

**TRIBAL MOVEMENTS AND
LIVELIHOODS:
RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN
ORISSA**

Sakti Padhi

Nilakantha Panigrahi

Working Paper 51



Chronic Poverty
Research Centre



Indian Institute of
Public Administration

The CPRC-IIPA Working Paper Series disseminates the findings of work in progress to encourage exchange of ideas about poverty related issues. The findings are being placed in the public domain at the earliest with a view to generate wider debate.

For information about the working paper series, contact:

Professor Aasha Kapur Mehta

Professor of Economics

or

The Registrar/Deputy Registrar (Academic Support)

Indian Institute of Public Administration

Indraprastha Estate, Ring Road

New Delhi- 110002

Tribal Movements and Livelihoods: Recent Developments in Orissa

Sakti Padhi

Nilakantha Panigrahi



Indian Institute of Public Administration, New Delhi



Chronic Poverty Research Centre

2011

Sakti Padhi, Professor of Economics, Nabakrushna Choudhury Center for Development Studies was born on 17.08.1956 and passed away on 02.03.2010. He completed his M.A. from Delhi School of Economics (1978), M.Phil in Applied Economics from JNU (1979) and Ph.D in Economics from JNU (1989). He authored three books and a large number of research articles in the areas of poverty, health, livelihood, agriculture and employment. He completed 17 research projects and made an immense contribution to the State Development Report (2001) and Orissa Human Development Report (2004) supported by UNDP and Planning Commission of India. He devoted his life to understanding and contributing to issues and debates pertaining to the field of economic development, both nationally and in the context of Orissa. The insights he has provided through his work will remain valuable for policy makers and researchers for decades to come.

Nilakantha Panigrahi is a Faculty member in Social Anthropology, Nabakrushna Choudhury Centre for Development Studies, Bhubaneswar. He has an M.A., M.Phil, Ph.D in Anthropology and Bachelors Degree in Law from Sambalpur University, Orissa. He has worked with Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA) for a decade in different positions. He has published 35 research papers in different national and international professional journals, completed 21 research reports funded by various international and national organisations such as the DANIDA, UGC, ICMR, World Bank, The Ford Foundation, ICSSR, Overseas Development Institute (ODI) London, Committee of Governors, IWMI-Ratan Tata Trust, Orissa Information Commission, etc. on issues relating to tribal development, tribal livelihood, community health, disaster management, ethnicity, impact of progressive policies like MGNREGA and RTI etc. He has authored 3 books. His areas of interest include Development Anthropology, Action Anthropology, Disaster Management, Tribal livelihood, Ethnicity and Ethnic problems, and ECO-Tourism.

ABSTRACT

For the last few decades and more particularly since 1990's the issue of human rights-violation of rights to life and livelihood of tribal peoples' is a central concern. Therefore, the discourse on tribal movements and issues of tribal livelihood revolved around securing their well-defined rights on land and forest resources. This paper attempts to critically review major tribal policies and programmes of the state of Orissa. It tries to assess the impact of and changing perspectives regarding development programmes that affect the livelihood resources of the tribal people. The paper also tries to review various methods of articulation of collective concerns of tribal people with regard to the promotion and protection of their natural resources based livelihood.

The experience in Orissa shows that tribal peoples' protest movements, however well organised, have to take cognisance of the powerful interests of economic elite and industrial capital - both domestic and foreign - that wield considerable political power. Protest movements by the tribal people of Orissa in different pockets have attracted the attention of policy makers, bureaucrats, academia and activists across the world. These movements have contributed to strengthening the sporadic articulations by tribal people to organised protests and have led to the recognition that there is need to review the approaches and strategies of development interventions of the state as well as streamline the development programmes.

Keywords: *tribal people, tribal livelihoods, shifting cultivation, Orissa, bauxite mining, agitation*

Tribal Movements and Livelihoods: Recent Developments in Orissa*

Sakti Padhi and Nilakantha Panigrahi

1. Introduction

1.1 Livelihood Rationale of Tribal People

The traditional livelihood system of tribal people (also known as adivasis) has been based on shifting cultivation and collection of edible forest produce. Such a system was rendered sustainable by a level and pattern of utilisation of land and forest resources, which ensured their self-generating capacity. Sustainability was also ensured through adoption of a highly diversified pattern of production and shifting cultivation. When shifting cultivation began to decline from about the second decade of the 20th century, and tribal people took to settled agriculture mainly on the uplands, they actively adapted to upland conditions by growing a large variety of crops. While the physical yield of these crops was quite low in comparison with that of modern mono-crop agricultural practices, it minimised the risk of complete crop failure. Such a livelihood system also provided for a nutritionally balanced food consumption basket. All in all, one may say that tribal people were perhaps the earliest ‘social ecologists’: tribal people’s economic conditions of existence were rooted in both subsistence and conservation ethics.

In social terms, the traditional livelihood system was based on customary, usufructuary rights of tribal communities over land and forests. It was also an ‘extensive’ system of production. The ‘common pool’ nature of resources supported customary rights and

*The authors acknowledge the contribution of Dr A. K. Mishra, NCDS, for his computational assistance during the writing of this work.

prevented the intensification of production, in the interest of conserving and sustaining the long-term productivity of livelihood resources. The sustainability of tribal people's livelihoods was thus firmly rooted in a system of 'property' rights over land and forests. As a consequence, the livelihood system's 'carrying capacity' was relatively low and it typically supported sparse populations relative to the size of the 'territory'.

The customary rights of tribal people over livelihood resources and their territorial sovereignty (insofar as land was territory, not property) increasingly came in to conflict with the forces of 'modernisation', which was defined by the developmental state and by 'outsiders' (whom we may call the plains people). In this discourse, it was thought that tribal people's traditional livelihood system was characterised by underutilised, wasteful and 'inefficient' use of productive resources. Thus, the developmental state, mainly using the logic of the market, created a policy and legal framework for gaining control over resources from the 'tribal territory'. The territories of tribal people were thus broken open. There was widespread resentment and organised protests by tribal communities when this process of territorial intrusion was initiated by the colonial state through its land tenure policies in the uplands of Orissa in the mid-19th century and through forest conservation policies introduced at the end of that century. This indirectly facilitated the entry of caste Hindus into tribal territory for the commercial exploitation of productive resources. Thus, the space for the penetration of varied forms of commercial capital into the tribal hinterland was created. All this threatened to undermine the viability and sustainability of tribal people's livelihood base as their access to productive resources started to narrow. It is against the above background that we can understand the role and effectiveness of developmental interventions by the Indian nation-state and international development agencies for the protection and promotion of tribal livelihoods, and how tribal people have played a role in this.

1.2. Broad Objectives

The following are the main objectives this paper seeks to cover:

- a critical review of tribal policies and programmes of the state within the broad framework of planned development efforts;

- the impact of state interventions on the livelihood base and structure of tribal people;
- how and why the rationale and approach of the state's development interventions have changed;
- the manner in which the tribal people have articulated their collective concerns from the point of view of the prospects of their livelihood promotion and protection;
- the major limitations of state tribal policies; and
- recommendations on how the livelihood question for tribal people needs to be addressed in order to mainstream tribal development processes in an era of rapid macro-economic changes.

1.3. Major Focus of the Paper

In the following section, we give a brief account of the physiographic conditions and historical factors, which together carved out a niche for the tribal people of Orissa and gave them a pre-eminent position in the state. In section 3, the critical natural resource base, and customary access to it, of tribal people's livelihood structure is presented. How this has changed over time is described to provide a backdrop for the discussion that follows. Section 4 briefly presents the extent and causes of development-induced displacement and the poor record of rehabilitation and indebtedness as conditions of livelihood insecurity. Section 5 gives a detailed account of the nature of and approach to planned interventions by the state and central government. Section 6 critically examines certain major government initiatives specifically aimed at improving the livelihood base of tribal people, as well as some from bilateral funding agency and non-governmental organisation (NGO) bodies. Section 7 illustrates the changing nature of state interventions through adoption of a participatory mode and autonomous institutional support. Section 8 gives an account of the different forms and contexts of the open articulation of tribal rights in the recent past, while section 9 provides some concluding remarks.

2. Orissa, its Physiography and Tribal People

2.1. Physiography of Orissa

The administrative division of the state comprised 13 districts and was restructured into 30 districts in 1992, which are sub-divided into 59 sub-divisions, consisting of 314 Community Development Blocks (CD Blocks) and comprising of 56,887 villages. Around 3.74 percent of India's population is in Orissa. Since 1921 the state has experienced a progressive decline in the female-male sex ratio. Despite immense diversity in its agro-climatic conditions, it can be classified into four distinct agro-climatic zones. They are the coastal plains, the central table land, the northern Plateau and the Eastern Ghats. The major rivers of this region are the Mahanadi, Brahmani, Baitarani, Budhabalang, Rushikulya and their many tributaries. Orissa has 480 km of coastline. It has an essentially undulating topography, with highlands constituting 64.2 and 50.6 percent of the cultivated area in the northern plateau and Eastern Ghat regions, respectively. The tribal people, who constitute about 22 percent of the total population of the state, are concentrated in this highland region.

2.2. Formation of Orissa State

The history of Orissa dates back to antiquity. The territorial boundaries of the state were never fixed in the past and in ancient times this land was known variously as Udra, Kosala, Tosali, Kalinga and Utkal, representing the different territorial, political and cultural contexts of the Rajas and Maharajas. Cultural links between the regions bear testimony in the field of art and artefacts, music and dance and in the processes of amalgamation of different cult groups by the dominant religion of Hinduism, with the Jagannath Cult and the Oriya as a numerically powerful linguistic group. The important dynasties that ruled over Orissa at different periods had their capital in the coastal region. Orissa lost its independence to Afghan invasion (1568–78), Moghul domination (1578–1751), Maratha control (1751–1803), and British rule (1803–1947).¹ Towards the end of the 19th century more than half the land area of present-day Orissa was under the control of 24 feudal chiefs; this area contains most of the ethnic minorities and major land area of the present state. In 1936 Orissa became the first state (after Sindh) to be formed on the basis of language. Its inland regions are by and large inaccessible thanks to ecological conditions. The heavily forested Eastern Ghat hill range

runs across the state in a north–south direction, which has made the tract inaccessible. Tribal people are the original settlers of this region. These inland regions, which were divided into *Garjats* were more-or less-independent of the kings of coastal Orissa until the Maratha and Moghul rule. During British rule most of these *Garjats* were raised to the status of princely states and maintained their identities until India achieved independence.

2.3. Tribal Communities of Orissa

Orissa has always taken an important, distinct and colourful position on the national map by harbouring various culturally unique ethnic groups from time immemorial. In 1956 the President of India declared 62 different tribal communities in Orissa to be ‘Scheduled Tribes’ (STs), of whom 13 communities are considered Primitive Tribal Groups (PTGs), and were assigned special treatment. Almost 44.25 percent of the total land area in Orissa has been declared as Scheduled Area.² The major tribes of Orissa, in terms of their numerical strength, are the Kondh, Gond, Santhal, Saora, Bhuiyan, Paraja, Koya, Oraon, Gadaba, Juanga and Munda. There are also several smaller tribal communities living in the state. They are the Chenchus, Mankiridia Kharia, Baiga, Birhor and Ghara. Tribal communities such as the Santhal, Gond, Munda, Ho, Birhor, Koya, Lodha, Kondha, Bhumija, Kharia and Oraons cut across state boundaries and are found in the neighbouring states of Jharkhand, Chhatisgarh, Andhra Pradesh and West Bengal, while tribal communities like the Juanga, Bonda and Didaye are found in the region of their origin in the districts of Keonjhar and Malkangiri, respectively. These tribal communities can be classified on the basis of geophysical zones, geographical regions, ethno-language, and crude techno-economic development. They have rich social institutions, dwellings, natural habitats, folk dance, folk music, musical instruments, festivals and festive occasions, folk art and artefacts, a nature-based economy and life skills. In spite of the impact of outside forces on the socio-cultural processes, many tribal communities are trying to maintain their ethnic boundaries, reflected in various fronts of their life. These communities by and large possess certain common characteristics, like animism, use of crude technology, concentrated habitations, use of dialects, subsistence economy, etc. and other characteristics that distinguish them from complex and hierarchical societies.

3. Tribal Livelihood Resources

3.1. Customary Land Tenure and Land use Systems of Tribal Societies

The survival of tribal communities critically depends on land and forest resources. For historical and ecological reasons, most tribal people inhabit the forest and highly inaccessible regions of the state. These communities practise various customary land tenure systems, which have often been modified by state policies and legislation. The clan-based land tenure system was based on customary rights over land, trees and forest. For example, the Kondhs clans were called *muttas*, who may be further sub-divided into their linkage-based territories, as observed in the case of Dongaria Kondhs and Kutia Kondhs. The land use and tenure systems vary from tribe to tribe, as reflected in the practice of swidden and terraced cultivation. In general, tribal communities cultivate valley bottoms as paddy lands and kitchen gardens, while in the uplands they practise swidden or shifting cultivation as observed among the Kondhs, Saoras, Parojas, Gadabas, Bondas, Juangs and Bhuiyans. Juangs, Bhuiyans and Kondha enjoy community ownership over certain valleys and hillsides.

It may be noted that the tribal-dominated regions of Orissa inherited land and forest administration systems from the Madras presidency (south Orissa), central provinces (parts of western Orissa), Bengal Province (coastal Orissa) and many princely states like Mayurbhanj, Keonjhar, Bamara, Bonai, Boudh, Kalahandi and Rairakhol. During the pre-British period most of the tribal areas were autonomous. During the British period the inclusion of tribal areas in the state and state administration was often violently contested. Much of this resistance was brutally put down. This often led to the dispossession of tribal people as *zamindars* (village headmen) and tribal cultivators with usufructuary rights within the customary land tenure system. This was perhaps the beginning of the forced displacement and forced migration of the tribals to the plains. In the subsequent period, both the British and Princely States increased their administrative control over tribal areas and settled lands with non-tribals who carried out settled cultivation. In Gangpur Princely State most *Gountias* (intermediary tenure holders responsible for rent collection) were tribals in the early 1800s; but by the 1890s there was a great preference for non-tribal *Gountias* from the Agharia and Teli castes. The major

motivation for encouraging the settlement of upper caste cultivators in lands customarily held by tribals was to increase land revenue.

In 1882 the policy of the Kalahandi king to settle Kultas, an agricultural caste, in tribal areas led to a *Kondh* rebellion, which was suppressed with great brutality with the support of the British (District Gazetteer, Kalahandi, 1980). The policy of encouraging Oriya cultivators in tribal areas had led to a rebellion by 20,000 Juang in Dhenkanal and Keonjhar Princely State in 1868, and was again boldly suppressed with the help of the British. Thus, the entry of non-tribal peasantry, encouraged by the ruler to open up settled agriculture and wet rice cultivation, led to the transfer of land from tribals to non-tribals and, in the plains areas, converted tribals into landless labourers or pushed them into marginal lands. Since the non-tribals were given virtually free passage into the cultivable plains lands, large-scale alienation of such lands occurred. In terms of future access, it should be noted that the power of assigning wastelands to cultivation was vested in the village headman – a colonial policy.

Immediately after independence the land administration in the state moved from an intermediary land system to a *rayatwari* system following the principle of tillers as owners, accompanied by laws to regulate the concentration of land holding through a process of fixing a land ceiling. The process of land reforms in Orissa was piecemeal and full of loopholes, and it failed in its goal to ensure equity and efficiency in agriculture. The Orissa Estate Abolition Act, 1952 provided for abolition of all intermediary tenure holders and vested all the rights in the state and intermediary tenure holders. The Orissa Land Reforms (OLR) Act, 1960 provided for permanent heritable and alienable land under the principles of land to tillers and the Act was amended in 1965 and 1972. The corporate and joint rights of tribal people over land did not allow it to be a saleable commodity. Uncritical adoption of the colonial concept of land ownership in the post-Independence era thus made it difficult to determine how much land, over which they had customary usufructuary rights, tribal people have lost in practice. How much land owned by tribal people has been alienated into the hands of non-tribal landed elite and upper caste cultivators through illegal transfers? It is a fact that the loss of land affects tribal people's social and sacred relationship with the land, which is reflected during ploughing, collection of non-timber forest products (NTFPs), utilisation of stream water, maintaining

sacred groves, etc. One can say that among the tribal communities loss of land seems to be equal to the loss of social identity, not only for the present generation, but also for future generations. Whatever quantity of land tribal people cultivate, only a negligible percentage of it is recorded against their name. Land above a 9⁰ slope from sea level is normally declared government land. The land patches used for shifting cultivation and terracing are normally above 9⁰ elevations.

The Government of Orissa (2000) recently realised that the non-conferment of entitlement rights to tribal people for cultivation of land in the hill slopes within 30° represents a major non-performance of the state in the matter of land reforms and a reason for unrest among tribal communities. Now the government has made a conscious policy to carry out a special survey of unsurveyed hill slopes within 30° in Scheduled Areas (except Kasipur Tehsil), with the purpose of transferring ownership of such lands to tribal cultivators who in many cases have been practising terraced cultivation and adopting indigenous techniques of cultivation.

3.2. Shifting Cultivation

Shifting cultivation is a primitive farming technique known by different names in different tribal communities of Orissa.³ Increased population pressure has not discouraged the shifting cultivators much, mainly because of the non-suitability of 'better' farming and multi-cropping (mixed cropping of ten to 20 varieties) which have proved to be more productive and agriculturally viable for tribal people. Different estimates of shifting cultivation in Orissa carried out by different agencies and experts suggest that around 11 tribal communities follow this practice, constituting around 30 percent of the total tribal population of the state (Government of Orissa: 1960–61; 1971–72). However, estimates of the extent of shifting cultivation in terms of area contain wide variations and thus it is difficult to assess with any degree of certainty their relative reliability. The crop cycle, crop quality and quantity depends on the cultivation cycle and distance of *podu* patches. This type of crop diversity ensures conservation of minerals of the soils, checks damage from pests and diseases, ensures food grains for couple of months, conserves soil nutrients and acts as an insurance against total crop failure, unlike under mono-culture systems (Pathy, 1987). There is no doubt that over the decades the growth of population, restricted government forest policies, commercial plantation, deforestation, land alienation,

non-availability of suitable hill slopes and availability of viable livelihood alternatives have reduced the cycle of shifting cultivation and its production substantially (Mohapatra, 1968).

Many scholars interpret shifting cultivation as a form of subsistence economy. While looking at the strengths and opportunities of tribal societies in general and the non-availability of infrastructure facilities in tribal areas in particular, it is very difficult to say that shifting cultivation is a subsistence economy. Pathy (1987) points out that cash crops are more or less of equal importance to staple crops because in many cases in tribal societies crops are found mortgaged even before they are harvested. It has been observed that the shifting land is community land, where the individual households are given usufructuary rights over a patch of land. However, over time, as a result of increasing pressure on land, a tendency towards heritable rights in shifting land has emerged. As a result, tribal people have moved from cultivating shifting patches to cultivating permanent patches. Although they have been cultivating the same patches for years, together with back up social support, the Revenue Department of the State Government still considers them to be encroachers on forest land, even in areas where there has been no forest for the past couple of decades. In this regard Fernandes *et al.* (1984) write: ‘in this marginalized stage a large section of tribal cultivators instead of living from forest as earlier, now live on forest’. As *podu* cultivation did not supplement their subsistence, and forest encroachment prevented them from engaging in collecting forest products they have been forced to look for other sources of income from outside the region as migrant wage labour in irrigated areas inside and outside the state.

Denial of rights over shifting lands and considering this practice as an encroachment on government land has always been the principal guideline for the state. Most shifting cultivation has been on ‘objectionable’ land, i.e. categories of revenue land not eligible for the issuance of entitlement rights as per law, and such lands are not settled under the provisions either of the OLR or of land encroachment laws (OPLE, 1972). Alternative measures to win tribals away from shifting land cultivation were adopted during the 1960s and 1970s through large-scale plantations of cashew and sisal, etc. The Economic Rehabilitation of the Rural Poor (ERRP) provided the rural poor with usufructuary rights on plantation programmes on shifting lands.⁴ Such rights were handed over to eligible beneficiaries when

these plantations bear fruit; however, absolute rights over the land were to remain with the state. The right of usufruct was heritable and transferable in favour of similar beneficiaries with the approval of the Tehsildar. The allotment of *podu* affected government land for plantation by *podu* cultivation in accordance with circular no GE (GL) S 69/79-3755/ Revenue Department, Government of Orissa alt.18 January 1980, which envisaged the planting of commercial fruit trees like mango, tamarind, jack fruit, guava and orange by the *podu* cultivators.

Notwithstanding the debate on the desirability or otherwise of shifting cultivation, one can say that many among the tribal population still practise it and from it generate their livelihood, which helps ensure the flow of food. It is a fact that, in the wake of capitalist approaches to land and land-based resources, planners, development workers and the state at large have started viewing shifting cultivation negatively. But none of the welfare services provided by the government during the past five decades to discourage tribal people from practising shifting cultivation seems to have been effective.

3.3. Forest Resources

The relationship of tribal people and forest resources has been symbiotic in nature. The life-way processes of Orissa's tribal people are reflected in their economy, religion, polity and social institutions, which cannot be understood without understanding various aspects of the forest surrounding them (Behura, 1990; 1996; Mallik and Panigrahi, 1998).

Until the intervention of the British, tribal people believed that they were the owners of the forest and forest resources that surround them. Their attitude towards forest resources as a source of food did not change much until Independence. They were more forest-friendly and were not exploiting forest resources randomly. Almost all the tribal communities in Orissa observe various forms of social sanctions related to undertaking or not undertaking certain forest-related activities: eating or not eating certain products, when and how to eat forest produce, and performance of rituals on a community basis before the first intake of forest food items. The customary laws of various tribal communities have become the guiding force for binding them closely with the forest. This can be seen when one examines the folk taxonomies given by tribal communities to flora

and fauna, and from their classification of plants as more and less useful, edible and non-edible, hygienic and poisonous, ritualistic and non-ritualistic, medicinal and non-medicinal (Behura, 1982).

A large extent of land in tribal areas is categorised as forest, hence the laws related to forests also have a major impact on access to land for tribals. The Orissa Forest Act 1972, the Forest Conservation Act 1980 and the Orissa Forest (Grazing of Cattle) Rules 1980, Sections 5 and 6, all have an immense impact on the livelihood resources of the tribals. The state's forest, can be classified as reserve forests, demarcated protected forests, undemarcated protected forests, unclassified forests and other forests. *Prima facie* the forest laws provide protection for settlement of the rights of local people and communities before land is declared forest land, but this does not always hold because some reserve and protected forests are so deemed without any settlement taking place, and there is often non-recognition of rights on land used for shifting cultivation, and a lack of settlement of rights and family settlements. This implies that once an area has been classified as forest of any sort, it can not be used for cultivation or any other purpose without the permission of the Ministry of Environment and Forest (MOEF) and ownership rights cannot be given without the Supreme Court's permission. In this process the regional variations of customary practices are not taken into consideration. In most cases the rights of the tribal people, which were prescribed in the /FA/927 audits amendment in 1954, were not followed and forests were created in *ad hoc* survey and settlement processes. The reservation of forests has often been made with little consideration of the interests of cultivation. The areas declared as forest very often carry tribal villages where no settlement has in fact taken place.

In this context Saxena (1995) points out that 'Protected forest (demarcated or un-demarcated) is invariably classified as non-forest area in the Record of Rights (ROR) prepared and maintained under the Orissa Survey and Settlement Act and in function issued by Revenue Department (G.O. No-4898 of 1966) for reservation of Government land for specific purposes in rural areas. There is dual control of both the departments over such land/forests and virtually no management exists. Most of the Protected Forests are either declared as such under subsections 4 of section 33 of the Orissa Forest Act 1972 or deemed to be Protected Forests under sub-section 4 at section 81. Box 1 describes the realities on the ground regarding the issue of the status of forest villages in Orissa.

The identification of such villages could not be completed until 1980, when the Forest Conservation Act 1980 was passed. This ultimately neutralised the process of regularisation of the cultivation of forest land which was later treated as encroachment. In this way the tribal people are unable to access their age-old livelihood sources. Since they are deprived of entitlements over land, they are not eligible for certain state programmes and welfare measures intended for them. Despite the various attempts made by the state government, the MOEF, Government of India and the Tribes Advisory Council of Orissa to expedite the process of land settlement as per the Orissa Forest Act, little progress has been made. In 2000, the Government of Orissa (GoO) submitted a proposal to the MOEF to regularise 4,429 ha of forest area for cultivation. While this is an underestimation of the actual figure, the GoO has, through an affidavit, submitted to the Supreme Court of India a proposal for regularisation of 42,605 ha of such land in the whole of Orissa.

Box 1: Recognition of rights of the Forest Dwellers over the encroached land will strengthen their livelihood basket

In the Sunabeda sanctuary area, there are 30 revenue villages and 34 unsurveyed settlements, mostly inhabited by Chuktia Bhunjias, a PTG who are considered by the Forest Department as encroached villagers in the forest, although these people have been living there for generations together. Similarly, such villages in reserve forests are also observed in the Kutia Kondh-dominated region of Belghar in Kandhamal district, whose rights have not been settled. Such situations are observed in many sanctuary areas of the state. Likewise, Nabarangapur, Umakote and Koraput district (Nabarangapur Working Plan, P-275) have a number of such villages. Since these tribal people do not have legal rights over their habitations, they are unable to access many state livelihood-related programmes. The restrictions on them entering into the forest have multiplied their poverty to a situation that is chronic in nature. Again the data show that in 11 districts, a total of 0.276 million acres of forest land was under cultivation, while 0.316 million acres of government waste lands were fit to be reserved as forests. The Campaign for Survival and Dignity is a coalition of tribal organisations and NGOs lobbying for recognising the rights of such forest dwellers who have encroached to the extent of 20,000 hectares. The Nabarangapur division of the Working Plan enumerates 23,039.45 hectares as per 1980 encroachment.

There has been controversy over the Scheduled Tribes (Recognition of Forest rights) Bill, 2005, which specifies 13 rights for the adivasis, including access to and ownership of minor forest products, grazing rights, habitat and habitations for primitive tribes, settlement for old habitations and unsurveyed villages, and community rights to intellectual and traditional knowledge relating to forests and cultural diversity. Entitlement over land will be given to those adivasis who have been cultivating forest land since 1980, up to 2.5 hectares per nuclear family. The bill aims to look at the rights of adivasis along with their responsibilities for conserving the forests and protecting wildlife, while seeking to end the inefficient and monopolistic exploitative hold of the Forest Department over the adivasis by nominating the Gram Sabha (village council) as the authority to recognise and verify their claims. But the fact remains that the rights of the Gram Sabha seem vague. The bill has not properly reflected the principles of the Panchayat Establishment of Scheduled Areas (PESA) Act. It seems that the bill has made tribal people dependent appendages of the state, instead of making them free citizens, on a secured livelihood basis. In addition, misconceptions with regard to land distribution, old rights vs new rights, rights of non-tribal forest dwellers, etc. have multiplied the confusions over the new bill.

In the post-Independence era in Orissa, serious damage to forest resources, 'the food basket' of the tribal people, has been caused by the establishment of development projects. These projects can be categorised as multi-purpose irrigation dams, mines, roads, railways, new townships, refugee settlements and major industries. A few of the development projects so far established in Orissa's tribal-inhabited forest areas, which have had a tremendous impact on the forest resources and tribal life, are hydroelectric-cum-irrigation projects like Hirakud, Balimela, Machakund, Sileru, Upper Kolab, Upper Indrabati, Mandira and Rengali; mineral-based industries like the Rourkela Steel Plant, National Aluminium Company and Hindustan Aeronautics Ltd; and mining projects for cement, iron, dolomite and limestone. A detailed estimate of the deforestation carried out for various purposes, like irrigation, mines, roads and housing, railways, defence and industry shows that there were 190 projects established in Orissa by 1999, and 24,124 hectares of land have been deforested. The massive social cost of modern development projects – which are mostly borne by the local tribal

people – have not been taken into account in the project pre-appraisal and impact assessment documents, either in the private or public projects. Details of the distribution of forest areas released for non-forest use under the Forest (Conservation) Act 1980 (up to June 2001) are given in Table 1.

Table 1: Diversion of forest areas released for non-forest use under Forest (Conservation) Act 1980 (up to 1 June 2001)

Sl No	Name of the sector	Proposals finally approved by government	
		Numbers	Forest area diverted (ha)
1	Irrigation	51 (23.50)	5739 (22.64)
2	Industries	4 (1.84)	2403 (9.48)
3	Mining	74 (34.10)	8228 (32.46)
4	Transmission on line	37 (17.05)	2488 (9.82)
5	Roads and bridges	21 (9.67)	221 (0.87)
6	Railway line	4 (1.84)	1909 (7.53)
7	Defence	4 (1.84)	3865 (15.29)
8	Miscellaneous	19 (8.75)	163 (0.64)
9	Human habitations	3 (1.38)	322 (1.27)
	Total	217 (100)	25,343 (100)

Source: Pande, B. 1998 and Swain, M. and Panigrahi, N. 1999.

The impact of massive deforestation has been observed in the life-way processes of tribal people, and can be categorised as environmental effects, social effects and economic effects. The social effects of deforestation restrict tribal people's access to the forest and affect their religious activities, lifecycle rituals, customs, practices and habits. Similarly, the economic effects of deforestation have drastically influenced the traditional livelihood resources of tribal people, which were providing them with food and economic security.

In the Orissan context, studies have shown that tribal people have followed best practice in managing their land-based resources (Saxena, 1995). Tribal people have protected 150,000 to 200,000 hectares of forestland in 3000 villages (Kant *et al.*, 1991). At a certain level this reflects the functioning of various formal and informal village-level organizations in protecting their forest resources. In addition to the protection of village forests, such local level organisations have also been playing constructive roles in maintaining common resources, organising the community and establishing social harmony by resolving community conflicts. The Forest Department of the GoO tapped these resources only much later and formed Village Forest Protection Committees (VFPCs), which by and large maintain the traditional authority structure of tribal villages. In this regard the role of a few regional people's organisations, like 'Brukshya O' Jeevara Bandhu Parishad' (BOJBP) in Kesharpur, Nayagarh district, 'Budhikhamari Joint Protection Party' (BJPP) in Baripada, Mayurbhanja district and Budatika Anchalik Committee, in Negipalli, Balangir district, is remarkable.

**Box 2: Orissa shown the path to start Joint Forest
Management of forest resources**

In 1988 Orissa was the first state to introduce Joint Forest Management (JFM), which was later adopted as a policy by the Government of India. In 1990 the GoO passed another resolution to include all the reserved forests under protection by tribal villagers and to recognise the role of VFPCs in the management of both reserved and protected forests. Again during 1993 the GoO provided a 50 percent share over any major harvest of produce, in addition to meeting all intermediate requirements of the protecting communities. The distribution of VFPCs in different Forest Divisions of Orissa reflects the fact that there are certain Forest Divisions like Koraput, Sundargarh, Kalahandi and Rayagada, which have suffered from encouraging community participation in forest protection when compared with other Forest Divisions in Orissa.

3.4. Minor Forest Products and Tribal Livelihoods

Because of the uncertainty of agricultural yields, tribal people largely depend on minor forest products (MFPs) as a source of food security, as well as for household medicines. As a result, in the recent past policy makers, environmentalists, researchers and government have been highlighting the significance of MFPs in the life and livelihood of tribal people. Although MFPs are the sustainable sources of livelihood for poor tribal people, middlemen, traders and forest contractors have affected the prices received by primary producers through unfair trade practices. This has no doubt adversely affected the livelihood sustenance and food basket of a large number of poor tribal households. Tribal people are denied a fair price and most often receive a price lower than the prevailing market price (Roy Burman, 1982; Mohapatra, 1982–83; Mallik and Panigrahi, 1998). The collection and sale of NTFPs by the tribal population of Orissa have been drastically and systematically curtailed as a part of state strategy. In addition, the growth of the tribal population, which increased its dependency through adoption of commercial ways, conversion of tribal rights into concessions through the National Forest Policy, 1952, unscrupulous use of forest resources by middlemen and traders, and lack of interest on the part of the government in regenerating forest resources through plantations have affected the natural and only livelihood base of the forest dwellers. This is the reason why the Dhebar Commission suggested that the Forest Department should not function via an exclusive obligation to trees and vegetation but should also accept an obligation to utilise the forest as much as possible from the angle of the economic development of the tribal population. This section will end by discussing what the GoO has done in respect of giving tribal people a greater flow of income from MFPs.

The Government of Orissa has from time to time formulated and implemented a host of policies and enacted laws with regard to the collection, processing and marketing of NTFPs. Trade in kendu leaf, sal seed and bamboo was nationalised in 1973, 1983 and 1988, respectively. The objectives behind the nationalisation were partly to enable the primary collectors to obtain a remunerative price for their produce. Despite various policies formulated by the state at different times regarding the optimal collection, fixing of fair prices and processing of NTFPs, there still exist rampant corrupt practices, exploitation of tribals, state monopoly over forest resources, lack of

management skills and non-responsive attitudes of the government agencies working for the procurement, processing and marketing of NTFPs. These have all paved the way to encourage illegal trading of forest products both within and outside the state. Government organisational networks for the procurement and marketing of NTFPs have largely failed.⁵ This is reflected in the proportion of revenue generated from NTFPs (excluding kendu leaf) to total revenue from the forest, which reflects a fluctuating trend. It was 7.8 percent in 1985–86, 9.1 percent in 1986–87, 5.1 percent in 1987–88, 4 percent in 1988–89, 7.6 percent in 1989–90 and 4.3 percent in 1990–91. The corresponding estimates for each of the years from 1991–92 to 1998–99 were 9.4, 5.1, 6.1, 6.8, 4.8, 10.8, 18.1, and 9.6 percent, respectively. The contribution of income from the forestry sector to the National State Domestic Product (NSDP) (current price) in the state of Orissa constituted 1.00 and 1.4 percent respectively during the 1960s and 1970s and the 1980s, and 1.9 percent during 1989–1994-95. This calls into question the government's adoption of revenue maximisation policies, which have ignored the state's welfare responsibilities towards the tribal population, and demands the adoption of people-friendly forest resource management policies. In this process the pricing of NTFPs, leasing of NTFPs, royalties received, procurement and processing of products, and marketing of produce are some of the issues to be given due importance by the state.

Box 3: Organisational arrangements made by Government in Orissa for the marketing of SAPs and MFPs

The Tribal Development Co-operative Corporation (TDCC), which is an apex co-operative organisation, is engaged in the collection of MFPs and surplus agricultural products (SAPs) in tribal regions. The business achievements of Tribal Development Co-operative Corporation, when analysed, do not show a definite trend in harvesting a good business (TDCC, 1996). The TDCC has sustained a net loss for various reasons. They are: heavy interest rates on borrowing, high establishment costs, market fluctuations, irregular tapping of MFPs, high royalties and scarcity of working capital (Mallik and Panigrahi, 1998). Thus, the objective of having such an organisational structure to upgrade tribal people's socioeconomic condition by procuring and processing MFPs and in providing soft loans to poor tribals could not be achieved to the desired extent. In Orissa almost 90 percent of Large Area Multipurpose Societies (LAMPS) are defunct because of their large operational areas, heavy expenditure on transport of products, poor financial base, low payments to primary collectors, irregular supply of agricultural inputs and lack of dynamic management. There is also poor co-ordination among the TDCC, AMCS, Orissa Rural Development and Marketing Society (ORMAS) and National Agriculture Federation (NAFED), and a poor staffing structure (Mallik and Panigrahi, 1998). Such arrangements are unable to solve the basic purpose of protecting tribal or state interests.

Even the attempt by the GoO to go for a joint venture between IPICOL and M/S J.P. Lat & Associates, which gave birth to Utkal Forest Products during 1989, was severely criticised by NGOs, activists and planners because of its monopoly over 29 MFPs in Orissa. During 1989 the Panchayati Raj of the GoO created an autonomous organisation, the ORMAS to procure, process, add value and market a few MFPs in Orissa. As observed, ORMAS also suffers from weak management, poor accounting, lack of market-oriented planning and lack of efforts at product development.

4. Induced displacement and indebtedness

4.1. Induced displacement

The establishment of mega-projects in tribal regions has encroached on tribal people's age-old lands and thereby displaced them. These projects have an immense impact on their life and livelihood. They include hydroelectric-cum-irrigation projects like Hirakud (1948), Balimela (1963), Machhkund (1949), Upper Kolab (1978), Indravati (1978), Mandira, Rengali (1973) and Subarnarekha; mineral-based industries like Rourkela Steel Plant (1950), National Aluminium Company at Angul (1985), Hindustan Aeronautics Ltd (1962); the bauxite mining project at Koraput (1981) and projects on cement, iron, dolomite and limestone. A cursory calculation shows that, since Independence, Orissa has set up 190 such projects, which have deforested 24,124 hectares of forest land, the basic source of livelihood of the tribal people (Principal Conservator of Forest Office, Government of Orissa, 1999). Estimates of the magnitude of human population displacement in Orissa resulting from the establishment of various mega-projects during 1951–95 show that hydroelectric multi-purpose projects have displaced around 325,000 people, of whom only 90,000 (27.69 percent) have been rehabilitated. Similarly, out of 71,794 people displaced by industrial projects in Orissa, only 27,300 (38.03 percent) have been rehabilitated. Mining projects have displaced around 100,000 people, of whom almost 60 percent have been rehabilitated and around 50,000 people have been displaced through declaration of sanctuary, of which only 15,540 (31.08 percent) have been rehabilitated (Mohapatra, 1999). All these projects have had an immense impact on tribal village economies, family life and village power structures, as has been documented through various empirical studies in the state (Panda and Panigrahi, 1989; Behura and Nayak, 1993; Mohapatra 1998; Swain and Panigrahi, 1999; Patnaik, 2000; Behura and Panigrahi, 2001; 2002). The following Tables 2 and 3 explains the extent of displacement of households according to decadal variations and different sectors.

Table 2: Extent of displacement of households in different development projects in Orissa

<i>Sectors</i>	<i>No of families displaced</i>				<i>Total</i>
	<i>1950-60</i>	<i>1961-70</i>	<i>1971-80</i>	<i>1981-90</i>	
Power project	22,144	1357	19,769	443	43,713
Irrigation project	1015	578	2883	3607	8083
Industrial project	4251	468	-	5794	10513
Total	27,410	2403	22,652	9844	62,309

Source: Pande, B. 1998. and Swain, M. and Panigrahi, N. 1999.

Table 3: Displacement caused by development projects in Orissa from 1950 to 1990

<i>Categories of projects</i>	<i>No of families affected</i>	<i>% of total displacement</i>
Mines	3134	3.37
Industries	10,704	11.47
Thermal power	2426	2.60
Dams	64,903	69.55
Wildlife sanctuary	142	0.15
Urban slums	12000	12.86
Total	93,318	100.00

Source: Pande, B. 1998, Swain, M. and Panigrahi, N. 1999.

4.2. Moneylending and Indebtedness

Problems of indebtedness in the tribal areas of Orissa are the root cause and output of poverty. The subsistence economy of the tribal people does not provide them with livelihood support for the entire year. Not finding the existing livelihood sources sufficient, and faced with limited alternatives, they quickly and easily go to non-tribals to seek help both in cash and kind. Realising this the state authorities have formulated various rules and regulations in order to minimise the extent of exploitation. The basic objective of the legislation is to

ensure that moneylenders register themselves, maintain proper accounts and charge only reasonable rates of interest.

It is a fact that the imbalances between the income and consumption expenditure of tribal people makes them easy prey in the hands of the non-tribal moneylenders (Behura and Panigrahi, 2001). The caste communities who practise money lending are the Pana, Sundhi, Kumuti, Mohanta and Gouda, who have been in the business for a long time. Inter-regional movement of non-tribal populations into tribal areas has also brought in Telgus, Kumutis, the Oriya, Sundhis and the Doms, who have been exploiting tribals through unscrupulous trade and moneylending business (Patnaik, 1972:12). In fact, the moneylending system has been the major route of large-scale land transfers from tribals to non-tribals.

In order to check the extent of indebtedness among farmers in general and tribal farmers in particular, the state of Orissa formulated the Orissa Money Lenders Bill 1938. The Second Money Lenders (Second Amendment) Bill was passed on 23 Aug 1947 and the Orissa (Scheduled Area) Money Lenders Regulation 1967 Act (Regulation 2 of 1968) has been in operation since 1968; it introduced the registration of moneylenders for ten years and the maintenance of loan registers, etc. The Planning Commission Report on the Tribal Development Programme in 1969 admitted the acuteness of tribal indebtedness and expressed the view that no programme of economic development was likely to have any impact on the tribal economy unless tribals were freed from the clutches of the moneylenders.

Later a package of services was proposed relating to production and consumption credit, and supply of agriculture inputs and consumer goods in a more integrated manner. The first experiment in creating LAMPS was started in the Bonei sub-division of Sundargarh district. Presently in Orissa there are 240 LAMPS and 47 Block or Panchayat Samitis functioning in the Scheduled Areas of the state, but these agencies are incurring losses as a result of low turnover, low working capital, high overheads, a heavy interest burden and payment of royalties (Behura & Panigrahi, 2004). An evaluation study by the Scheduled Caste And Scheduled Tribe Research and Training Institute (SCSTRTI) (1995) on the working of LAMPS in Rayagada districts observed that the primary object of LAMPS, namely to provide short-term loans to tribal people for seasonal agriculture and medium-term loans for the creation of farm assets, seems not to

have been fulfilled. Similarly, the study by Das (1996) on the functioning of the Baliguda branch of the Tribal Development Co-operative Corporation of Orissa Ltd (TDCCOL) found that the operational areas of branch organisations were too big to address TDCCOL's objective. Mallik and Panigrahi (1998) found that, although entitled to procure 19 MFPs from an available 27 items, the TDCCOL in Bhuiyan and Juanga pirha of Keonjhar district, in practice collected only two items. This has led to *de facto* agents of TDCCOL collecting more varieties of forest products.

The problem of moneylending in Scheduled Areas in which tribals live has not been solved through regulation, as desired by the state. Money lending has inflated the interest rate and encouraged bonded labour in tribal areas. The functioning of credit institutions in Orissa does not have organic linkages with tribal marketing networks and such formal institutions have not been attuned to the needs of the tribal economy. The state government has not been able to make effective use of penal provisions in the legislation to counter evasion by moneylenders. Unless tribal people are provided with long-term support to increase their purchasing capacity and to enhance their income level, it is fruitless to expect to free them from the clutches of chronic poverty.

5. Planned Development of Tribal Areas

The British Legislature in India passed the Scheduled District Act XIV of 1874 by which local governments were empowered to identify and declare certain areas as Scheduled Areas. The British had at different times created the semi-autonomous territory of Kandh Mahal and promulgated Tenancy Protection Legislation in Orissa. The Indian Education Commission of 1882 made suggestions for the preferential treatment of tribal children in the form of non-payment of school fees and additional grants to schools located in tribal areas. Later the Government of India Act of 1919 and 1935 created a number of partial and fully excluded areas. A review of such privileges provided by the British suggests that they were compelled to grant such status perhaps not to improve tribal communities, but in response to the revolts and protests of the minorities, and with the purpose of containing them. In the post-Independence era, in consideration of tribal people's socioeconomic backwardness, constitutional experts drew up 20 articles, clauses and sub-clauses and two special schedules in the Constitution of India, which elaborately explained the protective privileges for tribal people, and which came into force on 26 January 1950.⁶

5.1. Tribal Welfare Programmes in Orissa

The First Plan made it clear that all tribal development programmes must reflect the expressed wishes of the communities concerned, while the Second Plan stated that programmes should be formulated by consulting tribal representatives and their councils. The Nehruvian Panchsheel also influenced tribal development policies in the state.

To examine the backwardness of the tribal people and tribal regions of Orissa, the Partial Excluded Areas Enquiry Committee, under the chairmanship of A. V. Thakkar, visited Orissa in 1938 and submitted its report, which was reviewed during 1946 by the Backward Classes Welfare Section. Finally, the GoO formed a separate department in 1948, known as the Backward Class Welfare Department. Not finding the name of the department appropriate, the GoO thought of changing it to the Rural Welfare Department or the Welfare Department; presently it is known as the ST and SC Development Department. In spite of the constitutional provision (Article 164) for a separate minister in charge of the welfare of SCs, STs and Backward Classes (although the states of Bihar and Madhya Pradesh have already made separate provision for the development of STs), the state of Orissa is yet to have such provision. The Tribes Advisory Council (TAC) formed in Orissa on 24 June 1950 has been advising the GoO from time to time on matters of the welfare of tribal communities in the state. The Scheduled Areas Order of 1950 first issued in Orissa by the Government of India and revised during 1977 added two full administrative districts as fully scheduled areas, with a few districts as partial scheduled areas. The recent reformulation of these districts in Orissa includes six districts as fully Scheduled Areas and five as partially Scheduled Areas.

In the initial days of Community Development programmes, special projects known as Multipurpose Tribal Blocks were started in 1956 on an experimental basis. The major objectives of these experiments were to develop tribal people in line with their culture and to safeguard their interests in land, the forest and forest-based resources. Being pilot projects by nature such experiments in financial, administrative and functional autonomy aimed to produce a development model for tribal people. However, these experiments were not methodologically and contextually sound for this purpose. In consideration of the recommendations of the Elwin Committee (1960) regarding implementation of the structure of Tribal Development Blocks (where

more than 50 percent of the population was represented by tribals) the state of Orissa initially opened up 62 such blocks, which were later increased to 74.

Since the beginning of the concept of the Community Development Programme in April 1951 and later the Community Development Blocks during the Second Five Year Plan period, planners have given special thought to the advancement of the tribal communities. Despite the constraints of proper policy formulation and impediments in the structural arrangements for tribal development, during the First and Second Five Year Plans, planners earmarked Rs 390 million and Rs 470 million to them, respectively. Perhaps the failure of the special Multi-Purpose Tribal Development Projects to find a model organisational and administrative structure for tribal development forced the government to establish both the Dhebar Committee and the Elwin Committee, which had recommended the structure of Tribal Development (TD) Blocks for implementing tribal development programmes. The basic objectives of the TD Blocks were to cover a contiguous area of 150 to 200 square miles and a population of 25,000. With 500 Tribal Development Blocks the expenditure for this purpose during the Third Five Year Plan was Rs 534 million, an increase of 21.2 percent over the Second Five Year Plan. Compared to the Second Five Year Plan Period (Rs 3.90 per person), the per capita expenditure for tribal development was lower (Rs 3.58) during the Third Five Year Plan period. This was mainly the result of the increase in coverage of the tribal population and the decrease in budget expenditure for tribal development from 0.81 percent in the Second Five Year Plan to 0.61 percent during of the Third Five Year Plan period. Since there were insignificant qualitative changes in tribal people's life-way processes, an evaluation of this programme was carried out by the Special Multi-purpose Tribal Block Committee under V. Elwin in 1959. The Committee (1960) observed that alienation of land, the role of moneylenders, and the fraudulent sale of agricultural produce had all resulted in the backwardness of tribal people.

The Tribal Development Programme also faced a major halt during India's involvement in war during 1962 to 1965. This forced the state to prepare Annual Plans during 1966 without any change in the thrust and priorities of the TD programme. During the Fourth Five Year Plan (1969-74) the programme started with a Commission headed by P. Shilu Ao (1961) and an assumption that most of the benefits of

planned expenditures had not reached the tribals as desired, primarily because of their socio-cultural set up. The Maoist Naxalite movements and the slogans of 'Garibi Hatao' or Poverty Eradication have largely influenced the change of emphasis in tribal development programmes. In order to devote more attention particularly to the weaker sections of society, the Fourth Five Year Plan initiated certain special programmes, like the Small Farmers Development Agency (SFDA), Marginal Farmers and Agricultural Labourers Development Agency (MFALDA) and the Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP). There was a major shift from a target-oriented development strategy to a family-oriented development strategy. One can say that the approaches adopted, programme content, programme type, their (lack of) integration, and an irregular flow of funds all caused the concept of TD Blocks to suffer. Such inherent deficiencies in policies, programmes, and also in implementation, subsequently provoked planners, executives, scholars and many others to rethink the concept and strategies of tribal development.

A Tribal Sub-Plan (TSP), as an integrated part of the state plan, was conceived during the Fifth Five Year Plan (1974–79) to cover both tribal-concentrated areas (having more than 50 percent tribal populations) and tribal-dispersed areas including those home to PTGs). The TSP approach had multifarious objectives: to bridge the gap between the levels of development of both tribals and non-tribals; to improve the quality of life of tribal people by wiping out the net of exploitation around them due to land alienation, bonded labour, high rates of interest during lending, low payment for forest products, etc. Allocation of funds for tribal development was streamlined and demarcated from State Plan Outlays, the sectoral outlays of Central Ministries, Special Central Assistance and institutional funds. Policy measures were enacted to protect tribal interests from liquor vendors, land alienation, moneylending and collection of forest produce. The Tribal Sub-Plan approach was introduced in Orissa in 1979, where Integrated Tribal Development Projects (ITDP) were launched. Thus, presently Orissa has 118 TD Blocks distributed over 21 ITDPs and Tribal Development Agencies, for planning and execution of tribal development programmes. These cover 1,549 Gram Panchayats (GPs) and 17,597 villages. Further, special micro-projects for the development of PTGs were implemented from time to time. Presently, Orissa has 17 micro-projects to bring the 13 PTGs into the mainstream. The first was started in 1976–77, five were started during 1978–79,

one each during 1984–85 and 1985–86, three each during 1986–87, 1988–89 and 1997–98 and the last two were started during 1993–94. The basic objective of all these arrangements is to bring tribal people out of poverty and to free them from of exploitation by non-tribals.

5.2. Flow of funds for tribal development in Orissa

The financial allocations for Tribal Sub-Plan areas of Orissa come from three major sources, namely, the State Plan, Special Central Assistance (SCA) and Central and Centrally Sponsored Schemes. Under the Tribal Sub-Plan framework, there has been major flow of

Table 4: Distribution of flow of funds in different years from various sources for tribal development in Orissa (at current prices and constant prices, 1993–94)

Year	Current prices (Rs million)				Constant (1993–94) prices (Rs million)			
	Flow from State Plan to TSP	Flow from Central and Centrally Sponsored Schemes to TSP	Flow from SCA	Grand Total	Flow from State Plan to TSP	Flow from Central and Centrally Sponsored Schemes to TSP	Flow from SCA	Grand Total
1974–75	1761	213	81	2055	7789	942	358	9089
1975–76	1970	458	299	2727	9572	2225	1453	13,251
1976–77	2062	795	427	3284	9708	3743	2010	15,461
1977–78	3271	849	728	4848	14,577	3783	3244	21,604
1978–79	5101	1077	950	7128	22,742	4802	4235	31,779
1979–80	5565	1109	871	7545	20,490	4083	3207	27,780
1980–81	8664	1306	775	10,745	26,183	3947	2342	32,472
1981–82	9209	2018	1022	12,249	24,856	5447	2758	33,061
1982–83	10,087	2730	1240	14,057	24,230	6558	2979	33,767
1983–84	9174	1662	1326	12,162	20,459	3707	2957	27,123
1984–85	11,311	6282	1563	19,156	24,330	13513	3362	41,205
1985–86	13,847	4220	1180	19,247	27,622	8418	2354	38,394
1986–87	15,893	5016	1762	22,671	29,657	9360	3288	42,305
1987–88	18,458	5587	1731	25,776	32,814	9932	3077	45,824
1988–89	19,665	8147	1894	29,706	33,235	13,769	3201	50,204
1989–90	22,956	10,809	2656	36,421	36,157	17,025	4183	57,365
1990–91	31,888	1196	2260	35,344	43,162	1619	3059	47,840
1991–92	23,560	6958	2608	33,126	27,727	8189	3069	38,986
1992–93	30,455	13,002	2455	45,912	32,867	14,032	2649	49,549
1993–94	36,701	18,388	3277	58,366	36,701	18,388	3277	58,366
1994–95	33,570	27,583	2871	64,024	29,497	24,236	2523	56,255
1995–96	30,723	27,888	4271	62,882	23,270	21,122	3235	47,627
1996–97	43,988	13,377	3766	61,131	32,473	9875	2780	45,128

Source: Report of the Annual Administration of scheduled Areas in Orissa, welfare Department, Government of Orissa (Various Years).

Table 5: Distribution of compound annual growth rate of allocation of resources under Tribal Sub-Plan in Orissa (constant prices, 1993–94)

Sl No.	Plan period	Name of the plan	Flow from State plan to TSP	Flow from Central and Centrally Sponsored Schemes to TSP	Flow from SCA	Grand Total
1	1974–79	5th	2.92	4.6	77.76	34.88
2	1980–85	6th	-3.36	23.08	8.25	2.82
3	1985–90	7th	6.74	19.66	11.89	10.23
4	1992–97	8th	-4.68	-5.48	0.84	-3.83
5	1974–97	5th–8th	5.32	9.67	3.25	6.27

Sources: Statistical Abstract – 1991, 1996, Directorate of Economics and Statistics, Government of Orissa; Economic Survey, 1997–98, Government of Orissa; Sixth, Seventh, Eighth and Ninth Five Year Plans, TSP Document, Harijan and Tribal Welfare Department, Government of Orissa; and State Plan Document for 1998–99, Government of Orissa.

resources into TSP areas. There has indeed been a massive increase in allocation, in nominal terms (i.e. at current prices) although it should be noted that the share of allocations under the State Plan has been the highest – about 72 percent (see Table 4). In order to get an idea of the magnitude of increase in real terms, the nominal figures have been expressed in constant 1993–94 prices (by using the implicit deflators of Orissa's NSDP) (see Table 5).

Using these constant price estimates, we have estimated the annual compound growth rates of expenditure in TSP areas. One point that needs to be noted is that there was a massive growth during the second half of the 1970s, i.e. during the Fifth Five Year Plan period, when the TSP came into force. However, expenditure growth rates came down drastically during the 1980s and declined further during most of the 1990s.

During 1974–1997 (i.e during Fifth to Eighth Five Year Plan period) the annual compound rate of growth of total expenditure under TSP

was 6.27 percent. Assuming that the tribal population was growing at a rate of at least 2 percent per annum, per capita expenditure in TSP areas during this period would have grown at something like 4.27 percent in real terms.

6. Livelihood Enhancement Programmes

6.1. Special Tribal Development Projects in Orissa

The Government of India, with the assistance of the International Fund for Agriculture Development (IFAD), set up a special tribal project on 14 May 1988 for a period of 14 years, in two phases and with a budget approval of Rs 317 million. The project aimed at the all-round development of tribal people in the Kashipur block of Rayagada district (447 villages covering a population of 51,385). However it was not continued after the first phase of seven years. Similarly, an integrated Livestock Development Project, assisted by the Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA) in Koraput district, which was planned to go into an extension phase, closed down at the end of the pilot phase in 2000. The Long Term Action Plan (LTAP) in Koraput-Bolangir and Kalahandi (KBK) districts has yet to yield many of the results planned at the initial phase. These projects have by and large failed to achieve their desired objectives. Only recently (2003–04) has the Government of Orissa, with assistance from IFAD, the UK Department for International Development (DFID) and the World Food Programme (WFP), started implementing a special 10-year development project. Called the ‘Orissa Tribal Empowerment and Livelihood Programme’, it is being implemented in ten blocks of four districts, i.e. Gajapati, Kalahandi, Koraput and Kandhamal, and is still in its initial stage. The following section more specifically explains the impact of a few tribal development projects.

6.2. Special Micro-projects for the Development of Primitive Tribal Groups

Given the perceived backwardness of the primitive tribal communities, planners realised that these communities required special care and holistic attention under the Tribal Sub-Plan approach. The gamut of development activities planned under the Tribal Sub-Plan covers sectors such as agriculture, horticulture, soil conservation, health, education, animal husbandry, communications and provision

of drinking water. In Orissa 17 such special micro-projects have been established at different times. These projects cover 13 vulnerable tribal communities made up of 61,240 households in 537 villages distributed over 20 CD Blocks in 12 districts. These special micro-projects have been formulated for these communities with a 100 percent subsidy under SCA. A review of the flow of funds to these micro-projects suggests that, although there is a standing instruction that 75 percent of the grant is to be spent on income generation programmes, in practice, since the state government is suffering a financial crunch and is unable to provide the necessary expenditure, there is often a slippage of funds from the programme head to the establishment head. Inconsistencies in the flow of funds are observed in respect of the period of release and quantity of funds allotted. This affects the physical achievements of the project and their impact on the development of vulnerable communities. As a result, the timely supply of various inputs, of institutional credit, and of training in improved dry-land farming and dissemination of knowledge on crop diversification are yet to have much impact on these communities (Acharya et al, 2000). In other words, the government has not given due importance to these special micro-projects that was planned in the Tribal Sub-Plan approach.

6.3. Orissa Tribal Development Project, Kashipur

The Orissa Tribal Development Project (OTDP) in Kashipur aimed to achieve sustainable economic progress for the tribal population of the region through an integrated programme which includes investment in agricultural production and natural resources development. The project covered around 12,500 tribal households and 4,000 non-tribal households. The total project cost was US \$24.4 million, of which IFAD provided a \$12.2 million loan at a highly concessional rate, the WFP granted \$1.4 million, while the balance was met from domestic contributions. The United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) was the co-operating institution, while the Harijan and Tribal Welfare Department of the GoO was the executing agency. The project ran from May 1988 to December 1997, followed by 21 months of extension. Around 84 percent of IFAD's loan was disbursed, although by June 1998 all remaining funds had also been disbursed (Orissa Tribal Development Program, 1998).

The project adopted an integrated programme of investments. Forty-two percent of the loan was spent on agricultural production

and natural resource development, human resource development was allocated 6.5 percent, rural infrastructure 10 percent, land survey and settlement 5.5 percent and implementation/management support received eight percent. Around 26 percent of the loan was used as price contingency, while only two percent was used for physical contingency. IFAD undertook an evaluation of the OTDP in November–December 1998. This evaluation has contributed a diverse range of knowledge about the project which provides guideline for implementing TD projects.

Infrastructure developed under the project included upgrading or construction of rural roads and bridges, which provide a vital lifeline for transport and communications in the interior villages of Kashipur. This generated sizeable wage employment. However, there was lack of participatory decision making and lack of maintenance and management of the assets in the later period by the project. Wage employment and payment, both in cash and kind, were not carried out on the same scale in post-project periods. On one hand, the project gave the tribals an opportunity to get to know the use of a money economy and also supplemented their income. However, in subsequent periods, because of a lack of sufficient wage employment provisions, many of them were forced to revert to moneylenders and this aggravated their indebtedness status. The process was unable to build any institutional mechanisms oversee the subsequent processes.

The allotment of funds for human resource development was six percent and was less than the project management component (eight percent). The programme basically aimed to build awareness and self-reliance with the help of NGOs. It was observed that the project was over reliant on establishment of physical infrastructure, agricultural development, land development, etc. and gave little importance to identifying an NGO alternative to Agramee, a local NGO. Agramee left the project after the initial period, following a power struggle with the project management unit (International Fund for Agriculture Development, 1998). At one level this reflects the failure of the project to recognise the importance and contribution of human resources development for meeting the overall project objectives and related development processes. Limited success in HRD was the one of the major shortcomings of the project, because the target group did not feel included and sufficiently integrated in it (IFAD, 1998). In other words, participation, training, empowerment and education of the

target populations, which are essential for the success and sustainability of any programme, were not given due importance. As a result, the project could not be people-centred and was unable to establish a sense of trust and confidence among the intended beneficiaries of the project.

The project claims that it has placed more emphasis on the role and importance of the indigenous knowledge system and tried to make use of this in the design and implementation of the programmes. However, many instances have been observed where the knowledge of rural people has not been given due importance. For example, the project did not consider the sites suggested by the villagers for constructing a few water harvesting structures on the grounds that they did not fit the engineering requirements. Similarly, the coffee plantations promoted by the project as a cash crop have never been traditionally favoured by tribal people for cultural and economic reasons (Industrial Management Consultants of Orissa, 1998). The development processes adopted in the project did not place much importance on the valuable knowledge system and problem-solving strategies in the farming system, on natural resource management, biodiversity, health, education, social organisation or mobilisation. The project could not incorporate the traditional knowledge resources with technical knowledge suitable to the context and environment of the tribal people. In other words, a land-to-lab approach should have been used as a catalyst in accelerating the development process, while adopting new knowledge-transferring technologies to the tribal people.

Illegal cultivation of podu land is a common practice in many tribal-dominated regions of the state. Tribal people in Kashipur region observe this as an age-old practice. From an agricultural point of view the project conferred land titles on these shifting patches, promoting sound environmental management practices, and helped tribal people restore the agro-ecological balance. From a socioeconomic point of view the initiative of providing land titles in the names of both spouses enhanced the social status, security and confidence of the tribal people and provided opportunities for income generation. However, this manner of privatising landed property imposed on tribal villages partially upset the existing community-based social security networks. In such a situation the land reform programme could not be accompanied by opportunities for

employment, marketing, and access to rural financial services or institutional support.

The Project Management Unit (PMU), headed by a project manager and officials deputed from line departments, managed the project poorly (IFAD, 1998). This was the result of frequent changes of project managers, adoption of a top-down approach in administration with limited scope for participatory management, lack of an appropriate monitoring and evaluation system, low take-up of key positions and poor co-ordination among key functionaries located at Bhubaneswar and Rayagada (IFAD, 1998). Staff were not adequately technically equipped. The PMU was not sufficiently prepared for a participatory approach in implementation, which greatly marginalised their performance.

The project could establish that, without the adequate participation of different shareholders and more particularly the target groups at different stages of the project, like design, decision making and implementation, post-project sustainability would be of major concern (BJKK, 1998). In the IFAD project the involvement of tribal people in the preparation of action plans programmes and budget was minimal. This created mistrust and discontent between the tribal people and the development agencies, which were reflected when the state entered the region through the corporate sector to explore bauxite minerals in the Kashipur region.

6.4. Revised Long-Term Action Plan (LTAP) for KBK Districts

The LTAP and KBK⁷ programme was launched by the then prime minister on 18 August 1995 for an initial period of seven years, with an objective to pool the available resources and integrate them scientifically to effect the speedy development of the extremely backward KBK districts of Orissa. Over time the undivided KBK districts have been divided into eight districts, comprising 14 subdivisions, 37 Tehsils, 80 CD Blocks, 1437 GPs, and 12,293 revenue villages. The total geographical area of the KBK region is 47,810.2 square km². The average density of population per square kilometer in this region varies from 69 in the case of Malkangiri district to 188 in the case of Bolangir district, with an average of 13 people per square kilometer in the whole KBK region. The basic objectives behind this reformulation are to give people greater access to welfare services.

The demographic strength of the KBK districts lies in their differences in ethnic composition, which includes SCs, STs and many other caste communities, who, despite their similarities, maintain cultural specificity, distinct practices, values and customs. Tribal communities like the Bonda, Didayi, Dangaria Kondha, Chuktia and Bhunjia, as well as the Kutia Kondha, still express their identities in their backwardness and development features.

Looking at the gaps in the envisaged achievements of the LTAP, the Government of Orissa submitted and has been implementing its revised LTAP (RLATP) for the period 1998–99 to 2006–07, consisting of Central Plans and Centrally Sponsored Schemes in various sectors. The RLATP envisages drought proofing, poverty alleviation, and improved quality of life in the region through strategies like building a productive rural infrastructure, income generation on a sustainable basis, mobilising and energising the rural poor and restructuring and energising the social security system.

The major programmes covered emergency feeding for 2,00,000 elderly people, nutritious food for 9,42,000 children up to the age of six, provision of health services to 130,000 patients through 90 Mobile Health Units, irrigation of 39,520 hectares of agricultural land through 314 watersheds, and of 16,480 hectares of land by 645 lift irrigation points and 26 medium irrigation projects, planting of 1,25,000 hectares of land and creation of person days of employment for the poor, provision of drinking water from 13,151 hand pumps and the establishment of 400 tribal girls' high schools, each with a 40-bed hospital, for educational expansion among the tribals. Various educational programmes, like mid-day meals for the students and free distribution of books and clothing, amply reflect a positive impact on the drop-out rates, which fell from 75.89 percent during 1996–97, to 28.93 percent in 2004–05 (Government of Orissa, 2004). Similarly women's literacy was 15.87 percent during 1991, which increased to 29.10 percent during 2001 (Government of Orissa, 2005).

Despite many claims for the achievements of this special programme, many studies have demonstrated the realities on the ground in the KBK districts and the programme's deficiencies in affecting the different areas of life and livelihood of this region. These may include problems with primary education and the primary health service delivery system, and the increase in planting and reduction in the coverage of shifting cultivation. That apart, deaths from starvation

in Kashipur and Nawarangpur, of children in Rayagada, due to anthrax in Koraput and Rayagada, the eating of mango kernels in Kandhamal and Rayagada, bonded labour, child labour, the selling of children and, migration of the poor from this region are still featured in the media, and in the reports of various committees and commissions. The poor growth of infrastructure, most particularly communications, in highly inaccessible regions like Malkangiri, Koraput and Rayagada has substantially affected the delivery of basic life-support systems to the villages. This has partly encouraged the growth of the Naxalite movement in these regions, which has become a constant headache for the state.

6.5. Western Orissa Rural Livelihoods Project (WORLP)

The Western Orissa Rural Livelihoods Project (WORLP) has the overriding goal of reducing poverty in rainfed areas of India and aims to establish a more effective approach to sustainable rural livelihoods, particularly for the poorest, by 2010. DFID has provided Rs. 2.3 billion to be spent over 10 years, while TC funds to support capacity building for government and NGO generation of knowledge accounts for around 9.075 billion. The operational area of the project covers 14 blocks in Balangir, and five in Nuapada district, while a mid-period review would consider extending it to six blocks in Kalahandi and four in Bargarh district. The project aims to establish 'Watershed Plus' activities, i.e. capacity building, minor irrigation, drinking water, and livelihood initiatives for the poorest. The GoO intends that WORLP will complement the KBK plan and help to build the capacity needed to implement it. The project has three major components. These are promoting livelihood improvements, capacity building for primary and secondary stakeholders, and encouraging an enabling environment. The project includes four major elements: pooling additional resources, capacity building for vulnerable groups, building a government staff structure, and focusing on enabling policies. The project expects that the interventions of various programmes will improve agricultural incomes, reduce drudgery, use water in a more effective manner, reduce environmental degradation, provide greater food security, empower the community to better access resources, establish equitable access to livelihood opportunities, strengthen institutional capacity and help formulate people-friendly policies. In total the project will have an impact on production, employment, poverty alleviation and capacity building.

The project completed four watersheds in 2000–01, 22 in 2001–02, 48 in 2002–03 and 60 watersheds in 2003–04. It has encouraged better water management by way of minor irrigation, drinking water, sanitation and forestry interventions. Women and landless people are also included on the village watershed committees. Since its inception the project has tried to involve its target groups while preparing project documents through people's planning processes and also encouraging their involvement by strengthening certain institutional mechanisms, transferring low cost technologies in selected areas like agriculture, soil conservation, food processing, and irrigation. Box 4 presents a case study on the intervention of International Development Enterprises, India (IDEI) in the field of transferring low-cost irrigation technologies.

Box 4: Participatory technology development and promotion of micro-irrigation

International Development Enterprises, India (IDEI) is committed to reducing hunger and poverty through promotion of affordable irrigation technologies. IDEI is a partner of WORLP and decides the areas of action research with Natural Resource International (NRI) – a technical partner of WORLP. IDEI has identified opportunities for assisting poor farmers to make their farming systems more resilient, diverse and productive. It works in collaboration with local Project Implementing Agencies (PIAs) like government departments and NGOs who have been introduced and oriented to various aspects of technologies and their trials.

The development of surface 'treadle pumps', 'pressure pumps', 'rope and washer pumps', 'KB irrigation systems' and 'water storage bags' through Participatory Technology Development (PTD) has reduced the drudgery of the women. IDEI is disseminating these technologies through demonstration plots, training for PIAs, developing promotional strategies, process documentation, and carrying out impact studies. The organisation's capacity building programme has emphasised training in agronomic practices, low-cost technologies, farmers' camps, vermi (i.e. pesticide) wash, and exposure of farmers and PIAs to new ideas as part of its outreach work. The research and development programmes are carried out through learning and doing methods, which have greatly helped to popularise the participation technologies developed.

Source: International Development Entrepreneurship Institute, Bhubaneswar, Orissa.

7. Participation and Empowerment

7.1. Panchayati Raj Institutions in Orissa

Unlike many other states in India, Orissa passed the Gram Panchayat Act of 1948 to form local authorities like District Boards or Joint Committees. Similarly, the Zilla Parishad and Panchayat Samiti Act of 1959 led to the foundation of Orissa Panchayat Samitis at block level and Zilla Parishads at district level. Since then elections for both Panchayat Samitis and Gram Panchayats have been held in 1967, 1970, 1975, 1985, 1992, 1997 and 2002. Elections to the Panchayati Raj in Orissa have been influenced by the political interest of the parties in power. For example, various alternative structural arrangements have been tried for Zilla Parishads, which at different times have been called District Advisory Councils and District Development and Planning Boards. These newly formed bodies were replicas of Zilla Parishads, and they led to concentration of power either in the hands of ministers or of District Collectors. The over-politicisation and bureaucratisation of panchayat bodies has encouraged malpractice and malfunctioning of the system, as desired by groups with vested interests.

The 73rd Amendment of the Constitution of India has empowered the Gram Sabha at the village level, the Panchayat Samiti at the block level and Zilla Parishad at the district level. In Orissa there were 5261 GPs with 93,781 elected representatives, 314 Intermediary Tiers (i.e. Panchayat Samitis) with 6,541 elected representatives and 30 Zilla Parishads with 884 elected representatives (State Election Commission, 2002). Orissa has introduced a 33 percent reservation to encourage women's participation, and the achievements in this regard have been spectacular, notwithstanding the low literacy levels among women in the state (Mathew, 1994).

A critical comparison of the Central Act 40 and the Orissa Gram Panchayat (Amendment) Act 1997 shows that, as per section 4 (iv), the state of Orissa provides traditional rights to the Gram Sasan and makes it competent to safeguard and preserve the traditions and customs of tribal people, their cultural identity, community resources and customary mode of dispute resolution consistent with the relevant laws in force (they are not included in the Central law) and in harmony with the basic tenets of the Constitution. However, in practice the rules of Criminal Procedure Code (CrPC) and Indian Penal Code

(IPC) prevail over the customary laws of the tribal communities. The Central Act, Clause 4 (1) provides scope for consultation with the Gram Sabha over the acquisition of land in the Scheduled Areas, but the state law in Orissa, under section 3 (6) of the Orissa Zilla Parishad (Amendment Act 1997), confers this right on the Zilla Parishad which, even without the knowledge of the Gram Panchayat, can lease out land for mining, resettle the displaced people, and manage the minor water bodies. In this context, Orissa is in effect curtailing the power of the Gram Panchayats, which is a matter of concern. The Orissa Gram Panchayat Bill 2003 contains provisions for a minimum presence of one-tenth of the members in Palli Sabha. The proposal for setting up industries within the geographical areas of the Gram Panchayat has to be approved by it within 60 days and then sent to the District Collector for approval. In the case of any dispute at district level, the decision of the government will be final.

In July 2003, the state government empowered Gram Panchayats with various development activities within 11 different government departments such as Agriculture, Co-operatives, Schools and Mass Education, SC and ST Development, Women and Child Development, Panchayati Raj and Water Resource Development. The power to plan, implement and monitor development activities rests with the Panchayati Raj Institutions at various levels.

With the 73rd Constitutional amendment, the Government of Orissa enacted the Orissa Gram Panchayat (Amendment) Act 1996 for operation in the Scheduled Areas of the state. The GoO has realised that NTFP items have been an important source of livelihood for tribal and rural people but the prevailing system does not provide them the scope to get a fair price for these products (Government of Orissa, 2000).

7.2. Orissa Tribal Empowerment and Livelihood Programmes (OTELP)

The Orissa Tribal Empowerment and Livelihood Programme (OTELP) is jointly funded by IFAD, DFID and the WFP in partnership with the Government of Orissa. It proposes a long-term development intervention in the northern and southern tribal belts of the state and is being implemented in three phases over a period of ten years. The programme ensures that the livelihoods and the food security of poor tribal households are sustainably improved by promoting a more

efficient, equitable, self-managed and sustainable exploitation of the natural resources at tribal people's disposal through off-farm and non-farm enterprise development.

The programme covers 30 of the most backward blocks with tribal concentrations in the seven districts of Gajapati, Kalahandi, Kandhamal, Koraput, Malkangiri, Nawarangpur and Rayagada in southwest Orissa and in Sundargarh in the northern tribal belt. The total cost of the project over ten years is estimated at US \$91 million. The IFAD loan represents 22 percent (\$20 million) of the total, the DFID grant 44 percent (\$40 million), while WFP is contributing \$12 million (14 percent) in food form. The Government of Orissa is contributing \$9.7 million (11 percent of the total).

OTELP was launched in Orissa on 2 October 2004. It has a State-level Programme Management Committee running state-level administrative unit programmes, while at district level Integrated Tribal Development Agency (ITDA) implements the programmes through a District Management Committee headed by the District Collector. The Public Sector Units (PSU) has five subject matter specialists for Capacity Building; Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation; Management Information System Executive; caps should be small Livelihood and Natural Resource Management; and Finance. Fifteen NGOs were selected to implement the programme in ten blocks of four districts. Under the livelihood enhancement programme certain activities like land and water management, production system enhancement, farming system approaches, rural financial services, community infrastructure and participatory forest management are being carried out as policy initiatives in respect of settlement of land rights, land record surveying of hill slopes between 10° to 30° and ensuring food security for tribal people.

The project aims to introduce watershed plus activities (see above), particularly with respect to community empowerment, diversifying livelihood sources, identifying the root causes of vulnerability, strengthening GoO-NGO partnerships, encouraging convergence programmes, emphasising process rather than targets, strengthening institutional structures, and improving the mode of delivery of tribal development programmes at ITDA level. It also prioritises investment at ITDA level, based on the Village Level Development Plan with respect to *podu* cultivation, moneylending, migration, MFPs, market

linkages and health improvements. Since the project is at an early stage of implementation, it needs to emphasise the programme monitoring and evaluation system, which can act as an effective management tool, formulating input–output and process monitoring indicators, along with establishing an evaluation mechanism with focused indicators.

8. Articulation of Tribal Rights

Recently the state has witnessed repeated mistakes whereby poor tribal people protesting against state encroachment on their age-old land rights in the name of development, have lost their lives. Incidents in Maikanch in Raigada district, Mandrabaju in Kandhamal district and Kaling Nagar in Jajpur district may be linked to the impact of globalisation on the poor tribal people of Orissa. Yet incidents involving the subjugation of tribals in Orissa and the deprivation of their natural rights over resources are not new. In post-British India, as a result of deprivation, the tribal people of Orissa have taken part in many movements and revolts. These include uprisings of the Kondhs of Ghumasar (1835–37), the Gonds of Sambalpur (1857–64), and the Bhuiyans of Keonjhar (1867–68). These regional anti-feudal and anti-British agitations and movements gave birth to a class of regional leader, including women, in Orissa in general and in ethnic minority-dominated areas of the state in particular to fight against the British during India's independence struggle. F.G. Bailey (1963), in his village study among the Kondhs of Orissa, rightly pointed out that land alienation, money lending, killing of marginalised groups, burning of crop fields and huts of the poor and imposition of collective fines were some of the major causes of such uprisings. Pathy (1987) opines that this milieu of underdevelopment, destitution and disunity seems to be being reproduced even after more than six decades of the formation of the state and more than five decades of independence.

The following section discusses the present profile of tribal resistance and Community Based Organisation (CBO)-led movements, their approaches, strengths and weaknesses. It will help us to understand what kind of socio-political and institutional capital exists, and how this could be mobilised to create or strengthen the existing platform for seeking better deals from policies and programmes.

8.1. Tribal People's Struggle Against Bauxite Mining in Orissa

The state of Orissa, particularly the southern belt, i.e. undivided Koraput, Balangir and Kalahandi districts, is endowed with 1733 million tonnes (70 percent) of the total bauxite resources of the country. In the post-liberalisation period this mineral resource has attracted foreign investment, which brought the state into the international arena. During 1992–97, bauxite resources in Orissa have pulled in foreign investment to the tune of Rs 973 billion (US\$20.5 billion) (Agreement signed by the State). Since 1986 several attempts have been made in western Orissa to explore bauxite ores. The deposits of bauxite in different regions of these districts include 2.13 million tonnes in Gandhamardan in Balangir and Bargarh region, 195.73 million tonnes in the Baphalmali hill range, 81 million tonnes in Sasubohumali in Kashipur block of Rayagada district, 86 million tonnes in the Sijumali region, 40 million tonnes in the Kutrumali region of Rayagada and Kalahandi districts, and 91.4 million tonnes in Kodingamali in Laxmipur block of Koraput district (Government of Orissa, 2000).

Among the companies which have tried but ultimately failed to explore bauxite mining in Orissa at different times are BALCO Ltd in 1986, Utkal Alumina, INDAL, TATA, Hydro (Norway), ALCAN (Canada) and HINDALCO. Any such mining projects will have an adverse impact on the life and livelihood of tribal people. The physical displacement of villagers caused by such projects will involve serious consequences, both in the long and short run. Estimates of the losses incurred from these mining projects vary according to different organisations and period of loss calculation. However, mining has been projected as the only means to combat famine, flood, starvation, and the consequences of all other forms of natural calamities. The state has pushed the 'globalisation mantra' through mining and industrialisation to attract the middle and lower middle classes of the Oriya people in the hope of providing ample employment opportunities for the young unemployed in the state. Orissa has 60 percent of India's bauxite reserves, 25 percent of its coal, 98 percent of its chromites, 28 percent of its iron ore, 92 percent of its nickel ore and 28 percent of its manganese ore.

In all these mining project areas forest resources, hill slopes and natural water bodies constitute the major livelihood sources of tribal people. Because of the paucity of suitable land, wet cultivation is not

feasible in these regions. Depletion of forest resources has become the biggest threat to tribal people in the wake of the many hydroelectric projects established in the state. In addition, mining projects result in the piling up of solid effluents such as red mud and tons of sodium hydroxide, leaving a high PH level in the soil and loss of vegetation and natural habitats. The establishment of bauxite mining by NALCO at Damanjodi only 100 km from Kashipur has adversely affected the tribal people and their livelihood. The tribals have been pushed out to the level of wage labour in the informal market. Similar situations have resulted in the tribal-dominated Mayurbhanj, Sundargarh, Keonjhar and Sambalpur districts in northern and western Orissa, where iron ore mining operations and open cast coal mining operations are underway.

The tribal people in Orissa have raised their voice against such mega-development interventions. They have questioned the development process by asking 'Development for whom and at whose cost?' noting that it basically affects tribal people and their non-renewable livelihood resources. This is why the tribal people in Orissa have expressed their strong opposition to bauxite mining. Since 1985, tribal people and other peasants have united under the banner of the Gandhamardan Surakhya Parishad to battle BALCO in the Gandhamardan Hill ranges in Sambalpur (undivided) and Balangir; this has stopped the implementation of the project. In 1996 tribal people in Kashipur came together under the banner of a local organisation, Prakrutika Sampad Surakha Parishad (PSSP). Similar processes in Thuamul Rampur of Kalahandi district have also stopped work being carried out by the Sterelite Company. All these movements have resulted in police firing on and killing poor tribal people and dalits (previously known as untouchables) in the state. The police shootings at Sindhigaon, Gopalpur (1997), Maikancha, (2000) and Kaling Nagar (2005) symbolise the conflict between the state's approach to development, which favours industrialisation and mining, and that of those who do not. In all these movements women's groups have taken an active part through picketing, processions and public hearings. The emergence of an indigenous leadership made all these movements more widespread. The government and political forces of the state left no space for the people, but rather made strenuous efforts to overcome their resistance by labelling these movements a problem of law and order. In fact, in this process of micro movements,

the forest-dependent communities are trying to re-establish the functional importance of their indigenous institutions as a part of the political process and to determine the regional needs of the people. A brief profile of proposed and current bauxite and alumina projects in Orissa and of their operational status is given in Table 6.

During all these movements BALCO and UAIL were unable to establish trust among the local people. They were not able to establish a dialogue on the issue of the relationship of the local tribal people with their natural livelihood resources and with the local ecology. These movements reinforced people's belief in community strength, women's abilities, and environmental consciousness. Villagers were able to protect their indigenous productive forces. Their agitations have proved that a people's movement against globalising forces can make a meaningful path to preserving indigenous sources of livelihood. Boxes 3 and 4 describe some of the regional movements against bauxite mining in Orissa.

8.1.1. Bauxite Mining in Sambalpur

The Bharat Aluminium Company (BALCO) is a Government of India undertaking. It entered the Gandamardan hills (see Box 5) in the district of Sambalpur and Balangir (both undivided) on the basis of a lease of 9.6 square km of the hill range, which carries 213 million tonnes of bauxite on 2 May 1983. A delay in the completion of the project increased its cost from Rs 320 million to Rs 560 million. The three-year agitation by the peasants and tribals of Paikmal region almost froze all progress.

The Paikmal region comprises tribal peasants and scheduled castes, who together constitute 55 percent of the population. The major tribal communities of the area are Gonds, Binijhals, Kondh and Kultas (chasa), who are the dominant landed gentry of the area, followed by Gandas, Teli and Sahara. The Marwaris and Gujratis, though numerically fewer, control trade and commerce in the region and have often entered the agrarian economy, occupying a sizeable land holding in the region. The landed gentry is popularly known as *Gauntias*. The average number of landless households ranges from 30 to 50 percent in each village. They largely depend on forestry and wage labour (Rao *et al.*, 1987). Paddy production ranges from 18 to 22 bags per acre (best land), with 8 to 10 bags on inferior land. Other crops include cereals and oil seeds. The labour exploitation

Table 6: Profile of bauxite and alumina projects in Orissa

District/area	Company	Nature of work	Work progress
Rayagada, Kucheipadar, Kashipur	UAIL	Proposed aluminium plant	Resistance under PSSP
Baphlimali, Kashipur	UAIL	Proposed bauxite mines	Resistance under PSSP
Siju Mali and KutriMali, Kashipur	MOU, L&T and GoO	Proposed bauxite mines	Resistance under PSSP
Sasubohu Mali and Indrajit Mali bauxite hill range, Kashipur	MOU of Sterelite with GoO	Proposed bauxite mines	Resistance under PSSP
Kalahandi Khandual Mali Thuamul Rampur Block	MOU & L&T & GOO	Proposed bauxite mines	Resistance under Khandual Mali Surakhya Samiti
Lanjigarh	Sterelite	Proposed aluminium plant	Resistance under the Niyamgiri Surakhya Samiti, work not started
Niyamgiri	MOU or Sterelite with GoO	Proposed bauxite mines	Resistance under the Niyamgiri Surakhya Samiti; work not started
Korapat Ghusuli Mali Dasmantapur	MOU, L&T and GoO	Proposed bauxite mines	Resistance started
Kodinga Mali Laxmipur	MOU of HINDALCO (Aditya Birla) with GOO	Proposed bauxite mines	Resistance under PSSP
Deomali, Samiliguda	MOU being negotiated	Proposed bauxite mines	Under negotiation
Damanjodi	NALCO	Aluminium plant	In operation since 1986
Panchapat Mali Semiliguda	NALCO	Bauxite mines	In operation since 1986
Bolangir Gandhamardan bauxite mining	MOU of BALCO with GoO	Proposed for bauxite mining in 1986	BALCO was forced to withdraw as a result of people's agitation

Source: The Struggle against Bauxite Mining in Orissa (2002).KVR, KNPVO, Manasa, PDF and PUCL.

practices in the region mainly follow *halia* (*Bonded labour*) depending on the nature of agreement.

Gandhamardam hill is considered the mother of all the local people in terms of providing food, firewood, fodder, water (22 streams and 150 perennial springs) and medicines, both for home consumption and sale (Panigrahi, 1986). The major NTFPs collected by the people are mahua flowers, sal seed, bamboo shoots, charseed, kendu leaf, mango, harida and bahada. Forest produce and paddy collection are siphoned through credit markets with cheaper rates. Bamboo cutting for Orient Paper on Gandhamardhan hill continues for five months per annum, which provides wage employment to the local population. The festivals and religious practices of the local people centre around the Gandhamardan hill, which acts as their 'cultural terrain' (Panigrahi, *ibid*).

The state's modernisation process showed a lack of belief in the people and their socio-cultural resources linked with the larger ecology of the region. It ignored the people's strength and cultural wealth. But in so doing, it established the fact of people's capacity, including the hidden strength of youth, women and children. The processes of people's organisation helped them to access information on their right to life and livelihood. The people's movement also established the fact that the state's interests, which normally represent the fewer well-to-do sections of society, are not above the interest of the common people, who need sustainable development as their natural right.

Box 5: BALCO movement in Sambalpur (Undivided) paved the secular processes of resistance by the Forest Dwellers to protect Forest Resources.

BALCO came to explore bauxite in Gandhamardan hill and guaranteed to provide support to 500 people on a permanent basis and 3000 people on a daily wage basis, a guarantee which seems very low due to the highly mechanical nature of ore exploration. The project authorities also presented a rosy picture to local people, making the hill out to be a modern temple. Since the project's inception there has been fighting between local people on one side and local political representatives on the other, the latter considered supporters of BALCO. The processes of organising and reorganizing people took two years and continued up to the first blasting operation in July 1985, which caused the collapse of part of the 800-year-old Nrusinghnath Temple - the cultural symbol of the region. This was a direct attack on the religious sentiment of the local people. The situation was rightly exposed by the Viswa Hindu Parishad, which initially took the lead and channelled people's religious sentiments under the banner of Harishankar-Nrusinghnath Surakhya Samiti (HNSS). This frontal organisation made use of different mythological stories from the Puranas, linking the hill system and the people around it. The construction of roads polluted stream water, and the polluted water was symbolically misinterpreted as the anger of the local god. During his visit to Paikmal, Late Sundarlal Bahuguna was given a bottle of muddy water to present to the Prime Minister as a symbol of the impact of the modern temple built by BALCO in the tribal people's abode. Deforestation carried out by BALCO to make conveyer belts and roads was considered by the tribals to constitute the loss of their divine symbols, home of the *totem* of their clans. Since the project's inception BALCO attacked at the roots of culture and society of the local people and their sentiment.

The second phase of the movement was led by the Gandhamardan Yuba Surakhya Parishad (GSYP), which was formed in 1985 and led by local youths, representing almost all the local villages. The GSYP mobilised women, who participated in all the *dharana*, picketing, processions and public meetings, because women are the chief users of forest resources for domestic use (Panigrahi, *ibid*). Children were also involved in different picketing and blockades. Thus, the emergence of an indigenous leadership and the marginalisation of outside leaders helped the secularisation processes of the movement. Not only did BALCO betray the local people, local political representatives also gave false promises to the villagers. This gave them the mental strength to fight to the last.

8.1.2. Bauxite Mining in Kashipur

Kashipur is one of the tribal-dominated blocks of Rayagada district. There are 412 villages distributed over 20 Gram Panchayats, accommodating a total population of 101,995. The Paraja and the Kondhs are the two major tribal communities of the region. Of the total geographical area of 15,059 square miles the block has forest coverage of 59,000 acres and reserve forests of 33,000 acres. Around 36.3 percent of villages are electrified and only 19 percent of the total population is literate (Census of India, 2001). The total labour force is 43.12 percent, of which agriculture labour comprises 24.95 percent while household industry accounts for 0.99 percent. The agro-products of the region include ragi, paddy, millet, grams (chickpeas), maize and niger seed. Hill broom is the most important forest product of the region. The weekly local *haat* (Market), where the barter system still dominates, is the major mode of transaction in the region. Tribals are often forced to make distress sales of their produce, including their own labour.

The block was once full of natural forests and perennial springs. The tribal people living therein terraced the land and made the region habitable. They maintain a symbolic relationship with nature and natural resources. They enjoy natural rights over the resources surrounding them. Intervention in the region started with various state laws basically designed to exploit the natural resources available in the region. The influx of non-tribal people suppressed the tribals. This has been reflected in the form of massive land alienation, resulting in landlessness and severe impoverishment. People's poverty has become chronic as a result of money lending, bonded labour practices, the geographical inaccessibility of the region, exploitation by middlemen, contractors and petty traders, and the low bargaining power and lack of organisation of the people.

The systematic exploitation of the forest resources was started, in the name of national development, by J. K. Paper Mill of Rayagada, which ruthlessly destroyed the ecological balance of the region and the people. Food security turned to food scarcity. Until the 1980s it was the lower ranks of revenue officials, police and forest personnel who represented the state; they enjoyed royal treatment from the people. State intervention in the socioeconomic development of the region after 1980, in the form of 20-point programmes, Indira Awas

Yojana, old-age pensions and drought relief, made the people realise the role of a welfare state. NGO intervention with the support of funding agencies also started in the region in the 1980s, but promoted dependence. In this process tribal people received a different image of the state, which they now considered indispensable to their welfare. They were told that welfare measures were not reaching them as a result of dishonesty in the delivery system. This notion became fixed in people's minds following the continuous famine and resultant food crisis of the 1980s, which invited increasing intervention by outside agencies, including the state. This contributed to the creation of a dependency syndrome among the people. NGO intervention for the socio-economic development of the people over two decades has raised certain issues. Now people are challenging the government over their rights and opposing exploitative elements, reviving community strength and helping their communities to escape from the clutches of the money lender network. UAIL (See Box 7) and other companies have entered the region to mine its hills in the guise of developing the area. Deaths from starvation in Kashipur in 1987 brought it to the attention of the then Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, who made an aerial tour of the situation. The result was a new vision of development, which was later able to mobilise IFAD funding worth Rs 400 million.

Given this situation, the people oppose all major projects (dams, mining, plants, and sanctuary and reserve forest areas). The villagers believe that such interventions have led tribal people to destitution. Although most of the land for acquisition is government land, in practice most of it has been under cultivation by the tribals for generations. Acquisition of this land deviates from the provision made in Regulation 2 of 1956, Section 3(1), as the tribal people have been made landless. In the course of their struggle local tribal people were able to see the true character of the state, which has essentially worked in favour of corporate bodies and federal interests and against the people of the region.

Box 7: Bauxite mining in Kashipur contributed to strengthen people's movement in Orissa to protect natural resources.

In 1993 the state proposed a bauxite alumina plant owned by Utkal Aluminium International Ltd (UAIL), a joint venture of Hindal, Tata, Hydro Alumina (a Norwegian company) and Alcan (a Canadian Company), with technical support from Alusuisse, a Swiss company (at the time of writing Tata and Hindal had withdrawn from the venture). UAIL is a 100 percent export-oriented project, costing around Rs 24 billion, to source bauxite and transport it along a 25-km ropeway. People also learned of a second alumina project at the beginning of 1995, under a joint venture of L&T and Alcoa (a US company) with a 100 percent export-oriented project and a cost of Rs15 billion.

The plant at Kashipur (Doraguda) was to directly affect 2500 people in the 24 villages of Kucheipadar, Hadiguda and Tikiri Gram Panchayat (required for the plant site, red mud and ash pond). However, the company claimed that only 147 families from three villages would be affected. In addition, 42 villages in Chandragiri, Maikanch and Kodipari panchayat would be directly affected by open cast mining at Baphlimali, while the company claimed that not a single village would be affected. The UAIL project required 2,865 acres of land in Kashipur block in 1995, which includes 1,000 hectares of land which has been in use for years for cultivation, forestry and shifting cultivation.

As a form of protest against the mining 18 tribal people met the Chief Minister of Orissa, the late Biju Patnaik, for the first time in 1993 and demanded the cancellation of the project. In 1994 the villagers of Kuchipadar snatched away the survey team's instruments and set fire to their camps. In 1995 the protest took a violent turn, destroying the survey team's camp, and as a result 15 tribal people were arrested. In 1996 the aforementioned local organisation, PSSP was formed. In 1997 Utkal Alumina created an NGO - Utkal Rural Development Society (URDS) - to try to win people over through socioeconomic development works. PSSP opposed URDS and destroyed the company's resettlement colony. In 1998 local people built a barricade at Kucheipadar to stop the entry of project personnel. The police injured nearly 50 people. During 1998 to 1999, a 15-day *padayatra* (walk) was organised to co-ordinate all the agitations of the area. In 1999-2000 all the company's development activities were stopped. In the year 2000, police gunned down three tribal people and injured eight others. In 2001 a protest against the shootings in Maikanch was organised and around 10,000 people participated. Demands were made for mobile health services and irrigation facilities. Since 2002, the people of Kashipur region have been demanding the cancellation of all bauxite projects in KBK districts. On 29 December each of six Gram Sabhas in all the project villages rejected the proposal and suggested scrapping the treaty for the proposed mining. The people had seen the adverse effects of mega-development projects in Koraput district.

8.1.3. Tribal People Protest at Kalinga Nagar

The tragic death of 12 tribal people on 2 January 2006 at Kalinga Nagar, while protesting against the mega-industrial complex encroaching on their age-old rights over the land, added another page in the history of protest by the people of Orissa against mining and industry. The tribal people of this region had migrated from Mayurbhanj and Keonjhar in Orissa and from Ranchi and Singhbhum in Jharkhand at different times in the 19th century (Madox Settlement Report, 1897). The last official land record of settlement during 1928 did not give a land entitlement to the people of the region, despite their having lived there for generations. In the post-liberalisation period, the dream of creating growth in Orissa through industrialisation made the state look to Kalinga Nagar as the steel hub of Orissa. Perhaps this is why 12 industrial complexes have been built in and around Kalinga Nagar and a few new companies are in the pipeline. Of the total land (13,000 acres) acquired by the Industrial Development Corporation of Orissa (IDCO), around 6,900 acres are privately owned. Lack of legal entitlement over the land deprived many tribal people of compensation for the loss of their land. In addition, undervaluation of the land paid in the form of compensation to the land holders, and the role of IDCO as an agent of the state in order to make a profit out of the transactions are issues to which the people affected have yet to receive an answer from the state.

In a situation where the state government does not have a Resettlement and Rehabilitation policy of its own and manages the situation through *ad hoc* strategies, displacing poor people and expecting them to sacrifice their life and livelihood seem to be the only means acceptable to the state in pursuing industrialisation. The affected/displaced people are still objecting to any form of displacement. They are promoting adoption of a land-for-land strategy, conferring absolute rights in the form of a share for tribal people in companies' profits. The state needs to realise the situation and the consequences of the widespread effects of its actions following the Kalinga Nagar incident.

9. Concluding Remarks

'Sustainable livelihood' is usually understood in material terms – in terms of access to and sustainable management of livelihood resources. However, in a broad sense, sustainable livelihood –

particularly in the context of tribal people – is perhaps more appropriately seen in terms of enhancement of capabilities. Ensuring a subsistence income is not sufficient for this purpose. Rather, sustainability is a function of access to institutions and institutional resources in general and to social and economic services in particular. Indeed, it would seem that the ‘mainstreaming’ of tribal people requires a broader approach, which effectively deals with their manifold vulnerabilities in a rather harsh physical environment. These vulnerabilities are perpetuated because of lack of access to and poor functioning of government food transfer programmes, such as Public Distribution System (PDS), Integrated Child Development Services (ICDS); lack of an appropriate nutritional programme; high survival risks on account of preventable illness and poor health services, leading to high mortality rates, among infants and children in particular; and high morbidity among adolescent girls, which affects their reproductive health and increases reproductive risks. Without insuring against these risks livelihood programmes are not likely to be sustainable in the long run.

The current discourse on tribal movements and tribal empowerment mainly revolves around securing well-defined rights to land and forests through participatory practices. At a more fundamental level, the question of abuse of tribal people’s human rights – violation of rights to life and livelihood – is a central concern. All this is very well. However, it is important to recognise that, by the very nature of the issues involved, tribal people’s protest movements, however well organised, have to contend with the powerful interests of a local economic elite and industrial capital – both domestic and foreign – who wield considerable political power.

On the other hand, making the state do its job of enhancing capabilities is essential. There is an immediate sense in which pragmatic considerations (e.g. making tribal people realise that it is their right to have a doctor at primary health centres) play a useful and important role in mobilising tribal people. This may contribute to strengthening the organised articulation of the fundamental livelihood struggles of tribal people.

References

1. Acharya, P. K., Mishra, R., Panigrahi, N. and Mohanty, R. P. (2000). ‘Functioning of welfare schemes for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled

- Tribes: a report on Orissa'. Report submitted to the Committee of Governors of India. Bhubaneswar: NKC Centre for Development Studies.
2. Bailey, F.G. (1963). 'Politics and Social Change Orissa in 1959', University of California Press: Berkeley and Los Angeles.
 3. Behura, N. and Panigrahi, N. (2001). 'Functioning of the Fifth Schedule of the Constitution of India: The Role of Welfare Agencies in the State of Orissa'. Report submitted to ICSSR New Delhi: NKC Centre for Development Studies, Bhubaneswar.
 4. Behura, N. and Panigrahi, N. (2004). 'Tribal Indebtedness and The Functioning of Money Lenders Regulations in the Scheduled Areas of Orissa: An Empirical study'. *The Journal of Anthropological Survey of India*, Calcutta, 2004.
 5. Behura, N. K. (1982). 'Forest and tribal world view'. *Journal of Social Research*, XXV (1), 1-8.
 6. Behura, N. K. (1990). 'Socio-economic problems and social change', in Sudarshan, V. and Kalyan, M. A. (eds), *The Uprooted*. New Delhi: Gyan Publishing House.
 7. Behura, N. K. (1996). 'Environment, displacement and development: case study from Orissa'. *Indian Anthropologist*, 31, 149-159.
 8. Behura, N. K. and Nayak, P. K. (1993). 'Involuntary displacement and the changing frontiers of kinship: A study of settlement in Orissa', in Cernea, M. M. and Guggenheim, S. E. (eds), *Anthropological Approach to Resettlement*.
 9. Behura, N. and Panigrahi, N. (2001). 'Functioning of the Fifth Schedule of the Constitution of India: the role of welfare agencies in the state of Orissa'. Report submitted to ICSSR New Delhi. Bhubaneswar: NKC Centre for Development Studies.
 10. Behura, N. and Panigrahi, N. (2004). 'Tribal indebtedness and the Functioning of Money lenders Regulations in the Scheduled Areas of Orissa: an empirical study'. *Journal of the Anthropological Survey of India*, Vol-53 No-1 March
 11. Bharatiya Jana Kalyan Kendra (BJKK) (1998). 'Evaluation report on Orissa Tribal Development Project, Kashipur' (IFAD assisted project). Report submitted to the Welfare Department, Government of Orissa (mimeo).
 12. Das, B. (1996-97). 'Tribal Development Co-operative Corporation of Orissa Ltd'. (TDCCOL) Balliguda Branch, Balliguda. Phulbani Orissa. Report submitted to SC, ST, RTI, Government of Orissa.
 13. Elwin Committee (1960). *Report of the Committee on Special Multipurpose Tribal Blocks*. New Delhi: Ministry of Home Affairs.
 14. Fernades, W. *et al.* (1984). 'Forest, environment and forest dwellers economy in Orissa' (mimeo). Indian Social Institute, New Delhi.
 15. Government of Orissa (1960-61). *Shifting Cultivation in Orissa*. Agricultural Department of Social Conservation Organisation. Bhubaneswar: Government

Press.

16. Government of Orissa (1971–72). 'Report on the survey on shifting cultivation'. THRTI, ST and SC Development Department, Bhubaneswar.
17. ————— (1988). 'Transfer of Land Alienation in Scheduled Areas of Orissa', Proceeding of Tribes Advisory Council, ST and SC Development Department, Govt of Orissa.
18. ————— (1995-96). 'Report on the Annual Administration of Scheduled Areas in Orissa', Welfare Department, Govt of Orissa, Bhubaneswar.
19. ————— (1974-75 to 1998-99). 'Reports of the Annual Administration of Scheduled Areas', S.T. and S.C. Development Department, Govt. of Orissa.
20. Government of Orissa (2000). 'Conferment of ownership rights to persons cultivating land in the hill slopes within 30 degrees in Scheduled Caste', Revenue Department, Government of Orissa.
21. ————— (2000). 'Policy on Procurement and Trade of Non-Timber Forest Produces'. Govt. Resolution No. 5503/F & E, Forest and Environment Department, Govt. of Orissa.
22. Government of India (1998). 'Report of OTDP Kashipur, Orissa', (Assisted by International Fund For Agriculture Development, IFAD), Government of Orissa.
23. Government of India (1996). 'The Constitution of India', Law Ministry, Govt of India, New Delhi.
24. ————— (1997-98). 'Annual Reports'. Social Justice and Empowerment, Govt of India, New Delhi.
25. ————— (2002). 'State Election Commissions Orissa', Office, Bhubaneswar.
26. India (1998). 'Orissa Tribal Development Project', Completion evaluation.
27. http://www.ifad.org/evaluation/public_html/eksyst/doc/agreement/pi/orissa.htm
28. Industrial Management Consultants of Orissa (1998). 'Study on natural resources development programmes of OTDP, Kashipur' (mimeo). Report submitted to Welfare Department, Government of Orissa.
29. Maddox, S. L. (1990). 'Orissa: Final report on the survey and settlement of the Province of Orissa (Temporarily settled areas), 1890-1900'. Calcutta, IOR/V/27/314/88 1900.
30. Mathew, G. (1994). *Panchayati Raj: From Legislation to Movement*. New Delhi: Concept Publishing House.
31. Mallik, R. M. and Panigrahi, N. (1998). 'Non-timber forest produce: collection, benefits and management in Orissa'. Study report of the NKC Centre for Development Studies, Bhubaneswar. Submitted to the Ford

Foundation, New Delhi.

32. Mohapatra, L. K. (1968). 'Problems and welfare of Orissa tribals', in Vidyarthi, L. P. (ed.), *Applied Anthropology in India: Principles, Problems and Case Studies*. Allahabad: Kitab Mahal.
33. Mohapatra, L. K. (1982–83). 'Barriers to development in isolated tribal areas: two case studies of most backward Gram Panchayats in Orissa', *Journal MANAV*, 1 (1).
34. ————— (1993). 'Customary Rights on Land and Forest and the State in Continuity and Change' in K.S.Singh (ed.), *Tribal Society* Shimla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study.
35. Mohapatra, L. K. (1998). 'Participatory approach in resettlement and rehabilitation implementation'. Paper presented at the Seminar on 'Resettlement and Rehabilitation', Gopabandhu Academy of Administration.
36. Mohapatra, L. K. (1999). 'Tribals' rights to land and the state in Orissa', in Behura, D.K. and Pfeffer, G. (eds), *Contemporary Society Tribal Studies*. New Delhi: Concept Publishing House.
37. Ota, A.B. (1998). 'Countering Impoverishment Risks: The Case of Rengali Dam Project', in, H.M. Mathur and David Marsden (ed), *Development Projects and Impoverishment Risks*, Delhi: Oxford University Press.
38. Panda, P. and Panigrahi, N. (1989). 'The Problem of Displacement of Displaced People: A study in the coal mines of Brajarajnagar, Orissa', in Pati, R. N. and Jena, B. (eds), *Tribal Development in India*. New Delhi: Ashish Publishing House.
39. Panigrahi, N. (1986). 'Men and mining in western Orissa'. Study report submitted to Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA), New Delhi.
40. Pande, B. (1998). *Depriving the Underprivileged for Development*, Institute for Social and Economic Development, Bhubaneswar.
41. Pathy, J. (1987). 'Ethnic minorities and processes of their development' (mimeo). Report submitted to UGC, New Delhi.
42. Pattnaik, N. (1972). *Tribes and their Development: A Study of Two Tribal Development Blocks in Orissa*, Hyderabad: National Institute of Community Development.
43. Patnaik, S. M. (2000). 'Understanding Involuntary Resettlement: An Anthropological Perspective'. *The Eastern Anthropologist*, 53 (1–2).
44. Rao et al. (1987). 'Peoples Movement: A study of Gandhamardan Bauxite Mining' (Unpublished).
45. Roy Burman, B. K. (1982). *Report of Committee on Forest and Tribals in India*. New Delhi: Tribal Development Division, Ministry of Home Affairs.
46. Saxena, N. C. (1995). *Forests, People and Profit: New Equations for Sustainability*. Report produced for the Centre for Sustainable Development, Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration, Mussorie. Dehradun: Natraj Publishers.

47. Senapati, N. (1980). *Kalahandi District Gazetteer*, Bhubaneswar.
48. Swain, M. and Panigrahi, N. (1999). 'Development, displacement, and rehabilitation in Orissa: an overview'. *Man in Life*, 25 (3-4), 163-179.
49. Taylor, J. H. & Maddox, S. L. (1899). 'Puri: Report on the Khurda settlement of 1897-98'. Calcutta, IOR/V/27/314/98 1899.
50. Tribal Development Co-operative Corporation, (1996). *Annual Report, 1995-96*, Government of Orissa.

(Endnotes)

¹The British annexed Orissa in three different phases: southern Orissa in 1768, coastal Orissa in 1803 and the western Hilly Tracts, i.e. Sambalpur, in 1849, which were under the three different provinces of Madras, Bengal and Central Provinces, respectively.

²Fifth Schedule area in Orissa: Mayurbhanj, Sundargarh, Koraput, Rayagada, Nabarangpur and Malkangiri districts in whole, Kuchinda Tehsils of Sambalpur district, Keonjhar, Telkoi, Champua. Barbil Tehsils of Keonjhar district, Kondhamal, Balliguda and G.Udayagiri Tehsils of Kondhamal district, R. Udaygiri tahsils, Gumma and Rayagada Block of Parlekhemundi Tehsils in Parlekhemundi Sub-division and Suruda Tehsils of Ghumsur sub-division in Ganjam district, Thuamul Rampur and Langigarh Block of Kalahandi district and Nilagiri block of Balasore district. The total area of the Scheduled Areas of the state contains almost 70 percent of Orissa's forest areas, even though they form only 44 percent of the state area.

³Podu or shifting cultivation in Orissa is known as *dangar, bagad, toila, rami, dabi* and *biringa*. This type of cultivation is largely practised by 11 tribal communities living in the districts of Phulbani, Keonjhar, Sundargarh, Rayagada, Gajapati, Koraput, Kalahandi, and Ganjam. The tribal communities practising shifting cultivation are the Bonda, Didayi, Koya, Gadaba, Paraja, Kutia Kondh, Dangaria Kondh, Lanjia Saora, Malua Kondh, Pengo Kondh, Desia Kondh, the Juanga and Pauri Bhuiyan.

⁴Circular No GE (GI)-S-*/81-37565/REV, Revenue Department, Government of Orissa laid down the operational guidelines for provision of usufructory rights on plantations taken up under the programme on government land and concept reserve forests. Each beneficiary was to be given usufructory rights.

⁵A few of such networks established over the time are: the Tikabali Agency Marketing Co-operative Society (AMCS) in 1950s; The Orissa Forest Development Corporation Ltd. (OFDC) in 1962; the Tribal Development Co-operative Corporation Ltd. (TDCC) in 1973; the Large Size Agricultural Multi-Purpose Co-operative Societies (LAMPS) in 1977; the Tribal Co-operative Marketing Federation in India Ltd. (TRIFED) in 1989; Utkal Forest Produce Ltd. (UFPL) in 1989 and the Orissa Rural Development Marketing Society (ORMAS) in 1989. The fact remains that many of these agencies are suffering from structural and operational constraints which have affected the larger goals of the organisation.

⁶Protective provisions are incorporated in the Constitution in different sections. They are: Part III on Fundamental Rights, Part IV on Directive Principles of State Policy, Part X on Scheduled and Tribal Areas, Part XII on Financial Provisions, etc., Part XVI on Special Provisions relating to certain classes and lastly the Fifth and Sixth Schedules of the Indian Constitution. Specifically the protective provisions contained in the Constitution are Articles 14, 1 (4), 16 (4), 17, 19 (5), 23, 24, 29, 46, 164, 330, 332, 335, 338, 339 (1), 271(A), 371(B), 371(C), 342, Fifth Schedule and Sixth Schedule. The Directive Principles of State Policy also explain privileges for the tribal communities through various articles, such as 38, 39, 39 (A), 41, 43, 46, 48 and 48 (A).

⁷The term 'KBK' refers to the three old districts of Kalahandi, Bolangir and Koraput, since sub-divided. A seven-year Action Plan, comprising rural employment and social schemes was announced in 1995; in July 1998 Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee ordered a revised 'KBK Plan', including finance for watershed development in 1980 in 800 micro-watersheds.

CPRC-IIPA Working Papers

1. David Hulme, Karen Moore and Andrew Shepherd, Chronic Poverty: Meanings and Analytical Frameworks.
2. Aasha Kapur Mehta and Amita Shah, Chronic Poverty in India: An Overview.
3. Anand Kumar, Political Sociology of Poverty in India: Between Politics of Poverty and Poverty of Politics.
4. Solomon Benjamin, From Income to Urban Contest in Global Settings: Chronic Poverty in Bangalore.
5. Amita Shah and D.C. Sah, Chronic Poverty in a Remote Rural District in South West Madhya Pradesh: A Multidimensional Analysis of Its Extent and Causes.
6. Aasha Kapur Mehta and Shashanka Bhide, Issues in Chronic Poverty: Panel Data based Analysis.
7. Kate Bird, Chronic Poverty and Understanding Intra-Household Differentiation.
8. Kanchan Mathur, Shobhita Rajagopal and Pradeep Bhargava, Understanding Childhood Poverty in Rajasthan: Emerging Issues and Strategies.
9. Aasha Kapur Mehta, (assisted by Nikhila Menon and Deepa Chatterjee) Multidimensional Poverty in India: District Level Estimates.
10. Asmita Kabra, Chronic Poverty and Vulnerable Social Groups: The Case of the Sahariya Adivasi Community Displaced from Kuno Wildlife Sanctuary, Madhya Pradesh.
11. R. Radhakrishna, K. Hanumantha Rao, C. Ravi and B. Sambhi Reddy, Chronic Poverty and Malnutrition in India.
12. Ratna Sudarshan and Rina Bhattacharya, Chronic Poverty and Gendered Patterns of Intra-Household Resource Allocation: A Preliminary Enquiry.
13. N.C.B. Nath, Political Perspectives to Chronic Poverty.
14. Sheila Bhalla, Anup K. Karan and T. Shobha, Rural Casual Labourers, Wages and Poverty: 1983 to 1999-2000.
15. Shashanka Bhide and Aasha Kapur Mehta, Correlates of Incidence and Exit from Chronic Poverty in Rural India: Evidence from Panel Data.
16. P. V. Thomas, Chronic Poverty in Rural Areas: The Role of Government Policy.
17. S. Irudaya Rajan, Chronic Poverty among Indian Elderly.
18. Aasha Kapur Mehta, Ramakrushna Panigrahi and Sashi Sivramkrishna, Operationalizing Multidimensional Concepts of Chronic Poverty: An Exploratory Spatial Analysis.
19. S. Mahendra Dev, Safety Nets for Chronic Poor in India: An Overview.
20. M. S. Swaminathan, Technological Change in Food Production: Implications for Vulnerable Sections.
21. Amita Shah and Baidyanath Guru, Poverty in Remote Rural Areas in India: A Review of Evidence and Issues.
22. D. C. Sah, Commons and Community, Evidence from South-western Tribal Belt of Madhya Pradesh.
23. Rohini Nayyar, Planning for the Development of Backward Districts.
24. Aasha Kapur Mehta and Andrew Shepherd, Chronic Poverty in India: Overview of Emerging Issues.
25. Amita Shah, Poverty and Natural Resources: Understanding the Dynamics in Context of Dry Land Regions in Western India.
26. N.C.B. Nath, Policy Implications based on the Work Done by CPRC India.
27. Sakti Padhi, Nilakantha Panigrahi and Aswini Kumar Mishra, Tribal Population and Chronic Poverty in Orissa: A Note on North-South Divide.

28. Shashanka Bhide and Aasha Kapur Mehta, Tracking Poverty through Panel Data: Rural Poverty in India 1970-1998.
29. Puja Vasudeva Dutta and Hari K. Nagarajan, Spatial Inequality in Rural India: Do Initial Conditions Matter?
30. David Hulme and Andrew McKay, Identifying and Measuring Chronic Poverty: Beyond Monetary Measures.
31. Aasha Kapur Mehta and Sreoshi Gupta, The Impact of HIV/AIDS on Women Care Givers in Situations of Poverty: Policy Issues.
32. N.R. Mohanty, Chronic Poverty and Social Conflict in Bihar.
33. Sukhadeo Thorat and Motilal Mahamallik, Chronic Poverty and Socially Disadvantaged Groups: Analysis of Causes and Remedies.
34. Amita Shah, Saroj Kumar Nayak and Bipin Das, Remoteness and Chronic Poverty in a Forest region of Southern Orissa: A Tale of Entitlement Failure and State's Apathy.
35. N.C.B. Nath, Suggesting Effective Policy Frames for Chronic Poverty Alleviation in India.
36. Shashanka Bhide and Aasha Kapur Mehta, Economic Growth and Poverty Dynamics.
37. Anand Kumar, Kamei Aphun, Khuraijam Bijoykumar Singh and Homen Thangjam, Situating Conflict and Poverty in Manipur.
38. Aasha Kapur Mehta and Trishna Satpathy, Escaping Poverty: The Ralegan Siddhi Case.
39. Nidhi Dhamija and Shashanka Bhide, Dynamics of Chronic Poverty: Variations in Factors Influencing Entry and Exit of Chronic Poor.
40. Amita Shah and Animesh Kumar, Diversion of Land and Displacement in India: Review of Evidence and Issues.
41. Amita Shah and Aasha Kapur Mehta, Experience of the Maharashtra Employment Guarantee Scheme: Are there Lessons for NREGS?
42. Anand Kumar and Kanihar Kant, Post Conflict Face of Poverty and Society: Understanding a Gandhian Initiative against Pauperization and Violence in Mushahari (Muzaffarpur, Bihar).
43. Amita Shah, Natural Resources and Chronic Poverty in India: A Review of Issues and Evidence.
44. Naresh C Saxena, Hunger, Under-nutrition and Food Security in India. (forthcoming).
45. Amita Shah and Animesh Kumar, Evidence and Issues in Migration and Poverty in India: A Review, (forthcoming).
46. Amita Shah and Shiddhalingaswami, Interface Between Education And Poverty In India: Eluding Goals And Search For New Perspectives, (forthcoming) ?
47. Shashanka Bhide and Ranjan Dash, Prospects for Poverty Reduction in India, (forthcoming).
48. Aasha Kapur Mehta and Sanjay Pratap, 'Policies and Programmes: Analysing NRHM and ICDS to Identify What Has Worked, What Has Not and Why.' CPRC-IIPA Working Paper, (forthcoming).
49. Samik Chowdhury, Aasha Kapur Mehta, Suparna Das Mukherjee and Sourabh Ghosh, 'An Exploratory Analysis of Deprivation and Ill-Health led Poverty in Urban India: A Case Study of Delhi, (forthcoming).
50. Aasha Kapur Mehta, Sanjay Pratap, Suparna Das Mukherjee and Gadadhara Mohapatra, Efforts to Reduce Chronic Poverty: A Few Best Practice Cases, (forthcoming).
51. Sakti Padhi And Nilakantha Panigrahi, Tribal Movements and Livelihood: Recent Development in Orissa.