic public services (Marsden and Mathur, 1998).

The IRR model of Cernea is being increasingly used operationally not only by displacement research organizations and scientists but also in several international scientific conferences that took place in Colombia, South Africa, India, the United States and elsewhere. In international level the use and
application of IRR model are found such as research on impoverishment risks and impact was done in Lesotho (Hitchcock, Scudder et al, 1999), impact evaluation resettlement study on Kali Gandoki project in Nepal which had revealed positive resettlement experiences and produced operational recommendations (Sapkota, 1999). But Robert Muggah's study on conflict caused refugee population (1999) in Colombia and Crip's review (1996) of United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) program in the light of IRR framework had revealed causes of success and failure in the itinerary from social disarticulation to social reconstruction. Some important books also got published in the framework of IRR model. For example, L.K.Mahaptra's (1999a) analysis had fully confirmed the IRR model. Using IRR model Parasuraman (1999) in his book on displacement in India stressed that loss of land is the single most important cause of post displacement impoverishment in India. Similarly M. Basu (1994) explained the linkage between the IRR model and basic needs framework and ensures that people's basic needs are retrieved and addressed within IRR model. Juliette Hayes had derived and developed his capital loss model in the IRR framework for better understanding of displacement (Cernea, 2000: 53). It is worth mentioning that Pandey and associates (1998a) systematically analyzed field data in term of each component of Cernea's eight risk model. A large study on coalmining, dam, thermal plant, and industrial projects by Pandey and others (1998a) and study on Rengali Dam by Ota (1996) and by Ota and Mohanty (1998) were carried out in IRR frameworks in Orissa (Cernea, 2000). In this respect, studies based on Cernea's (1996) risk model are few and far between in India and Orissa. In Africa, Lassailly-Jacob (1996) has used this model. For further improvement on IRR model, Dewet (2001) advocates an open ended flexible approach to resettlement planning. Baboo's design of spatio-cultural categories, i.e., analyzing displaced/affected and rehabilitated people in terms of caste and tribe as well as territory and opportunities – made significant contribution to understand dam affected people.

Since the mining project has been taken for the research, the researcher has reviewed MIDR literatures in general and of literatures developed by Downing in particular. Supplementing to IRR model, Downing has not only analyzed his MIDR specific resettlement effects such as problems of new poverty, landlessness,
homelessness, joblessness, marginalization, health risks, disruption of the educational facilities, other risks and vulnerability of certain groups and the forces of countering resettlement effects such as role of displacement specialists, international financial institutions and NGOs, Resettlement Action Plan (RAP), social preparation, impoverishment risk assessment, and entitlement but also discussed focusing all these problems through three possible goals (displacement, relocation and rehabilitation) with three possible means (forced appropriation, compensation and benefit sharing) for the displaced people, compensation dilemma, externalization of cost, liabilities (acknowledged, probable and possible liabilities), liabilities limits and consequent suggestive solutions over the problems of MIDR world wide. It seems to have evolved a unique MIDR risks and reconstruction model in the world. He also develops a noble idea of institution of displacement insurance after distinguishing between acknowledged liabilities, possible liabilities and probable liabilities (Cernea, 2006:14).

His conception of new poverty and definition of affected population is quite different from others. Downing prefers to use “affected peoples” (APS) rather than the Asian development Bank’s affected persons (APs) to emphasize social and individual nature of project affected displacements and to avoid the temptation of individualizing what is fundamentally a socio-cultural and economic process (Downing, 2002: 6). The affected peoples (APS) are those who stands to lose, as a consequence of the project, all or part of their physical and non-physical assets, including homes; communities; productive lands, resources such as forests, range fields, fishing areas, or important cultural sites, commercial properties, tenancy, income earning opportunities and social and cultural networks and activities (Downing, 2002: 6). The APS may also includes ”host communities” when a large population is displaced into the land of a smaller existing host population. Rehabilitation means the restoring of the incomes, livelihoods and social system of the displacees to at least the level of their pre-project status (Downing, 2002:6). In this way his approach is a credible contribution to the literatures of MDIR process. After reviewing literatures on mining induced displacement, Downing (2002) has explained how the sustainable societies (existed before displacement) have been threatened (after displacement). Probably Downing wants a sustainable development for the APS after MIDR. It is quite necessary to give a
brief overview over the analysis on MIDR by Downing for facilitating research framework. MIDR goes with the definition of resettlement effect defined by displacement specialists.

However, what Downing talks about resettlement effects are more comprehensive. According to Downing (2002:8), development induced displacement unleashes widespread social, economic and environmental changes that follow well established patterns. He says that although they vary in severity, their patterns are remarkably consistent irrespective of type of project or industry is responsible for the displacement (ADB, 1998; Pandey, 1998a&amp;b; Mathur, 2001; Cernea, 1999, 2000; Downing, 1998; Scudder and Colson, 1982; Scudder, 1996). According to Downing (2002), when affected people fail to mitigate or avoid these risks may get into the process of new poverty as opposed to the old poverty. In case of new poverty explored by Downing many APs who have already suffered have to suffer (Cernea, 2002) and the poor people even become poorer (Pandey, 1998a; Mathur and Marsden, 1998). Downing (2002) further says that measured in terms of daily survivality and human dignity, the loss for the poor, of even a small bit of resource is devastating. In case of long term impacts the MIDR significantly truncates social and individual chances for sustainable development. The long live societies can be quickly unraveled and disintegrated under the pressure of forced displacement (ibid: 9). Like Cernea Downing (2002) also first analyzes the risks of landlessness but for better understanding of the concept of new poverty, he examines it in detail. MIDR raises the significant risks of landlessness that remove the foundations upon which productive systems, commercial activities and livelihoods are articulated. The process of decapitalization and pauperization occur consequently in losing land to mining projects and the displaced are unable to find suitable replacement land either because of inflated local prices due to increased demand or unproductive use of compensation amount for meeting immediate survival needs (Downing, 2002:9). Baboos (1992) argues that since most of the oustees are from deprived section of the society and less educated and feel depressed during such crises they spend the inadequate compensation on pilgrimage, marriage, treatment of the old disease, drinking and gambling.
Further, more adverse impacts due to mines related contamination, flooding and environmental damage on lands, the process of decapitalization emerges (Downing, 2002:9). This process of pauperization and decapitalization due to landlessness cannot be replaced with alternatives. Land-based productive economics of traditional societies in particular are not readily transferable because it involves highly articulated knowledge about ecological risks, fauna and flora of land (OXFAM, 2001; Downing, 2002). Downing gives four forms of landlessness such as the initial loss of land to mining, damages to the land’s productive potential in the surrounding and non-approached areas, subsequent losses in the productive value of land on account of environmental problems, and loss of land occurring because landless people are unable to gain access to alternative lands (Downing, 2002:9). These four forms of landlessness has been certainly supplementary to the andlessness of Cernea’s IRR model.

Before the prospect of industrialization and service sector came into being land was an inherent source of employment for the people everywhere in the world. No doubt landlessness leads to joblessness but more often the displacement studies do not take into account of other potential economic impacts that are not directly related to land ownership, such as the loss of wage employment, access to leaseholds and share-cropping opportunities. The risks of post displacement unemployment or under employment and lack of pre-displacement economic opportunities (which were used to recur local and regional economic cycle and to sustain) are also not observed seriously. So, it is important to investigate the overall employment losses and gains throughout all development, handing over and incorporation process (Downing, 2002:10).

In addition to the indirect displacement physical displacement of the affected population further push them into the risks of homelessness. In case of IRR model homelessness means the loss of house-plots, dwellings and shelter. Downing argues that homelessness is not a temporary problem that may overcome but it remains chronic in poorly executed relocation and resettlement. New poverty becomes a problem when the losses go beyond the simple loss of structures. A "home" is often associated with a profound loss of identity and cultural impoverishment as symbol of place, in term of family cohesion and a remembered location for mutual support, not only for the household but also for neighboring
households (Bonwell, 1998; Downing, 1996; Aaronsori, 2002). For example, inhabitants of Teberebie in Ghana displaced by the American-Ghanaian Gold Mining Company Teberebie Gold Fields Ltd, in 1990s were impoverished due to homelessness. Even their illiterate chief's signed agreement for 168 housing units in 1991 was not fulfilled till 1998 (Brands, 1998; Downing, 2002: 11). As a result of landlessness, joblessness and homelessness, the displaced people and their affected entire communities are marginalized from mainstream society and further pushed into the risks of new poverty. The risk of marginalization threatens displaced individuals as they slip into lower socio-economic status relative to their local areas. Since marginalization is accompanied by a loss in self-esteem the DPs become outsiders and new comers in host communities (Downing, 2002:11). Consequently, other risks flow leaps and bound to the affected people in the new atmosphere and in the resettlement sites.

Since already marginal health status of displacees worsened by the stress and trauma of land acquisition and displacement, the recurring problems such as unhygienic conditions, non-safe sewage, increased diarrhea, dysentery and epidemic infection occur. These health impacts more often fall disproportionately on infants, children, pregnant mothers and the elderly DPs (Downing, 2002:11). Besides it, MIDR also mostly affects educational activities of pre-displaced people. When Cernea notes that displacement and relocation often cause a significant interruption in the functioning of schools and in child’s access to education during the year of transfer or for longer periods of time, Downing finds that the chaos of relocation distracts parents from focusing on the concerns of their children and the process of their education and routine socialization. As a result, these children never return to school and instead join the labour force at an early age (Downing, 2002:11). Unlike Cernea Downing explains the risks as the risks of new poverty. Downing's concept of new poverty is also resulted from other risks such as the loss of access to common property and public services, increased food insecurity, social disarticulation and the loss of civil and human rights (Kibreab, 2000; Downing, 2002:11-12). Of course, there is variation in causing the risks of new poverty, mostly indigenous people, elderly and women have been more vulnerable to it. For instance, indigenous people, elderly and women of the indigenous area in India, Peru, Papua New Guinea (PNG), Australia, the Western

In case of MIDR projects, mining companies, financiers, and governments have been externalizing displacement costs onto the weakest party, the displacees. Ethically, making profit from mining endeavor without paying the costs for rehabilitation means the displaced are taxed to benefit those who profit financially from the mine. So, displacement is for greater common good, are difficult to defend if revenues flow to a select few (Roy, 1999). On the other hand, there is business practice to reduce costs by having someone else pay them. More often these costs are rolled into fees or price or transferred to third party (Downing, 2002:16). But when the recipient gains benefit, then transfer might be economically justified. If the unfortunate third party gains no benefit from the transaction but mostly pay the price then it is injustice. The benefit transfer to third party has been subsidizing whoever is benefiting from its loss (Downing, 2002:17).

This argument of Downing (2002) against cost externalizing of MIDR onto displacees might still sound a moral one, not an economic ground. Because concerned governments throw blames on the company by saying that they have granted concession to the companies for mining and it is responsibility of the company to look after eradication of impoverishment risks. Government also claim that they did not accept responsibilities because neither risks nor the possible mitigating steps were identified (Downing, 2002:17). To address such concerns, Downing (2002) defines three liabilities i.e. acknowledged liabilities, possible liabilities and probable liabilities depending on the degree of regularization of obligation. Acknowledged liabilities are some widely acknowledged liabilities. Possible liabilities are not currently accepted though scientific research found them valid. For example, liabilities for health and social disarticulation and impoverishment impacts may be included in this. A broad and unstable band of probable liabilities falls between the possible and acknowledged liabilities. For example, liability for rehabilitation, accepting the emerging international finance intermediaries safeguards policies on involuntary displacement and drafting and following corporate responsibility statements. The company and financiers will
come and go but the government cannot limit liabilities because unmitigated liabilities soon become development induced new poverty (Downing, 2002:20).

**Theoretical Overviews on Compensation**

Compensation money is neither a net benefit to those displaced nor is an investment for expanding resettlers' former productive potential. But it is only a restitution of what was taken away (more often an incomplete restitution) as well as a refund for replacing equal value of assets that existed before displacement and destroyed after displacement (Cernea, 2008: 8). Compensation has not been sufficient means to achieve the policy objectives of improving resettlers' livelihoods after resettlement (*ibid*: 9), so the over optimistic assumption that compensation is sufficient for full restoration is myth.

When modern states either remove a single asset or regulate to remove much of the value from a set of assets, it becomes taking. Taking are carefully regulated under modern constitution. Here concern is to protect the individual rights rather than the advancement of aggregate social welfare. The rights-based approach necessitates the recognition of the individual's property and the rights to a procedure that recognizes the individual's rights to participate in the determination of appropriate compensation package. (*ibid*: 117). The rights-based approach implies the use of willingness to accept (WTA) measures of individual welfare rather than willingness to pay (WTP). WTA is an estimate of the person's willingness to give up individual rights, while the WTP is an estimate of the person's Willingness to pay for social goods. More often it is WTA process that designs to compensate taking in lawful way. Individual rights are expensive entitlements suitable for wealthy societies but in the context of development project the goal should be social wellbeing (socio-economic and institutional). Human rights perspectives should also be built into economic development project. In this regard Kenneth Boulding in his book 'The Economy of Love and Fear' has distinguished three general principles of social organization such as first is the 'Threat Principle' which explains as you do something good for me or else I will do something bad to you where motivation is fear, Second is the 'Exchange Principle' which explains that you do something good for me and in turn I will do something good for you where motive is self-interest and third is the 'Integrative Principle' which explains that I will do something for you independently of what you do where motive is love. (Daly, 2008). In today's market economy the
reciprocity is usually favored. But the involuntary resettlement falls under the first metric of threat principle than that of exchange (ibid: 120).

According to neo-classical economists the very capacity of earth to support life is to be treated as an externality. Externalities are much more important than what remains internal. In empty world growth may displace mainly nature but in case of our full world the growth displaces both nature and human being. In the empty world, opportunities costs are low and new projects are worth doing. In empty world there are more externalities. In full world opportunity costs are much higher because many more things are displaced. The vulnerable groups and ecological settings are affected due to the developmental projects. But what would be about the opportunity costs the projects to bear or not. Economic growth approach of any modern state will not stop increasing opportunity cost even if it is not being economical in the sense (ibid: 124). Therefore, low opportunity cost displacement is there where only displacement is nature itself but it will be more when displacement is both nature and human being and other things. Efficiency requires that the cost of an internal displacement of other human activity should be equal to the cost of external displacement of nature (ibid: 124). The cost of internal human displacement rises in step with the cost of external displacement as economic growth expands (ibid: 124). Even if we cannot help displacing both the nature and other things increasing opportunity costs in our full world we must think about the development of the PAPs. On the basis of theoretical assessment the benefit sharing mechanism and benefit development reinvestments can be extended to the PAPs on following grounds. Firstly, economic rationale as exploiting natural resources the development projects can generate significant economic rent which economists say a surplus return over and above the value of the capital, labour and materials used by projects to exploit the resources. Rent is a windfall created by the bounty of nature. (Rothman, 2000:15). In this sense project should not have any problems to share its benefits to its PAPs. Secondly, ethical rationale as according to Cernea (2008:20), those who give their lands to the new projects are in fact investors of equity in those new projects. Since they are investors, they must be entitled to a share of the benefits created by the projects (ibid: 324). Thirdly, enhancing local acceptability of the project as benefit sharing to the affected population with integration and compensation measures
from the project will ensure that project will be built and will operate for long years without protest and dissent of the local populations. So, the benefit sharing with affected population will enhance local acceptability of the project.

NTPC and Coal Mining Projects under Study: Specific Review Land Acquisition/ Displacement due to NTPC Projects

A vast tract of land is acquired not only for setting up a thermal power plant but also for its different purposes such as for depositing the effluent, for constructing reservoir, roads, railways, townships, port etc. In India till 1996, 14 NTPC projects had acquired about 19,203.2 hectares of lands affecting 4,915 households and by displacing 25,539 families. But only 10,342 persons were rehabilitated out of which only 42 per cent were the employed PAPs till the said date. So, a large number of people were left out without project engagement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Name of Project</th>
<th>Land acquired in ha</th>
<th>Families displaced</th>
<th>Household affected</th>
<th>Rehabilitated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Auniay</td>
<td>207.7</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NCPP</td>
<td>1001.6</td>
<td>2291</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rihand</td>
<td>1902.4</td>
<td>1807</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>1248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Singurauli</td>
<td>1932.1</td>
<td>1755</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>1395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Korba</td>
<td>1463.5</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vindhyachal</td>
<td>2511.3</td>
<td>2330</td>
<td>1718</td>
<td>1583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ramagundum</td>
<td>4189.4</td>
<td>2221</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Farakka</td>
<td>1760.2</td>
<td>6910</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kahalgaon</td>
<td>1361.7</td>
<td>3587</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Talcher</td>
<td>1497.5</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Antas</td>
<td>158.5</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Kawas</td>
<td>230.8</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>FGU TPP</td>
<td>793.9</td>
<td>1407</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>JGGPP</td>
<td>192.6</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19203.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>25539</strong></td>
<td><strong>4915</strong></td>
<td><strong>10342</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NTPC Publication Centre, New Delhi. (Quoted in Fernandes and Paranjpye, 1997:138)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Name of Project</th>
<th>Person Emp.</th>
<th>PAPs Emp.</th>
<th>PAPs given shop</th>
<th>Contracts license issued</th>
<th>Other source Reha Emp.</th>
<th>Self Emp.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Auniaya</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>NCPP</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Rihand</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Singrauli</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Korba</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Vindhyachal</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Ramagundum</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Farakka</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Kahalgaon</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Talcher</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Antas</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Kawas</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>FGU TPP</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>JGGPP</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Kayamkulam</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Jhanorg</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2977</strong></td>
<td><strong>4321</strong></td>
<td><strong>186</strong></td>
<td><strong>1311</strong></td>
<td><strong>686</strong></td>
<td><strong>861</strong></td>
<td><strong>10342</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NTPC Publication Centre, New Delhi. (Quoted in Fernandes and Paranjpye, 1997:138)

**Land Acquisition and Coalmining projects in India**

Till 1980s, coalmines, iron mines, manganese mines and bauxite mines were the major projects for land acquisition and displacement in India. According to a report prepared by Fernandes and S. Anthony Raj (1992), there were four major mineral projects such as 498 coalmines, 298 iron mines, 235 manganese mines and 136 bauxite mines in India. These 498 coalmines were located in 10 states of India i.e., Andhra Pradesh, West Bengal, Assam, Bihar, Jammu and Kashmir, Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa and Tamilnadu. According to official figure 32,751 families or 180,000 persons were displaced by
the four major mining companies during 1982-1985 (Government of India 1985, Fernandes and Raj, 1992:3). However, according to Fernandes and Raj's estimate about 21 Lakh population has been displaced by all mines till 1990s (ibid: 3). Further, according to another estimate prepared by Fernandes in 1994, about 25.5 lakh persons have been displaced by mine project in India from 1951 to 1990. Mostly tribal area is highly affected by these mines. Since nationalization of coalmines in 1971 various sub-companies of Coal India Ltd have been acquiring vast areas of land and displacing huge numbers of families. According to Government sources, between 1981 and 1985, the Central Coal fields Ltd, acquired 1, 20,300 acres of land and during sixth plan the Eastern Coal fields Ltd. acquired 30,000 acres of land. More than 32,750 families were displaced by CIL (Areeparampil, 1988: 238). The opencast coalmine displaces more persons than underground mines (Krishna and Sachdeva, 1990:106). Consequently, since 1970s mining induced displacement has been increasing in the country. At a conservative estimate about 2.55 million people have been displaced due to mining industries in between 1950 and 1990 (IGNOU,2001). The displacement issues due to mining industries have gone beyond economics and environment. All organizations and agencies such as local NGOs, Operational Research Group, a consultant of Coal India Ltd (CIL) have reported that MIDR is creating a pattern of gross violation of human rights and enormous trauma in India. Under Northern Coalfields Ltd, Kharia coalmining project (set up in 1981 & completed in 1996) acquired 15.48 sq.km from two villages displacing 218 families (including 166 SC families), the Kakri coal mining project (set up in 1980 and completed in 1993) acquired 8.28 sq.km from six villages displacing 170 families (including 120 SC families) and Bina coal mining project (set up in 1975 and completed in 1988) acquired 12.84 sq.km from seven villages. Under South Eastern Coalfields Limited, the mining projects in Korba (started in 1935 and its proper production in1958) had acquired lands from 58 villages displacing 3,543 families. According to Mathur and Marsden (1998:295) the coal and other mines had displaced 1,700,000, out of which only 450,000 were rehabilitated and rest 12, 50,000 was left backlog. A conservative report on rehabilitation status of different projects (and especially on tribal displaced) from 1951 to 1990 prepared by Fernandes in1994 is given below for an overall understanding.
Table 3.3
Conservative Estimate of Persons Displaced by Development Projects from 1951-90

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of project</th>
<th>All DPs (Lakhs)</th>
<th>% of DPs</th>
<th>DPs Resettled (Lakhs)</th>
<th>% of Resettled DPs</th>
<th>Backlog (Lakhs)</th>
<th>Backlog (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dam</td>
<td>164.0</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>123.00</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mines</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industries</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>53.80</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>159.20</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 3.3 shows that next to dam projects the mine and industrial projects have caused maximum displacements but more than 70 per cent of DPs due to these projects were left out as backlog for resettlement till 1990. Similarly,

Table 3.4
Conservative Estimate of Tribals Displaced by Development Projects from 1951-90

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of project</th>
<th>Tribal Displaced (Lakhs)</th>
<th>% of All DPs</th>
<th>Tribal DPs and Resettled (Lakhs)</th>
<th>% of Tribal DPs</th>
<th>Backlog of Tribal DPs</th>
<th>% of Backlog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dam</td>
<td>63.21</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>15.81</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>47.40</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mines</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>52.20</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industries</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85.39</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>21.16</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>64.23</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 3.4 shows that next to dam projects the mine and industrial projects have caused maximum tribals displaced persons. But 75 per cent of them displaced due to such projects were left out as backlog for resettlement till 1990.
Impact on Economy of the PAPs

On Landholdings

After land acquisition the size of land holding of PAPs has been reduced due to both NTPC and coalmining projects in the country. Many studies on NTPC and Coal mining projects conducted by the different researchers like Pandey in 1998, Satyanarayan in 1999, Reddy in 1999, Saksena and Sen in 1999; Dhagamwar, Dey and Verma in 2003 and Verma in 2004 prove that most of the PAPs became landless and other had a substantial reduction in their land holding status after displacement/land acquisition. As for instances, the decline of land holding from 4 acres to less than 1 acre due to Ramagundam project (Satyanarayan, 1999: 123) and the proportion of landless category was doubled from 11.1 per cent to 22.2 per cent in case of Talcher coalmine and thermal power station (Pandey, 1998a) in Orissa. In case of Ib Thermal Power Station (ITPS), the landless people have been increased from 11.1 per cent to 68.2 per cent and marginal farmers decreased from 36.4 per cent to 29.5 cent and middle farmers from 27.3 per cent to 2.3 per cent. Thus, the number of landless has increased while other has gone down in number. As a result, the status of farmers has not only been reduced but also many affected and displaced people lose their economic power and slide down. For instance, small shopkeepers and craftsmen lose their clientele and slip below the poverty threshold. The landholding status of small and marginal farmers, STs, SCs and OBCs were more affected by land acquisition than others (Satyanarayan, 1999: 125).

Cropping Pattern

A significant decline in agricultural land after displacement has affected the cropping pattern of PAPs. There has been the positive and negative impact on the cropping pattern of land due to NTPC projects. For example, according to Satyanarayan, (1999: 126-7), while his survey on NTPC Ramagundam project suggests that the crop yield per acre has increased in case of paddy, maize, groundnuts, pulses, cereals and some tubers, the cultivation of wheat, tobacco and mixed crops have been eliminated and production of sunflower, cotton, onion, vegetables and chilies has been completely affected. The yields of some crops were increased because the left out farmers have been using chemical fertilizer, high yielding variety of seeds and other modern methods in these days. But the
affected farmers now no more entirely depend on the land for their household consumption. For instance, Satyanarayana notes that 85 per cent of the households surveyed used to receive their food grains from their land before NTPC's land acquisition but now they used to purchase food grain from market (Satyanarayana, 1999: 128). So, after land acquisition/displacement landlessness has been the major problem for the affected farmers.

**Cause and Problems of Landlessness**

Since its late origin the impoverishment risks analysis are not being carried out in detail in any NTPC projects in India. However, the impoverishment risks were analyzed by some researchers like Balaji Pandey in Orissa and D. Agarwal in India. Agarwal (1998) has applied Cernea's model indirectly through NTPC's policy, plan and survey. In case of Rihand and Vindhyachal NTPC projects he finds out that landlessness could not be avoided due to several constraints such as non-availability of government revenue land, PAPs' unwillingness to return the compensation received for equivalent land, non-availability of private land in same locality, PAPs' unwillingness to move far away, PAPs' expectation of getting total land at one location for keeping their identity, homogeneity and relationship of a village, expectation of those who bought land on their own that more land will be given to them and a demand of at least five acres of land in free of cost in lieu of job etc (ibid, 162). Thus, in case of Rihand and Vindhyachal projects three important factors responsible for the landlessness of PAPs i.e. conditionality of NTPC's R&R policy, scarcity of lands and jobs and people's willingness to accept R&R depending upon their economic motive and socio-cultural identity. With compensation money land oustees could not purchase same size land as rate of land was raised due to displacement/land acquisition. In some NTPC and coalmining projects, the compensation money was not released by the bank during the time of need. Further, displaced people could not grab forest and government land due to many governmental restrictions. For example, the enactment of Forest Act (1980) has restricted the use of forest land for non-forest purposes. Landlessness has very serious socio-economic implication not only for the owner of land but whole of family members as it provides hidden employment to every member of the family. It also implies loss of access to green vegetables, religious trees and gift of nature, loss of medical herbs and plants (Pandey,
In the past PAPs' livelihood was based on cultivation, rearing domestic livestock and collection of forest produce but landlessness caused them severe socio-economic problems after displacement. This process of landlessness paves their way to the process of marginalization.

**Impact on Occupation**

After displacement there has been change in the occupational pattern of PAPs from their caste and hereditary occupations in the past to the achieved occupations in the private and government projects at present. For example, due to Ramagundam NTPC project in Andhra Pradesh, there was a significant decline in the practice of occupations like toddy tapping, weaving, artisan trades, fishing and sheep rearing in comparison with parental occupations after land acquisition (Satyanarayana, 1999:92). Dhagamwar, De and Verma (2003) reported in their study that before displacement the Mahato, a tribal community used to make product of bamboo like supa (Sieve) Jhora (Basket) etc for their livelihood. But after displacement the industrialization has destroyed their traditional occupations in Korba area. After displacement they had neither forest nor the agrarian community for continuing their traditional occupation. Even they could not become a part of rehabilitation package because they did not have landed property (Dhagamwar, De and Verma, 2003: 63 -64).

In case of Ramagundam NTPC project the service caste families such as washerman, hair dressers, toddy tappers and artisans (60 per cent of them belonged to marginal landholding) lost their livelihood and occupation due to land acquisition (Satyanarayan, 1999: 65-66). According to Satyanarayana, many of the agriculturists (52 per cent of the samples surveyed) became agricultural labourers and service occupationists. Since the caste based occupations have been changed agricultural labouring and service occupation were the major occupations across all caste groups after land acquisition (Satyanarayana, 1999: 69-70). There was no change in case of SCs and STs as higher per centage of SCs, STs and also OBCs were classified as agricultural labourers after displacement. Reddy finds in his study that the PAPs were forced to change their occupations from land based to non-land-based after displacement (Reddy, 1998:15). According to Verma (2004), the agricultural intensive environment of project affected region was changed into labour oriented areas due to
Vindhyachal Super Thermal Power Project (VSTPP) and Rihand Super Thermal Power Project (RhSTPP). After losing their lands the project affected persons were pauperized as they became mere workers in the industries or being holders of petty shops, kiosks, etc (Verma, 2004: 114). According to Verma, as many as 71.2 per cent of the total samples he studied were engaged in agricultural activities before displacement. But after displacement only 10.8 per cent of them were engaged in such activities (ibid: 114). So, obviously PAPs might have been given permanent jobs. It is partially true or if it is given then in which positions and who is given is a debatable thing. For example, according to Saksena and Sen (1999), only two persons were employed in a regular basis in NTPC, Bijpur. But the tribal such as the Baiga, Dharker, and Kol did not get any employment in these projects. Interestingly, 261 persons were given jobs in Anpara NTPC project as claimed by the project authority but no single oustees was found as a regular job holder in the samples taken by Saksena and Sen for the study. In fact, most of the families depended upon casual type of employment (mostly labour) which earned them little money that was hand to mouth (Saksena and Sen, 1999: 122).

Similarly, according to Sam Thangraj in his study of VSTPP, out of 2330, only 272 oustees had been rehabilitated with regular employment. Out of the rest only few oustees were engaged in construction work as a labourer (Verma, 2004: 57).

Verma(2004) asserted that after losing their agricultural lands, the inhabitants of Singrauli became labourers because except few (only 18), most of the oustees were not imparted training or skill necessary to get employment in the project (Verma, 2004: 129-30). The projects promised them to provide jobs. So, many PAPs remained unemployed anticipating jobs in projects without having any self-employment training. The Cernea's Joblessness risk is found in many displacement literatures. In the same line, Pandey's study also emphasizes that though there has been marginal reduction in post displacement employment scenario in case of ITPS, MCL (Ib Valley) and NALCO projects, as compare to other projects, displacement has rendered many more people unemployed (Pandey, 1998:54-55). Before displacement the oustees had better employment opportunities.

Before displacement members of agricultural family used to contribute to the family budget by working in fields or by doing agriculture related jobs. The land
related occupation not only provides sustainable income but also generates a mechanism for the survival of their culture and society. But after displacement landlessness leads to Joblessness for many. Joblessness is a state of affair where a person loses his only source of livelihood due to displacement and does not possess any skill to learn new methods of earning. In both projects (NTPC and Coalmines) the displaced persons are required to have specific qualifications and skills to get jobs. There may be project provisions for acquiring specific qualifications and skills but that cannot be provided to all members of the displaced families. As a result, some may be eligible to get jobs and others cannot. It was found by Savithri Ramaiah (1995) in a study SSTPP and VSTPP that jobs were made available through contractors. In Singrauli plant contract job was given at government rate while in the Vindhyachal project private contractor employed PAPs at a lower than recommended rate. Alternative employment opportunities to all affected members of the family are neither available nor provided by the projects. So after displacement entire family banks depend upon the single or a few employable persons. Further, after displacement the PAPs of coalmine and NTPC projects were exposed to monetary market in which they were compelled to operate. It was the male members of the household who become the only bread earner as job in the project are given to them in maximum. As a result, women are dependent upon them totally and rendered powerless. For example, in the case of Talcher and Ib valley coalmine projects studied by Pandey (1998a) the MCL authority have given one job per one displaced family that too to the family who had their patta for land. In case of ITPS in Orissa also one job has been provided to each displaced family. But the others who had no patta for land were denied the rehabilitation benefits and remained jobless. Artisans, share croppers, landless labourers and small business men who lost their occupations after displacement were not eligible for getting R&R benefit. According to Dhagamwar (2003) the oustees those who do not get job in the project generally seek employment in shops, business houses, repairing works on roads and canals through different petty contractors and try to become manual labourers in private carrier, in stationery shops and in cycle repairing and two wheeler servicing centres (Dhagamwar, 2003: 144-45). There were some cases of impersonation by the outsiders for getting R&R package. In case of
Ramagundam project, Agarwal argues that the rich, educated and the knowledgeable people both from within and outside the affected area seized opportunities or benefits of project by registering themselves as PAPs (Mathur and Marsden, 1998:164). Some outsiders also played role of impersonation by giving little money to the oustees and got jobs. The nominees of land oustees were found as sons in laws but from different castes (Agarwal, 1998: 164-65).

**Impact on Income**

No doubt there has been an improvement in the monthly income of some of the fortunate PAPs after their displacement but inflation, new necessities and lack of sustainable income have further pauperized too many in the new environment. Even there may be a big gap between project employed person's nominal income and real income or cutup income at hand to home. So no one takes care of the above factors while analyzing the change in income after displacement.

It is also clear that the casual labourers are not employed throughout the days of a month or throughout the months of a year. It is very difficult to count the monthly income of the households before displacement. Including children and old aged persons everybody used to be the workforce in the household before displacement in rural areas. So, their monthly income remains in a disguised form. But after displacement, the money economy calculated in monetary term sometime seems to be more than earlier, suggest an increasing trend of monthly income. In fact, the present value of income is not same rather less than the earlier one. Satyanarayana (1999) finds in his study of Ramagundam NTPC project that though on an average the number of earning persons in a household increased from 1.4 in 1980 to 1.9 persons by 1991, earning from subsidiary sources were not increased proportionately after displacement.

In case of ITPS and MCL (IB valley), Orissa studied by Pandey in 1998 household income of the displaced persons was marginal not substantial. Dhagamwar, Dey and Verma (2003: 133) in their study found that more land meant more power over others and control on the economy.

**Impact on Dwelling Structure and Homelessness**

In addition to the risks of landlessness and joblessness the homelessness leads to alienation of oustees from their villages and relatives. It is also placelessness, loss of group's cultural space and identity or cultural impoverishment as argued by
Downing (1994). In ITPS (NTPC) and lb Valley (MCL) in Orissa housing facilities have been provided to each family but not to each adult member that results homelessness to many (Pandey, 1998).

Since homelessness is different from houselessness, the colonies consist of some houses constructed by company with some modern amenities will not make the PAP happy, healthy and comfortable. PAPs feel a loss of environmental benefits and CPRs and feel their inability to participate in village planning and maintenance of amenities.

The heterogeneous character of community compositions of Indian villages are not taken into consideration while planning for resettlement of oustees in the new sites. Availability of jobs, business opportunities, agricultural land, basic civic amenities and market facilities, forest location etc are to be made available in new sites but with same community movement is important. For example, Dhagamwar, Dey and Verma (2003) find that resettling the entire village at one site was not fruitful in case of Dipika Open Cast Mines at Sirkhand. On the basis of their community character the villagers of the mine were divided into three groups over their choice of rehabilitation sites. They argued that the logic of community cohesiveness would be destroyed in one rehabilitation sites for different communities (Dhagamwar, Dey and Verma, 2003:158). Community movement is essential but unfortunately in most of the displacement projects PAFs neither have choice nor have voluntary movement for which a successful resettlement is not possible. In most cases it is the project authority which decides new sites for resettlement.

Since authority decides sites and allot plots the project arbitrarily tends to ignore the need of the oustees. For example, according to Dhagamwar, Dey and Verma (2003:164), the projects (NTPC and SECL) had failed to understand the size of dwelling land and of an average room per family in the resettlement sites. Consequently, the size of the dwelling land in the resettlement sites was decreased from an average, 10.40 decimals to 8.45 decimals for a family of four. Even if it is manageable location the condition of sites do not attract many to settle down there. For example, In case of Chanduwar NCL colony, the rocky and high location of the housing plots dissuaded the PAPs from shifting, particularly from Ambedkar Nagar (ibid: 165). Sometime the project authority not only makes
temporary transit camp for PAFs but also forces them to move there without forecasting consequences that both PAFs and projects to face further. For example, Banaharpali oustees were given houses (only 5 decimal each) in the transit camp of ITPS in 1988, which were built for early evacuation of the villagers. They were forcibly displaced from the village, treated like goods and were dumped in the transit camp (Pandey, 1998: 89).

Impact on Livestock

Village's prosperity and culture cannot be imagined without livestock. Indeed, livestock provide a ground for agrarian economy and socio-cultural life in the rural India. Domestic cattle as the backbone of the agricultural economy fulfill basic needs of the farmers such as milk, fodder, agriculture and transportation (Verma, 2004: 179). But after displacement due to NTPC projects (VSTPP, RhSTPP, Ramagundam NTPC, Singrauli NTPC, Anapara NTPC, Bijpur NTPC) there has been a significant reduction in the possession of livestock. For example, due to VSTPP and RhSTPP the number of buffalo, oxen, cows and goats was reduced (Verma, 2004: 180). In their study Saksena and Sen (1999: 115) also find that the number of livestock was reduced after displacement due to Singrauli, Anapara and Bijpur NTPC projects. Similarly according to Satyanarayana, due to Ramagundam NTPC project about 53.5 per cent of total sample households (414) had reported a decline of livestock. After displacement the most of the households have lost their livelihood based on livestock because many either could not able to purchase livestock or could not continue to keep them without cowshed or lack of space in the new place (Satyanarayana, 1999: 130).

Loss of Access to Common Property Resources

According to Vandana Shiva (1995:8) in centralized macro economy, people participate in environmental destruction imposed by developmental forces beyond their control because they are reduced to move as resource suppliers in periphery for the cities where political and cultural life is centered (Verma, 2004:198). The people's local stability and ecological harmony are undermined as the forced relocation throws them out of their familiar common social and geographical resources such as ponds, wells, grazing lands, forests, community centres, panchayat places, temples etc. Loss of familiar social and geographical surrounding put the PAPs into despair.
Even projects impact on the traditional panchayat system of PAPs in some area. For instance, Special Area Development Agency (SADA) is a body of bureaucrats with politically appointed chairperson had replaced the traditional panchayat system in Korba area due to NTPC project. The SADA had facilitated civic infrastructural management in and around the township ignoring the affected villages. According to Dhagamwar, De and Verma (2003: 71-73), the affected people were not happy with SADA.

**Displacement and Risk of Marginalization**

Marginalization is one of the serious impoverishment risks (Cerneea, 1995) occurs when families lose economic power and slide downward and often overlaps with joblessness, landlessness and homelessness (Reddy 1998 :147). NTPC and CIL neglect or do little about socio-psychological dimension of marginalization. Marginalization is caused by the deprivation of land, employment and home and indicates that the loss of land, productive assets and livelihood result in downward mobility among oustees. In case of the two power projects (Singrauli and Rihand in both UP and MP) carried out by TISS, Bombay during 1993-94 (TISS, 1994a & 1994b), I.U.B Reddy analyzed the problems of marginalization on the basis of occupational patterns, landholding patterns, income level and overall standard of living in post-displacement period (Reddy, 1998). For example after displacement the proportion of landless families increased from 23.5 per cent to 70 per cent in his study and the size of land holding was drastically reduced from 6.21 to 2.4 acres in the case of the Singrauli project and from 5.3 to 1.5 acres in the case of the Rihand project. Similarly a declining trend in the land holding patterns of PAPs in Talcher coalmine and thermal power station of Orissa studied by Pandey (1998a) has led to PAPs’ marginalization in Orissa. Marginalization of women oustees has aggravated not only by the loss of the traditional and independent source of income to which they have access earlier but also by denial of jobs and other rehabilitation benefits by the project authorities which results their lower status and role in the family. Those who were aged could not get job in the projects and gradually became marginalized. In fact, relative marginalization often begins long before the actual displacement (Pandey, 1998a:108-10). There were several reasons for the overall decline of people’s standard of living such as lack of diversified earning opportunities, low wages for contract labour, relatively poor
housing conditions, decline in land ownership pattern, limited material assets, lack of adequate skill level to improve with given compensation etc (Reddy, 1998:151-52). The money that was given to the oustees was spent on consumer goods and unprofitable ventures (Pandey, 1998a:108-10). Since NTPC brings the PAPs’ exposure to world’s consumerism developing in them a curiosity and desire to have more and consume more, the compensation money are utilized on unnecessary expenditures such as on TV, scooter, marriage, illness, lending to friends or relatives, drinking, gambling etc. Such type of misutilization of compensation money soon makes them into a state of marginalization without a steady source of income.

But it makes a different to those who are employed in the NTPC and coalmine projects. This generates a psychological state of deprivation to those PAPs who do not get employment in the company. So marginalization is not an economic problem but also socio-psychological problem of PAPs before, during and after coming up of projects. It has also social and psychological dimension such as since land is a status symbol, the loss of which gives an overwhelming feeling of marginalization. The affected populations further get marginalized when the immigrants who are usually skilled and experienced, outperform the local people in many respects. PAPs’ high expectation from project and their belief in project’s false promises force them to wait in desperation which in turn put them in a state of marginalization. Agarwal (1998) also explains that there will be PAP’s alienation from the project, mental agony and xenophobia when a strong feeling is created that local people are lethargic and inefficient as compared to outsiders. Sometime this type of blame from outside makes them weak from inside that they lose self-respect and self-esteem. Since they are in this state of mind they themselves feel refugees on their own land. According to Agarwal (1998) this leads to impoverishment of mind as displaced people are given a feeling that their way of thinking and analyzing a problem is wrong. So marginalization is more a mental impoverishment than economic one. In this process, the NTPC project benefits will wither away from PAPs to get into the hands of outsiders.

**Displacement and Security Problems**

After displacement PAPs hardly get secured life in colonies. For example, in case of Vindhyachal and Rihand NTPC projects studied by Verma, out of 250 residents
211 (84.4 per cent) said that they were not secured at new relocation site (Verma, 2004:194-96).

Project and Dependency Syndrome

PAPs, NGOs, activists and projects are divided into different groups blaming one another for the causes and consequences of PAPs’ dependency on others. The PAPs blame not only to developmental project but also to themselves for their dependency on others. They have to depend upon others for adequate compensation for the loss of property, plots in resettlement colonies, permanent and contract jobs in the project, etc. (Verma, 2004:203). But the project authorities including some NGOs blame the people as some people used to make hue and cry through agitation in front of the world community to fetch a better compensation package from the project authorities. According to a NGO called “Srijan Lokhita Samiti”, the affected population had indulged in frauds, business and became greedy to grab as much money as possible from NTPC (Verma, 2004: 203). On the other hand, according to Verma, an activist, working for the cause of the displaced and downtrodden said that NTPC was the culprit for their dependency syndrome. It seems that NTPC had created a dent into the peaceful life of the people and brought turmoil.

Displacement and Risks of Food Insecurity

Time was there when rural farmers used to purchase readymade goods from the town or urban market and the people for urban area used to depend upon rural farmers for food productions. In our agrarian society while crops are grown in the field that provide food for the entire family for years, vegetables are grown in the kitchen garden for the daily consumption of the family. Only surplus foods and vegetables are sold in the market. But the Talcher and Ib valley coastline projects have destroyed the means of agricultural livelihood not only by acquiring land and displacing the people from their habitats but also polluting their natural environment. Now the time changed. The rural people depend on urban market for everything. After displacement, they spend money to procure food-grain and vegetables (Pandey, 1998:112). Agarwal (1998: 67) argues that the expropriation of land destroys farmer’s self sufficiency. The change in culture and exposure to urban market bring corresponding changes in people’s food insecurity and food habits. For instance, in case of health survey of the Singrauli region and other
resettlement projects (Ramaiah, 1995) wage earners had lower mean expenditure as compared to other groups (Mathur and Marsden, 1998).

**Impact on Health and Risks of Morbidity**

NTPC and Coalmine projects have been both cause and effect of bad health as well as good health of the PAPs after displacement. NTPC not only provides the capital expenditures for the construction of dispensary and purchase of furniture, equipments and others, but also provides allopathic and homeopathic doctors, medicine and other facilities. NTPC hospital provides subsidized medicines and even at free of costs in emergency cases to the PAPs. The project authority also organizes medical camps such as family planning camps, eye camps, and activities for handicapped persons etc in the affected area. Community facilities such as safe drinking water supply through hand pumps or piped water, necessary drainage, sanitation, etc are provided by the NTPC projects in the colonies (Agarwal, 1998:168; Fernandes and Paranjpye, 1997). However, these facilities are not made available to all the PAPs throughout the year. It is also that the project facilities are either not accessible to many or are there but without functioning. For instance, there were medical centers in Talcher and lb valley coalmining projects, but these were not functioning properly due to lack of doctors (Pandey, 1998: 114).

When thermal power and coal mining projects cause displacement the PAPs consequently will have stress in fear of relocation and in fear of abandoning the places of worship that may invite the wrath of gods and goddesses. Further these stresses aggravate their helplessness, sickness, death and grief (Agarwal, 1998: 168-69). In many NTPC and Coalmining area the colonies do not have basic health facilities. For example, in case of Kharia rehabilitation colony the resettlers had an unhygienic atmosphere devoid of lane, drains and slum like growth of houses on the plots provided by the Northern Coal Fields Limited (NCL) (Saksena and Sen,1999: 165-67).The facility of dispensary was not there in the rehabilitation colonies of Kharia, Chanduwar, Barwani, Bansi and Rehta (ibid: 165-67). In case of Jawahar Nagar (NCL) facility of dispensary was there but did not function (ibid: 166). Interestingly, if it was there with functioning conditions there was a problem of access to it. For instance, the projects like BALCO, SECL and NTPC had special project hospitals but their access were restricted to employees.
only (Dhagamwar, Dey and Verma, 2003:172). According to these authors both pre-displacement and post-displacement situations had witnessed dependence on private health services. The government services were least used by the people as they used to depend on their traditional medicines (ibid: 173).

Cernea said that the weakest segments of the demographic spectrum - infant, children and elders are most vulnerable to relocation-related diseases like parasitic and vector borne diseases (Malaria, Schisto-Somiasis) and diarrhea and dysentery due to unsafe water and poor sewerage system (Cernea, 1995). For instance, according to Pandey (1998) in ITPS, the resettlement colony is located close to the Hirakud reservoir which results water borne diseases and malaria. In Ib Valley and Talcher, the displaced are suffering from diarrhea, eye irritation, gastric disorder and skin diseases due to coal dust. More often there are some common causes such as mental stress, polluted air and water sources and increased pressures to do more work responsible for such health hazard of PAPs in and around NTPC projects (Ramaiah, 1995).

**Displacement and Social Disarticulation**

**Impact on Family**

Displacement effect has brought a remarkable change in the pattern, size, composition and nature of PAPs’ family. This change has been clearly reflected in the study of the thermal power and coalmining project done by Burma (2004), Satyanarayan (1999), Dhagamwar (2003) and others. Dhagamwar, De and Verma (2003: 129-31) in their study argue that the breakdown of the joint families sometime we see in movie like a romantic picturization and a subject for romantic novel but in Korba it was a hard economic tragedy. Land acquisition has affected the family pattern as the number of extended and joint families has been decreased and the number of nuclear families has been increased. For instance, in case of Ramagundam, NTPC project studied by Satyanarayan (1999: 38) in A.P, out of 2,034 families more than half-1158 (56.9 per cent) became nuclear families after land acquisition. Similarly the size of extended family decreased from 10.3 per cent to 1.4 per cent and the size of joint families from 55.7 per cent to 41.7 per cent respectively (Satyanarayana: 1999: 38). In another study of Dhagamwar, De and Verma (2003: 123) in Korba, per centage of nuclear families
increased well above the half way mark, while percentage of joint families decreased proportionately.

There have been some important changes such as changes in family occupation, family disputes, marriage pattern, and family responsibility (Dhagamwar, De and Verma, 2003: 130), age and sex compositions, family background, mental status of family members, family authority, land ownership, educational status etc. After displacement family as a system crumbles down and its long established heritage and ancestry are scattered (Verma, 2004). Land acquisition and industrial mode of production have shattered the joint family structure. For example, the small patch of agricultural land and tiny plot of 60 by 40 sq. ft allotted by Vindhyachal Super Thermal Power Project in Madhya Pradesh and Rihand Super Thermal Power Project in Uttar Pradesh to affected population in resettlement colony was no longer able to accommodate big joint families (ibid: 153).

In the process of land acquisition and displacement the industrial projects have destroyed the mechanism of social networks and family relationship such as places of worship, graveyards of ancestors, sacred mountains, trees, deities etc. As a result PAPs' community structure and social networks becomes weak and the dispersed kin groups of joint family lose their cultural identity, traditional authority and mutual obligations which were their cultural capitals before displacement. Emotional bonds, social bonds, social networks, social control, traditional authority, leadership, we feeling etc are either loosening or breaking due to the project activities. For example, in case of Ramagundam super thermal power project, social support systems like Jeeta system, kinship networks and the bond of interdependency and social security between agricultural communities have been disrupted by the process of displacement and project activities (Mathur and Marsden, 1998:170). Pandey also found that the mutual help arrangement, labour exchange relationship, production oriented organization and other socio-economic relationships of the displaced persons rehabilitated in resettlement colonies of ITPS, NALCO and IB Valley coalmining area, have been totally disrupted (Pandey, 1998a:113). In the absence of such cultural capitals, there have been many family disputes after displacement due to NTPC and Coalmine projects in India. More often a majority of family dispute started with disagreements on sharing of rehabilitation benefits received from the projects.
For example, according to Verma (2004) about 33.2 per cent families under his studies admitted that they were experiencing family dispute of some kind or other between son and father and other close affine relatives such as uncle, mother, brothers, sisters etc. The family dispute and quarrels were resulted not only due to disintegration of joint families and the breakdown of the affine ties, but also due to conflict of interest, shattering of hopes and desires that developed among PAPs after displacement (Verma, 2004: 298).

In post displacement scenario gradually displaced peoples live in a new atmosphere, in a new place with changing attitude and values and confront the problem of broken families, deserted parents, quarrel over money, increased use of liquor, gambling, stealing, jealousy and so on (Satyanarayan, 1999: 38). Providing job to only one person of a household creates a tension to rest of other family members who do not enjoy the same benefits. Consequently, this divides the families and creates frustration, jealousy and animosity within and stratifies them on economic and social levels (Verma, 2004).

**Socio-Cultural Impact**

The customs such as use of traditional musical instruments going with the Barat, worship of village deities, worship in temples with traditional rituals and social practices have undergone change in the process of thermal and coalmining projects. For instance, the Chamar caste of Jawahar Nagar rehabilitation colony (under NCL) and a Biyar caste of Barwani rehabilitation colony had a well knit Biradari unit headed by Biradari Mukhia before displacement. The traditional caste and village panchayat usually control the behaviours of the people through different customs for which there is no deviation on marriage practices and no dowry demand. For example, there was a Baigadeeh and temple for the Chamar caste and Biyar caste in their past village. Saksena and Sen also found that the Biyar Biradari headed by a Mukhia was dealing with cases of theft, violation of caste rules, illicit sex relationships and family quarrels. But after displacement at rehabilitation colony, this custom has been decreased (Saksena and Sen, 1999: 191-97).

After displacement the Panchayat Tat of Chamar caste had lost its importance, the worship of village deities was given up, dowry had become a regular custom, and other such changes are found. In the old village, these castes used their
traditional musical instruments during marriage time. But after their displacement they are attracted to go on barat party with modern music (Saksena and Sen, 1999:191-95). After displacement gradually the PAPs started losing their faith in magic, sorcery and traditional medicinal specialists. For example, the Chamar caste had faith in magic and sorcery and Baiga/Ojha who was consulted in the event of illness, crop diseases and for driving away evil spirit (ibid: 89). The some Biyar castes were traditional medicine specialists treating different types of diseases. They were also traditional veterinary healers. Now the use of herbs and shrubs, consulting Vaid for different kind of traditional treatments has been reduced (ibid: 97). However, materialist culture, newly created mindset and movement to another place could not diminish the deep rooted values and beliefs of PAPs after displacement. For example, according to Verma (2004), the residents of the NTPC Singrauli region had been undergoing the same feeling of detachment to their ancestral belief and places. Since they had deep emotional feeling attached with house, wells, ponds, trees and stones in their earlier villages, they kept on memorizing their fondest memories and some of them often visualized those places in their dreams. The PAPs believe that not worshiping gods/goddesses buried under projects may bring curse to their family members. For example, the people of Singrauli believed that their not worshiping of those monuments and gods buried under the dam or NTPC project bring curse to family members.

**Displacement Impact on Caste Relation**

It is fact that every Indian village has caste compositions but still all live in given village systems although they have many differentiations. After displacement some of the PAPs are virtually divided on the caste line. Because of this some dominant caste can better grab the opportunities than others. Saksena and Sen (1999) find from their study that after displacement the caste composition became a caste division which was being used as a means to get compensation from project authority. It was purely based on the status, economy and political power of higher castes who managed to get good and early compensation and rehabilitation than lower caste populations. For instance, in case of acquisition of Chanduwar village by NCL in 1982-83, by and large, the Brahmins managed to get better compensation even for their jungle lands (Saksena and Sen, 1999: 82).
But the SCs had suffered since they had government land, for which no compensation was admissible. Even inter-caste interdependency and inter-relationship has also been hampered by the NTPC and Coalmining projects. Saksena and Sen found that a higher caste man of NCL rehabilitation colony complained that the service of Biyar caste man who used to take care of diseases of the cattle was no more easily available after displacement (ibid: 194). Similarly, Biyar caste used to depend upon the Baiga priest for the marriage space and the Brahmin priest for officiating at the actual marriage ceremony. But this type of inter-caste relationship has been declined (ibid, 191-96).

On the other hand, after displacement there have been the instances of widening of caste conflicts among the displaced population. For example, according to Verma, though industrialization has widened the inter-caste interaction and inter-dinning among the oustees, caste rivalry and conflicts among different castes were still more in NTPC Singrauli region (Verma, 2004: 151). This was due to NTPC policy of divide and rule, discriminatory approach of NTPC authorities, vandalism and dominance of upper caste people who grabbed creamy jobs, plots and resources and consequently of agony, anguish and frustration of lower caste people (ibid: 151).

Impact on Caste Interaction and Inter-Caste Marriage

In case of Singrauli NTPC region, except lower caste (Chamar and Dharkar), upper castes and middle castes were living happily without discrimination in the resettlement colonies. According to Verma, caste interaction had improved than before displacement (Verma, 2004: 214). Though they change in their mentality but resilient on the question of inter-caste marriage as they wanted to carry on with their superiority mark in caste status and other traditional customs (Verma, 2004:215). However, acceptability of inter-caste marriage was still a distant dream among the PAPs of different castes (Verma, 2004:217). However, according to Satyanarayana, there was no major change in the inter-caste occupational relations among the people after land acquisition. Out of his 414 respondents surveyed, 364 (87.9 per cent) stated that the jajmani system continued even now as before. The people used to depend on each other on jajmani relation as lower caste people were earning their livelihood by rendering service to the higher castes. But there has been a change in the mode of payment from kind to cash.
(Satyanarayana, 1999: 179-80). Satyanarayana found that more than half of the backward castes (BCs) claimed that they had lost their self-esteem due to land acquisition (ibid: 83).

**Impact on Cultural Life**

One can observe sudden socio-economic changes among the project affected population. But their cultural change would not come as quick as economic change. The affected population neither able to imitate nor assimilate into new dazzling culture and life styles nor withstand and behold their tradition and cultures as they get swept away with the forceful current of industrial civilization. The residents find themselves in a stage of cultural shock seeing the new life styles for the first time (Verma, 2004:207). Consequently cultural degeneration such as selfishness, greed, jealousy, leg pulling, frustration, cut-throat competition, temptation, hunger, breach of trust, etc develop instead of values, ethics, morals etc as in the NTPC Singrauli region. (Verma, 2004:203).

**Impact on Family Ritual**

According to Verma (2004), after displacement people did not have time, money and patient to celebrate the family functions such as birth, death, marriage and other functions of rites -de-passage of social importance in as usual manner as before .

**The Problems of Basic Amenities in Colony**

Like NTPC, the rehabilitation colonies of NCL and SECL did not provide the basic amenities such as drinking water, road, electricity, school, dispensary, drains, community centre/ panchayat house, etc. If it was provided in some of the colonies those were not functioning. Some of the infrastructures were promised to be set up soon. Many colonies in case of NCL studied by Saksena and Sen did not have basic amenities. For example, in case of Chanduwar colony (NCL), Bansi Colony (NCL) and Rehta colony (NCL) the resettlers were not provided with many of the amenities (Saksena and Sen, 1999:165-69). Kayam Kulam combined cycle power project involves the dredging of backwaters over a small stretch for raising the plant area. The fishermen depending upon the river lost their livelihood due to dredging. The projects identified all these affected fishermen through many cooperative societies for their rehabilitation. After handing over the Kayal farm area to NTPC, the government of Kerala retrenched all the farm workers with
minimum retrenchment benefits but without any economic rehabilitation. But it was NTPC which recognized all the Kayal farm workers as PAPs for its R&R package (Agarwal, 1998: 164). So it can be said that from loss of access to common property resources to rights to rehabilitation was taken place. But this is not true everywhere. Pandey (1998) in his study finds that in the resettlement colonies of NALCO, UKP, ITPS and Ib Valley coalmining projects common land like burial grounds or grazing land were not provided. The colonies are located at far away where the oustees do not get any access to fuel wood and other minor forest produces which they used earlier.

Review of Resettlement Policies at International Level

World Bank Resettlement Policies

The R and R policy for the World Bank financed projects was evolved steadily since 1980 through several key steps in 1986, 1988 and 1990. While the policy of 1980 was a descriptive platitude, the 1986 guidelines were on developing a new economic base for resettlers to achieve sustainable development. Since it was merely a recommendatory in nature, the project authorities paid lip service to it. But the policy directives of 1990 (OD 4.30) were followed seriously (Fernandes, 1997: 232-233; Mathur and Marsden, 1998). The first objective states that involuntary displacement should be avoided or minimized whenever feasible selecting the least displacing alternatives. But it could not make it mandatory to the bank financed projects as it does not take any stern action against any project. It also did not clearly identify the minimum level of basis human rights of the affected people that must not violate (Fernandes, 1997: 233; Mathur and Marsden, 1998). The policy did not indicate the threshold level or cut off point for rejecting a project at the inception stage. Another objective of the policy states that whenever displacement is unavoidable, the bank will assist displaced persons in their efforts to improve or at least restore their former living standards and earning capacity. To improve or at least restoring former standard of living or capacity are sound like empty sentences without appropriate strategy. Why the word "at least" but not must for restoring socio-economic status of resettlers. It means if they were poor and would be living like poor after displacement as carefully used phrases did not have any serious positive effects. The World Bank acknowledges in its own report that "as far as the projects in India are concerned,
valuable evidence indicates that until 1992 most affected may not have been able to regain their previous standard of living". (Fernandes, 1997:233). Besides these above points, some noteworthy objectives such as compensation at the replacement cost, share of project benefit etc are there in the World Bank policy. But these are rarely operationalised. Fernandes argues that neither anybody gets a share of project benefit nor the replacement cost against his lost asset is given (Fernandes, 1997:234; Mathur and Marsden, 1998:294). The other objectives such as to minimize the distance between departure and relocation sites so as to facilitate the resettlers' adaptation to the new socio-cultural and natural environment, participation of the resettlers and the host population in the process of their conflict resolution, opportunity to the resettlers with infrastructural and service facilities for their training and aptitudes, the needs to maintain the ethnic values and social relationships of the indigenous communities and treating the informal customary rights as natural rights to land (Fernandes, 1997:23-35; Mathur and Marsden, 1998:294-95). But these objectives are hardly operationalised. However, the World Bank's resettlement policy has been globally recognized benchmark which is based upon a sound and well reasoned socio-economic definition of displacement and resettlement. World Bank policy aims to ensure that "the development process fosters full respect for the dignity, human rights and cultures of indigenous peoples". The World Bank has encouraged the states in the development of policies on international standard. For instance, accordingly in this standard, the Orissa Resettlement and Rehabilitation Policy of project affected persons 1994 was formulated for the World Bank funded Water Resources project in Orissa.

**The Asian Development Bank**

Except minor differences in the terminology used by the World Bank and Asian Development Bank (ADB), there are no essential differences in their principles on R & R policies (Mathur, 2008: 588). Both the banks emphasize on the R&R policy to avoid displacement and if unavoidable, suggest minimizing it to the extent possible. The policy guidelines make provisions for lost assets and income, physical resettlement where appropriate and rehabilitation to allow affected people to regain or to improve their former economic capacity (Mathur, 2008: 559-60). The Asian Development Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank
have developed their own policies on involuntary resettlement. Today, relevant policies on involuntary resettlement exist in a number of countries, including China, Cote D'Ivoire, Uganda, and the Central African Republic. Three states in India—Maharastra, Madhya Pradesh and Karnataka also have resettlement legislations.

It was Susanna Price (2008) who examined the landscape of resettlement policy in Asia and focused on important initiatives taken by ADB for its member countries. Price explains as how these initiatives help the developing member countries to evolve policy or reform policy on displaced population. ADB's three regional assistance programme have achieved success in formulating policies with many obstacles (ibid: 147).

Like WB, the ADB approved its policy on involuntary resettlement in 1995. The policy allows scope for assistance to build the capacity of developing member countries (DMCs) to plan and implement in the project and to strengthen the DMCs capacities and macro frameworks for involuntary resettlement. In fact, ADB tried to help the DMCs but not according to their national standard. Asian Development Bank cannot lower its policy standard if national policy and framework differs with its policy. So it is clear that ADB's initiatives were to change or supplement to national policies.

**Status of R&R Policy in India**

In pre-independence India though there was huge displacement such as about 35 million displaced persons by British Indian industries in between 1830 and 1842 and huge land acquisition such as 84,700 sq miles of forest areas by the year 1890 through the Indian Forest Act 1865 and 99,000 sq. miles by the Forest Department by the year 1947 (Fernandes and Paranjpye, 1997:9 -10) but no policy was made available for the rehabilitation and resettlement of the affected population at that time. But after independence the partition of India forced Indian Government to evolve something for the rehabilitation of forced population displacement. Just after independence the Government of India had established a "Department of Rehabilitation" to alleviate the pains of traumatic experiences of million people displaced from Pakistan. It was continued till the late 1960s but after that was closed down. The problems of displacement and rehabilitation were further aggravated due to political causes such as political turmoil in Burma,
disturbances in Tibet and a stream of refugees from Bangladesh and due to natural disasters such as drought, flood, earthquake and cyclone. The problems of rehabilitation of the victims of such political and natural disasters had continued to plague the country but there was no policy and national level adequate programme (Fernandes and Paranjpye, 1997:1).

Besides these nature and politics made disasters; India started having man-made forced displacement through planned development projects such as dams, mines, thermal powers, industries, railways, roads, ports, national parks and urban infrastructures. Unlike natural disasters development projects are planned and subjected to human control. In planned development projects, rehabilitation and resettlement were not addressed. Otherwise, displacement could have been minimized and the Rehabilitation and Resettlement could have been provided (Fernandes and Paranjpye, 1997:2). On the other hand, the policy makers and international financial institutions started using the pretentious phrase “involuntary relocation” instead of forced eviction for such development caused displacement. The Vienna Declaration and programme of action on the basis of world conference on human rights at Vienna, June, 1998, identified forced eviction as “gross violation of human rights” that needs to be addressed (Fernandes and Paranjpye, 1997:1).

Maharastra Government was the first state to pass a law in 1976 for rehabilitation and resettlement. Orissa Government passed several government orders from 1977 which were put together into a policy for irrigation displaced persons in 1994. Madhya Pradesh passed its Rehabilitation and Resettlement Law in 1985. The Karnataka Act was passed in 1987 (Vaswani, 1992) and received President’s assent in 1994 (Fernandes and Paranjpye, 1997:16). Gradually some other state government policy guidelines on Rehabilitation and Resettlement issues came into being. Most importantly rehabilitation policies on dam projects came into being in different states. In 1980s Maharastra, Madhya Pradesh and Karnataka governments and in 1990s Orissa and Rajasthan government had enacted laws on the rehabilitation of irrigation project displaced persons (Fernandes, 2008:185). Beside these guidelines in the state level there were also different project specific R&R policies such as the policies of National Thermal Power Corporation (NTPC, 1993), revised National Thermal Power Corporation (NTPC, 2005), Coal India Ltd
(CIL, 1994) and the National Hydropower Corporation (NHPC, 2006) were formulated in India (Fernandes, 2008:185).

Only after 1985, the Central Ministry of Welfare (Government of India, 1985) appointed a committee to prepare a rehabilitation policy on tribal. It was especially on tribal displaced people because of the important report given by the National Commission for Schedule Castes and Schedule tribes that about 40 per cent of the DPs / PAPs were tribals. However, the committee suggested extending the rehabilitation policy to all the DPs along with tribals. This rehabilitation policy had to be integral to every project above a certain size of both public and private sectors. It was also made a binding on the state and the project implementation agencies to apply the rehabilitation policies recommended by the committee. After displacement of about three crore persons during four decades of planned development from 1950 to 1990 a rehabilitation policy for the displaced persons came into being on the basis of above backgrounds. The Ministry of Rural Development (MRD, 1993 & 1994) brought draft national policy for rehabilitation of persons displaced as consequent of land acquisitions (Fernandes and Paranjpye, 1997). Both drafts (MRD, 1993 & 1994) clarify the displacement for granted differently. While the first draft (1993) justifies the displacement in the name of planned growth, the second draft (1994) recognizes it as necessary. The first draft does not support displacement as a deliberate choice (Sinha, 1996:1455) but argues that planned development caused displacement was a national need. The first draft was at least sympathetic toward displaced people but the second draft did not even do that. It was also a fact that both the draft was applicable only to future DPs not to the past millions displaced and not rehabilitated since 1951 (Fernandes & Paranjpye, 1997). Neither draft recognizes rights to common property resources (CPRs) or rights to life or life with dignity (Article 21). But both drafts explain the necessity of public purposes against DPs or PAPs. The drafts also did not recognize the rights to participate in the decision making for displacement. So Fernandes rightly argued that the question of reducing displacement or questioning its rationale did not arise in the second draft (Fernandes and Paranjpye, 1997:41).
The Modified Draft Water Resource Development (WRD) Policy

The modified draft of Water Resource Development Policy (WRD, 1994) recognizes the limitations of irrigation projects on people, society and environment. The draft had some positive points such as recognition of the role of NGOs and civil societies for displacement repercussion and implementation of R&R package, limitation of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (LAA) and limitation of monetary compensation based on inadequately worked out incomplete and incorrect data (Verma, 1997:119-123).

From the above positive points, we should not assume that the draft WRD (1994) had formulated positive policy for the displaced and affected population. However, the draft WRD (1994) highlighted only land requirement of the project. Minimization of displacement was logic behind the Rehabilitation and Resettlement policy but no such alternatives i.e. evaluation of social and human cost of development, evaluation of cost and benefit including ecological and social ones at the planning stage, the assessment of land requirement by an independent body and other alternatives designs were found in the draft. Recognizing the limitation of LAA, 1984 and later acting its superiority over the people's ownership rights on their land was mere a false logic cooking before formulating the actual policy. Since public purpose was not clearly defined acquisition of land for the same should not come. But the WRD draft insisted on the statement of public purpose for which more lands than required were taken over and often misappropriated by officials (Verma, 1997:125, Vaswani, 1992:156). The amendment to land acquisition in 1984 has made further easier to the projects for land acquisition. The WRD draft makes provisions for the determination of compensation on the basis of capitalized value for the tribal lands. But the registration price as taken for the determination of the market value of land cannot be the real capitalized value. So, the draft does not say how to calculate the capitalized value without any distortion. Though the WRD draft ensures compensation to the sharecropper, agricultural labourers, artisans and others but it did not mention any compensation for those who have cultivated or lived on some land for generation but do not have record of rights. (Verma, 1997: 126).
National Policy for Resettlement and Rehabilitation (NPRR), 2003

Fernandes (2008) finds that policy formulation took a new turn in 1993 when the World Bank withdrew from the Sardar Sarovar project on the Narmada River. Consequently, the MRD (Ministry of Rural Development) prepared a draft, revised it in 1994 and in 1998. However, in 2003, the MRD finalized the draft and published in 2004 (Fernandes, 2008:185). The policy provisions are based on the size of the displacement, land for land option, one time grants for land development and agricultural production, house size plot in free of cost, grant for BPL families on house construction, monthly allowance and financial assistance to many.

This policy was applicable to the projects which displaced 500 or more families (about 2500 to 2750 persons) enmasse in the plains and 250 or more (1250 to 1350) in the hill or tribal areas known as Schedule V and Schedule VI in the Constitution of India (Fernandes, 2008:185-86). Provision for land allotment was there but subject to availability is the inbuilt contradiction to the policy itself. Similarly, one time grant, one time assistance, minimum agricultural wages not maximum or that too not more than two years, silence of gender dimension etc are some of the obvious policy bottlenecks. Without getting land options, job options, self-employment schemes and the special grants/ allowances in the actual policy practice the PAPs and DPs have to spend their compensation in unproductive ways. In fact, the NPRR, 2003 (ibid: 185-186) was finalized by the Ministry without participation of the DPs/ PAPs and civil society. The constitutional rights to life (Art 21) and dignity as interpreted by the Supreme Court are not being realized through NPRR, 2003 policy instead the displaced are being pushed into even deeper below the poverty line (Ibid: 185-186). Though NPRR (2003) policy states for the minimum displacement, it does not say how to do it. The notifying authority is to discuss with the Affected Person (AP) for rehabilitation matter but not on minimizing displacement. Unless there is pressure from the PAPs/ DPs there will be no minimization of displacement. In this way, more land is being acquired by the projects. Earlier draft at least recognized that more lands were acquired than required and previous DPs/ PAPs were not resettled. But the present draft did not acknowledge the history and pleads for only DPs' rehabilitation (ibid: 188). The policy also indirectly says that linear projects such as
railways and road do not displace more people. But it is not true since about 6600 persons due to East coast highways in Guntur district of Andhra Pradesh (Fernandes et al, 2001) and about 185 families in Goa and many more in Karnataka were displaced. It was also fact that unless the court ordered for the resettlement several thousand affected by the Mumbai-Pune express way were not resettled (ibid: 191). Land allotment option is there but its subject to the availability of government waste land. So, it recognizes the option of land allotment but skirts away its responsibility when land is not available (Fernandes, 2003).

The National Policy, 2003 has further been revised and the National Rehabilitation and Resettlement Policy, 2007 has been notified. But the national R & R policy 2007 is also not free from criticism. The National Policy, 2007 has some positive guidelines and provisions such as enumeration of rehabilitation benefits, mandatory social impact assessment, norms of compensation assessment, gamut of physical amenities and social infrastructures to be provided at the resettlement site, use of unutilized acquired land, preparation of a rehabilitation plan, updating of land records, arranging of grievance redressal and monitoring process, taking tribal development plans for the restoration of alienated tribal land, settling land rights, replacing forest for the forest lost and giving additional financial assistance. But the policy does not assure land option for land lost (Saxena, 2008:712-14). The policy does not contain the rights of people those who depend on CPRs for compensatory entitlement and provisions for countering other impoverishment risks explained by Cerenea and Downing at international level. So the revision, alteration and modification of previous draft policies for the commencement of new policy are something like old wine in new bottle.

**Status of R&R Policy in Orissa**

In Orissa there was no effective rehabilitation policy before independence. There was development-induced displacement project like inter-state Machhkkund Hydel Project which had displaced 2,938 families in the early 1940s. But only 600 (20.42 per cent) of the total displaced families (450 tribal and 150 other communities) were rehabilitated. It was also true that the scheduled caste families displaced by the project were not rehabilitated at that time (Mahapatra, 1990: Pandey, 1998a: 13). In 1948, Orissa Government had adopted "**Orissa development of industries**,
irrigation, agriculture, capital construction and resettlement of displaced persons (Land Acquisition) Act”. But this act guaranteed only compensation against acquired land, standing crops and building (Government of Orissa, 1948) without resettlement of the oustees under the Land Acquisition Act on alternative sites (Pandey, 1998a: 13).

In post independent India, Orissa did not have any uniform R & R policies till 1990 (Dalua, 1993). However, gradually different departments (public and private sectors) had framed different R&R policies. It was only in 1970s a new chapter in the history of R&R in the state of Orissa began when Rengali dam project evolved a resettlement and rehabilitation policy in 1973 (Government of Orissa, 1993; Dalua, 1993; Nath, et al, 1987). Consequently, other government orders followed such as rehabilitation policy for displaced persons of the Rengali Dam project in 1978 and of major and medium water resource projects in 1989, rehabilitation policy for different Irrigation projects in 1990 and 1992 (Government of Orissa, 1993; Dey, 1997: 215). It was in August 21, 1990 that a uniform R&R policy for different irrigation projects came into being (Pandey, 1998:13). Finally in 1994, putting all these orders together the State Government further amended the policy with active involvement of NGOs and the World Bank. Then on August 27, 1994, the policy was promulgated as the Orissa resettlement and rehabilitation of project affected persons policy, 1994 (Dey, 1997: 215). It was a liberal policy as compared to R&R policies of other projects.

In case of Hirakud Dam Multi-purpose Project, there were no specific policy guidelines. The affected persons were paid full compensation for land and property. Civic amenities in the resettlement colonies were provided and cost of reclamation of land was borne by the authorities as well as manures and fertilizers etc were supplied free of cost (Government of Orissa, 1993). But the cash compensation was given to the displaced persons and that too only patta holders were taken into consideration. The landless and homeless were left out without compensation. The dependent on Common Property Resources (CPRs) such as food gatherers, hunters, forest produce collectors and tribal artisans were not entitled to cash grant. HDM project could not grasp the loss of agrarian people (Baboo, 1992). The cash compensation was not an alternative rehabilitative compensation for the displaced agrarian persons. In case of the Hirakud dam,
Salandi irrigation project and Balimela multipurpose projects, the affected persons were compensated against their land and property only (Dalua, 1993; Pandey, 1998a). Like Hirakud Dam, the Salandi Irrigation Project funded by the World Bank also brought the same plight to the displaced persons. The project authorities had ignored the policy guidelines of the World Bank. Like Hirakud Dam, Balimela multipurpose project had also similar problems with policy guidelines. The Rengali Dam project’s R&R policy 1973 was further amended and extended to Upper Kolab and other medium irrigation projects in the state. The revised resettlement and rehabilitation policy, 1977 announced by the State Government had an improvement on earlier policies. Lands were allotted to the oustees irrespective of their status. The term displaced persons were extended to the landless, homeless, dependent on acquired land and the people who lose their livelihood due to land acquisition. A displaced family means the displaced person, his or her spouse, minor sons, unmarried daughters, minor brothers or sisters, parents and other member residing with the person and other dependent on him. In 1987, date of publication of notification under Section 4(1) of LAA 1894 was taken as a date for enumeration of families. In 1989, amendment to R&R policies, 1977 was made and according to which major sons (21 years and above) and married sons were to be treated as separate families. But the reference date for enumeration was from the date of laying the foundation stone of the project. The cost of development of homestead land, reclaiming agricultural land, laying out approach road, transportation of shifting as well as carrying house building materials, common civic amenities etc were to be borne by the government (ibid:16). Most importantly land for land provision was the positive stand of this policy.

However, R&R policy of 1977 could not look into the important problems of displaced persons. Till 1989 it did not make any difference between a joint and a nuclear family in the matters of rehabilitation package. It had left out physically handicapped, mentally retarded, widows and the divorcees. It also did not mention about non-agricultural oustees who would have been provided with alternative occupations. No employment provision was found in the policy. Especially the identity of tribal with their natural habitat and socio-economic surrounding was not taken into consideration in the policy framework. Consequently, the R&R policy,
1977 was amended and in August 21, 1990, the Irrigation Department announced a uniform R&R policy for irrigation projects which had many improved provisions on previous ones. A son above 18 years of age irrespective of marital status and physically handicapped and mentally retarded person were to be treated as a separate family unit. Minor orphans and divorcees were also taken into consideration for compensation benefits. Displaced families were provided with a homestead plot of 20 decimals and a pucca house (two rooms, a kitchen, a bathroom etc) and either 2.5 acre of unirrigated land or 1.25 acres of irrigated land along with maintenance allowance of Rs.500/- per month for one year. Fifty per cent of the unskilled and clerical posts were to be filled up from among the oustees who had the requisite qualification. The rest 50 per cent were to be filled by those oustees of other projects who had been left out unrehabilitated by the completion of those projects. Importantly role of the reputed NGOs was recognized to execute certain parts of the rehabilitation plan. The families affected by the canal system of irrigation project were compensated with land, plot and some benefits on the basis of their entitlement (ibid: 17-18).

However, the uniform R & R policy of 1990 had some shortcomings. It did not recognize unmarried women as separate family. The policy did not guarantee allotment of land for land lost by the persons who had retained their houses in the same village. As compared to joint family, the nuclear tribal families could not benefit in the same way as more eligible brothers of joint families got more land then the eligible member of the nuclear families under this revised policy. With the cash compensation of Rs.16000/- per acre for irrigated agricultural land and homestead and Rs.8000/- per acre for unirrigated land the oustees could not purchase same size of land that they had in the past. The government did not fix the cash compensation with prevalent market rate of land price. The house building assistance of Rs. 17000/- per family was also not enough to meet the rising price of building materials. Similarly maintenance allowances per family fixed at Rs.500/- per month could not help a large family. Uneducated and illiterate affected persons like SCs and STs could not avail the opportunity of employment provided by the revised policy. The policy also did not have training provision for these people (ibid: 18 -19).
The R&R policy of 1994 was a revised version of R&R policy 1990 by the Department of Water Resources in consultation with NGOs and the World Bank (Government of Orissa, 1994). Objective of this policy was to adopt the policy of World Bank to rehabilitate and resettle the affected persons in a manner so that they would not suffer from adverse effects and they would restore back to their minimum standard of living (Fernandes, 1997: 441). The R&R policy of 1994 for the first time recognized all project affected persons and also those who lost their trade and occupation for the rehabilitation and resettlement benefits.

The meaning of affected zone was made different from the affected village. While the former described that area in the project site that covers under the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, the latter was the isolated village due to the construction of water resource project. A large number of people such as unmarried daughter aged 30 years or more, share croppers/holders, widows having no livelihood and persons having occupation on encroached land but legally recognized were taken into consideration for rehabilitation benefit (ibid:18-19).

Socio-economic baseline survey was undertaken for the R&R package. The policy also stressed on allotment of land to eligible affected person in nearby submerged areas and involvement of representatives of the oustees, NGOs and the host communities in the process of planning the resettlement sites. The head of every displaced family was issued with “Pramari Patra” (identity cards) and a booklet containing information about the salient features of the project and rehabilitation programme. Other provisions included land for land in an area favourable to allottee, house building assistance revisable in every fourth year, alternative strategies such as dairy development, reservoir pisciculture, cottage industry, plantation, new or old trades or skills, vocational training and other developmental programme, etc (Fernandes, 1997:445-58). Provisions for shifting assistance and house building allowances (granted jointly) for the affected persons and the facilities of primary school, drinking water, well, village, pond, community centre, dispensary, main road, electrification, panchayat house etc at resettlement colonies were there in the policy (Fernandes, 1997:453). However, the Orissa R&R Policy, 1994 cannot be free from the following shortcomings. It did not speak of rehabilitation rights of the DPs. So, it was merely welfare measure. That too, the policy was limited to only water resource projects. It also excluded indirectly
affected families in its policy. The basis for compensation was based on the market value instead of replacement value. Rather it proposed depreciated value as the basis for compensating public properties. One had to prove his unobjectionable encroached land for compensation. Though there was a provision for escalation of maintenance allowance every year and the revision of amount in every fourth year but these were not reflected everywhere. The policy also did not spell out any compensation to be paid for the loss of trees. The provision of Lok Adalat for speedy disposal of the grievance was no doubt a welcoming step but it is made and run by the government authorities. Despite favourable statement, the policy did not have any space for the involvement of NGOs in the settlement of grievances. For instance, there was only one NGO working in the affected zones along with 17 bureaucrats and two political leaders. And that too the selection of NGOs is not specified as either by the oustees or by the authorities (Fernandes, 1997: 224-26). The withdrawal of the provision of employment benefit was also not progressive in the policy (Pandey, 1998: 21). It was seemed to be an economic rehabilitation because the loss of community support base, amenities and services, socio-cultural relationship, institutions, psychological strain and stress of displaced people were not taken into consideration. It did not come upto the expectation of a comprehensive resettlement and rehabilitation policy for the DPs and PAPs. The Orissa Government also did not enact the policy into law.

**Gender Bias in R&R Policy of Orissa**

There has been no holistic gender perspective in the rehabilitation and resettlement policy and package of different industrial and development projects in Orissa. Gender and dislocation do not seem to be mentioned anywhere in the National Policy documents, either the citizen's, the Govt's or the gender policy, let alone any state policy (Ray, 1998). According to Ray, there are many articles, provisions and commissions regarding women's rights and development such as articles 14, 15, (3), the 73rd and 74th constitutional amendment acts, the central social welfare board, the state social welfare board, the state department for women development, the national commission for women, the state commission for women, department of women and child development, gender development index, the creation of gender sensitization programme, etc. But none of these Programmes have ever placed in any section of the issues of gender and
dislocation (Mahapatra, 1998:142). The development projects like Rourkela Steel Plant, the NALCO, the ITPS, the MCL projects at Ib Valley and Talcher etc had not adopted any special measures on gender and dislocation (Pandey, 1998: 93). It does not mean that no development programme was initiated by the development projects. The Government of Orissa had issued the resolution of July 11, 1992 to provide facility for female divorcees. But it was not successful (Mahapatra, 1998: 139). The Land Acquisition Act 1894, amended in 1984 reveals gender bias by recognizing only male ownership of land (Ray, 2005: 06). Ray also points out that the land acquisition officers (LAO) are only concerned with the delivery of compensation from a fiscal perspective but they do not pay any attention to social or cultural issues (Roy, 2005: 20). She rightly observes that economic reductionism (where the conventional economic perspective assess everything on the basis of capital, profit, nature of exploitation and inequality) leads to an overlooking of cultural dimension as well as to a failure of identifying the holistic social issues (ibid: 15).

Agnihotri (1996) who had scrutinized the Orissa Resettlement and Rehabilitation of project affected persons policy (Government of Orissa, 1994) and brought about a gender parity by giving equal status of independent family to both a boy and girl of 18 years and above, finds that the Orissa policies are robust against risks 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7; i.e. 5 of 8 risks of Cernea’s IRR model. She adds gender disparity accentuates any negative impact of displacement. Ray also finds a gender disparity and relative deprivation of women and children in the policies of government, institutions, donor agencies and private parties (Ray, 2005: 20). According to Ray in Orissa, at least in rural and tribal context, laws and policies are father centric. Since the worth of men and the women are not calculated and women perspectives are not taken into consideration in the strategies of displacement and rehabilitation, the R&R package in Orissa cannot be womencentric (ibid: 16). In Orissa, one can find a male oriented perspective in the process of displacement, rehabilitation and resettlement. For instance, Ray (2005), in her study of three irrigation sub-projects (Harabhangi, Baghua and Badanalla) finds that controlling and capturing the natural resources have been the parts of the larger masculine obsession.
The Orissa Resettlement and Rehabilitation Policy, 2006

According to Mathur (2008: 560), before the commencement of Orissa Resettlement and Rehabilitation Policy, 2006, the earlier resettlement policies had many shortcomings. These policies did not make any provision for reducing the scale of displacement and hardly stressed on oustees’ livelihood reconstruction. The existing Orissa's policies on R&R are weak in regard to associating the affected people in decision making process and assigning NGO's role in the overall R&R matters. Rather these policies regard resettlement as a burden, and not as an opportunity to share development benefits with affected populations. In reaction to the above shortcomings the present Orissa’s R&R policy 2006, has been a welcoming step as many media have declared it as the best policy in India. It is designed to response to new challenges arising from development-induced displacement and development process triggered by globalization, liberalization and privatization in the state. It is an UNDP-initiated resettlement policy. It is based on the six field based research studies conducted by well known displacement experts familiar with the local situations. In this respect the policy has been unique in the state.

On the findings of the research studies on projects and human issues such as the lower Suktel Irrigation project studied by Agnihotri (2005), Coal mining projects under MCL in Angul and Jharsuguda conducted by a team led by Pandey (2005), four industrial projects (Tata Steel at Gopalpur, NTPC project at Kaniha, NALCO at Damanjodi and Bhusan Ltd at Jharsuguda) conducted by Ravindran (2005)), national highway project in Orissa studied by Ota (2005), tribal issues studied by Mahapatra (2005) and gender issues studied by Ray (2005), the feedbacks from stakeholders consultation such as consultation with the PAPs at project site, consultation at Divisional headquarters and consultation workshops at state headquarters and the lessons from the study visits of the researchers the UNDP submitted the draft resettlement policy to the Government of Orissa in July 2005 for its final consideration and promulgation. With some change the Government of Orissa finally announced the policy in May 2006 (Mathur, 2008: 560-72). Thus Orissa's Resettlement and Rehabilitation Policy 2006 came out with participatory approach of different stakeholders' consultation, field studies and some innovative provisions which are not yet common in many other policies. With better prospect
and for better future the policy has many provisions such as possible ways of avoiding / minimizing displacement, payment of due compensation before the relocation of affected people, selection of resettlement site in consultation with the displaced families, employment in projects, training for self employment, convertible preference share, provision for homestead land, assistance for self-relocation, house building assistance, provision for shop and service units and important issues like tribal issues, gender equality for rehabilitation and resettlement, scope of affected people's participation in project activities etc. Besides these, there are also redress grievance mechanism and monitoring system. But this policy is also not free from criticism. The policy is applicable to all public, private and joint sectors projects in the state. It means, it will cover all types of displacement projects such as dams, canals, flood control works, power stations, industries, mining, urban housing and shopping complexes, slums clearance, roads, railways, airports, seaports, conservation, parks/ bio-reserves/ sanctuaries, sports complexes, amusement parks and defence establishments. But it prescribes the rehabilitation benefits differently. For instance, while there is employment provision only in 'A' type and 'B' type projects, the provisions for assistance for agricultural land in 'C' type projects, either land or employment in 'D' type projects and no provision for 'E' type projects are found in the policy. In case of linear projects though there is provision for employment but it is applicable where total displacement is caused. For PAPs/DPs, it does not matter whether it was industry or non-industry project. But they lose land as their valuable and sustainable livelihood generating source. So, they want to have adequate source of replacement which is not seriously taken in the policy for rehabilitation. The policy has neither assured replacement of land for land lost nor has ensured for any durable, sustainable and dignified employment. The policy did not recognize the rights of people to have compensation for their loss of access to CPRs. The policies also did not mention the impoverishment risks as well as mechanism for mitigating these risks with counter risk actions. For survey and identification of displaced families, the role of NGOs, civil society and intellectuals are not made mandatory in the policy. Indeed the responsibility is being vested with concerned project and government authority that always tend to bypass the nature and consequences of the project. Still there is no mention of bottom up
mechanism for survey and identification of displaced families for which vested interest, corruption, favouritism, limitation of legal documents etc will be reflected at this stage. Anomaly in land acquisition act, coal bearing act and other such acts are not clearly rectified in the policy. Even the differences between different acts are not being rectified. Negotiation of price for land purchase although is being ensured in the policy but how it will be operationalised against the earlier practices of exploitation through the price of sale statistics and revenue rate is a question mark. On the other hand, the policy states that land not utilized by the project within prescribed limit shall be returned. But it is not mentioned that unutilized lands should be returned back to the people. Even after close down of the project or extraction of natural resources, the damaged areas should have been returned back to the people which is not mentioned in the policy. The policy does not have any mandatory provision for selection of the site for resettlement by the village committee, civil society, concerned social activists and intellectuals, displacement specialists and others. Instead rehabilitation and periphery development advisory committee as government body will select the site for the resettlers. Though there is provision for immediate steps by the government authority for the revenue status of the resettlement site but how it will take place where there is specific time period is required for any human habitation to become revenue village in the state. So, without changing the state level rules and regulations for the status of revenue village, taking steps to declare any site as revenue village will be futile.

**NTPC and Coalmining R&R Policy: Specific Review**

**NTPC Policy**

When the central government and state government did not have any specific rehabilitation and resettlement guidelines, the NTPC had certain basic guidelines in 1980. Since then the specific guidelines such as compensation for the lose of assets acquired by the project with a 30 per cent additional solatium, allotment of housing plot for homestead loss, community facilities (such as drinking water, dispensary, school, roads, drains, street lighting etc) in the colonies, employment in NTPC or in its associated agencies and other provisions (like petty contracts, shop, vendor license etc) were provided to PAPs by the NTPC (Verma, 204: 317-18). But the guidelines were neither sufficient nor were implemented effectively in the project affected area. Either employment or shop allotment (not both) was to be provided to the nominee of land oustees based on a merit list prepared by the
NTPC (Mathur and Marsden, 1998:159-161). These merit list guidelines were also not as useful for the displaced and affected people as there was no scope of participation for their employment and shop allotment.

The earlier NTPC project also had provision for socio-economic survey to ascertain the PAPs socio-economic status. On the basis of this survey, it was supposed to have remedial action plan (RAP) to focus on community facilities, training and upgrading of skills and opportunities and improvement of PAPs through the integrated rural development programme. But no where in India it was found that the NTPC policy was applied through the integrated rural development programme. There was also provision for a village to be adopted for the example of developing other villages as model villages (Fernandes and Paranjpye, 1997:342-44). But it was nothing but high sounding provision which remained in the provision itself. Since the policy guidelines were not enough the NTPC brought new policy guidelines in 1991 and 1993. However, the NTPC suddenly decided to frame common R&R policy in 1993. It was because of the compliance with social and environmental safeguard conditionality, to satisfy the requirement of funding agencies, to have sectoral policy of each project (mines, water, industry etc) and to declare that NTPC has R&R policy in a national and international level. So, the policy was formulated to address others but not to project displaced and affected people. In fact, NTPC's R&R policy formulated in 1991 and revised in 1993 addressed the individual as basic unit rather than family for its R&R package (Mathur and Marsden, 1998:160). The preamble of Resettlement Policy, 1993 though contains many important guidelines for the displaced and affected population but still it missed out many problems. For instance, it says that since the NTPC projects located in remote rural areas and displaces the rural population it will take affected persons (PAPs) in such way that they will improve or at least regain their previous standard of living. This objective in preamble seems to improve the economic standard of living but not socio-cultural and psychological living of the oustees. To improve or at least to regain previous standard of living is a hypothetical proposition. The statements are also not empowered with the words like must, should or mandatory provision for the NTPC to implement it in reality. There was also provision in the policy that NTPC (1993) would review and modify its R&R policy on the basis of national R&R policy as and when finalized
and adopted. But its review and modification was to be done if national R&R polices were suitable for thermal power projects. In this sense, NTPC gives priority to its own convenience. It does not clear its stand either for a compromise or in favour of the people. Since its stand is to work in close collaboration with concerned state government, the NTPC policy will be implemented within the framework of locally applicable law. Here also the preamble plays an ambiguous stand as if its stand on displacement, rehabilitation and resettlement is destined to fall.

The preamble also says that NTPC's effort is complementary to rural development process. But the preamble does not contain any provision of collaboration between rural development programme and NTPC's R&R policy in clear-cut levels (Fernandes and Paranjpye, 1997:31). Though the NTPC recognizes the different basis of R&R policy for DPs but mostly rely on its own needs than needs of others. Because of this, NTPC has managed to ignore the problems of displaced and affected population. It is clear that since displacement is inevitable and unavoidable, rehabilitation of PAPs and environmental safeguards are given lower priority. Why does NTPC authority give priority to involuntary displacement and forcible eviction of PAPs? Might be, authority did not want the PAPs to demand their voluntary displacement. Rather it washes its hands by following the law of public domain or in the name of public purpose. It also says that people have no choice but to face the involuntary displacement, eviction and the new social set up. It also acknowledges that PAPs will find it increasingly difficult to cope with the new environmental set up and when age old rural environment changes into a semi urban environment, initially the cost of living will rise but the traditional source of income will likely to be reduced. But how to cope up in the new setting is not elaborately given by the projects. There should have been more clarity on coping up needs for both Project Displaced Persons in particular and PAPs in general. NTPC wanted its problems of coping with new environment by some possible means that came as R&R policy for the PAPs and DPs. Though it acknowledges the alternative drastic changes in their land use pattern it hardly uses the word "sustainable alternative economic system" (Fernandes and Paranjpye, 1997:31-32). It has got Rehabilitation Action Plan (RAPs) for PAPs to improve or at least regain their previous standard of living, earning capacity and
production level and to minimize their transition gap. It also ensures that NTPC will continue its rehabilitation activities until such time as it has taken all actions to achieve these above hypothetical statements. But it has neither the human rights issues nor the issues of preventing impoverishment risks. In the name of transition phase as it indirectly says that after sometime everything will be set rights but how could it be possible, the preamble is silence (ibid:332). It seems that project authorities somehow facilitate the activities of R&R programme. But the policy does not clear it. For instance, since NTPC policy (1993) does not have provision for special R&R cell, project personnel are given additional charges. More often these project officers feel their additional charges as burdensome or punishment job designed by the projects (Fernandes and Paranjpye, 1997:147). It is also fact that taking executives from the corporate centre for additional charges at site work is neither desirable for the executives nor adequate staffing for the R&R implementation. There are some eligibility criteria to become PAP such as (i) person losing entire land, (ii) person left with land that is economically not viable (less than 2 hectares), (iii) person whose homestead is acquired, (iv) person whose homestead and land is acquired (v) person in actual possession of land (tenant/tiller) (vi) agricultural labourers (vii) tribal residing or deriving livelihood from forest land (viii) landless person cultivating government land, (ix) a person having client relationship with displaced communities, (x) a person has joint holding or joint share in the land or homestead (may be in joint family), (xi) permanent resident of the area which was acquired but not defined above and (xii) absentee land owner or absentee homestead owner who is not in actual possession of the land or homestead for five years prior to the date of notification (Fernandes and Paranjpye,1997:333-35). So, these eligibility criteria are either based on land related losses (agricultural land, forest land, homestead land and permanent resident of the land) or land dependents (mostly tenants, agricultural labourers, directly or indirectly involved client with land losers displaced communities). But these criteria do not include some problems of some people like women and dalit. For instance, there is no mention of dalits or lower castes those who also depend upon the forest lands to be eligible for PAP. More often in India, women have no ownership status over land and homestead property and though they directly and indirectly help out in the agricultural process but hardly regarded as agricultural labourers, tenant cultivators, share croppers, or client
based on jajmani relation. Of course, they do all type of work but do not claim the status. So to say, they may not be included in these categories of PAPs. So gender dimension is missing in the policies. Since it is referred as project affected persons not project affected people, only the owner of land as a person, no mention of gender, caste, tribe and minority clearly specified. So they may be cultivators, land owners, homestead landowners, share croppers, tenants, agricultural labourers, tribals, joint landed property holders, and permanent resident of the area from whom land was acquired by the project. Temporary business man from other village in same locality, temporary migrants who live in rented house and other such invisible cases are not taken into consideration for compensation entitlement. Fly ash affected and also sometime ash ponds affected people are slipped out of becoming PAPs. According to Fernandes (1999) the status of each category of persons or families must be subjected to RAP entitlement procedures such as the cut off date of notification under the land acquisition act, section 4(i). The patta holder can produce written legal document but the tenants, seasonal labourers and agricultural labourers, client servers can neither produce written document nor produce reference card. In such case, people may not only be left out of the PAPs category but also they have to face difficulty to prove their case. It seems that the RAP and the criteria for PAPs are there to illuminate the fake or fraud claim but there is nothing to check that anybody is left out or missed out for the PAPs eligibility due to the cumbersome procedures. The absentee land owner or absentee homestead owner has no mention of entitlement under RAP (Fernandes and Paranjpye, 1997:334-35).

In NTPC Policy, the calculation of the losses and asset for compensation is not based on the principle of replacement costs. NTPC should have calculated the compensation value by using the District Schedule of Rates (DSR). The R&R policy was not being proposed for its retrospective application to the affected families under Remedial Action Plan (RAP) (Paranjpye and Kewartramani, 1997:143-48).

One thing is very important that NTPC is not optimistic in its policy regarding the availability of land options and unnecessarily imposes condition over the issues. The word if, but or subject to availability are suspicious or avoiding formula creeps into policies. The maximum land allotment also limited to two hectares of suitable
land. The PAP opting for land allotment identified by the land purchase committee within 25km radius in the vicinity of project area subject to two alternative options only (subject to availability). Another shortcoming may be a PAP who chooses this option will not be entitled to any other rehabilitation except transport assistance (ibid: 337-38').

When alternative land is not available and not acceptable to PAPs or the PAPs those who are not entitled to land for land option will be getting a variety of income generating schemes (ibid:338). After displacement the policy provisions for homestead plot, self-employment schemes, shop, job, training, community facilities etc are also not free from the criticism. For instance, eligible PAPs will be given only a developed plot (50X40 sq) free of cost at new place and evaluation of lost homestead and land are done under the land acquisition act. Self-employment schemes do have also shortcoming. For instance, as NTPC claims that most viable rehabilitation options such as dairy, poultry, handicraft etc with a finance of Rs.15000 per family will be generating self employment prospect for the PAPs (ibid:338). But subject to NTPC regular review and adjustment and establishment of such schemes channelised through banks may not bring the success. Because of lack of willingness of NTPC authorities and corruption involved in bank financing may make these schemes complicated. As in rural area involving government or public institution means opening up the scope for others to get share of the project benefits. For the sake of construction of shop without taking into account the need, market and capacities of PAPs in the locality such schemes are bound to fail. Other provision like awarding petty contracts to the PAPs on preferential basis without training them or giving them contracting license from the respective state government will lead to the entry of other outside contractors who may, on behalf of PAP make benefits. The contractors will be persuaded to give jobs to eligible PAPs on preferential basis. Though policy mentions that NTPC will pay the vocational training cost including tuition, residential charges, books and stationery requirement charges, it does not give job commitment. However, it gives preference to vocationally trained PAPs for company jobs if they have capability and aptitude and met the job requirement. But NTPC will train the people and develop their aptitude and capacity. It increases the hope of getting jobs after training but their hope may not be
translated into reality since it does not give any job commitment. It means for the sake of giving training to PAPs it gives and forgets about their employment. The hidden motive behind the training is clear and visible to a serious researcher. According to Paranjpye and Kewartramani (1997:145), community facilities provided by the NTPC projects are inadequate. Permanent Ash ponds with adequate maintenance mechanism, cremation ground, building for sacred groves or temples, community centre, fodder and firewood groves etc should have been there in the policy.

However, the positive contribution of NTPC policy cannot be undermined. More importantly, NTPC's provision for job opportunities and different means of livelihoods to the oustees, imparting vocational training in over 20 different trades (poultry, dairy, handicraft etc) and providing innovative community facilities are being implemented in different states. The NTPC, through its proposed Rehabilitation Action Plans (RAP) covers several tasks such as making legal instrument and regulations, complying objectives of R&R, making maps, doing baseline socio-economic survey, ensuring community participation and integration with host populations, evolving mechanism to select alternative sites, evaluating losses and allocating plan for resettlement and rehabilitation, estimating cost and financial plan, making responsibility, organization and staffing and time table for implementation of RAP, monitoring and evaluating, consulting with representatives of government, district authorities, village panchayat and concerned NGOs (Fernandes and Paranjpye, 1997:340).

However, it does not make it mandatory for the concerned projects clearly. As a result, the Rehabilitation Action Plans (RAP) has not been implemented properly involving the project affected people. In fact, the NTPC does not address the problems of multiple displacements in its R&R policy. For example, in Rihand dam and Singrauli power plant, there were instances of double and triple displacement. The NTPC policy states that it involves the project authorities for limited period which would phase out these activities as early as possible leaving the DPs to manage their own affairs (Paranjpye and Kewartramani, 1997:139). NTPC does not take full responsibilities for restoring the economic livelihood and dignity of affected population. One time compensation and short time rehabilitation policy of NTPC contradict the rehabilitation policy guidelines of the ministry of environment.
In this respect NTPC should at least take 10 to 15 year time to complete the rehabilitation process. NTPC's argument of not giving land for land option because of land scarcity is illogical. Only after land acquisition compensation is paid. Consequently the transition period from displacement to rehabilitation gets longer. For example, in case of Ramagundam, resettlement process began in 1981 but only after 1994, the project could complete the process of resettlement. NTPC policy has the alternative options but if one opts out for land for land option then he would not get job option simultaneously. In this way, son of agricultural cultivator will become a cultivator not a job holder and if he will be jobholder he cannot be land owner. It seems that from beginning to end the NTPC R&R policy is based on its conditionality than a clear-cut policy. In 1994-95, some development on NTPC policy guidelines were taken place which includes establishment of Village Development Advisory Committee (VDAC), Public Information Centre (PIC), Rehabilitation Action Plan (RAP) for the old projects, recruitment of sociologists for better co-ordination between PAPS and NTPC, induction of adviser at corporate centre from social science background to advise NTPC, appointment of consultants for various income generating schemes (IGS) and Involvement of NGOs. But the idea of bridging the gap between the PAPs and NTPC officials through these institutions as suggested by world community has hardly materialized in the absence of effective co-ordination of project authority. The VDAC (comprised of the representatives from district government, local NGOs, Gram Pradhan or Sarapanch, representatives of the oustees and officers of NTPC) was formulated to incorporate the members from diverse area and to discuss the problem of PAPs and to eradicate the problems as well. But the VDAC hardly functioned and mostly remained as paper work only. According to the finding of Verma (2004) in his study of NTPC project the affected villagers complain that the meeting of VDAC seldom takes place and in case it does, the representatives are not informed in advance. In the absence of representatives from the oustees, only NTPC agenda is discussed in the meeting. So Verma argues that the plight of the victims remains unheard and ignored without any solution. He also finds that the affected villagers complained that the public information centre (PIC) also does not function and remain closed all the time and opens only when some dignitaries visit the place. The public information centre (PIC) meant for transparency in activities done by NTPC and has a public library
Coal India Ltd (CIL)

The largest mining organization in the country, Coal India Ltd (CIL) did not face much problem in acquiring land in the 1970s and early 1980s. According to Banerjee (2004) during 1973 and 1993, a total of 33,470 land losers were employed by the subsidiaries of CIL in those days though provision for a job to at least one member of each displaced family who lost a minimum size of two acres of irrigated land or three acres of unirrigated land. But the CIL did not have corporate guidelines for rehabilitation of the displaced peoples in those days. In the absence of such guidelines for rehabilitation the LAA Act or the CBAA Act did not provide any assistance for tenant farmers, sharecroppers, squatters, unemployed youth, small traders and agricultural labourers who did not lose landed property to the project. Like NTPC's practice of erecting a boundary wall at the very start of a project it was not possible for the CIL in adopting the same practice in coal projects. To overcome such problems the CIL adopted an R&R policy in 1994 in tune with the thinking of World Bank OD 4.30 of 1990 on involuntary resettlement that the Project Affected Persons (PAPs) improve or at least regain their former standard of living or earning capacity after a reasonable period of transition. This Policy had three important improvements over the previous rehabilitation practices in the mining industry. First, it recognized every adult member of the land owner's family as the unit of entitlement than only one from each family in the earlier practice. Second, it also recognized that landless people, squatters and tribal residing in the village being acquired are also eligible for R&R assistance. Third, the policy requires the coal subsidiaries to provide some minimum community facilities such as school, road with street light, public drain, pond, dug well/ tube well for drinking water supply, community centre, place of worship, dispensary, grazing land, etc, at the resettlement sites. This policy considers adult individuals above 18 years of age as unit of entitlement. But it divides the PAPs into two categories such as (1) landowners, including those with whom government land is settled and sub-settled and (2) landless who derive their livelihood from the land to be acquired (for a minimum of three years prior to
the date of notification). The former category has three sub-categories such as (a) persons from whom land is acquired, (b) persons whose homestead is acquired and (c) persons from whom land and homestead land are acquired and the latter category has also three sub-categories such as (a) sharecroppers, land lessees, tenants and day labourers (b) tribal dependents on forest produce and (c) persons whose homestead is acquired. The policy ignores the forest land cultivators and those tribal, Dalits and backward castes who were dependent on the forest produce for decades not as land owners (Fernandes and Paranjpye, 1997:158).

The policy has five rehabilitation packages such as package- A for the project employment facility, package-B for the land for land option, package-C for the agricultural self employment, package-D for the Rehabilitation Assistance and package-E for the assistance for housing structure. But this package option is not equally applicable to each PAP. Those who opts Package-B will not get other benefits except transportation. The homestead-loser, sharecroppers, land lessees, tenants and daily labourers will be denied employment benefits. So, the policy does not ensure either to improve or to guarantee the earlier standard of living of PAPs/DPs after displacement. The policy, 1994 was revised further in 2000. But the offer of employment against land acquisition became more difficult for the project in the revised policy as it requires approval of Board of Directors of the concerned subsidiary company. Rather the policy has an alternative provision for payment of one time cash grant (Rs. one lakh for the first acre and Rs. 75 000 each for subsequent acres of land) in lieu of employment. It has also provision for jobs with contractors and assistance for non-land-based self employment and the issue of photo identity cards to each entitled project affected person eligible for economic rehabilitation benefits, based on a socio-economic survey of the affected area. Another important institution known as Coal Sector Environmental and Social Mitigation Project (ESMP) funded by World Bank from 1996 to 2002 was evolved for the planning and implementation of the Resettlement Action Plans and to mitigate the environmental and social impacts deriving from the investment component of the Coal Sector Rehabilitation Project (CSRP). In 1996 CIL went for a large-scale financial support from the World Bank Coal Sector Rehabilitation Project for its 25 opencast mines.
On June 21st 2001, a formal complaint against World Bank's violation of its own policies was made to World Bank's Inspection Panel (IP) by PAPs of one village of Parej East through the Chhotanagpur Adivasi Sewa Samiti, a local NGO. The IP had made two visits to Jharkhand for the spot inquiries and interviews. The IP had listed about 30 violations of Bank's own policies with a further 10 issues of serious concern. The Bank Management was supposed to response to IP's 100 page report with suggestions for remedial actions (Herbe and Dutt, 2004: 2403-09). The main issue raised by the PAP petitioners to the World Bank Inspection Panel (IP) was about income restoration or economic rehabilitation. The IP reported that income restoration programme has been failed as PAPs are forced to spend their left over compensation simply to survive suffering from losses and harm due to delays in restoring their income potential (ibid). PAPs petitioners complained that significant number of PAPs had settled on their relatives' lands in other places, many live in the adjacent local sale coal dump and other live by running pilfered coal on cycles to local market. Rather illegal activity of taking coal and selling has been developing in coal mining areas (ibid). But it was a hypothetical question.

The CIL has been always giving a hope of naukari (jobs) as "a bargaining chip" (called World Bank, 1996) to get people to willingly give their land over for the mining projects. Unfortunately, in spite of the radical curtailment of jobs, the CIL still uses job as bargaining chip. The World Bank Inspection Panel (IP) had criticized this method of artificial creation of job expectation. The Coal India Limited replied that jobs were neither available nor possible to provide to all PAPs (ibid). The World Bank Inspection Panel observed that land for land option was never offered in any of the subsidiaries it visited. In fact, a radical curtailment of workforce in the CIL subsidiaries was one of the conditions for the coal sectors loans by the Banks. Most importantly the curtailment of workforce was being implemented through voluntary retirement schemes, retrenchment and radical reduction in new employment by mechanized processes (ibid). So naukari (job) was no more offered to the PAPs as a compensation entitlement. Though the failure of self-employment opportunities was recognized by the bank management but puts the blame back on to the PAPs.

According to IP's report, in baseline survey of the rehabilitation action plan (1994) nothing was indicated about the counseling PAP's for self-employment options. It
was also misleading to advocate training or self-employment as the means to restore PAPs’ standard of living in East Parej. At most, self-employment options only provide a supplementary source of income to the PAPs. According to the panel reviews there were several difficulties regarding land compensation such as inadequate compensation, compensation without full replacement cost, only 30 per cent solatium which was less than replacement cost, under reporting of sale prices, the sale price based on rates at the date of notification and not date of payment (sometime 10 years difference) and lack of transparency in compensation details.

An Overview on Land Acquisition Act in India

Land Acquisition Act.

The LAA 1894, amended in 1984 is used to acquire the lands for the different projects in India. In the law of right of eminent domain, state can have monopoly over land and community resources. This is like terra nullius (Australia, New Zealand, Canada, USA and other countries) which means land and community resources without individual title belong to none. In India too, land without individual patta is state property and state alone has the right to decide what a public purpose is. Government is empowered to acquire land for the public purpose but the term public purpose is not defined exhaustively till today. Government acquires land for private company in the name of public purpose but it is more often misused. Though there is provision for objection but it is only at the notification stage that too time period of objection is only one month. Under this act government can cut short the entire process of notices and objections in case of urgency or emergency. But the term urgency or emergency is not being defined clearly. LAA gives only cash compensation that too to interested party and to those who have lost landed property but it ignores landless labourers and artisans. Compensation is given to land patta holders not for CPR dependants. Replacement value is the right value as it is equal to the cost of the land, the cost of crops/ trees grown multiplied by 20 years. But compensation is given on market value than replacement value of land. There is provision for employment for land dependents but not for those whose livelihood is based on wood, forest produce, grazing etc. There is only provision for payment of reasonable expenses for changes of residence and business due to land acquisition. Since notification date
treated as date of valuation, there is no provision for the subsequent increase in the value. Even values of standing crops and trees are also decided on market rate since notification. Though provision for a Committee (members from government, project authorities, PAPs, NGOs) is there to plan, monitor and direct the entire process of acquisition, compensation and rehabilitation but it hardly works out in favour of the PAPs needs. LAA does not opt for non-displacing or least displacing alternatives before displacing the people. All lands are acquired under land acquisition act 1894 and 1984(amended). But this LAA does not recognize the claims of the people who depend on common property resources (CPRs). Even the amendment to LAA 1894 makes land acquisition easier. As before its amendment state government could not able to acquire land alone and the public sector had to get it through government and the private sector had to buy it from the open market. After amendment the public sector can acquire land directly and the private sector can do so through the government. Most importantly this LAA, 1984 is also based on the principle of eminent domain. So, displacement is taken for granted in the name of eminent domain or public purpose.

**Coal Bearing Act**

Under the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition Development) Act (CBAA), 1957, the Central government can acquire coal bearing land. Government is empowered to cut down standing crops or a fence or jungle. CBAA has provision for the compensation of license holders, licensee and person interested in the form of reimbursement of expenses. The expenses are expenditures incurred in the license, preparing maps, charts or other document for collecting minerals ores from the land, constructing roads or any essential work on the land, prospecting land. Coal bearing act gives ministry of coal to acquire land without involving state governments. It involves state government in some exceptional cases. Under this act the district collector decides about the compensation based on claims of land owners and other evidences such as sale of similar land in recent past and the sale of land subject to taxation. Market value of land/property, 12 per cent per annum from the date of preliminary notification and a solatium of 30 per cent of market value are important compensation provisions under this act (Adhikari & Ghosh, 2005:18). But in order to reduce tax liability, the land owners usually
reports sale price lower than actual price. So, neither sale price nor government taxation price helps the PAPs to get the actual value of their land. As a result of this a deflated price is being decided (Adhikari & Ghosh, 2005:18).

Apart from LAA and CBAA, there are also other acts which acquire land in India. National Highways Act (NHA) came into effect in 1957 (amended in 1977, 1993, 1995 and 1997). Central Government may issue a notification in the official gazette and designate any person or authority as a competent authority and give them power to perform specific function under this act (Adhikari & Ghosh, 2005).

Under the Maneuvers Field Firing and Artillery Practice (MFFAP) Act, land is acquired for Army, Navy and Air Force. The affected persons can claim compensation for any damage to life, or property or interference with their rights and privileges. It has compensation for the loss of wages. In other acts there is provision of compensation only. This is the only act where the damage must be repaired. But it is not being mentioned in LAA and CBAA. Under the Wildlife Protection Act neither anybody challenges nor does anybody object to this act. But there is provision that person's rights taken away must be given compensation. Under the Indian Forest Act, 1878 (amended in 1927), forest settlement officers take into the rights of people. The land losers, dependent on shifting cultivation, pasture and forest produce may claim compensation but the government can withdraw its decisions anytime regarding acquiring the forest land and accepting claim or rejecting them, without ascertaining any reason.

Cost Benefit Analysis

Since cost benefit analysis depends upon the market value quantification of other assets is limited to the marketable commodities of the formal economy. For example, under Land Acquisition Act, 1894, the market value compensation for tree is based on the price of timber but not of food and energy it produces for the people. The market value of the assets in the backward or tribal area is extremely low. The tribals are not able to set themselves in the process of market economy. Most DPs being powerless, are not able to make their voices heard despite the economic, social, cultural and psychological dispossession they suffer (Areeparampil, 1989:26).

Though the policy drafts recognize for the compensation of CPRs losses and inclusion of the cost of rehabilitation in the project's budget other aspects such as
social and environmental impacts, psychological trauma, and cost of transaction on the displaced and affected population are not being included in compensation policy (Fernandes and Paranjpye, 1997:40-42).

The cost benefit analysis also limits itself to pre-construction economic planning of the project. It does not take into account the post-construction cost escalation. In both dam and industrial projects, post-construction cost is escalated due to improper project planning. For instance, a study of major dam projects by the Comptroller and Auditor General shows that hardly any of the dams was completed without ten year time overrun and 500 per cent cost overrun and most of them function at less than 50 per cent of their installed capacity (Singh, Kothari and Amin, 1992 quoted in ibid ). Even many of their life span has been reduced to half due to deforestation in their catchments area and siltation of their reservoir. In case of industrial project, the Fertilizer Corporation Plant at Talcher in the Angul district of Orissa faced cost escalation from 95 crores to 216 crores and it runs at 40 per cent of its installed capacity. Hardly these things are taken into account by the projects (Fernandes and Paranjpye, 1997:40-42).

Benefit Sharing

The first draft though realized the importance of benefit sharing as few benefits of projects has reached to the DPs, it could not ensure how could it be possible to provide such benefit like T.N Singh's formula (1967) of one job for one DP family when there is mechanization of projects and reduction in unskilled jobs. The second draft omits this reference as mechanization and job reduction are an integral part of liberalization. At least, the first draft recognizes the importance of distribution of benefits and burden but second draft omits both introductory section and the reference to benefits. The second draft states that development projects raise the questions of equity, fairness, justice and equality before law. But this is not enough without its procedure for implementation (ibid: 42-43).

Though both draft insist on the job creation by displacing agency along with technical training and preferences to be given to DPs and for other job planning like self employment and cooperatives but it could not ensure how to avail these to the unskilled, poor, powerless and illiterate DPs (ibid:43). Even construction works are done by the outsiders and the DPs cannot help to stop these outsiders. It is because they do not have any legal rights to work. This type of construction
work is temporary in nature. The self-employment provision like business economic activities for DPs cannot work without social investment by the project. The DPs may not able to compete with rich merchants and moneylenders (ibid :).

The Discrimination of Women in Orissa

The discrimination of women in Orissa is deep rooted in the system of male lineage property inheritance. Compensation payment is usually given to the male heads leaving women at the mercy of the men folk (Ray, 2005: 28). According to Pandey (1998), compensation amount as a collective asset of the family unfortunately was owned solely by the male heads which not only deprived women’s rights in pre-displacement period but also exposed them into a higher risk of future deprivation. Families with daughters’ only, single mother parent with only daughter is neglected in multifarious ways (Ray, 2005: 26). For instance, 19 per cent of total 1361 PAPs were widows in Mahanadi Chitrotpala Irrigation Project (MCIP). Unfortunately, about 34 physically and mentally challenged female PAPs, 29 divorcees and 35 unmarried daughters above the age of 30 years and 22 widows out of 323 PAPs in the Badanalla irrigation project had not received any R&R package. Ray rightly says that there are always value loaded factors involved while compensating a widow (Ray, 2005: 6-7). It is because a divorcee woman has to prove that she is divorced. For this she has to go for court affidavit and produce it before the officer-in-charge of the rehabilitation. As women are mostly illiterate, they often do not know the importance of divorcee certificate. Many people desert their wife without a formal divorce. It is entirely in the mercy of officer-in-charge of rehabilitation who takes a decision on the merit of the case. (Ray, 1998: 139-40). Women’s access to common properly resources were neither grasped during the social assessment nor compensated for them by the authorities (Ray, 2005: 31). The women were not only accruing their income from common property resources but also used to have a vital socio-cultural links with them. For instance, rural women from tribal communities used to have an independent livelihood source from Upperjonk Irrigation Project (Ray, 2005: 31). Now women are marginalized because of their dislocation from CPRs and their dependency on projects. Loss of their earning from agricultural and non-agricultural sources and from non-firm activities like handicrafts, cottage
industries, petty business and livestock rearing has been the reality after displacement (Pandey, 1998a: 93-94).

The studies of Pandey (1998a) and Ray (2005) in Orissa reveal that industry created jobs mostly give preference to men. In Orissa, except NALCO project none of the displacement causing development projects taken up in the state has provided jobs to women (Pandey, 1998a). Unfortunately, project authority in Orissa and R&R policy failed to treat both men and women oustees equally. Interestingly, even industrial training institutes set up by the projects mostly promoted men for skill formation and to impart technical education (Ray, 2005: 17). For instance, in case of NTPC project the women folk had failed to receive technical education imparted by ITI because of their cultural background and lack of educational qualification (Ray, 2005: 25). Age parity in R&R for both men and women is not mentioned in policy. For instance, MCL policy states that the sons above the age of 18 are treated as separate families. But there is no mention of women above the age of 18 in the policy (Ray, 1998: 140). Sexual division of labour and wage disparity is also found in industrial complexes. Women used to play vital role in the family, community and society prior to their displacement. But the project authority does not consider the importance of women's decision regarding compensation, displacement, shifting and resettlement. It is not that project authority does not know the fact but they deliberately discriminate women, so that men folk agree to them easily.

Gender Rights

Mere acknowledgement of women as the worst sufferers due to displacement, without adequate provision in the R&R policy for their solutions does not serve the gender interest. There is provision for separate sites for major sons but not for the major or unmarried daughters. Even allotment of lands is not made in the name of couple with joint holding status. The tribal women and caste women are not equal in their social status and the gender discrimination further lowers the status of lower caste women. Tribes, castes, genders and other sociological factors are done away with in the name of pure economic criteria for compensation.
Rehabilitation as Rights

It is all important to recognize that proper resettlement and rehabilitation of people displaced and negatively affected by the development projects is a matter of right. However, all such R&R policies framed at the national level as well as project specific policies have so far failed to give justice to the oustee population. This is more or less evidently clear from our review of various R&R policies and impact evaluation studies of various development projects carried out by the researchers and social activists at different points of time. No doubt, the R&R policy often provides for a detail survey about human resource base such as individual economic status of family members, ownership of movable and immovable property, deprivation of property (including lands, structures, trees, houses either occupied or owned with tenancy rights or even as encroachers or de facto possessors), deprivation of means of livelihood due to development projects such as loss of property, loss of access to clientele, loss of jobs and gainful employment, deprivation of community life, (communities and services, socio-cultural relationship and institutions and places of historical and cultural values) and loss of habitats and lands; degradation of land and water resources, impact of degradation on health and people and the like (Fernandes, 1997). But without adequate mechanism these are meaningless.

The Policies though have been undergoing changes; still lack so many socio-cultural and human concerns. The issues like human rights, human dignity, civil rights, tribal rights and their access to common property resources, gender rights, disable rights and overall rights to rehabilitation and resettlement are not found in the policies. Even the Allahabad high court rejects displacement as rights to rehabilitation in the matter of job to the displaced persons. Till today the category like PAPs/DPs are not being recognized as legal terms. They are being defined not by the constitution of India but by the respective policy guidelines of the projects. So no body can challenge it in the court of law. Though the provision of compensation, rehabilitation and resettlement has been changing from time to time, project to projects and state to state the basic philosophy of pro-projects and anti-people remain same.

Though there are provisions for DPs participation in rehabilitation process and their organization to join the implementing agency, no such possibilities are
practiced. Involvement of NGOs in rehabilitation envisaged but sometime priority is given to the pro project NGOs in reality. In true sense, the tribals as CPRs dependents and the dalits as caste community service dependents are supposed to be compensated and resettled, but how would they be resettled without the same CPRs and community service sources of livelihood. Agricultural inputs are to be supplied with free of cost. But how would the land allotees make use of such facilities unless they get adequate replacement land. More often, the state government does not replace land with a plea of shortage of land. Thus, on the whole, the various development projects have caused displacement of human population and have mostly caused impoverishment risks among the oustee population, especially the marginalized and agriculture dependent ecosystem people including tribals and dalits in India. There are very few instances where displacements caused by development projects have become win-win situation for both the oustee and beneficiary population. Hence, in the light of this the present study critically examines the resettlement and rehabilitation of the displaced people of mining and industrial projects in Orissa, who were displaced about 20 years back by the central public sector undertakings.