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Introduction

The resettlement and rehabilitation policy in the Upper Krishna Project has evolved gradually in the last two decades. From a rudimentary stage prior to 1978, the R and R Policy took a concrete shape in the World Bank sponsored Phase-I programme of the Upper Krishna Project between 1978 and 1986. Policies were further refined comprehensively in the World Bank sponsored phase-II project from 1989 to 1997. The current policy on the resettlement and rehabilitation of the project-displaced families is a result of this continuous process of refinement in the Upper Krishna Project. An attempt has made, here to evaluate the policy with problems of people.


1. Some of the crucial terms have defined in the policy namely, displaced person, displaced family, land owning displaced person or land owning displaced family and landless displaced person.

2. Monetary compensation calculated on the basis of prevailing legal norms.

3. Some of the provisions have made; examples, ex-gratia amount for acquiring agricultural land. Income Generating Scheme, Free house plots, Monetary assistance for transportation to all project displaced families.

4. The choice for selecting the any resettlement colony to live in, other than the same village, which has been affected by the displacement.

5. Land compensation: Amount payable in addition to compensation. Those have more than 10 hectares land; there is no additional payment for such category.
6.76 to 10 hectares - Rs. 20,000/-
3.51 to 6.75 hectares - Rs. 40,000/-
0.25 to 3.50 hectares - Rs. 60,000/-

- Income Generating Scheme costing not more than Rs. 20,000/- (for lost some land and left 1.5 h.a.s.).
- Bank loans for income generating schemes.
- Rs. 22,000/- for house construction.
- Provisions of plots - Extent of pre-project agricultural land - holding; size of the site for which the family is eligible.
  Less than 0.25 hectares - 100 sq. mtrs.
  Between 0.25 hectares and 3.50 hectares - 200 sq. mtrs.
  Between 3.51 hectares and 6.75 hectares - 300 sq. mtrs.
  Between 6.75 hectares and 10 hectares - 400 sq. mtrs.

These are some main features of the resettlement and rehabilitation policy of Upper Krishna Project in Karnataka. The main features of the policy are evaluating with problems, identified in the research study. The identified problems are: resettlement colonies do not represent the past villages. The present policy does not speak about resettlement pattern; the Government buildings are constructed according to the Engineers will and wish. For Example, the two buildings have constructed in a cylindrical manner and the both buildings are distributed for Anganawadies. The echo disturbs children and teachers and some are become deaf. The architecture of such buildings has failed to serve the need of the people in the Honnihal resettlement colony. The basic facilities like water and sanitation are not provided in the colony. The overall resettlement pattern is neglected by the policy.

The problem of displacement is not taken as serious problem in the present policy. The people of Honnihal resettlement colony were explained their bitter experiences, and which reveals that policy makers and executers are not considered the displacement problems as serious.
The policy only speaks about physical and not about the socio-psychological aspects of people. Physical assets, viz. land, house are taken as serious issues and monetary compensation is provided.

The joint family has lost many more beneficiary facilities provided in the policy; two major brothers of the joint family are eligible for house construction grants but not others. The joint landholders have received compensation cheque on the joint account in the banks, made the situation very complex.

The policy is gender biased. The monetary compensation is provided for never married daughter of family the age limit is above 35 years. There are many examples, which reveal the policy has not considered widows. Such example as some of young widows are between 25-30 years of old, who have no children and they are living with their parents not in their husband’s houses. No one of Devadasi just below 35 age in Honnihal resettlement colony have considered in the policy. It is a common problem found in all resettlements.

The policy does not speak of Matrilineal female head of family and the property rights go only to daughters, such daughters are living with their husbands in her own mothers house. The policy speaks about only two major sons in the family are eligible for sites and grants but not major daughters.

Most of the people in Honnihal resettlement are not aware of participation of ‘local people’ in the policy matters.

The policy speaks about the Income Generation Schemes, which helps to generate Income. In the policy, tailors/cobblers/barbers are considered for Income Generation Schemes but not considered Potters, Blacksmiths other traditional occupants.

The policy does not look beyond compensation and not speak about land for land compensation. Weaker sections of society have no fair chance to get labour work in resettlement colony. The policy does not considered them in respect of their daily wage problems.
The policy is not pro-society, it is pro-individual but it has no wholistic approach. People of Honnihal resettlement are expressed their views about the R & R policy that, “We do not know about policy but we only know about lawyer, who is helping us”. The illiterate people of the villages are not aware about their rights. They have believed that, when the Government is asking them to dislocate their land and house, it is bounded duty to obey the order. Such type of innocent people is living in the colony. The middlemen like lawyer helped people in court cases; most of the people lost their compensation money, provided by the Government.

Most of the people not utilized the compensation money for gaining the lost asset. Even though the policy has provided economic generation grant, house construction grant etc. but the people are not utilized the money for the given sake, mainly poor and illiterate people have misutilized the money. Most of the families are migrated from the colony even though they have site on their name, mainly because of livelihood.

Most of the people have rejected the colony life and they have made a habitation near by old submerged village area, that habitation is called as ‘Katikyana Maddi’; this habitation is 3-4 kms away from the resettlement colony. According to Mandal Panchayat office source of Honnihal resettlement colony, the total number of families in the colony are 333 and the total population is 1789. But according to the basic census study report of the present research, carried during 2005 to 2006 in the resettlement colony of Honnihal, shows that the total population is 1223 and 214 families are dwelling in the colony. The figure reveals that 119 families are not living in the colony, among these families most of the families are living in the ‘Katidyana maddi’ - people made habitation. It clearly shows that most of the displaced families are not willing to live in the Government/UKP made resettlement colony.
The policy has not considered the Non-Government Organization's community building skill or economic improvement skill. The policy provided facilities like IGS but such Organizations helps to improve the economic life.

People of the colony have realized about their economic condition. Few female self-help groups are trying to generate many for their economic developments. There are 6 Self Help Groups are existed in the colony and they are working for improve the family income. Some of the schemes they have involved are Dairy, Poultry etc. People of Honnihal realized that they have to help themselves, accordingly they have planned many new schemes to introduce in their organizations.

**Conclusion**

The present resettlement and rehabilitation policy has certain loopholes but it has provided compensations for the assets of people along with some exgratia amount, Income Generation Schemes, Transport facilities and free sites. Even then, it is not a holistic policy, which has not considered the mechanism of the socio-economic and cultural life of people.