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The Public Policies of government of Orissa in the 1990s has led to two major problems of food insecurity and migration. Following the path of economic reform process in 1991, the state of Orissa replaced the system of 'License Permit Raj' by a more market friendly economic system where economic decisions of private agents responded to market signals. The reforms involved two major components: trade liberalization aiming at outward orientation and integration with rest of the world, and deregulation and privatization of industrial and financial activities that placed the private sector as the major driver of economic growth. The primary objective of the reform was to put the economy on a sustainable high growth path by providing an incentive framework that leads towards an efficient allocation of resources across various sectors in the economy. It was expected that the higher growth path would be broad based enough to improve the welfare of all major sections of the population. But contrary to the stated objective, in the post-reform period the government of Orissa has framed the public policies encouraging effective private investment throwing open its natural resources to the mercy of multinational corporations. In 1990, with the restructuring of the economy into an open economy, the mining sector was liberalised, making it easier for mine-owners to obtain permission for prospective mining. In March 1993, with the announcement of India's new National Mineral Policy, the mining sector was opened to private initiative and investment. Between 1994 and 1999, restrictions on foreign equity participation in the mining sector were removed in order to attract foreign capital and technology. The setting up of the apex advisory committee to monitor and review the environmental aspects of mining activities is merely a formal gesture, as the committee is chaired by the mining secretary and most of the members belong to the mining lobby. In general, the environmental expertise within government has weak representation, and there is no space at all for representatives of grassroots groups and local communities. The government of Orissa has actively promoted transnational and national exploitation of the state's mineral resources based on the stated objectives of development and employment generation. The production and export of minerals have indeed contributed to state
revenues. But the question arises, is it sustainable? Does the revenue from mining and allied activities take into account their profound social and environmental costs that constitute a social and ecological debt to the people of Orissa? In pursuit of growth based on a neo-liberal development paradigm in an era of heightened economic globalisation, the state government policies have favoured increased foreign investment in mining and related industries, and have relied significantly on the exploitation of domestic mineral resources for export— at the expense of the environment and local communities. The policies in the mining and other sectors have increasingly shown that "development" is not just a concept any more. Under the current neo-liberal paradigm, it has become an ideological garb to disguise the appropriation of people's resources by private capital, thereby increasing ecological debt owed to people. Thus there is a need to examine every single development project, which consumes tremendous resources, through environmental and social lens, to ensure that genuine development accrues to people.

The question arises what measures the government should adopt to fill in the lacunas in the policies implemented by it? What is called for is a structural approach, a change in the legislative and policy interventions. The Policies because of their organizational and operational weakness are identified with corruption and growing indebtedness of the poor. They are aiming at short term goals with immediate benefits, rather than planned on a sustainable basis with long term objectives. Therefore they should be reviewed critically and be reshaped in order to benefit the people for whom these are designed. It calls for decentralization. Apart from the organizational arrangements for various categories, the delivery mechanism needs to be strengthened. It is ineffective due to various reasons like lack of sensitive, trained and aggressive managerial personnel, lack of sensitized preparedness of the state for large investments, procedural delays and lack of proper evaluation and planning. According to widely held opinion the legal framework relating to land and forest issues must ensure the interests and livelihood of the communities. Community participation has to be truly recognized while taking decisions on allowing mining and industrial activities. With the participation of village and panchayat level committees the causes and effects as well as cost-benefit analysis can be analysed prior to decision-making. The governance system must acknowledge the role
and place of the community. The public policies have been politicized and are implemented as more out of political commitments than of constitutional commitments. They are guided by political interests, overlooking the democratic interests of the state. The administrative structures, institutions and processes have not been designed to sustain the democratic values, traditions and collective participation in the polity. The heavy reliance upon bureaucratic methods and procedures has proved a stumbling block in the path of development. The result has usually been disastrous. The abilities of the administrative system are not enough and sufficient due to its own inherent weakness, distance between it and the public and the lack of cordial relations with the common voters. A change in the institutional environment is required to make the policies more effective. The strong states are a necessary but not sufficient condition for good governance for poor people. It requires at the same time strong institutions and organizations of dispossessed and excluded people who assert as an inalienable entitlement their right to participate in all aspects of governance, and to hold the state tightly, continuously and effectively accountable. The way forward therefore entails demonstrating alternatives to the neo-liberal paradigm, critiquing policies and legislations, and providing alternatives through research, advocacy, lobbying, networking and alliance building.