Chapter - 6

Displacement Effects
and People’s Survival Strategy
It has been revealed from our analysis of present socio-economic condition of oustees of both MCL and NTPC projects in the previous chapter that notwithstanding rise in money income and reduction of poverty incidence level in the post displaced years, the oustees in general are not happy with their R&R status. They feel deprived in many respects vis-à-vis unaffected people sharing benefits of these development projects. In the light of this, the present chapter deals with analysis of R&R policy provisions of these two projects, affected people's protest movement against the projects, their grievances against compensation and present major problems, people's survival strategy and the major findings relating to our research objectives of the study.

Mahanadi Coalfields Limited (MCL) and its R&R Policy

Mahanadi Coalfields Limited (MCL) was established on 3rd April 1992 with its corporate headquarters at Sambalpur in Orissa. This is now ranked as the second highest coal producing and second highest profit-making coal company in India. Since MCL is a part of the public sector CIL, it follows the R & R policy of CIL. However, inter alia it is mentioned in the policy that the subsidiary company will follow the R&R policy of the state government if the same is beneficial to the land oustees. Before the formation of MCL as a separate subsidiary company, it was part of the undivided company South Eastern Coal Limited (SECL) with its headquarters located at Bilaspur of present Chhattisgarh. At that time the Government of Orissa had framed and approved a new R&R policy for the displaced families of the then SECL projects at Sambalpur and Dhenkanal districts on 2/1/1989 after modifying the old policy guideline of 2/6/1988 and 8/11/1988. Accordingly, the MCL projects taken up in Angul-Talcher belt in early 1990s followed the R&R Policy 1989 of the Government of Orissa.

Eligibility Criteria for R & R Benefit

In the R&R Policy 1989 adopted by the MCL, the displaced and project-affected families were categorized into four groups such as ‘Group A’, ‘Group B’, ‘Group C’ and ‘Group D’. Families losing their all lands to project were included in ‘Group-A.
'Group B' included all such families who lost more than 1/3rd agricultural land along with homestead land. 'Group C' included those families who lost only the homestead land and 'Group D' included all houseless/homestead less persons residing in the acquired village. For the eligibility for R & R benefit, a family in the aforesaid context included both husband and wife or either of the two as the case may be and their unmarried children. However, according to this policy a major son separated from the family on or before the date of notification under Section 4(1) of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 was to be treated as a separate family.

According to the policy, employment was to be given on 1st priority basis to one member of each family that lost dwelling house, homestead land and agricultural land not less than 1/3rd of the total holding. The 2nd priority category for employment to one member of each family included those families who lost 3 acres of non-irrigated land or 2 acres of irrigated land. In the 3rd priority category, employment was to be given to one member of each family that lost only homestead land or the total agricultural holding but subject to availability of job. The 4th priority for employment to one person of each affected family in the project was to be given to all such families who lost 1/3rd of the total agricultural holding, but subject to availability of job. Rehabilitation of other displaced families was to be made through self employment schemes.

Apart from that each displaced family was to be allotted reclaimed government land up to 10 decimals for homestead purpose free of cost. The policy further made provision for assistance at the rate of Rs.2000/- for construction of temporary shed. According to policy guidelines, the following basic civic infrastructures and services such as road, drainage, electricity, street lights, school building, health centre, provision of drinking water, recreation centre, ponds, tanks, playground, veterinary centre, tree plantation, shopping centre, etc. were to be provided in the resettlement colonies as per the state norm for provision of basic services and amenities to people. Added to all these the policy further stipulated that if any rehabilitation package finalized by Government of India, Department of Coal towards compensation in lieu of loss of earnings would automatically be applied to the rehabilitation schemes of the Company.
Critical Analysis of the MCL R&R Measures

The policy clearly shows that there was no provision of employment to "C" and "D" category land oustee families. The policy also does not mention what to do with the left out patches of plots not acquired by the project. It also does not specify the mechanism to deal with the delay in acquisition of land under CBA Act and delay in compensation, rehabilitation and resettlement process. There was no provision to compensate the displaced sharecroppers, encroachers, squatters and people depending upon common property resources. Also, there was no mention of mechanism to check the environmental pollution and the effects of mining in its vicinity.

Though there was provision for plot allotment, there was no provision for the construction of house structures in the colony by the project authority at their own cost. The policy did not keep any financial or social security provision for the unmarried daughters and sisters above marriageable age. It also ignored the social security of the physically and mentally challenged persons irrespective of age and sex suffering from more than 40 per cent permanent disability, minor orphans, widows and divorcees. Also, there was no mention of mechanism for appointment of separate officers by the project to deal with the R&R issues of displaced and project-affected population.

There are only two resettlement colonies established for the resettlement of the displaced families of MCL project in Angul-Talcher belt namely, Handidhua resettlement colony with 321 housing plots of 5 decimals each and Kuiojungle resettlement colony with 200 housing plots of 8 decimals each. Only a few affected/displaced villages of Jagannath and Bharatpur coal mining area were resettled in these two colonies with very little infrastructure and service facilities. Majority of the displaced families are left on their own with uncertain future. In fact, all promised infrastructure facilities are not yet being provided to the resettlement colonies. The major problem faced by the majority of oustees during all these years of displacement is joblessness and lack of steady source of earning. At the time of the field survey it was found that there were many eligible oustees left out for job based rehabilitation and they were all desperately trying for the MCL jobs.
Employment-based Rehabilitation

The MCL had total manpower strength of 20591 as on 1.4.2007. Out of this, 1215 were executives, 4582 monthly rated, 14484 daily rated and 291 were piece rated workers (MCL Archives, 2007, 4-15).

The employees of MCL are broadly categorized into skilled workers, semi-skilled workers and unskilled workers. The skilled workers including heavy goods vehicle operators are appointed from technical background through open selection method. According to MCL Archives (2007: 20.8) report, out of the total 20591 regular workers including executives, 7164 (34.79%) are skilled manpower. The semi-skilled and unskilled workers with minimum level of technical/general education are usually appointed from the eligible persons of project displaced families on rehabilitation ground.

However, just after displacement the oustees of Talcher coalfields were neither highly literate nor technically trained. After training given by the MCL or after achieving technical qualifications only a few among the first and second generation oustees could get skilled and semi-skilled jobs. Owing to lack of minimum level of education, the oustees could mostly be given unskilled category jobs. But unfortunately quite a few among the oustees failed to get unskilled jobs even, as such jobs were limited in supply vis-à-vis the demand.

The oustees working as daily rated workers should have been absorbed under regular job category on monthly salary basis. In the case of employment matter, the policy of "hire and fire" was followed by the coal mining projects before nationalization of coalmining industry. The same policy continues to prevail even after its nationalization in 1970s. It is further observed that while on one way MCL has made the people dependent on mining jobs by wiping out the other sources of employment (mostly traditional occupations such as agriculture and allied activities), at the other end it has started downsizing its manual workforce by increasing mechanization of work.

The increasing unemployment with decreasing jobs has been the catastrophic future for the oustees after displacement. The people have been struggling to take shelter under MCL Company and quarters but their efforts are gradually going in vein. The MCL recruitment not only divided the people of coalfield into skilled and
semi and unskilled but also executive, monthly rated, daily rated, piece rated, badli, apprentice (stipend trainees), etc.

Moreover, it has been observed that employment-based benefits given to only a few eligible oustees are generating many unintended effects among the oustees and non-oustees families of the same village/region. This further divides the people into beneficiary and non-beneficiary. There has also been affected and non-affected village controversy over getting employment opportunities, although in case of mining activities the environmental pollution effects have no boundary between substantially land affected villages and non-affected villages. Affected does not mean only where actual mining are undergoing but also the surrounding villages and localities. It is very difficult to say that which village is not affected by mining activities.

NTPC Policy and R & R Benefits

NTPC Rehabilitation and Resettlement plan, January, 1988 was applied to Talcher Super Thermal Power project at Kaniha. The eligibility for R & R benefit was the affected family. The definition of affected family is the affected person with his or her spouse, unmarried sons and unmarried daughters. According to this NTPC policy, the affected persons were divided into three categories, the SAP, LAP and homestead oustees. The SAP refers to substantially affected persons those who lost more than 1/3rd of their land and the LAP refers to least affected persons or marginally affected persons those who lost less than 1/3rd of their land to NTPC. The homestead oustees (HSO) are those who lost their homestead land including houses.

All the SAP families were entitled for job-based rehabilitation. However, only one educated person from the SAP family was entitled for one project-based job. But where there were more than one educated persons in a family, the person was to be nominated by the head of the family for job in the project. The policy confined itself to SAP from the affected villages in the 1st phase and to SAP of Derang village in the 2nd phase. Employment under the maintenance contractors on a permanent basis was given to the eligible SAP. Apart from that the policy provided for other self employment schemes like small business, poultry and dairy, land for land provision through purchase. There was also option for payment of cash dole assistance to un-rehabilitated oustees. The substantially affected persons (SAP)
had been given specific options for skilled jobs. They were given training and absorbed in the project depending upon their eligibility.

But for unskilled jobs, the SAPs were directly taken in the project for maintenance works (house keeping, main plant, coal handling plant, lighting, sanitation, township maintenance, etc) under the contractors on permanent basis. About 160 shops were constructed by the NTPC for allotment to SAPs for their self-employment and Rs.30,000 was given to each of them as working capital to start their own business.

In addition there was provision of Rs.50,000/- for the oustee families to pursue other self employment schemes like poultry, dairy, small industry etc, or cash assistance of Rs.50,000/- for purchase of agricultural land at a place of their choice. Families losing their houses were provided with developed house sites at NTPC's cost in Tolakbeda and Takua village. Each displaced family was provided with cash assistance of Rs.16,000/- for construction of the house.

**Critical Analysis of NTPC Policy Provisions 1988**

The NTPC rehabilitation policy 1988 was not even at par with the rehabilitation package given to the persons affected/displaced by Ib Thermal Power Station (TPS) at Banaharpali of present Jharsuguda district of the state at that time. The policy package of Ib TPS, Banharpali had provision of job for both substantially affected and marginally affected families. But the policy package of NTPC, Kaniha did not have job provision for marginally affected family. The policy also did not follow the conditions given by the ministry of environment and forest, Government of India on rehabilitation of affected families.

The ministry had approved the NTPC projects on the following conditions such as to provide job to the affected family in NTPC or in any state government undertaking/organization or to provide equivalent land in the exchange of land lost or to provide adequate training to the oustees to enable them to be fully equipped to compete successfully for jobs or to provide cash compensation in the shape of fixed deposit, so that it can be enchased and may ensure steady periodical income.

The World Bank's instruction for a mechanism to be adopted to ascertain the preferred choice of oustees in various options available to them was also not strictly followed by the NTPC rehabilitation policy package. The affected families
seriously doubted the plea of NTPC that since there was non-availability of land, the land for land option was not materialized.

Although on the line of World Bank's instruction a committee was appointed to survey the affected villagers but representation of sociologists, anthropologists, NGO specialists and affected families and women was not found in the committee. As a result, gender dimension and sociological effects due to land acquisition were missing in the policy of original rehabilitation plan 1988. However, in the absence of adequate replacement land the original NTPC rehabilitation policy, 1988 adopted some rehabilitation options. These were training in ITI for suitable candidates having educational qualification, allotment of shops adjacent to the plant approaches and inside the township and the promotion of agro-based industries like dairy, poultry etc.

The project authority identified the affected persons for imparting training in ITI on the basis of extend of land lost and its financial effects on the family, educational level available in the family and permissible age limit. But there were implementation problems of these rehabilitation options. The state government had some reservations about the rehabilitation plan and had taken up with NTPC for certain modifications, particularly relating to employment matter. However, the NTPC authority clearly stated that neither it was possible to absorb all the affected families in project nor the affected families had similar qualifications for the jobs.

Finally a meeting was called at Dhenkanal, headquarters of the then undivided district for a discussion regarding these matters. In that meeting on 22.5.1990, the Director (Technical), NTPC, New Delhi stated in the presence of District Collector and other officials that the requirement of trained qualified personnel for the efficient running of the project cannot be sacrificed at any cost. According to the decision of the meeting all the posts under unskilled category were to be filled up by selecting from among the displaced families, the number of persons to be sent for training in ITI was to be decided strictly and the trained oustees had to appear a test for selection to different categories of posts. The schemes like poultry, dairy, etc could not be accepted as sustainable gainful source of employment for the oustees. The families which could not be covered under employment in the project, provision was made for allotment of shops to the interested families. The option of land for land for the rehabilitation of oustee families was made through a
land purchase committee and the NTPC was asked to examine the scope of reducing the requirement of private land in order to reduce the number of oustees. Consequently, a revised policy plan came into being which is known as revised rehabilitation plan, 28/11/1990. But unfortunately, this was not much different from the earlier policy.

**Employment Status of NTPC Kaniha**

For skilled jobs none of the oustees had necessary experiences for which NTPC did not have liberal stand. Later, however, NTPC provided ITI training for them. Similarly, in unskilled jobs only 8th class passed oustees were employed. More so, for all such jobs of unskilled category even only substantially affected family was taken into consideration. The marginally affected families were denied job-based rehabilitation benefit.

The minimum qualification required to be sent for ITI training was matriculation. Though a number of persons among the SAPs had their necessary qualifications, only one person from each of the SAP family was sponsored for training in different categories of jobs. The post of operators of transport vehicle, crane and dozer required minimum qualification of a heavy vehicle driving license. Since very few among the SC and ST SAPs were having minimum level of education or heavy vehicle driving license at that time, almost all of them became the immediate victims of joblessness.

Even some seven persons having light driving license were asked for obtaining heavy vehicle driving license. Many non-technical category jobs in the NTPC plant, which could have been given to SAP oustees on priority basis, were ignored by the project authority. According to oustees the project authority followed an exclusion policy. They say according to NTPC policy, if someone was not educated, he/she was not fit for job, if someone was educated, he/she was not experienced, so could not be given job. Similarly, if someone was educated and experienced but did not have necessary driving license for heavy vehicle, he/she was not fit for operator jobs of heavy machinery like crane, dozer and other transport vehicles.

The NTPC R&R package not only divided the affected villagers into SAP and LAP but also divided the brothers as not all of them were eligible for getting job on rehabilitation ground. Further, villagers argue that it also made split between the
father and sons. The employed son or brothers as jobholders have left for staying at NTPC quarters. In many cases, the employed son did not share their salaried income with parents and unemployed brothers.

Employing outsiders by NTPC in jobs and in maintenance works is not only opposed by the villagers, but also they, especially the harassed and discontented affected people create sometime law and order problems in and around the project area. The villagers argue that for jobs and engagement in project, priority should be given first to SAP, followed by LAP. If SAPs and LAPs are not available, then the local people should be given preference for regular project jobs or for the project maintenance work according to one’s capability and educational qualification. On the contrary, it is found that NTPC has engaged many outsiders while many among the SAPs have been waiting for project jobs and for the maintenance work.

NTPC authority, however, replies that it is not possible to debar skilled persons for higher posts as NTPC Delhi office did not have any reservation on this ground. The affected villagers are not satisfied with such readymade reply of project authority. They allege that it is not only skilled and semi-skilled jobs, but also many unskilled jobs have been given to the outsiders. For instance, the surplus manpower from TTPS, Talcher was deployed against the vacant posts of NTPC, Kaniha whereas there are still 273 left out SAPs who have been desperately waiting for jobs in the project since its inception. The authority of NTPC, Kaniha says that the Head office at New Delhi has framed rules to deploy its surplus manpower of other NTPC projects in the upcoming vacancies of any NTPC project. If that is so, the villagers argue that then why not their left out 273 SAPs can be engaged in other 23 NTPC projects in India?

Maintenance Works

NTPC entrusts certain maintenance works like house keeping, coal handling, sanitation, etc to the contractors. It, however, ensures that the contractors confine their recruitment from among the substantially affected families. Those who are eligible to get jobs are being engaged as permanent wage labourers, so that they cannot question the project authority for their employment. This has in fact generated wide socio-economic disparities among the SAPs, as the regular jobholders are getting handsome salary with other allowances, whereas the same
unskilled workers working under the contractors get much less in terms of monthly wage and allowances. More so, since NTPC does not have reservation provision on contractual jobs, the weaker sections like SC, ST and women are often deliberately excluded by the contractors for maintenance works. It is further found that as the marginally affected families belonging to upper social strata face problems in getting employment in maintenance works they always try to influence the contractors for such jobs.

Rehabilitation through Self Employment Schemes

The NTPC's constructed two market complexes: one inside the shopping complex of the township (50 shop rooms) and the other outside the plant area (110 shop rooms) for allotment to the substantially affected families who were not rehabilitated by other means of rehabilitation. However, it did not benefit the affected families because of the long distance of market complex from main inhabitation and the allotted SAPs were not used to such shopping business. The self employment schemes like industry, dairy, poultry, etc did not materialize. The one time cash dole assistance of Rs.50, 000 (deposited in the bank) was given to the substantially affected families who were not rehabilitated through any of the rehabilitated schemes. It involved the monthly cash dole for a period of 30 years. This, however, was not an amicable solution, as the SAPs desperately needed money for their immediate needs.

Grievances on MCL and NTPC Projects' Compensation and Rehabilitation

The affected/displaced people complain that once the notification was declared for land acquisition, they were helpless till the compensation received or shifted to the new place. In case of MCL area, due to delay in land acquisition and in the payment of compensation the affected/displaced people had many problems such as they could not sell or mortgage their land at the time of urgency of money and had to postpone the planning of purchasing another land, building of alternative houses, searching for alternative means of livelihood, executing of essential social functions and meeting of immediate needs like medical treatment and marriage. None of the affected villagers were given compensation or finalized compensation with his or her consent much before the land acquisition and displacement. As a result, the villagers could not plan for their possible reconstruction even after they have been given the compensation and jobs in the projects. The affected
displaced people complain that those who had the government lands and constructed houses upon such lands have not received compensation. Some lower caste and tribal people could not get adequate compensation. Without legal documents over such land and house the mining and NTPC authorities refused to recognize them as eligible oustees. Some of the MCL affected/displaced villagers refused to accept the payment of compensation complaining that the compensation fixed on available market rate was wrong and the mode of payment under coal bearing Act was harsher than that of land acquisition Act.

The affected/displaced people of both MCL and NTPC projects were not satisfied with the valuation of land based on registered sale deeds because such deeds did not take into account the fact that in order to avoid increased stamp duty the land buyers usually execute the sale deeds at a lower price than the actual purchased price. In some cases, due to lack of availability of such sale deeds for the acquired village the project authority fixed the compensation by taking into account the prevailing sale price of the land in the nearby villages. In fact, such valuation based on the price of other’s sale deeds does not reflect the actual value of the land in the acquired villages.

The price fixed for the compensation value of the land in the acquired villages of both the projects was alleged to have been worked out at far lower price than the actual market value. The displaced villagers have expressed in group discussions that the valuation of land based on the type of land as recorded officially was not correct. Over the years many of them had made substantial investment in order to improve the quality of their land, as agriculture was their sole means of livelihood. This, however, was not taken into account for the compensation. As a result, some of the affected people did not get a reasonable amount of compensation for their land.

For example, before land acquisition many farmers had improved their Taila land into Sarada land. But they did not change it in their land record in order to avoid various land taxes to be paid to the government. Also, it was mentioned by the people that the high quality land in the region was deliberately recorded as low grade land in order to avoid arbitrary and exploitative taxes levied by the ex-feudal ruler of Dhenkanal Princely State. These benefits of doubt were never taken care of either by the government or by the project authority.
The affected/displaced people complain that the concerned authorities did not value the actual price of the lost assets. They complained that the authority neither had proper classification of the various types of land, wells, ponds, tree and houses, nor did they value them properly for their compensation. On the other hand, in many cases the affected/displaced people were asked by unscrupulous officials to pay bribe through middlemen for correct measurement and valuation of their lost property.

The oustees allege that many could not get their rightful compensation dues from the project authority, as they could not pursue their case persistently because of their ignorance or dependency on others. In the case of MCL project area, due to lack of NGOs’ support and political apathy everything related to compensation was decided arbitrarily either by the government or the project authority. But in the NTPC area, this was checked to some extent due to the active interference of political parties and grassroots level civil society organizations.

The MCL villagers also complain that when they did not accept the inadequate compensation, their cases were referred to the tribunal courts for reconsideration of higher compensation which took a lot of time and money. Because of the delay of compensation on tribunal cases many of the MCL land oustees not only got compensation later but also found difficulties in getting jobs in the project. Because of their illiteracy and ignorant of the land acquisition provisions and procedures of calculation for compensation, many MCL land oustees did not come out strongly against compensation package. Since it was not possible to go to the court due to the distance and the money involved in such matters, many MCL land oustees could not file cases at right time and place. All such weak positions of the affected/displaced people could better help the government and the project authority to win over the land oustees. So, a win-win situation for the oustees never happened in the affected villages starting from notification to compensation and rehabilitation.

Since there were no public announcements the common people could know very little about the date and time of land acquisition. The NTPC authority, concerned bureaucrats and some village touts had made many false promises to the people till the boundary wall for the project was constructed. But just after the construction of boundary wall, they and the NTPC authority did not respond to the
people. The division of the affected families into SAP and LAP weakened displaced people's unity to articulate their socio-economic interests before the project authority. The villagers alleged that due to the division between them into SAP and LAP many who lost just 1 per cent less than the 1/3rd of their land were denied rehabilitation benefits meant for the SAP. They also argue that many have applied for entitlement of SAP status but such cases are not yet decided. It has been observed by us that because of this division there is an undercurrent of hostility, hatredness, jealousy and feeling of deprivation and marginalization among the less affected persons (LAP) against the substantially affected persons (SAP).

**People's Movement against NTPC Project**

When survey work for the NTPC was started in 1985, the villagers did not organize any protest movement. Many felt that unlike irrigation project, Samal barrage, the Industrial project may generate jobs for them and many other new livelihood opportunities. Due to lack of awareness about the NTPC and industry projects, the villagers could not foresee the disaster that would come in the future after land acquisition.

However, in later stages of NTPC activities, the affected villagers gradually organized protest movement against the project. Unfortunately, no major political party was in mood to organize protest movements at that time. The SUCI (Socialistic Unit Centre of India) like a silver lining in the dark clouds came to the rescue of the affected villagers and organized protest movement against the project at that time.

In the beginning of the grassroots movement against NTPC project the people of Kaniha came to know that SUCI had led a successful movement in Sukinda mines. Under the leadership of SUCI, NTPC affected people organized their movement bringing different villages together to fight against the arbitrary imposition of land acquisition law and deficient compensation package as declared by the NTPC project and the state government in 1988.

With their knowledge and past experiences of irrigation project, the people of Kaniha area somehow developed an attitude to protest against the project activities. Since the affected villagers of Samal barrage could not benefit from the irrigation project, they inspired the NTPC project-affected people to organize the
movement and raised voice against land acquisition and compensation package. Under the leadership of SUCI, initially about 12 people at Rangabeda School held a meeting with the villagers of Gadasila, Karadei and Kateni and formally selected office bearers of their organization known as Khyatigrasta Bistapan Sangram Committee (KBSC) in 1988.

Accordingly, the Khyatigrasta Bistapan Sangram committee set out programme to oppose NTPC project and demanded for better compensation package. In each and every village four to five people were made in charge of organizing such activities at the village level. People supported KBSC with their little donations. The movement against land acquisition and rehabilitation package was initiated through different phases.

In the 1st phase, there was a meeting at Dalit Padia (in between the area of Rangabeda and Gadasila) followed by a rally covering 5 km long up to Kaniha was organized by KBSC under the leadership of SUCI in the last part of 1988. It was a democratic protest and appeal to the government by the affected villagers. Land acquisition, inadequate compensation and rehabilitation package, inadequate provision for project jobs and demand of separate family status to each adult individual member of the affected families were the main grounds of the protest movement. The organizer of the rally after submitting their appeal of demand and grievances to the local Block development officer sent the same copy of the letter to the Collector, Dhenkanal.

Since nothing happened to their demand and appeal, the affected villagers organized their second rally at the Sub-collector office at Talcher after one month. About 5000 people came to Talcher by truck, bicycle and walking on foot and organized a 2 km long rally and submitted the same demand and appeal to the Sub-collector, Talcher in the month of January, 1989. Further no adequate response was there from the government and project authority.

Followed to that, the 3rd rally was organized by KBSC under the SUCI leadership after lapse of one month of the 2nd rally. In the month of February, 1989, about 1500 people came to Bhubaneswar by train and organized the 3rd protest rally in front of the State Assembly and Secretariat. They submitted a memorandum based on their right, demand and appeal to the then Chief Minister, Mr. J. B. Pattnaik. It was a peaceful rally. Even after third peaceful protest nothing
happened to their demand and appeal. In spite of the repeated protests neither NTPC did something nor did the government stop NTPC activities. The NTPC wanted to impose the compensation package of Samal barrage on the affected villagers.

The notification was made in the district gazetteer for land acquisition. The affected villagers did not know about this. Even the SUCI leadership noticed it much later. Many came to know it only when land acquisition was started. In the 1st phase at Rangabeda, land was acquired for the construction of guest house and Temporary Township. In the site, there was a temple which was also acquired for the construction of a small office and to level the land into plain surface. It was on 14 April 1989 on Ram Navami day early in the morning about 1000 people from different affected villages arrived on the site and protested and opposed the construction of guest house and office.

The government and the NTPC authority had pre-plan strategy and they had declared Rule 144 of IPC (Indian Penal Code) on the construction site to ban gathering of people. Consequently, while organizing their protest against the project Bhimsen Behera (SUCI leader), Prahlad Sahoo and 52 others were arrested by the police. However, suddenly about five thousand people gathered in the site and shouted their voice and gave slogan against the arrest.

In their protest everybody - male, female, youth and child obstructed the road and large numbers of them slept on the road. They obstructed the movement of the police van to take the leaders into the police custody. Till 9 P.M, the police could not take them into custody. When the protestors started cooking together for their dinner in the night after collecting rice, dal and vegetables from their village, the project authority in the mean time brought about 300 more police force from Angul to disperse the gathering. At 9.30 P.M, the police force declared loudly at the protestors to disperse from the place and suddenly charged lathi and fired tear gas cells over them. They also started provoking the people's gathering and created such an attacking situation for which in order to save themselves the people started retaliating by throwing stones over the police force.

Consequently, the police started beating the people, spoiled the cooked food, seized the mike and meeting space, threw the people's cycle in the wells and also took away some cycles in the van. After dispersion of gathering the police took the
leaders into the custody. In the night of 14 April 1989, the police started combing operation, what the affected old people say it as ‘Tandava Lila’. The police force started beating, kicking and arresting the villagers throughout the night. In the night the villagers of Rangabeda and all other protestors were dispersed by the police to Gadasila, Tikiria, and Nadi-jungle area.

About 30 villagers and 52 leaders were arrested and put in jail for 14 days. Virtually the movement was stopped and the construction work was started normally. In fact, with 5 per cent of the affected villagers those who supported the activities of NTPC at that time, the construction work of guest house and office were started without any obstruction.

Subsequently, after April 1989 incidence, Malati Choudhury (a freedom fighter and wife of former chief minister of Orissa, Nabakrushna Choudhury), a reputed social activist came to the movement site in the company of Bhimsen Behera. She supported the movement and consoled the affected people in a meeting. In that meeting, however, the camera of the press was snatched and she was threatened by police. Subsequently, Biju Pattanaik, a former chief minister and a strong leader of Orissa came to the project site and supported the people. He used very strong words against the Congress government and promised the people to help if he would come to power. During election time the protest movement of people lost its fighting spirit. After the State’s Assembly election, Biju Pattanaik came to power. But unfortunately he did not keep his promises made to the project-affected people.

In 1990, the affected people under the leadership of SUCI opposed the NTPC activities with black flag at the village levels. The then Prime Minister of India, Rajiv Gandhi’s programme to come to Kaniha was cancelled. After six months, the programme was rescheduled for the inauguration and foundation of NTPC project. At the time of inauguration, people showed their opposition with black flag. However, the presence of plenty number of police force inside the plant did not allow the protestors to disturb the inauguration function.

After inauguration of foundation stone the authority imposed 144 rule on the site for many days. After a lapse of five months of inauguration, the affected people wanted to have meeting on the same issues under the leadership of SUCI.
Consequently Bhimsen Behera and other leaders organized different meeting for further movement.
Again section -144 was imposed and the movement leader, Bhimsen Behera was arrested. Due to police torture and oppression protest movement was totally stopped during 1992-93. After 1992-93, a small meeting was convened to reanimate the movement. But the government further imposed Section 144 in the area. In 1994, the unit-1 of the thermal power plant was started full fledged. This weakened the movement against project. Hence, from 1997 onward the protest movement started concentrating more on resettlement and rehabilitation issues.
In March 1997, the affected villagers through Mahila Sangram Samiti had blocked road demanding drinking water facilities in the affected villages. In 1997 the World Bank group wanted to visit the affected villages. But they were not allowed by the villagers to enter the village. Then, the NTPC officers by resorting to unfair means could manage to divide the protesters. Local pro-project people like Mahesh Pani and Rabi Pani who supported NTPC plant took this World Bank group into the plant area and facilitated for video shooting.
At the time of starting of NTPC stage-2 and Permanent Township, about 1000 people from Gadasila to Rangabeda had resorted to road blockade to stop dozer operations. Some of them slept before the dozer. Again 144 were imposed and the police lathi charged and fired tear gas over the protestors. About 500 males and females were arrested and were sent to the court. On 6th June 1997, however, all of them were released on bail. On this ground, leader of SUCI, Bhikari Pradhan was suspended (NTPC operator).
However, because of this movement the rate of compensation was raised, separate family status to adult member was considered, training cost of the affected eligible persons for jobs was borne by the project and the village infrastructural activities in affected villages were initiated by the project.

Village Level Protest against Coal Mining Projects in MCL Area
Unlike NTPC in case of MCL area no organized protest movement was started by the affected villagers against the coal mining projects. It is because of land acquisition by many OC and UG projects under both LAA and CBA, allurement of project jobs to oustees and big promises by the project authority to resettle the oustees after displacement and the like. In case of NTPC project since the villages
were not displaced the village level organization could mobilize their affected villagers against the project. In contrast, in the case of MCL the affected villages were totally displaced. The oustees could not come together, as they were not resettled in a colony or a cluster village. However, in each and every village there was village committee for negotiating the rehabilitation and compensation matter after land acquisition. In fact, the resistance to the evacuation process was found in almost all displaced sample villages. Though the District Action Group (DAG) under a NORAD funded project was working in the area for the rights of the land oustees, it did not mobilize the oustees like the SUCI in the NTPC area. So, due to lack of leaders, lack of interest of political parties, lack of active village level civil society organizations, etc the MCL affected villagers could not organize any strong protest movement. In case of NTPC area the SUCI firstly educated the people about the project activity through pamphlets, leaflets and group discussions. Secondly, it agitated the people about inadequate compensation and rehabilitation package against their land acquisition and finally it organized a successful protest movement against the land acquisition from village level to block level and to state level at Bhubaneswar. But in case of MCL area this was not happened because the affected people were agitated by the village committee without adequate knowledge about their exploitation by the project.

**Awareness Level of Oustees**

It has been found that many among the displaced and affected people of both MCL and NTPC projects were little aware of the R&R benefits package for their rehabilitation. As a result, the majority failed to enforce their rights as oustees and project-affected people. It may be perused from Table 6.1 that out of total 109 MCL sample households 51 per cent households knew about their eligibility for R&R benefits, 9 per cent households were aware of the employment conditions, 7 per cent households knew about land allotment, 14 per cent households knew about the facility to be available in resettlement colonies, 10 percent households knew about assistance for temporary construction of shed, 4 per cent households knew about shifting assistance and 5 percent households knew about self employment schemes before land acquisition. The oustees did not know anything about the facilities to be provided to them by the MCL in the resettlement colonies such as road, street lights, school buildings, health centre, infrastructure...
for drinking water, recreation centres, ponds, tanks, play grounds, veterinary centres, tree plantation, shopping centre and assistance for temporary construction of sheds.

Table 6.1
Awareness of MCL Policy Provision before Land Acquisition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>MCL Policy Provision</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Eligibility criteria for R&amp;R benefits</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Employment conditions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Land allotment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Facility in colony</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Assistance for temporary construction of Shed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Shifting assistance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Self employment schemes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Household Survey 2007-08

Table 6.2
Awareness of NTPC Policy Provision before Land Acquisition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>NTPC policy provision</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Eligibility criteria for R&amp;R benefits</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Employment conditions</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Provision for maintenance work</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Self employment schemes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Periphery development work of project</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Household Survey 2007-08

Similarly, in the case of NTPC project out of total 111 sample households only 45 per cent households knew about the eligibility criteria for R&R benefits, 22 per cent households knew about the employment conditions, 20 per cent households knew the provisions for maintenance work, 8 per cent households knew about the
self employment schemes and 5 per cent households knew about the periphery
development work of the project.

Many oustee households were not aware of the R&R package in detail because they were neither informed nor consulted by the concerned authority about the policy and programme meant for the land acquisition and their rehabilitation. They were rather gradually informed and became aware about the R&R policy and its likely effects by their own efforts in different phases of project activities. Many also allege that when they came to know about the pros and cons of the policy, their lands were already acquired by the projects.

The affected and displaced households came to know about the policy provision by consulting and approaching school teachers, bank clerks, postman, caste members, kinship organization and village committee and most importantly by consulting educated youth in the village.

It revealed from our household survey that about 90 per cent of them did not raise any questions to the surveying officers about the reason of survey and its repercussions on the people of the region or anything related to land acquisition during survey time. Even the surveying authority did not consult or ask the affected households about the status of their landholding in detail revealing the purpose of survey for land acquisition. Many householders were afraid of revealing their actual status and complicacy of the landholding. As a result, survey was carried out without consulting and involving the affected households.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SI. No.</th>
<th>Medium of information</th>
<th>NTPC/MCL No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Political leader's speech</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Notification at public place</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Friends and relatives</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Media information</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Village level organization</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Project Authority</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Govt. authority</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>220</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Household Survey 2007-08.
It is found that affected people of both the projects under study were little aware about land acquisition leading to their displacement from hearths and homes. It is seen from Table 6.3 that very few among the sample households had received authentic source of information relating to land acquisition either from project authority or government authority. Many came to know about land acquisition from friends and relatives (40%). Even few had access to notification made in public places, as they were mostly illiterates. Very few had access to information from the national and local media. Some came to know about this much later from the speeches made by the political leaders, when movement against displacement was started. Because of lack of proper information people did not get sufficient time to make them mentally and physically prepared to adapt to the adverse situation at the time of displacement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Would be losing the status of landholding</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Would not get the same agricultural land</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>They might not be able to purchase another land</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Would not get better employment</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>May not improve socio-economic status</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Tenses and confused</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Happy /relaxed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Would get better employment</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>May improve socio-economic status</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Household Survey 2007-08.

When notification for land acquisition was served 95 per cent of the sample households were afraid of losing their landholding status and 75 per cent of them perceived that they would not get the same agricultural land elsewhere. Some 52 per cent felt that they might not able to purchase agricultural land at all, as there was possibility of prodigal spending on wasteful consumption by the younger generation after getting cash compensation in bulk amount. This led to family level tension and confusion among as high as 85 percent of the sample households.
Only 5 per cent of the households could perceive better future after land acquisition. In the MCL area large number of the sample households was afraid of leaving the place of their socio-religious significance. None had feeling that they would be happier in future after losing agricultural lands for these projects. Rather many could foresee that due to their lack of education they would be deprived of any project-based jobs and their only source of living would be lost as it would not be possible to get equivalent quality and amount of agricultural land lost due to these projects (Table 6.4).

**Strategy used to avoid Future Disability**

In this confused situation the majority of the households did not have any knowledge to cope with the new environment after the commissioning of these two projects. Only thing they could all hope was project-based regular jobs to their family members. However, that was not possible for all to get regular type jobs in the project, as the jobs were limited and there were many claimants for similar type unskilled and semi-skilled jobs. There were very few households those who perceived better future after the commissioning of these two projects in the region. They sent their children for ITI training and higher education. Since they were optimistic they started investing money in the locality. Some started purchasing houses and lands in the nearby town. Some started obtaining contractor licenses and vehicle licenses for contracting works and driving jobs. This of course started generating some positive impacts among the illiterate people through informal caste kin linkages. They started discussing about land acquisition and their future with their kinship organization and community-based organizations privately. In the group discussion many among the oustees expressed that in every household mostly unmarried young person and married males were consoling their women and old grand parents those who were confused and depressed when the process of land acquisition started.

It is found that more than three-fourth of the households in the sample had objected to land acquisition by these two projects (Table 6.5). In both areas the major grounds of objection to land acquisition were inadequate valuations of lost assets, involuntary land acquisition and apprehension about loss of agro-based livelihood, loss of access to public resources, inadequate job placement in the project, inadequate resettlement plans and implementation and the like in the post
displacement period. In the MCL area involuntary physical displacement and the disparity in valuation of lost assets under LAA and CBA were the major ground of objection by the affected people. Added to that in NTPC project area people claimed separate family status to each adult member for job and other rehabilitation benefits and sought clarity on the explanation of public purpose of land acquisition. They raised further objection on the ground of superficial division of oustees into SAPs and LAPs by the project authority to avoid R&R obligations and benefits to majority of the project-affected families.

Table 6.5
Objection against Land Acquisition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Particular</th>
<th>NTPC</th>
<th>MCL</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Objected</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Not objected</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>111</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td><strong>109</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Household Survey 2007-08

It is revealed from our survey that more than 90 percent of the displaced and affected households were neither consulted individually nor were they encouraged to object the acquisition process of land in both NTPC and MCL area. However, the affected people had objected the process of land acquisition very strongly by expressing their resentment. While NTPC project affected villagers had objected to the land acquisition process through their collective organization, the MCL project affected/displaced villagers though could not organize all villages together, they had strongly objected to land acquisition through their respective village committees. It was found at the time of our focus group discussions that in NTPC area people objected to the land acquisition through their village committees and intercommunity level linkages across the affected villages. However, in MCL area there was an intra-community chain that worked with close cooperation with the village community to protect the rights of oustees and to fight against land acquisition.
Evacuation Process and Coping Strategy

It was revealed from our focus group discussions that in case of total displacement evacuation of families from the project area was a very painful experience. In the case of MCL projects the majority of the families had to shift to another site(s) for resettlement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Evacuation process</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Involuntarily evacuated</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Voluntarily evacuated</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Household Survey 2007-08.

It has been reported that more than 82 per cent of MCL displaced households were involuntarily evacuated by the project authority. During evacuation the project authority had used force and state machinery like police to evict the people from their hearths and homes. In some cases they were tortured, humiliated and arrested by the police. Also, the company informally used the services of local goondas and miscreants in order to terrorize the families resisting displacement from the land of their forefathers. According to our household survey data only 18 percent of the Sample households were voluntarily evacuated because they wanted to shift to the project quarters or to their self-settled clusters fearing disciplinary action of project authority against their offspring/close kin who were given employment in project-based jobs.

It is reported that when they were evacuated from their original inhabitation, some displaced oustees started organizing their caste-based community to shift together to a place where they can have easy access to land, water and forest resources. Especially, the chasa families from Balanda displaced village had visited different places before purchasing lands at Pabitrapur cluster. Before actual displacement some chasa caste villagers from Baideswar village also started thinking of their past geographical linkages from where their forefathers had migrated to the affected villages. However, many minority caste groups in the displaced villages belonging to upper and lower castes could not strengthen their
It is because some of the educated upper caste families having project-based jobs either wanted to settle in the nearby town Talcher or in the MCL quarters. The lower caste families lacked leadership and resource to organize them for better settlement before their evacuation. The oustees from very small villages like Chandpur and Purunia were relying on the decision of the nearby big village like Balanda. So, they did not have any self-settled cluster after displacement. It is reported that the oustees from big villages like Anantabereni and Balanda demanded their resettlement colony prior to the evacuation. So, the Handidhua and Kuiojungle colonies were constructed for the Balanda and Anantabereni villagers respectively. In fact, till to day the oustees from the small villages like Chandpur, Purunia and Nakhetrapur do not have their permanent colonies. As many among the displaces were mentally not prepared to leave their hearths and homes even after receiving cash compensation and many times the male members of Anantabereni, Balanda and Baideswar had left their villages and hided themselves in other places leaving women members in their houses in order to avoid torture, humiliation and arrest by the police. While some educated and rich farmers started constructing theirs houses in the resettlement colonies/clusters of their choice thinking that they would not be able to fight against the project authority for their evacuation, others were still thinking that the project would not able to displace them from their soil. Some of the families did not plan to go to the resettlement sites, as their compensation matter was not finalized at the time of actual evacuation. In the MCL area though land was acquired by 1984 from the affected sample villages, the oustees had refused to accept compensation till 1989-90, as there was dispute over valuation of their assets.

According to our household survey data out of the total 103 MCL displaced/affected sample households, 43 per cent went to permanent colony, 24 per cent went to temporary colony, 9 per cent went to MCL staff quarters and 24 per cent went to their self-settled cluster villages. This shows that 91 percent of MCL displaced households were resettled in the colonies and cluster villages after displacement. It has been found that there are no SC households in the cluster villages, but a large proportion of them are found to be residing in the resettlement colonies and also in the temporary colonies. Out of the total 34 per cent displaced
SC households covered in the MCL sample, 15 per cent are staying in the temporary colony. This shows that the SC households are the worst sufferers after displacement. In fact, the MCL has discriminated by forcing them to move to temporary colony without giving enough time for rebuilding their strength for shifting to another place. Now the MCL authority gives them warning to leave the central colony at the earliest. It was the OBC households mostly Chasa who shifted to the cluster villages. However, out of three higher caste households in our sample, one is at present staying in the colony and the other two are staying in MCL staff quarters.

According to people, in the MCL area the role of government and project authorities was neither useful nor encouraging for the oustees for their selection of sites and shifting to resettlement site. About 86 percent of the MCL displaced sample households have expressed their dissatisfaction against concerned authorities as they were bureaucratic (19%), coercive (16%), corrupt (17%) and not useful (34%) at the time of selection of resettlement site and their shifting. Only 11 per cent MCL sample households expressed their satisfaction about evacuation, because of their early placement in the project-based jobs and they had their prior resettlement in the town area before actual displacement took place. The rest were indifferent to the role of government and project authorities.

It is found from our field data that about 78 per cent of the sample households were given options for the resettlement but only 8 percent of the sample households were resettled voluntarily by the project. It is also found from our field data that 92 per cent of the sample households were involuntarily resettled. No government or project authority had ever consulted the displaced households for the alternative options about their resettlement and rehabilitation sites.

After giving compensation to the oustee families, the project authority gave job to eligible oustees and instructed them to shift to the allotted plot in the colony as soon as possible. Since it was not possible for the oustees to shift fast, the MCL authority threatened them to take disciplinary action against the jobholders of the respective households. In spite of the warning as some of them could not shift due to personal problems, the project authority finally demolished the structure of the remaining households and pushed the oustees into the colonies by using force.
It is reported by the displaced people of MCL that some of them were forced in hurry to move to the temporary central colony. But there the oustees without any project jobs suffered a lot, as there was very little avenue for them to pursue any gainful livelihood. This was just a temporary arrangement and all those who shifted there were promised plots for their resettlement in the permanent colonies at Handidhua and Kuiojungle. However, till today many do not have plot allotments in the permanent colonies. In contrast, some of the displaced families of Baideswar and Balanda villages have not only their own self-resettlement clusters, but also they have been given plot allotment in the resettlement colonies. Many complain that shifting allowance was not enough for the shifting of a family with bag and baggage from their ancestral homes. There was no provision for transportation of domestic animals, although almost all of them had agro-based living. They also argue that the size of the plot allotment to them is not enough for an agriculture dependent family. The oustees were not provided with any additional financial assistance to construct their own house in the colony, although it was known to all that the compensation money given for the acquired house was inadequate to build a new house in a new environment. Because of this reason many resettlers took more time to move to the colony.

**Resettlement Process**

It has been found that the displaced families especially the first generation oustees do not feel comfortable to stay in the resettlement colonies and clusters. They say that life was more happy and peaceful in their old villages.

**Table 6.7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Feeling in resettlement colony and clusters</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Feeling of friendly atmosphere</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Feeling of no friendly atmosphere</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Feeling of powerlessness</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Feeling in normal break down of normal social life</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Household Survey 2007-08.

This becomes evidently clear from the household survey data shown in Table 6.7: Only around 14 per cent of the households have reported that they are living in
friendly atmosphere in their place of resettlement. As against that 44 per cent of the displaced households feel that the place where they reside do not have the friendly atmosphere and 25 per cent households have feeling of powerlessness in their place of new inhabitation. Added to that 17 per cent households have feeling that they do not have normal social life in the colony and cluster villages. They still carry the stamp of oustee population and feel themselves rootlessness in their place of resettlement. It has been revealed that people those who feel comfortable in their place of resettlement are mostly MCL employees presently residing in the MCL staff quarters. Their life style is different and they are now acclimatized with the routine industrial life in MCL colony. However, people those who reside in the colony and clusters are feeling deprived in many respects. Many do not have adequate space for leading their agro-based life. The colonies do not have adequate civic amenities as promised to them by the MCL authority at the time of displacement. The main problem is access to safe drinking water and increasing air pollution. Owing to excessive mining activities in the region people face acute scarcity of drinking water round the year. The wells and hand pumps go dry during summer and it becomes problem for the livestock to get water and fodder for their sustenance. Also, people feel deprived of easy access to common property resources like village forest, fruit bearing trees, grazing land, etc. that subsidized their cost of living to a considerable extent by providing the with fuel wood, food items and animal food free of cost.

**Compensation Status**

It is revealed from the discussion held with the people that the displaced households of MCL had been given very nominal compensation for the land acquired by the project. According to government the compensation was paid to the oustees as per the prevailing market value of land in the region at that time. However, people say as the value was fixed according to registered sale deed of the land, which was almost half of the actual sale value of land, they got much less in terms of cash compensation. The rate of compensation paid to them in 1980s was Rs. 22,000 to 30,000 per acre for homestead land, Rs.20, 240 to 30,000 per acre for Sarada-I land, Rs. 17,120 to Rs. 25,000 per acre for Sarada-II land, Rs.12,500 to 17,750 rupees per acre for Sarada-III land, Rs.7,500 to 10,000 rupees per acre for Taila land and Rs.7500 per acre for other village forest land.
In the case of NTPC project, the rate of compensation paid to the displaced/land affected families was as follows: Rs.70,000 to 120,000 rupees per acre for homestead land, Rs.30,000 to 50,000 per acre for Sarada-I land, Rs.20,000 to 40,000 per acre for Sarada-II land, Rs.18,000 to 22,000 per acre for Sarada-III land, Rs.10,000 to 18,000 per acre for Taila land and Rs.8000 per acre for other village forest land. However, like the MCL oustees, the affected and displaced households were not satisfied with the rate of compensation fixed by the government on different land particulars.

Unfortunately neither the concerned government consulted the affected households before disbursing the compensation nor did the affected people themselves know the way compensation was calculated by the government. Even none of the affected sample households took any attempt to ask the concerned authority about the calculation on different assets lost to the projects. The people did not have any knowledge and capability to question the state on land acquisition and arbitrary fixation of value for their lost assets. By exercising the power of eminent domain the state acquired the assets of the people without obtaining their consent and willingness to accept the compensation value for the properties as fixed by the state/project authority. The government and the project authorities took advantage of the eminent domain power and did not bother to protect the interest of weaker sections of population. As a result, many marginal and small farmers became landless and the large and medium farmers landed up as small and marginal farmers in their place of resettlement or in their place of original inhabitation, as it was not possible to restore the lost assets with the compensation amount received from the project authority.

It is further reported by the people that the bulk amount of cash received by them in the form of compensation was misutilized in unproductive activities like marriage of sons and daughters, on buying luxurious consumer durables like refrigerators, motor cycles/scooters and also on repayment of old debts. Thus, in no way compensation helped the displaced and project-affected families to restore their lost socio-economic status in the post displacement years. It is a fact that people now have relatively higher level of income because of project-based employment and its multiple linkage effects. But after losing their land assets the majority has become socially more insecure and economically more vulnerable,
as project-based earning shall not last for more than 30 years and there will all be uncertain after that. More so, project-based earning cannot be shared by all family members unlike land-based living.

**Status of Rehabilitation**

It is found from our household survey data that the 220 substantially affected/displaced households of both MCL and NTPC projects have at present 1850 persons. Out of this, 1363 are adult persons above 18 years age and of them there are 513 male persons in economically productive age group of 18-60 years (for details see Table 5.9). If we assume that in a rural society having deep influence of traditional social values only adult males are expected to be principal earners of the households, then at least 513 persons in our sample households should have been rehabilitated properly by these two projects after their displacement from their traditional agro-based living.

**Table 6.8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Rehabilitation particulars</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Jobs given</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>19.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Project engaged contract workers for wage labour</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>48.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Allotted shops in the market complex</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Agricultural land provided</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Cash assistance given for business</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>383</strong></td>
<td><strong>74.66</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Household Survey 2007-08

However, it is found that only 19.69 per cent among the adult males of the oustee families have got project-based regular jobs. Besides that 247 (48.15%) persons are working as contract wage labour under the contractors, who do not get other benefits like paid holiday leave, sick leave, bonus, etc. unlike the regular workers employed by the MCL and NTPC. There is also wage disparity. A contract worker’s monthly earning is almost half of the monthly salary of a regular lowest grade worker of MCL or NTPC. Other than employment-based rehabilitation 5.85 per cent of the adult males of oustee families have been allotted shops in the market complex of NTPC to pursue their own business and another 0.97 per cent have been given some cash assistance to start their business. But none among the oustees has given assistance for land-based rehabilitation. On the other hand,
around one-fourth of the adult males have not been rehabilitated by the project authorities to pursue any gainful livelihood in post displaced years. It is obvious that had there been any agricultural land with the oustee families, every adult male member of the family would have remained engaged in agriculture-based occupations. Also, he would have got a share from the land owned by the family. It is found from household survey data that only 90 adult persons from the displaced families were given training by the project authority for project-based jobs. Apart from that 33 persons were given vocational training for self-employment. This clearly shows that all male adult persons of the displaced families could not be rehabilitated by the projects, not to speak of adult females. These two projects although contributed directly towards economic development of the state and country in general, they failed in protecting the economic interests of the people who made direct sacrifice for the projects. According to the respondents of the sample households, the project authority did not bother to absorb all adult males in project-based jobs, although they all were deprived of agro-based living due to acquisition of agricultural land by the projects. The oustees allege that the project authority has deliberately reduced the employment opportunity for people by using labour displacing technology. Some allege that the project authority did not give them proper training to make them capable for sustainable non-farm sector employment. The majority of the sample households say that it was not people’s inability but it was project which did not provide them training for project-based jobs or non-farm sector engagement.

**Impact on Land-based Living**

Before land acquisition/displacement almost all the villagers had access to variety of government land such as forest, grazing, pasture, temple, rock, water and lands under common property resources i.e. pond, well, school, village community well, river, canal, public road, government institutions, etc. But after land acquisition/displacement while the displaced villages lost all the lands the affected villagers are still left with some lands. In all affected villages old forest and village trees got reduced and in other displaced villages forest land was totally acquired by the projects. After land acquisition, old forests have been drastically reduced in the affected villages within five km radius from NTPC and MCL projects. It does not mean that project
has not acquired forest land 5 km away from the plant area. But the forest land mostly close to the affected villages was acquired by the project and forest land mostly far away from the villages was affected by the projects. Prior to projects, forest land was everybody's property with negligible control and restriction of forest department. But after land acquisition and displacement, people lost that privilege. Before land acquisition village community was its primary stakeholder not the government. After land acquisition community's access, control and use of forest land has been restricted by the government and now the government acts like the primary stakeholder of the forest land. In case of affected villages both in MCL and NTPC area rights to forest land is almost denied or there is no forest land in the village. In case of sample villages in NTPC area when the plant affected community (PAC) lost its traditional right over the forest land in the first phase, the Ash pond affected community (APAC) lost its control over the forest land in the second phase. The latter is gradually losing its right to forest land as the other power projects have started acquiring the government forests land from these villages. In the MCL sample villages both project affected community (PAC) and project displaced community (PDC) have lost their right over forest lands after land acquisition and displacement. So the village community as stakeholders is worst sufferers after the project came over. The village communities now miss their forest lands for their multiple purpose and use. The forest land was used for grazing animals, enhancing the geographical length of the village as political entity and for the construction of village road, building and brick making with its earth, rocks, stone, etc. The displaced communities such as colony project settled community (CPSC) in Handidhua, Kuiojungle and Central colony and cluster self settled community (CSSC) have also their differential access to forest lands. While the colony project settled community (CPSC) do not have access to the forest lands, the cluster self settled community (CSSC) though do access the forest land they do not have community rights over forest land as it was in the past. Now both the communities have conflict with their host villagers for sharing forest land.
**Grazing Land**

It was purely an unrestricted access land in many of the sample villages before land acquisition. These grazing lands were either encroached upon or legally taken over by the projects on the plea that these were barren and non-forestable lands. Those were easily accessible land without any complicacy of environmental clearance. The acquisition of such lands has not only generated adverse impacts on wild and domestic animals but also that has limited the geographical length of the village.

**Government Land**

The plain government lands are primarily good plots for the construction of village road, government and non-government institutions i.e. school, college, hospital, panchayat office, NGO office, trusts, etc. Prior to the projects, there was plenty of plain land for such developments to take place. But after land acquisition by the projects the state government has been facing problems to initiate such developmental activities in and around the affected villages in Talcher and Kaniha area. The forest and encroached government lands have mostly been acquired by the projects and whatever is now left that is not available for public use because of restrictions put by the government authority. Very few households subsisting on encroached lands have managed to get compensation for the acquisition of these lands. The lands that are not acquired or not restricted by the government can be made available to people for cultivation. But hardly anybody nowadays takes interest in acquiring such land for cultivation purpose because of pollution and consequential loss of fertility of the land. In the MCL area though the self settled oustees at cluster villages have access to the forest and government lands, there is problem on sharing the forest land between the resettlers and host villagers.

**Temple Land**

Temple land was purely a community land before land acquisition/displacement. Its legal status can't be challenged by any private party. In NTPC, Kaniha area, temple lands were king's lands meant for public use. However, in the name of public purpose these lands have been acquired by the project through government authority without adequately replacing with another piece of lands or religious structure. For instance, in case of Bhimakanda and Rangabeda villages, temple lands and religious structures were acquired by the NTPC project. In some
cases landed properties in and around the temples were acquired without affecting their sacred structures. This has resulted in loss of temple assets causing disruption of normal religious activities, although in the eyes of people of the region the temple still carries high religious importance for them. More so, in MCL project area it has been reported by the people that their temples and temple lands were completely acquired and their religious structures were raised to the ground without giving any importance to people's religious sentiments. Similarly, it has been found that other lands in and around the CPRs are either being acquired completely or partially by the projects. As a result, the schools do not have big playground or do not have scope for further enhancement, size of cremation ground has been diminished and side area of road and canal has also been narrowed down in many places.

Impact on the Private Landholding Pattern

Before land acquisition most importantly the land was not only the deciding factor for economic prospect of the village but also it was roots of the socio-cultural evolution of the village community. Land was only the ever lasting medium of interdependency and inter-relationships between the farmers. But after displacement, there has been an increase in number of landless category people and decrease of large, medium, small and marginal categories of landholders in both MCL and NTPC affected/displaced villages.

It is quite obvious that when there is land acquisition, there will be increasing landlessness of land loser families. But displacement-induced landlessness has come along with the impact of land alienation, decapitalization and pauperization of the affected farmers in both NTPC and MCL region. So mere understanding of economic calculation of substantial increase and decrease in the size of landholding is not sufficient to explain the effects of landlessness in the sample villages.

Marginal Farmers

Before land acquisition many marginal farmers were at the same time sharecroppers and agricultural labourers. They used to make their bread and butter through cultivation, share cropping and agricultural labouring and also by cultivating encroached government land. But after displacement many of them have been deprived of these opportunities and have slipped into poverty line. Only
some substantially affected marginal farmers have got employment opportunities in the projects. But the least affected marginal farmers are deprived of project benefits. Now the least affected marginal farmers without any project-based earning support live in penury. As all landholders of the region have been affected due to land acquisition for the projects, they do not have any scope to pursue their agro-based living on unacquired private lands or government land.

**Small Farmers**

It has been found that some of the small farmers who did not get any job benefits from the projects, they still cultivate their left out land or work as share croppers. The small farmers have been cultivating and share cropping on the lands of those who have got jobs and have settled in the NTPC and MCL quarters and elsewhere. However, it is observed that while the marginal farmers have almost become landless labourers, the small farmers are now turned into marginal farmers.

**Medium Farmers**

Almost all medium farmers of sample villages are found to be substantially affected farmers. Very few of them are now left with any substantial size of holdings, so as to earn the status of small farmers even. Nevertheless, some of the least affected medium farmer families carry on their agricultural activities. However, it has been found that from every medium land holding farmer household, there is one regular employee and one or two contract labourers working in project-based jobs. In spite of that many among them still prefer to preserve their status of land holding, although agriculture as such has now lost its sustainable status due to increasing pollution and desertification of land in the region.

**Large Farmers**

It is of course a fact that due to increasing division of joint families causing fragmentation of holdings in post Independent years, very few families in Angul-Talcher region had more than 10 acres of land before land acquisition. But all such families were in possession of good quality agricultural land with some irrigation support. The share croppers, marginal farmers and landless labourers used to depend on these large farmers. But after land acquisition there are very few large farmers who hardly cultivate their land and if cultivate they hardly require
wage labor for their land cultivation. In fact, the farmers report that they cannot afford to hire wage labour in the present market rate. It is, however, found that many of them are educated and they have all got project-based jobs. They are now either staying in company quarters or settled in nearby urban centres such as Talcher and Angul.

**Impact on the Homestead Land Holding**

After land acquisition, the size of homestead land holding of the NTPC and MCL affected households has been decreased. The size of homestead land holding of self settled households in the cluster villages is better than the project settled households in the MCL colonies. The size of allotted plots in the Handiadhua colony and in the Kuiojungle was only 5 and 8 decimals respectively. In fact, the multiple factors such as small size of patta (legal document) and non-patta land holding, break down of joint family, split of original family on rehabilitation ground, inadequate plot allotment, etc. have all added to the reduction of size and status of homestead landholding after land acquisition/displacement.

**Impact on Local Landholding Patterns**

Before land acquisition the farmers those who had more Sarada I and Sarada II lands were in better economic status than those who had Sarada III and Taila lands. Interestingly, major portion of the total affected/acquired private lands were Sarada I and II. Now the oustees are left with mostly Sarada III and Taila category lands in the sample villages. So, after land acquisition the farmers generate less income from the left out inferior type of lands. It means acquisition of more forest land and Taila land would not have impacted much on the cropping pattern and income source of the land losers. The affected/displaced households could not purchase lands further for their cultivation due to unequal and inadequate compensation, increasing price of land and lack of good quality agricultural land. More so, because of increasing environmental pollution of the region, agriculture has now become less attractive occupation due to low productivity, whereas for the majority of the agriculture dependent people there is little avenue for their absorption in non-farm sector economy.

**Cropping pattern**

Before land acquisition the farmers used to have different types of crops such as cereals (mostly paddy), pulses, oilseeds, vegetables and cash crops. But after
land acquisition they have almost stopped cultivating oilseeds and vegetables. Besides raising different crops the farmers had used their agricultural lands for raising grass and fodder for the livestock, developing kitchen garden, horticulture, dairy farming, fishing and the like. But now the left out farmers in the village hardly enjoy these multiple use of lands. The oustees and affected persons allege that though they were interested to purchase cultivable land, there was hardly land available for sale in the locality. Neither the government nor the project authority had initiated any steps to purchase the quality land at affordable price in other near by places.

**Impact on Livelihood**

The earlier sources of livelihood such as land, forest, trees, kitchen garden, seasonal employment, agricultural wage labour and caste occupations are decreasing fast in and around the villages after land acquisition. While the project affected villagers miss their earlier sources of livelihood, the displaced villagers have been totally cut up from these after displacement. At present the project has been the major source of employment and engagement for the affected and displaced villagers. But, unfortunately due to increasing mechanization and poor skill building efforts, the modern projects have failed to generate adequate number of sustainable jobs for the displaced/land affected people.

**Caste and Livelihood**

Since caste and livelihood are interrelated to each other in any Indian village the caste based livelihood was prominently found in the sample villages before land acquisition and displacement. The occupational castes like washer man, fisherman, barber, priest, blacksmith, potter, goldsmith, carpenters, etc were providing household services to the villagers on jajmani basis. Somehow their hereditary occupation was continuing till land acquisition by the project. But after land acquisition they have almost lost their traditional occupation. For instance, traditionally Dhobas as washer men used to receive payment in kind (paddy or other crops annually) for washing clothes of higher caste households. But now they hardly find their clients in the colony and cluster villages. They also do not find village ponds for washing the clothes of others. Since their ponds have been acquired and their client has been dispersed into different places by the project, they cannot carry on their traditional occupation in the colonies and clusters.
Similarly, the fishermen used to do fishing from river and village ponds for their livelihood. But the water sources are being polluted by the mining operation and fly ashes. In fact now it is very difficult for them to survive on fishing.

Impact on Health

Before displacement although people were affected by diseases like malaria, cold fever, diarrhea, dysentery, cholera, smallpox, measles, etc. from season to season, such diseases rarely caused any increase in morbidity level of population in the region. However, nowadays many people of the region are found affected by deadly and chronic diseases like tuberculosis, asthma, lungs disorder, jaundice, heart ailment, cancer, diabetes, blood pressure, diarrhea, dysentery, etc. Now malaria in the region occurs in endemic form. Besides, many people suffer from eye ailments, skin infection such as scabies, small cracks in the hands and toes, shortness of breath, respiratory problems, paralysis, etc.

Now more people fall sick almost at fortnightly interval and the medicinal expenditure of the households have remarkably increased in recent years. The children, women and old parents and grand parents are more susceptible to different diseases than others. The displaced households report that most of them get affected by malaria round the year. In Takua village of NTPC project area malaria once took such a menacing form with increasing death tolls that it dominated the front page news of the prominent Oriya dailies for quite sometime during early 2000s. No doubt the air, water and land pollution caused by the projects are responsible for such diseases. But more mental stress, tension and uncertain future in the wake of displacement and land acquisition make the oustee people weaker and more vulnerable to diseases.

Impact on Family

After land acquisition and displacement, joint family and extended family were disintegrated due to many factors such as conflicts over sharing compensation, conflict over sharing employment facility as only one adult member was provided job by the project depriving others, early marriage for project benefits, loss of joint property and the like. In some cases, the project employed person started staying in the staff quarters leaving the parents and other family members in the affected villages.
It is true that at the time of land acquisition and displacement the children of then married sons were more than 7 years of old and many of them are now married. All such persons are now either new entrants to local job market or looking for jobs. Many of them continue to live with their parents and children in joint family set up, as due to lack of any gainful occupation they cannot afford to live separately. Hence, so to say job scarcity and dependency of adult sons on parents has started further strengthening the joint family culture among the oustee households of the region to a considerable extent. Even if some married sons have got any job or contractual engagement, they do not have independent house or official quarter. In temporary central colony of MCL, the oustees have not yet developed allotted plots for their housing structures in the Handidhua site. So, some oustees of younger generation have been staying together in joint family setup in the colony.

But when married brothers or sons got separate rehabilitation benefits given by the project authority, the old parents found themselves left out with more responsibilities and liabilities with fewer assets than earlier. The mutual cooperation and family bond between the project employed sons and the left out family members was disintegrated. It is primarily due to economic stress and strain and the allurement of rehabilitation package. With regard to changing family structure we may conclude that there is breaking in but not breaking of the joint family structure. Joint family is not making for the shake of jointness but for the head loading in only or small house structure and in unavoidable circumstances in the affected villages /colonies/clusters.

Impact on Caste Behaviour

Weakening of mutual interpersonal behaviour, practice like Bhara and Bebhara (Presentation and Counter presentation) among kinsmen, neighborhood relationship and increasing compartmentalization or competition among the caste groups, assertiveness or political unity among them, claims for equality with or superiority than other etc are some of the changes noticed among the caste groups after land acquisition and displacement.

However, such changes in the caste structure have generated many latent positive effects also. The weakening of inter-caste and village solidarity has its positive effects on the age old caste hierarchy and rigidity of the old caste system.
In the changed environment all are busy in making their livelihood forgetting their stiff caste differences. Now some traditional caste occupation specialists have either given up their traditional occupation or prefer to take cash payment for their services. For instance, some educated barber, washer man, carpenter and blacksmith do not like to exchange their services under the traditional jajmani system of the village economy. Further, it is true that there has been a halt in the functioning of hereditary occupations as its base-land, village and agro-centric living are no longer available in the resettled colony.

Impact on Women and Weaker Sections
The women's contribution to the livelihood of family has been drastically reduced after land acquisition and displacement. In the past almost 90 per cent of the adult women were equal role players in the agro-based economy of sample households. Now only around 30 per cent of them are involved in directly productive economic activities, as there is no spread of education and skill among them to switch over to modern non-farm sector occupations. Now one can observe that only a few women are engaged in the self help group activities and project-based contractual engagements. But they do not have any significant contribution to the family income. The women's engagement and economic activities such as doing hereditary occupations, collection of fruits, fuel, fodder and forest produces from the jungle, taking care of livestock, growing vegetables in the kitchen garden, cultivating land, etc. have been drastically reduced after land acquisition and displacement. As a result, women's dependency on the male members has steadily increased in the post displaced years.

Loss of access to forest produces, loss of earning from both agricultural and non-agricultural sources, loss of their socio-economic status in the family, disruption of socio-cultural capital and linkage, male centric compensation payment, higher risk of deprivation, acute vulnerability to health hazard and malnutrition, increasing drudgery in collecting fuel, fodder and water for the family, etc are some of the displacement effects on women. After displacement and land acquisition, the poor people, women, widow, children, handicapped, old parents and grand parents, landless labourers, Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, etc have become more susceptible to many hardships. They are less able to reconstruct their lives than others.
Right from the survey time to resettlement, there was no formal women forum to voice their issues, concern and grievances in both NTPC and MCL area. As a result, the awardees and beneficiaries of compensation and rehabilitation were primarily the male members. Also, project-based jobs and assistance were given to the male heads only, thereby depriving the women at the mercy of the men folk. Since compensation was given to male head the women oustees could not exercise any control over the compensation money in their favour. In fact, about 83 per cent of sample households say that they have not consulted their adult women for the use and expenditure of the compensation amount. It means the compensation was spent by the male member at their mercy depriving the female members.

Gender discrimination is reflected in the R&R policy and its implementation process in the affected area. Pollution related problems caused by coal smoke in kitchen, respiratory and other problems and diseases, lack of access to well and water tap, drop out of girl child from school, early marriage, dowry demands, not availability of toilet facility, psychological stress, malnutrition etc are the other observable problems found in the colony, cluster and affected villages.

Cultural Change

The old culture of oustees included their simple technology, age-old sustainable agricultural life, norms, old values, traditions, etc that passed from generation to generation within the locality. The material and non material cultural contents were perfectly intermingled in and around the locality. Before the MCL and NTPC came into being, the economic structure and culture was inseparable and was contributing to each others with composite character. This cultural cohesiveness of the PAFs was deliberately disturbed by the projects. The foundation on which their collective conscience rested was first disrupted then captured. The culture keepers and culture takers were dispersed in different resettlement areas. As a result, the physical boundaries of cultural ethnicity was not only crossed but also got replaced with cultural others. The displaced families have now lost their regional identity.

In the temporary resettlement colony, the oustees have started forgetting their cultural memories but in the permanent resettlement colonies they have been trying their level best to restore and preserve their cultures. It is seen that the
oustees in the resettlement colonies have been trying to preserve their cultural life without any cultural foundation, while the self-settled oustees have been trying to revive their cultures with alternative cultural setting. The cultural psyches like common propensities, common cultural mentalities, collective conscience, we feeling, etc. are though visible in the cluster resettlement areas, there are many modifications and alterations, whereas it is missing in both temporary and permanent resettlement colonies. In fact, it is least possible to revive the identity of pre-displaced villages in the temporary and permanent colonies.

However, it is possible in the self-settled clusters because the same caste and ethnic group are settled together in their respective cluster villages. The common psyche of oustees in the permanent resettlement colony (Kuiojungle) is better than that of the oustees in the temporary resettlement colony (Central colony). The common psyche level of the oustees in self-settled clustered villages is far better than that of people residing in permanent and temporary resettlement colonies.

The MCL project in particular and the projects prior to MCL in general first hurt the psychology of oustees, second it tried to patch up their hurt psychology with false promises and some visible dividends and finally it left no stone unturned to polarize the psychology of the awardees, beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. The polarization effect helps further for individualization of oustees' intuitions, introspection and empathy toward each other. The polarization occurs not only between the awardees, beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries but also between those who are left out in the colonies and moved out in the clustered villages and those who are staying in the MCL quarters. It is also not purely generational gap but a disparity between those who got job and those who did not. Before displacement since people's technology was simple and environmental friendly the people associated with these were also simple and friendly in their behaviour. The oustee people miss their simple technology which used to help sustaining their culture, agriculture and physical, social and cultural environment. Now the mega mining and power projects with modern technology are fast eating into the roots of the grassroots organizations like civil society, voluntary organizations, village committee, Mahila Mandal, etc. There is loss of social capital like informal money lending and sharing of resources, kinship organization, community
organization based on caste, tribe and religion, Harinama group, Sankirtan Mandali, Bhagabat Gadi, Ramayana gadi, Ramalila, Jatra, etc. The vanishing of social properties like festive locations, places of religious worships, playgrounds, etc. and disruption and destruction of the common property resources like ponds, cremation grounds, community centres (including drama pandal, marriage hall and youth club), temple, deity structure, seating arrangement under trees, playground, grass land, waste land, grazing ground etc. have further added to oustees' woes.

Loss of Access to Government Facility
While the displaced villagers in the MCL area do not have access to the government facilities, the affected revenue villagers of NTPC area have been benefiting such facilities from the Orissa Government. But unless and until the displaced villages and colonies are declared as revenue village there will be no government facilities. While the displaced villagers have been trying to achieve revenue village status by political pressure, the NTPC project affected villagers have been trying to get BPL benefits from the government. Interestingly a conception of new poverty is in the making in the affected and displaced villages to which the government’s BPL criteria cannot be fit into. It is a matter of concern that the displacement specialists must look into.

Impact of Pollution
Water Pollution
It is worth mentioning as to how project activity pollutes the entire area as the Tikira River which gets polluted with its small water canal flowing from the area of the Ash pond, stage-2 in Derang area. The Tikira River then flows from the North (Tikira Bridge) toward north east. The polluted water from Tikira River not only pollutes the agricultural land but also flood over the cultivable land. During rainy season, the cultivable lands are deposited with flood sands of the river because of the blockage of the flexible flow of the Tikira River by NTPC and Samal barrage. The ash contained water spoil the productivity of the lands.

Ash and ash contained water from Ash pond and plant’s used mine contaminated water from the thermal plant after being discharged into the Tikira River get mixed with Brahmani River. The water sources stemming from above two Rivers are being polluted. As a result, the people have problems depending upon these
water sources for their multipurpose uses such as irrigation, drinking, bathing and washing of domestic animals, etc. The release of hot water by thermal plants into the nearby Tikira River dissolves oxygen level of the water. As a result, the flora and fauna sensitive to thermal hot water are adversely affected.

Similarly, the release of ash pond water by NTPC early in the morning pollutes the water resources in the NTPC locality. The emission of coal dust containing iron, aluminum, sodium, chromium, zinc, copper, nickel, etc and other wastes released from coalwasheries, OC and UG mines, surface runoff into the streams of rivers, toxics from other nearby industries and contaminated ash contain waters pollute the water sources of the MCL area. In both NTPC and MCL areas since the natural sources of drinking water such as canal, river, tube well, dug well etc have been polluted by the fly ashes, thermal plant and coal mines, the villagers do not have any substitute than depending upon the MCL and NTPC water tanker facility. But the supply of tanker water is meager, irregular and also not free from pollutions.

Owing to prolong mining operation, the ground water table has gone deep into the earth. Due to coal extraction, mining operation and powerful blasting in the coal mines the affected/displaced villagers not only draw water from the deepest recesses but also drink polluted water. After land acquisition and coal extraction, the available water sources like dug well and tubes well are drying up. Neither the government nor the project has any provisions for checking the water pollution in both MCL and NTPC area.

Further, government and project provided tube wells, dug wells and ponds are often found out of order and dry during summer season. Since the river water sources are polluted and well water is not suitable for drinking purpose the villagers boil the water for their drinking.

**Air Pollution**

The air pollution is caused due to the coal dusts which are more often released into air by mining operation and thermal chimney and during transportation of coal by vehicles, train and conveyor belt, depositing of coal by trucks at depot, burning of coal, blasting of dynamite and releasing of toxic gases like sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxide, carbon dioxide, etc and domestic use of coal in and around the villages of NTPC and MCL area. During summer season the fly ashes go on
rampant spoiling the villages, especially those located nearby the ash pond area. It engulfs the cultivable lands and village infrastructures as well. The chimneys of NTPC power plant more often emit burning ash and hazardous gases into the air making the entire physical environment a dusty cloud.

Though there are environmental and pollution control measures like ash water recirculation system, sewage treatment plant, solid waste control measures like utilization of ash for asbestos and brick manufacturing and plantation activities like compensatory afforestation for the development of green and clean belt around projects as claimed by the project authority but nothing has controlled the increasing level of pollution and temperatures and the adverse impact of fly ashes on land, water, air, plant, animal and human beings in and around the project locality.

**Land Degradation**
The mining overburden on sites of the projects covers up agricultural land, encroaches on forest land and causes top soil loss and affects drainage, soil micro-organism, vegetation cover and water table. The abandoned opencast mines and inadequate filling of land holes also cause land depression. Waste materials coming from the overburden heavy metal and hazardous substances released from mines into river, fly ashes and coal dusts make the soil hard and decrease its fertility. The abandoned opencast mines collect the rain water and become the breeding ground for mosquitoes.

**Noise Pollution**
Sounds of blasting, motor vehicles and coal loaded trains on merry go round railway line have been causing noise pollution in the affected locality. Blasting sound has been causing ground vibration, land slide, joint fractures and cracks. It is also adversely affecting the health of useful insects, animals and human beings living in both MCL and NTPC areas.

**Major Problems**
The major problems faced by the people from different angles like social, cultural, psychological, political, environmental and above all economic are so complicated and nerve breaking for the affected people of these two mining and industrial projects that the temporary economic gain of some people as found from our analysis in the previous chapter fails to impress the researchers and social
activists about the success of modern development strategy. When we interact with the oustee populations barring a privileged few everybody talks about their despair and hapless conditions. This becomes evidently clear when we analyse the people’s response to our series of questions relating to the problems of displacement and resettlement shown in Table 6.9.

**Table 6.9**  
**Major Problems due to Resettlement Impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>Major problems due to resettlement impact</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Landlessness</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Joblessness</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Marginalization</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Increase morbidity</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Food insecurity</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Loss of access to PDS facility</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Water scarcity</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Air and water pollution</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Loss of access to higher educations</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Increasing sickness of family members</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Non availability of forest produces</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Indebtedness</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Loss of access to government facility</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Uncertainty of future plan</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Poor maintenance of infrastructures and halt in developmental work.</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Loss of interest and courage to invest in land and business.</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Loss of access to money lender or bank</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Increased loan interest</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Planning for marriage, education of children and health were affected</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Conflicts with family members</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Conflict with neighbors</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Conflicts with host population</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Difficulty in getting the daughter married</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Increased domestic violence on women</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Increased prostitution</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Increased gambling</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Increased consumption of liquor</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Theft of property</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Household Survey 2007-08.

The Table depicts about the major problems encountered by the displaced households due to resettlement effects. The major problems as reported by the oustee people are: landlessness (68%), non-availability of forest produce (70%), increased morbidity (55%), loss of access to PDS facility (90%), water scarcity (98%), air and water pollution (100%), loss of access to higher education (80%), loss of access to government facility (39%), conflicts with family members (60%), conflicts with host population (39%), adverse impact on planning for marriage, education of children and health (89%), increased sickness of family members (55%), increased indebtedness (70%), loss of interest and courage to invest in land and business (60%), uncertainty of future plan (75%), poor maintenance of infrastructures and halt in developmental work (45%), etc. This has further aggravated social problems like conflict with neighbours, difficulty in getting the daughter married, increased domestic violence on women, increased prostitution, increased gambling, increased consumption of liquor and theft of property in the resettlement colony, cluster and affected villages. Many affected senior people blame that the projects have made many unemployed youth demoralized and dishonest. It has spread the culture of rabid consumerism and self-centeredness and made people unscrupulous in a changed environment of break of close family and social ties.