

Development finalized and circulated the National Policy on Resettlement and Rehabilitation for PAFs, 2003 (NPRR-2003) vide Notification No. ACQ. 13011/4/2004. The Policy inter-alia claims to provide some special benefits for DTs, which are as follows:

- (a) Preference in allotment of land
- (b) A one-time financial assistance equivalent to 500 days of Minimum Agricultural Wages (MAW) for the loss of customary/grazing/fishing rights/usages in addition to other R&R benefits to the tribal PAFs
- (c) Re-settlement close to their habitat in a compact bloc so that they can retain their ethnic, linguistic and cultural identity
- (d) Land free of cost for community religious gathering
- (e) The families settled out of the district to get higher R&R benefits to the extent of 25 per cent in monetary terms
- (f) The tribal land alienated in violation of the laws and regulations in force on the subject to be treated as null and void and the R&R benefits to be available only to the original tribal land owner
- (g) The tribal families residing in the Project Affected Areas (PAAs) with fishing rights in the river/pond/dam to be given fishing rights in the reservoir area;
- (h) Foolproof mechanism to be provided consisting of representatives of PAFs, including SC/ST, women, elected representatives, and government machinery

Being the nodal Ministry, the Ministry of Rural Development is to monitor the implementation of the National R&R Policy.

2.1 Requirements of a Rehabilitation Programme

For any rehabilitation programme to be successful, institutional changes are required for its early planning. In the process, the participation of the PAFs is necessary in the decision-making process. Among the affected persons are also the artisans, labourers, seasonal visitors, women, and the host population. However, the 1984 amendment to the Land Acquisition Act has made it much easier for land to be acquired by the state. The amendment has made it possible for the public sector to directly acquire land, and for the private sector to do so through the

16
15. R&R

A Tribal Reading of the Resettlement and Rehabilitation Policy 2003

Joseph Marianus Kujur*

1. The Problem

This paper critiques the *National Policy on Resettlement and Rehabilitation of Project Affected Families - 2003* (R&R Policy 2003) from a tribal perspective. It highlights the inadequacy of the new policy as it further empowers the rich and the powerful at the cost of the poor, especially the tribals, who are dispossessed not only of their lands but also of their other sources of livelihood. The central argument is that 'real' development is the development of the last and the least which is possible only by collaboration and consensus and not by coercion and domination. The first part of the paper examines the 'R&R Policy 2003' in relation to the tribals. The second part highlights the interrelations between R&R Policy and other programmes of the government affecting the tribals. The third part of the paper presents some conclusions and recommendations on the basis of the discussion.

2. The "R&R Policy 2003" in Relation to Tribals

The rationale for a new rehabilitation policy is within the framework of the development, or rather the destruction discourse. Had the earlier governments taken the problem of displacement seriously there would have been policies for the rehabilitation of the Project Affected Families (PAFs) even before they were uprooted. It is only since 1988 that the Government of India considered a National Policy on Resettlement and Rehabilitation for PAFs. In the initial stage during 1988-92, the then Ministry of Welfare had prepared a draft National Policy for R&R of Displaced Tribals (DTs) and submitted it to the Committee of Secretaries. The Cabinet Secretariat thereafter directed the Ministry of Rural Development to prepare a general policy for R&R, which would take cognizance of the plight of the tribals. The Ministry of Rural

* Coordinator, Tribal Unit of the Research Department, Indian Social Institute, New Delhi.

government. Land can even be acquired for residential colonies (Dhagamwar, (1989:177).

Dhagamwar recommends legislation defining the concepts of displacement and laying down of broad principles within which the state must provide full rehabilitation. She makes a case for reducing displacement and suggests the need of (a) a detailed planning of the rehabilitation along with the very conception of the project itself; (b) a thorough consultation with the Project Affected Persons (PAPs), the beneficiaries and the host population at every stage; (c) a single authority in charge of rehabilitation in a given area to prepare an overall plan for rehabilitation; (d) a wider understanding of the meaning of rehabilitation to encompass opening of job opportunities; (e) giving exemption to the oustees from paying for the land, house and other facilities in the new areas; (f) education in order to enable people to participate in the decision-making process as well as benefit from job opportunities. Dhagamwar points out that displacement due to natural calamities such as floods, earthquakes, droughts, landslides, etc., should also be taken care of. She claims that these are due to the human interference with nature and that these people have just as much claim on the resources of the nation and just as much need for rehabilitation. Planning is required some for expected displacements, others unexpected. "But whatever is available by way of resettlement must also come their way. After all, their suffering is no less because they have been displaced by a landslide and not by a dam" (1989:183-84).

Given the requirements of a sensitive rehabilitation programme for the PAPs above as a background, a tribal critique of the 'R&R Policy 2003' will be presented below.

2.2 Implications for Tribals

The R&R Policy seems to be a bundle of confusion and contradictions. On the one hand it makes enormous promises to safeguard the interests of the evacuees; on the other it continues endorsing the displacement of people even without rehabilitating them. Unless there is a rule that all the evacuees have to be settled before their evacuation, the intent of the new policy will always be suspect. If it does not take into account the Displaced Persons (DPs) in the past, what is the guarantee that it will rehabilitate them and the new evacuees now? Where is the land?

Rehabilitation on the land-to-land basis implies that more people need to be evacuated in order to settle the old PAPs. Hence, R&R means always the rehabilitation of the 'displaced' at the cost of the 'newly' displaced persons.

In the process of R&R the problem is not of 'resettlement' but of 'recognizing the rights of the tribals' to making choices, to taking their own decisions, to their ownership of land either individual or communitarian. The new policy appears to be a camouflage – projecting all the positive guiding principles required for a good rehabilitation programme – but never to be implemented seriously. The reaction of many civil society groups to the R&R Policy is that of cynicism and scepticism due to their past experience of a political unwillingness in the implementation of such 'profound' policies and programmes.

The World Bank's directives in connection with the rehabilitation of the DPs are interesting. "Involuntary Resettlement" is one of the five topics of the Operational Directive (OD-4.30), adopted in June 1990, besides 'new land settlement', 'induced development', 'indigenous people', and 'cultural property'. When compared, the objectives of the Indian Government's R&R Policy 2003 and that of the World Bank's reveal some startling similarities and differences. Both the institutions use similar language of sensitivity to the acuteness of the problem, of being concerned about the socio-cultural relationships, of minimizing or least displacing alternatives, of the inevitability of displacement, of providing better living standards, involvement of resettlers and hosts in resettlement activities, and of having special consideration for the tribals/indigenous peoples.

The WB's Policy broadens the treatment of the rehabilitation issues beyond hydropower and irrigation projects to various types of investment operations. It also seeks improvement or at least restoration of the "former living standards, earning capacity, and production levels". Above all it wants a "time-bound" resettlement plan. The R&R Policy is silent about concretely and genuinely exploring other alternatives. It does not present any package either for environmental protection or for community participation. The biggest lacuna in both the policies is that they take the PAPs for granted. The so-called beneficiaries of R&R do not have any participation in the decision-making process in the course of their own future. Thus from the human development point of view the R&R

policy does not fulfill any of its parameters. A further analysis of the new Policy precisely proves the point.

2.2.1 Why *Adivasis* Always?

It is important to ask 'what' and 'how' of displacement, but more important is the question 'why' and 'whose'. The history of the tribals has been one of displacement without rehabilitation. If the history of Jharkhand is traced to the Muslim, British and post-colonial periods one is amazed as to how involuntary displacements have taken place down the centuries with no rehabilitation or without adequate rehabilitation. One of the excuses by various governments is that there is no policy on rehabilitation. Nevertheless, what is a matter of grave concern is the attitude of partisanship to a few haves at the cost of the have-nots.

Tribals are the most vulnerable and powerless in the periphery of the Indian democracy. Fernandes and Paranjpye (1997:19) observe that most of the displaced belong to the subaltern classes of which more than 40 per cent of the pre-1990 JPs and around 50 per cent today were tribals. No compensation had been given for the loss of other Common Property Resources (CPRs) on which the tribals depended so far. Their regions have been administratively neglected. If at all they get compensation, it is too late, too little, to live a dignified life. The Land Acquisition Act, 1894 limits compensation to *patta* holders. The affected people are ignored at the time of making the decision which will displace them and an effort is made to involve them only at the time of resettlement (ibid.:20-1).

The magnitude of suffering the tribals/indigenous peoples have gone through displacement is reflected in what Mulla and companions (1993:34) say:

Every biosphere reserve in the country is on *adivasi* land. Every major dam since the 1970s has been submerging *adivasi* land. Every wild life sanctuary in India is on *adivasi* homelands. Every national park is totally *adivasi*. Of the mines in India, a majority - 20 per cent - are on *adivasi* land. *Adivasi* lands produce most of India's coal, bauxite, and mica. Almost 50 per cent of the mineral wealth of India comes from *adivasi* areas. Yet, 85 per cent of the *adivasis* are below the poverty line. They form 50 per cent of those forcibly evicted from their homelands by "National Development Projects". Forming about 8 per cent of India's people, the *adivasis* predominate in about 20 per cent of the most inhospitable, inaccessible yet perhaps the richest tracts of land. Yet, only one per cent have any legal recognition of their land rights.

The alienation of land was one of the main reasons for the many tribal uprisings all over the country. In 1793, the British passed the Permanent Settlement Act to get as much revenue from land as possible. This Act, common to Bengal, Awadh and Madras presidencies, gave zamindars absolute proprietary right on land. These were middlemen created to collect revenue from their respective areas. Therefore, water, land and forests, hitherto considered as community owned natural resources, became private property of individual owners. The new landed class was naturally happy with these new arrangements, since it enabled them to establish recorded rights over land (NCAS 2002:3). So far, there was no ownership of the land but only the right of revenue collection "since, land ownership was considered to be private, the state could collect revenue from these lands but it could not take over the land as and when it desired" (ibid.). On the other hand, there was an increasing need for land for railways, roads, other government projects, for forest produce to support British industries. It was to establish rights over the ownership of land that the British created the Land Acquisition Act 1894. This Act facilitated the British control by destroying local people's rights over the country's natural resources (ibid.:4). The draconian Act of 1894 continued until as recently as 1984 when a few amendments were made. The painful reality is that so far as the monopoly over natural resources is concerned, the Indian rulers are no different from the British. The vested interests, the methods of oppression, and the basic ideology of both the agents, namely the British and the internal colonialists remain the same.

Land is sacred to the tribals because that is the only resource they have for their sustenance. About 70 per cent of India's population, most of whom are tribals, primarily depend on land-related work and agricultural production. Thus, land for them is a means of livelihood and the basis of socio-economic relationships. Alienation from land and displacement has threatened the livelihood of millions. People are displaced without any consultation or participation in the development process. Furthermore, they are denied their rightful share in the gains of the development project that displaces them. Moreover, the government's attitude to displacement has not changed substantially from the time of Independence. It still does not accept rehabilitation as an integral part of any displacement plan (ibid.:v).

Table-1: A Conservative Estimate of Displacement by various Projects (1951-1990)

Type of project	Total Displaced	No. of the Rehabilitated	Persons Not Rehabilitated	% of Not Rehabilitated
Mines	25,50,000	6,30,000	19,20,000	75.29
Dams	1,64,00,000	41,00,000	1,23,00,000	75.00
Industries	12,50,000	3,75,000	8,75,000	70.00
Wildlife	6,00,000	1,25,000	4,75,000	79.00
Others	5,00,000	1,50,000	3,50,000	70.00
Total	2,13,00,00	53,80,000	1,59,20,000	74.74

Source: Stan Lourdsamy (1997:25)

Table-1 gives an insight into the DPs by various projects in the State of Jharkhand from 1951 to 1990. It indicates that 75.29 per cent of the total displaced between 1951 to 1990 from mining industries was not rehabilitated. Similarly 75 per cent of the DPs from dams, 70 per cent from the industries, 79 per cent from the wildlife and 70 per cent from other projects of displacement were not at all rehabilitated. Thus over all 74.74 per cent of the DPs were not rehabilitated between 1951 and 1990. It should be noted that the figures above do not take into account the DPs from involuntary sources other than those mentioned above.

Table-2: Total Number of STs Displaced in Jharkhand 1951-95

Sl. No.	Project Name	Total DPs	STs % of ST DPs
1	Water Resources	1,75,127	75.2
2	Industries/Quasi Industries	22,473	
	Coal	7,415	34.0
3	Mining: Coal	79,568	
	Non-Coal	3,975	29.6
4	Defence Establishment	23,7147	89.7
5	Wildlife/National Park	80,867	15.8
6	Infrastructure Development	13,800	27.6
	Grand Total	6,20,372	41.27

Source: Ekka & Asif (2000:95)

Table-2 shows that most of the DPs in Jharkhand are tribals. It shows that the 75.2 per cent of the DPs from the water resources were tribals. The percentage of the DPs from the industries and quasi industries was 34. Nearly 29.6 per cent of the tribals were displaced from the mining industries. Similarly 89.7 per cent, 15.8 per cent and 27.6 per

cent tribals were displaced from defence establishment, wildlife sanctuaries and infrastructural development respectively. Thus according to the study by Ekka and Asif (2000:95) the total percentage of the tribals displaced from various enterprises in Jharkhand from 1951-1995 was 41.27. The figures clearly indicate that the *adivasis* are the worst sufferers of all the so-called development projects.

"Development", according to the Constitution, is "that process of governance which, while respecting human rights of all persons, secures to all Indians freedom from material impoverishment" (Baxi 1989:164). Baxi believes that in the planning process in India the spirit of the Constitution has been betrayed. People are not partners in the process of decision-making regarding the construction of dams, their size, areas of submergence, environment impact, cost-benefit analysis, allocation of resources, designs including safety designing, epidemiological impact analysis, contracts for construction, flow of benefits to certain classes/sectors, displacement, rehabilitation, etc. All these are considered the domain of the administration. Baxi argues for a development that has a more 'representative' and people-oriented character (ibid.:164-67). Involuntary relocation of sites of community existence is always problematic as the consequent dislocation of human beings is much too high (ibid.:169). Money compensation is only one component but not the most decisive one of rehabilitation.

2.2.2 Displacement as a Norm

The most disturbing part of the R&R Policy is its concept of displacement as a norm and not as an exception. The Policy (Ch. III, 3.1(g)) is meant only for the PAFs and not for the affected without the project in question. The "resettlement zone" for one group of people in fact is the "displacement zone" for another. (Ch. III, 3.1(r)). The land required could be for any company, a body corporate, an institution, or any other organization for whom land is to be acquired either for its "own use" or "in public interest" (Ch. III, 3.1).

The administrator's responsibility is the acquisition of "adequate land" for the project and also for settling the PAFs. It implies that more and more land has to be acquired irrespective of the consequences (Ch. IV, 4.5(vi) & 5). Though the survey seeks to take note of the members of families, trade, occupation, vocation, agricultural land and employment,

the Policy (Ch. V, 5.4) fails to address the problem of culture, religion, social organization and community life. The Policy (Ch. V, 5.11) identifies such lands as "waste lands and any other land" vesting in the government. But it reveals its true colour when at the non-availability of sufficient government land, it seeks to acquire 'other' land (Ch. V, 5.11(b)). It is complete eyewash when it says "such acquisition of land should not lead to another list of affected families". The fact that the Policy (Ch. V, 5.12) talks of "acquiring" land shows that the land does not belong to the government and hence it has to have "power to acquire land" through the amended Land Acquisition Act, 1894 or "purchase land from any person through consent and may enter into an agreement for this purpose". In the draft scheme/plan (Ch. V, 5.18) for R&R again, focus is on the "to be acquired" rather than on the problem of shifting, resettlement, culture shock and the trauma, and the ways and means to address them. The Policy talks of the "approval" of the state government and "consent" of requiring body before approving the same, but never talks of taking consent of the 'victims' (Ch. V, 5.19). Even if the draft scheme is published in the official gazette to give it wide publicity to the affected zone, it does not really reach the people.

One of the important issues around R&R is the 'development paradigm' (Fernandes 1997:22). Displacement is considered inevitable for development. It is not taken as the last resort. Even in the cases where displacement is the last resort, rehabilitation is only secondary. This is basically a denial of people's ownership to land and their right to live in dignity. Land is the only possession of the tribals. If that is taken away from them there is nothing left. The principle of *terra nullius*, viz. 'nobody's land' hence the state's, is applied. Even the private property of the individual can be acquired any time by the state. This principle of 'eminent domain' is the guiding principle of land transactions (ibid.:23). The Policy does not seem to recognize the historical, customary and cultural rights of the tribal community in practice though it does mention them in theory. According to Fernandes any policy should recognize the historically established rights of the people over their livelihood including land, natural resources and knowledge, etc. This entails recognition of their rights to land, livelihood and survival. Fernandes opines that the lands should be treated as a community resource. It implies therefore, that if the government acquires such lands it must pay full compensation to the traditional residents, and rehabilitate them totally (ibid.).

The Policy is insensitive to multiple displacements. There is no assurance that the PAFs from earlier projects will not be displaced again. The Policy is insensitive to the disruption of traditional culture and ecological degradation. There is no assurance that the DPs from other projects in the region will be resettled and rehabilitated first before the newly displaced are rehabilitated. The Policy is not gender sensitive. It does not take into account the trouble the women go through in such situations.

2.2.3 Inner Contradictions

It is farcical that the Policy (Ch. I, 1.5 & Ch. V, 5.1) is applicable only for projects affecting en masse, 500 families or more in plain areas and 250 families or more in hilly or scheduled areas. Those not falling under the above categories are left to fend for themselves irrespective of their displacement due to various projects. The minimum grants and monetary benefits are proposed in the policy (Ch. I, 1.6) but what about those displaced earlier? Will the government give them their backlog compensation with interest?

The height of inner contradiction of the Policy (Ch. V, 5.2) comes to light when it seeks to disseminate information by publishing it in at least two daily newspapers, one of them being in the local vernacular having circulation in villages or areas which are likely to be affected. Not only that but also "affixing a copy of the notification on the Notice Board of the concerned Gram Panchayats and other prominent place or places in the affected zone". Little does the Policy realize that most of the displaced among the tribals are illiterate. 47.1 per cent as per the Census of 2001. They live from hand to mouth. They have neither leisure nor money to buy newspapers. If some enlightened people read the notice in public places, well and good, otherwise the project begins in a clandestine manner. The Deputy Collectors pass the information on to the Block Development Officers who in turn pass it on to the *Mukhtias*. Often it goes unnoticed unless people are conscious of their rights.

There seems to be a lack of commitment in the Policy (Ch. V, 5.9) as it seeks to ensure the settlement of the affected "preferably in group or groups" and that too "as far as possible". It is a foregone conclusion that this will never be possible. The Policy also seeks to ensure resettlement of the PAFs with the "host community" on the basis of

"equality and mutual understanding, consistent with the desire of each group to preserve its own identity and culture". It preaches 'sharing' among the displaced and the hosts but fails to realize that this sharing is only a 'disempowerment' and 'dispossession' of the hosts as well. To resettle the displaced among the hosts will increase tension and conflict among the two communities which have so far been enjoying good relationship.

If the Policy (Ch. VI, 6.21.9) were sincere about giving reservation benefits to tribals in the "resettlement zone" why is it silent on the reservation of the STs in the Delhi Government? The migrant tribals in Delhi are the victims of rampant development in their respective states and as such. The Scheduled Tribes in Delhi claim that the Delhi Government has stopped extending Reservation Policy to the STs on the ground that the STs in Delhi are not notified by the President of India. The same is the case in Assam as well. The migrant Scheduled Tribes in Assam from other states are not entitled to the Constitutional benefits, such as reservations for STs unless they too are notified by the President of India in that State. There is still another contradiction in the Policy (Ch. VI, 6.22(a)). It seeks not to disturb the "socio-cultural relations" (social harmony) but on the contrary dislocates communities.

2.2.4 Non-Participatory

The R&R Policy seeks "processes an effective dialogue" between the PAFs and the Administration to "enable timely completion of projects with a sense of definiteness as regards costs" but is not concerned about the "timely rehabilitation" and the "human costs" (Ch. I, 1.4). The talk of "greater flexibility for interaction and negotiation" seems to be with the intention of greater acceptability of the government imposition of displacement rather than of rehabilitation. Hence, the talk of participation is misleading. There is one-sided decision and the 'dialogue' seems to be a means to convince people that their displacement in fact is serving the "common purpose" for the nation's development. The Policy (Ch. IV, 4.5(i)) talks about holding "consultation" with the PAFs and their delegates knowing fully well that the resettlement will be a pittance.

What do the illiterate people do to the publication of the survey reports? The draft is not even accessible to the affected. Even if it is available

there is no openness on the part of the requiring body. Their only aim seems to be to convince the victims to make 'sacrifices' for the common cause (Ch. V, 5.6). Even if there are objections by the PAFs the opposing lobby is strong. There is a clash of interests. And hence, the voice of the poor goes unheard (Ch. V, 5.7). The Resettlement Policy seems to be a Policy (Ch. V, 5.10) of 'negotiation' and 'consultation' for more "lands which may be available in any existing Gram Panchayat". There is no proportion of the land lost and the settlement in the new land. The R&R benefits in terms of cash and land are unjust and inadequate. The hard fact is that land today is not available unless snatched from the owners. That is precisely what the government has been doing. The Policy (Ch. VI, 6.2) seeks to give preference to the STs in allotment of land. What more shame could there be than the tribals getting "additional financial assistance" for the "loss of customary rights/usages of forest produce".

Chapter VI of the 'R&R Policy' when analyzed gives the impression that the Policy is out there to do 'charity' for the evacuees. The question is that of human rights violations. How can the government (Ch. VI, 6.21.4) re-settle tribal PAFs close to their natural habitat in a compact bloc to retain their ethnic, linguistic and cultural identity when no surplus land is available? The Policy (Ch. VI, 6.21.7) does not say anything about the past land alienation. It seeks to make the benefits available only to the "original tribal land owner". Who is the real land owner? The problem arises if a tribal has bought land from another tribal.

At present people have no consent in the setting up of the project. The affected people are not even involved by the government in the discussion concerning the policy. Till now no project has recognized this right. Fernandes says, "Displacement is taken for granted. The assumption is that the people, most of them poor and powerless, should adjust themselves to the situation once a decision to displace them is taken" (1997:24).

As per the 'cost-benefit analysis', due to displacement there is destruction of the livelihood of the poor. This happens because of the non-participatory decision-making. Though much has been said about the socio-cultural aspects in the new R&R policy, it appears as if only the marketable commodities of the economy are taken into consideration.

Fernandes (1997) suggests that while assessing the economic value of assets lost, for the purpose of compensation, the concept of "replacement value" of all quantifiable assets should be used in the place of "present depreciated value" of assets carrying ownership titles alone. He further adds that the policy should recognize the social and psychological trauma caused by dislocation and displacement, and focus on mechanisms to compensate and relieve the distress thus caused. Efforts have to be made to prepare the oustees for a new life, economically, socially and psychologically. The policy should also include a mechanism for making the host population appreciate the problems of the oustees, and to accept them.

The policy does not say anything about a proportionate pre-determined share in its ownership as well as benefits with the DPs. The policy for rehabilitation does not give such participation in the benefits on a long term basis. No benefits come either in terms of long term jobs, share in the product, stock ownership, literacy programme, capacity building, etc. The policy does not look beyond compensation though it tries to give an impression of being holistic. Fernandes (1997:26) points out that displacement in the name of national development has become a mode of transferring CPRs from the communities to whom they are a life support system to the corporate sector to whom they are a source of profit or raw material to produce consumer goods for the middle class. Thus a clear distinction exists between the class that gets the benefits and those who pay the price of "national development", particularly the tribals and dalits. This is a process of impoverishment of the CPR dependent and landless communities.

3. Conclusions and Recommendations

The 'R&R Policy 2003' is symptomatic of the larger tribal problem of four D's, namely dispossession, displacement, dislocation and disempowerment. The new policy appears to be another step in the process of adequately equipping the government and its powerful allies to legitimize the appropriation of the land of the marginalized. It may be good to ask how many tribals are involved in the formation of the document. And if at all some tribals are involved what kind of tribals are they – are they representatives from the bottom or from the elite. How far is the Panchayat involved in the making of the R&R policy? The elite are at the top controlling the functioning of the Indian

democracy. Those at the top have two programmes: firstly, the populist, determined by the vote bank politics; and secondly, economic, which ultimately builds up their economic and political domination. Therefore, steps are given from time to time. The R&R Policy seems to be one of them.

Collaboration is needed at the level of respect and dignity. Choice of the individual has to be respected. Communities have to enter into a relationship of collaboration with one another and not of domination. Hence, there should rather be a demand of a 'Displacement Policy', viz. one which asks for alternative ways of project planning that would minimize displacement or avoid it altogether. The new policy, however, looks like a clear design for land acquisition and nothing else. A policy is policy all the same. Unless it is converted into a law there is no binding on the part of the government or of the enforcing authorities. Every community has the right to develop and grow – using the framework to enter into discovery, develop itself by making use of what is available. The process of nation-building should come from within and the locals should not be betrayed by outsiders.

REFERENCES

- Baxi, Upendra. "Notes on Constitutional and Legal Aspects of Rehabilitation and Displacement," in Fernandes, Walter & Thukral, Enakshi, Ganguly (Eds.), *Development, Displacement and Rehabilitation*. New Delhi: Indian Social Institute, 1989, Pp. 164-70.
- Census of India, 2001.*
- Dhuganwar, Vasudha. "Rehabilitation: Policy and Institutional Changes Required," in *ibid.* Pp. 171-84.
- Ekka, Alex & Asif, Mohammed. *Development-Induced Displacement and Rehabilitation in Jharkhand; 1951 to 1995: A Database on its Extent and Nature, 2000.*
- Fernandes, Walter & Paranjpye, Vijay (Eds.). "Hundred Years of Involuntary Displacement in India: Is the Rehabilitation Policy An Adequate Response?" in *'Rehabilitation Policy and Law in India: A Right to Livelihood'*. New Delhi: Indian Social Institute, 1997, Pp. 1-34.
- Jajatiya Jagran*. Ministry of Tribal Affairs, Government of India. 15th October, 2004, Vol. 1, Pp. 1-12.
- Lourdansy, Stan. Jharkhand's claim for Self-Rule: its Historical Foundations and Present Legitimacy*. ISI, New Delhi and B.I.R.S.A. Chaibasa. 1997.
- Mullick S. Bosu, Jaydas, Edwin, Akkara, Anto and Jaydas, Anita. "The Adivasi and Land," in *Indigenous Identity*. Delhi: Navdin Prakashan Kendra. 1993.

- National Policy on Resettlement and Rehabilitation of Project Affected Families - 2003.*
Ministry of Rural Development (Department of Land Resources) New Delhi,
17th February, 2004.
- National Environment Policy 2004* (Draft for Comments: 30th October 2004), Ministry
of Environment and Forests, Government of India, New Delhi.
- Samuel, John (Ed.), *Displacement & Rehabilitation*. Pune: National Centre for Advocacy
Studies (NCAS). 2002.
- The World Bank's *Environmental Sourcebook*, Vol. 1, Chapter 3, 1991, as cited in
Resettlement and Rehabilitation (R&R) Policy - Online, page 1.

Books by Other Publishers Available at ISI

- Political Sociology of Dalit Assertion**
by Prakash Louis
Price Rs.250; US\$25.95 (HC) Pages 326
- The Jharkhand Movement**
by Ram Dayal Munda & S. Bosu Mullick
Price Rs.350; US\$35.95 Pages 382
- Ambedkar on Muslims**
by Anand Teitumbde
Price Rs.75; US\$7.95 Pages 100
- People Power: The Naxalite Movements in Central Bihar**
by Prakash Louis
Price Rs.250; US\$25.95 (HC) Pages 326
- Struggle for Swaraj**
by Mathaw Areeparampill SJ
Price F.s.100; US\$10.95 Pages 280
- Climate Change and Tribal Sustainable Living: Responses from
the Northeast.**
Edited by Waller Fernandes & Nafisa Goga D'Silva
Price Rs.100; US\$10.95 Pages 150
- Human Rights in Asian Cultures: Continuity and Change**
Edited Jefferson R. Plantilla & Sebastii L. Raj
Price Rs.400; US\$40(PB); Rs.600; US\$60 (HC) Pages 372

For your copies, please contact:

The Department of Publications
Indian Social Institute
10 Institutional Area
Lodi Road, New Delhi-110 003