

Nalin Singh Negi* and Sujata Ganguly**

Development Projects vs. Internally Displaced Populations in India: A Literature Based Appraisal

Paper presented at the ESF-UniBi-ZiF research conference on
'Environmental Change and Migration: From Vulnerabilities to Capabilities',
Bad Salzuflen, Germany, December 5-9, 2010

COMCAD Arbeitspapiere - Working Papers
No. 103, 2011

Series on Environmental Degradation and Migration
Editors: Jeanette Schade and Thomas Faist

* Indian Institute of Technology Roorkee, India

** International Institute of Population Sciences, Mumbai, India

Comments welcome to: negi_nalin@yahoo.co.in

Editorial

The conference “Environmental Change and Migration: From Vulnerabilities to Capabilities” was the first of a new conference series on “Environmental Degradation, Conflict and Forced Migration”. It was organised by the European Science Foundation, the Bielefeld University and its Center for Interdisciplinary Research. The Center on Migration, Citizenship and Development (COMCAD), the Universities’ unit responsible for scientific content and quality of the conference, has launched a COMCAD Working Paper Series on “Environmental Degradation and Migration”. The new series intends to give conference participants the opportunity to share their research with an even broader audience.

The symposium focused on how environmental change impacts the nexus between vulnerabilities on the one hand and capabilities on the other hand, and how this relationship affects mobility patterns. Although the conference organizers chose to include all kinds of environmental change and types of migration, climate change figured prominently among the submissions to the conference. Therefore, the conference aimed to bring together the perspectives from climate change, vulnerability, and migration studies, and to draw conclusions about the political implications of the knowledge scientists currently have available. Toward that goal, the conference was structured along three pillars. The first concentrated on climate change and the vulnerability of certain regions and groups. It covered case studies as well as different approaches for making climate change projections and assessing the likelihood of vulnerability. The second pillar focused on empirical research on environmentally induced migration from a vulnerabilities perspective, but acknowledged the occasionally strong elements of capability within it. In this way, the aim was to learn about approaches and options to support existing capabilities. The third pillar was concerned with the opportunities and pitfalls of policy options in dealing with the future challenge of climate induced displacement, and with the analysis of dominant public discourses within the field.

The researchers invited represented a wide range of disciplines, including sociology, social anthropology, migration, conflict, gender and development studies, geography, political science, international law, and climate and environmental science. The conference was also well balanced in terms of geographic origin, gender, and academic status of the participants. The conference programme and full report can be found at www.esf.org/conferences/10328.

Singh Negi, Nalin and Ganguly, Sujata: Development Projects vs. Internally Displaced Populations in India: a Literature Based Appraisal, Bielefeld: COMCAD, 2011
(General Editor: Thomas Faist, Working Papers – Center on Migration, Citizenship and Development; 103)

The COMCAD Working Paper Series is intended to aid the rapid distribution of work in progress, research findings and special lectures by researchers and associates of COMCAD. Papers aim to stimulate discussion among the worldwide community of scholars, policymakers and practitioners. They are distributed free of charge in PDF format via the COMCAD website.

The COMCAD Working Papers is a work-in-progress online series. Each paper receives only limited review. The opinions expressed in the papers are solely those of the author/s who retain the copyright. Comments on individual Working Papers are welcomed, and should be directed to the author/s.

University of Bielefeld
Center on Migration, Citizenship and Development (COMCAD)
Postfach 100131
D-33501 Bielefeld
Homepage: <http://www.comcad-bielefeld.de>

Abstract

India has invested in industrial projects, dams, roads, mines, power plants and new cities to achieve rapid economic growth. Available reports indicate that more than 21 million people are internally displaced populations (IDPs) due to development projects in India. Although the tribal population only makes up eight percent of the total population, more than 40 percent of the development induced displaced are tribal peoples in India. The difficulties faced by IDPs are numerous but distinct. Their right to participate and contest in the political processes is difficult. Such consequences lead to the requirement of legislations that address not only the issue of compensation, but also of resettlement, rehabilitation and participation in negotiation. Hence, the objectives of the study are to bring forth the impacts of major development projects on Internally Displaced Populations in India.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	6
2. Development related Displacement and its impact on the lives of Displaced people	8
3 Government's endeavour towards rehabilitation of IDPs	14
4 Conclusions.....	16
Acknowledgement	17
References.....	18

1. Introduction

According to UN guiding principles on Internal Displacement 'Internally displaced persons are persons or groups of persons who have been forced or obliged to flee or to leave their homes or places of habitual residence, in particular as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an internationally recognized State border' (UNs, 2004).

In India, [Displacement] due to [Development] is quite historical. Since, colonial period there has been enormous segment of displaced people. The most attractive zones for developmental projects have always been the forest resources, river systems and mineral base and have displaced many parts of the Indian society. Moreover, most of the developmental projects are located in the most backward areas and populated by tribals. The Indian tribes are believed to be the primitive settlers in India. They are usually called as adivasis implying original inhabitants. The constitution of India has documented these tribal groups as Scheduled Tribes (STs). They constitute approximately 8.2 per cent of India's more than one billion population and remain largely a neglected group. Although the tribal population only makes up eight per cent of the total population, more than 40 per cent of the development induced displaced are tribal peoples in India.

India has invested in industrial projects, dams, roads, mines, power plants and new cities to achieve rapid economic growth. This has been made possible through massive acquisition of land and subsequent displacement of people. Development Displacement Population is the single largest category among all Internally Displaced Populations (IDPs). In India around 50 million people have been displaced due to development projects in over 50 years. Around 21.3 million development-induced IDPs include those displaced by dams (16.4 million), mines (2.55 million), industrial development (1.25 million) and wild life sanctuaries and national parks (0.6 million) (IDMC, 2007).

Development-related Displacement may be divided into two subcategories – direct and indirect. Direct displacement refers to those cases, where the installation and commissioning of development projects lead to a direct displacement of people who have inhabited these sites for generation together. In India alone, between 1955-90 as a result of the installation of such projects as mines, dams and industries, wildlife and other projects, about 21 million people were internally displaced (Gaekwad and Nochur, 1995). Indirect displacement emanates

from a process whereby installation and functioning of projects continuously push up the consumption of natural and environmental resources, thereby depriving the indigenous people of the surrounding regions of their traditional means of wherewithal and sustenance (Das, Banerjee and Kumar, 2004). In the 1950s and 1960s, it may be said that the dominant view in development was informed by modernization theory, which, put crudely, saw development as transforming traditional, simple, Third World societies into modern, complex and westernized ones. Seen in this light, large-scale, capital-intensive development projects accelerated the pace toward a brighter and better future. In recent decades, however, a 'new development paradigm' has been articulated, one that promotes poverty reduction, environmental protection, social justice, and human rights. In this paradigm, development is seen as both bringing benefits and imposing costs. Among its greatest costs has been the involuntary displacement of millions of vulnerable people (Robinson, 2003).

Ever since independence in 1947, the Indian state has been committed to an ideology of 'development' led to state-led construction of dams, transport links and urban infrastructure. So strong was national consensus that protests against the large number of dams built in the first four decades of independence were rare. It was only with the Narmada Valley Project that the first serious popular opposition to development-induced displacement began. Soon agitations spread to urban renewal schemes, highway making, steel plants, mining and the ecological ravages of the prawn industry (Banerjee, 2004).

Consequences of these development induced displacement are numerous but distinct. Their quality of life and potential for physical and emotional growth is dormant; family and community life is almost totally destroyed; the opportunity for cultural activity hardly exists and the right of movement is highly restricted. Those living in camps, especially women, have to endure outrageous invasions of their privacy. Basic health care for all and education of children are virtually non-existent. Their right to participate and contest in the political processes is difficult. Such consequences lead to the requirement of legislations that address not only the issue of compensation but also of resettlement, rehabilitation and participation in negotiation.

“Like becoming a refugee, being forcibly ousted from one’s land and habitat by a dam, reservoir or highway is not only immediately disruptive and painful, it is also fraught with serious long-term risks of becoming poorer than before displacement, more vulnerable economically and disintegrated socially (Cernea, 1996).”

It is a profound socioeconomic and cultural disruption for those affected. Dislocation breaks up living patterns and social continuity. It dismantles existing modes of production, disrupts social networks, causes the impoverishment of many of those uprooted, threatens their cultural identity, and increases the risks of epidemics and health problems (Cernea, 1995).

Parasuraman (1999) documents the special vulnerabilities of women to displacement: any loss of access to traditional sources of livelihood — land, forest, sea, river, pasture, cattle or saltpan land — marginalizes women on the labour market. It is only when land and other sources are replaced that women at least partially regain their economic status. Women not only suffered in terms of health and nutrition, they also lost the capacity to provide a secure future for their children. By resorting to seasonal migration they have unwittingly denied their children access to school, health care, child welfare, and other welfare services.

Development-induced displacement is problematic at best, even when a state has the best interests of the entire population at heart. Such displacement can be catastrophic when it occurs in the midst of conflict or when a state targets a particular segment of the population—be they people in poverty; ethnic, racial, religious or political minorities; indigenous peoples; or other vulnerable groups—to bear a disproportional share of the costs of development and, either through neglect, malfeasance, or outright malice, denies them a proper share of the benefits (Robinson, 2003). Hence, the objectives of the study are to bring forth the impacts of major development projects on Internally Displaced Population in India.

2. Development related Displacement and its impact on the lives of Displaced people

India has one of the highest development-induced displacements in the world. There is however no reliable official statistics on the number of development related internally displaced in India. According to an official figure in 1994, about 15.5 million internally displaced people were in India and the Government acknowledged that some 11.5 million were awaiting rehabilitation. But calculations, on the basis of the number of dams constructed in India and its associated displacement show that the number of development-related displacement in India may be as high as 21 to 33 million people (Fernandes, 2000).

Dam building is one of the most important causes for development related displacement. According to a report, 'during the last fifty years, some 3,300 big dams have been constructed in India. Many of them have led to large-scale forced eviction of vulnerable groups. The situation of the tribal people is of special concern as they constitute 40 to 50 percent of the displaced population' (Kumar, 2005). The brutality of displacement due to the building of dams was dramatically highlighted during the agitation over the Sardar Sarovar Dam. It has been called 'India's most controversial dam project'. Medha Patekar, spearhead the anti-dam movement known as the *Narmada Bachao Andolon*. This movement for the first time systematically revealed how building dams can result in total dislocation of tribal societies. The

beneficiaries of the dam are meant to be large landowners; but the tribal people are paying the price. The Narmada Valley Development Project (NVDP) is supposed to be the most ambitious river valley development project in the world. It envisages building 3,200 dams that would reconstitute the Narmada and her 419 tributaries into a series of step-reservoirs. Of these, 30 would be major dams, 135 medium and the rest small. Two of the major dams would be multi-purpose mega dams. The Sardar Sarovar in Gujarat and the Narmada Sagar in Madhya Pradesh, would, between them, hold more water than any other reservoir in the Indian subcontinent. The official figure indicates that about 42,000 families would be displaced but non-governmental organizations such as the *Narmada Bachao Andolan* (NBA) puts the figure to about 85,000 families or 500,000 people. They argue that the official figure has not counted people who would lose their livelihood as a result of these dams as 'Project Affected Families' (PAFs). The official figure counts families who would lose their land or homes as the only PAF. The Narmada Valley Development Project would affect the lives of 25 million people who would live in the valley and would alter the ecology of an entire river basin (Das, Banerjee and Kumar, 2004).

The Tehri project is a multi-purpose irrigation and power project in the Ganges valley, 250 km north of Delhi, located in the Tehri Garhwal district of Uttaranchal state. Initially in 1969, the Tehri Dam Project Organization (TDPO) estimated that about 13,413 persons would be affected by the construction of the dam. But a working group for the Environment Appraisal of Tehri Dam established in 1979 put the figure of expected internal displacement to 85,600 persons. According to the 1995 report of TDPO, out of 135 villages affected, 37 would be fully submerged once the dam is completed. The total land affected by the project is 13,000 hectares (Das, Banerjee and Kumar, 2004).

According to one observer (Das, Banerjee and Kumar, 2004): Dams are built, people are uprooted, forests are submerged and then the project is simply abandoned. Canals are never completed... the benefits never accrue (except to the politicians, the bureaucrats and the contractors involved in the construction). The first dam that was built on the Narmada is a case in point - the Bargi Dam in Madhya Pradesh was completed in 1990. It cost ten times more than was budgeted and submerged three times more land than engineers said it would. To save the cost and effort of doing a survey, the government just filled the reservoir without warning anybody. 70,000 people from 101 villages were supposed to be displaced. Instead, 114,000 people from 162 villages were displaced. They were evicted from their homes by rising waters, chased out like rats, with no prior notice. There was no rehabilitation. Some got meagre cash compensation. Most got nothing. Some died of starvation. Others moved to slums in Jabalpur. Today, ten years after it was completed, the Bargi Dam produces some

electricity, but irrigates only as much land as it submerged. Only 5 per cent of the land its planners claimed it would irrigate.

Barring a few exceptions, most pre-1980 projects did not have a clear-cut resettlement plan. Resettlement was undertaken on a case-to-case basis. To mention a few, there were projects like the Nagarjunasagar, Hirakud, Tungabhadra and Mayurakshi dams; the Rourkela, Bhilai and Bokaro steel plants, several defense establishments, coal mines, etc, which did offer resettlement in the form of house sites to the displaced. Only National Thermal Power Corporation (NTPC) and Coal India Limited (CIL), two government undertakings have formulated a Resettlement and Rehabilitation policy (R and R policy) and constituted R and R departments to administer it. In addition, resettlement colonies have been demarcated near all their project sites to resettle the displaced (Asif, 2000). As a result of this ad hoc approach, many of the displaced were left out of the process and even though there is an absence of accurate national database studies on displacement, a study for 1951-1995 completed in six states and other research show that their real number between 1947-2000 is probably around 60 million (Fernandes, 2004). It was clear from the start that mega-projects would require the displacement or forced uprooting of substantial populations, particularly for hydraulic projects which entail large-scale submergence for reservoirs. However, national leaders and policy-makers typically viewed these as legitimate and inevitable costs of development, acceptable in the larger national interest (Hemadri and Mander, 1999).

Himanshi Thakkar (2000), in his paper on displacement for the WCD, says: 'Displacement due to dams in India has been variously estimated. Fernandes, Das and Rao (1989) claimed a decade ago that Indians displaced by dam projects numbered 21 million. As the authors themselves pointed out, these were very conservative estimates. A recent statement by Shri N.C. Saxena (the then Secretary, Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India) however put the total number of persons displaced due to large dams at 40 million. He said in an open meeting that most of them have not been resettled. Roy (1999), based on a survey of 54 projects, estimated the people displaced by large dams in last 50 years to be 33 million' (Global IDP Database, 2001).

The estimates provided about the IDPs are indeed considerable but the major cost of displacement is to be paid by the tribals. Tribal people are more dependent on forest and common property resources than other groups. Fewer tribals than non-tribals are being properly resettled or get benefits from the project displacing them. Landless agricultural workers generally do not receive any compensation. Tribal people share the problems of other rural people but they are even more dependent on forests and common property resources, their

documented legal rights on cultivable lands are even more tenuous, their ability to handle cash transactions in a market economy even more shaky, their skills for diversified livelihood not based on forests or land are even more rudimentary, and their ability to negotiate with state officials and courts even more weaker. It is not surprising that fewer tribal oustees are able to access whatever facilities for rehabilitation are provided by project authorities compared to non-tribals (Global IDP Database, 2001). The details about projects and people displaced have been given in Table 1.

Table 1 Dams and the displacement of tribal people

Name of Project	State	Population facing displacement	Tribal people as percentage of displaced
Karjan	Gujarat	11,600	100
Sardar Sarovar	Gujarat	200,000	57.6
Maheshwar	M.P	20,000	60
Bodhghat	M.P	12,700	73.91
Icha	Bihar	30,800	80
Chandil	Bihar	37,600	87.92
Koel Karo	Bihar	66,000	88
Mahi Bajaj Sagar	Rajasthan	38,400	76.28
Polavaram	A.P.	150,000	52.90
Maithon & Panchet	Bihar	93,874	56.46
Upper Indravati	Orissa	18,500	89.20
Pong	H.P.	80,000	56.25
Inchampalli	A.P. – Maharashtra	38,100	76.28
Tultuli	Maharashtra	13,600	51.61
Daman Ganga	Gujarat	8,700	48.70
Bhakra	H.P.	36,000	34.76
Masan Reservoir	Bihar	3,700	31.00
Ukai Reservoir	Gujarat	52,000	18.92

Source: Satyajit Singh, *Taming the Waters*, OUP, 1997, and Government figures.

Note: Projects are either under construction or have been planned. (Hemadri and Mander, 1999)

Apart from this, villagers are often not properly informed of the details of their displacement and there is lack of resources and access to alternative housing. New mega-projects displace already resettled communities; in some districts the population has been displaced several times in just a few decades. The utter casualness with which oustees are sometimes subjected to multiple displacements is described in the Bargi Tribunal report: ‘The plots allocated to the oustees for construction of new homes were chosen in cavalier fashion by the authorities. This becomes apparent when one learns of the fact that their carefully re-established homes —such as they were — fell victim to submergence once more without the slightest hint of a warning from the engineers and planners of the dam. Traumatized once, the loss of their security for the second time was unimaginable. For this second displacement, no compensation was paid, compounding several times over the original injustice of

forcing them to occupy plots barely one-tenth the size of their original holdings. The villagers had no choice but to put up the money to re-house themselves as they had no alternate shelter, or place to stock provisions and stores safe from the vagaries of weather'. To impose the trauma of forced relocation on any population once is grave enough. To do it again and again merely because of casualness or slipshod advance planning or lack of coordination by engineers and project officials reflects bureaucratic insensitivity and callousness at its nadir (Hemadri and Mander, 1999).

Lack of information is in itself a very serious matter, but even more unforgivable is the incomplete and defective information being provided to the people. For example, some of the oustees have been told that they will get compensatory land only if they go to Gujarat and that to a maximum of 5 acres irrespective of the area of land lost, whereas under the Award, they are entitled to get a minimum of 5 acres as compensation *either* in Gujarat or in Madhya Pradesh. Some oustees from the villages of Kukshi tehsil have been told that cash compensation will be paid to them in instalments, though the Award specifies that it is to be given in a lump-sum (Hemadri and Mander, 1999). A study done in Madhya Pradesh in 1987, three years after work on the Sardar Sarovar dam commenced, showed that people did not know which villages would be submerged, when and how many of them would be displaced, whether they would be resettled or what compensation would be paid. This situation is not specific to Sardar Sarovar but true about most projects (Fernandes, 2000).

Michael Cernea, a sociologist based at the World Bank who has researched development induced displacement and resettlement for two decades, points out that being forcibly ousted from one's land and habitat carries with it the risk of becoming poorer than before displacement. Those displaced 'are supposed to receive compensation of their lost assets, and effective assistance to re-establish themselves productively; yet this does not happen for a large portion of oustees.' Cernea's impoverishment risk and reconstruction model proposes that 'the onset of impoverishment can be represented through a model of eight interlinked potential risks intrinsic to displacement' (Robinson, 2003). These are:

1. **Landlessness.** Expropriation of land removes the main foundation upon which people's productive systems, commercial activities and livelihoods are constructed. This is the principle form of de-capitalization and pauperization of displaced people, as they lose both natural and human-made capital.
2. **Joblessness.** The risk of losing wage employment is very high both in urban and rural displacements for those employed in enterprises, services or agriculture. Yet, creating

new jobs is difficult and requires substantial investment. Unemployment or underemployment among resettlers often endures long after physical relocation has been completed.

3. **Homelessness.** Loss of shelter tends to be only temporary for many resettlers; but, for some, homelessness or a worsening in their housing standards remains a lingering condition. In a broader cultural sense, loss of a family's individual home and the loss of a group's cultural space tend to result in alienation and status deprivation.
4. **Marginalization.** Marginalization occurs when families lose economic power and spiral on a 'downward mobility' path. Many individuals cannot use their earlier acquired skills at the new location; human capital is lost or rendered inactive or obsolete. Economic marginalization is often accompanied by social and psychological marginalization, expressed in a drop in social status, in resettlers' loss of confidence in society and in themselves, a feeling of injustice, and deepened vulnerability.
5. **Food Insecurity.** Forced uprooting increases the risk that people will fall into temporary or chronic undernourishment, defined as calorie-protein intake levels below the minimum necessary for normal growth and work.
6. **Increased Morbidity and Mortality.** Massive population displacement threatens to cause serious decline in health levels. Displacement-induced social stress and psychological trauma are sometimes accompanied by the outbreak of relocation related illnesses, particularly parasitic and vector-borne diseases such as malaria. Unsafe water supply and improvised sewage systems increase vulnerability to epidemics and chronic diarrhea, dysentery, and so on. The weakest segments of the demographic spectrum—infants, children, and the elderly—are affected most strongly.
7. **Loss of Access to Common Property.** For poor people, loss of access to the common property assets that belonged to relocated communities (pastures, forest lands, water bodies, burial grounds, quarries, and so on) result in significant deterioration in income and livelihood levels.
8. **Social Disintegration.** The fundamental feature of forced displacement is that it causes a profound unraveling of existing patterns of social organization. This unraveling occurs at many levels. When people are forcibly moved, production systems are dismantled. Long-established residential communities and settlements are disorganized, while kinship

groups and family systems are often scattered. Life-sustaining informal social networks that provide mutual help are rendered non-functional. Trade linkages between producers and their customer base are interrupted and local labor markets are disrupted. Formal and informal associations and self-organized services are wiped out by the sudden scattering of their membership. Traditional management systems tend to lose their leaders. The coerced abandonment of symbolic markers (such as ancestral shrines and graves) or of spatial contexts (such as mountains and rivers considered holy, or sacred trails) cuts off some of the physical and psychological linkages with the past and saps at the roots of the peoples' cultural identity. The cumulative effect is that the social fabric is torn apart.

Further two additional risks intrinsic to displacement have been added by Robinson (2003) by borrowing from Robert Muggah and Theodore Downing:

9. **Loss of Access to Community Services.** This could include anything from health clinics to educational facilities but especially costly both in the short and long term are lost or delayed opportunities for the education of children.

10. **Violation of Human Rights.** Displacement from one's habitual residence and the loss of property without fair compensation can, in itself, constitute a violation of human rights. In addition to violating economic and social rights, listed above, arbitrary displacement can also lead to violations of civil and political rights, including: arbitrary arrest, degrading treatment or punishment, temporary or permanent disenfranchisement and the loss of one's political voice. Finally, displacement carries not only the risk of human rights violations at the hands of state authorities and security forces but also the risk of communal violence when new settlers move in amongst existing populations.

3 Government's endeavour towards rehabilitation of IDPs

At the national level, the first policy draft was prepared in 1985 by a committee appointed by the department of tribal welfare when it found that over 40 per cent of the DPs and PAFs 1951-80 were tribals (Government of India 1985). The next draft came from the ministry of rural development eight long years later in 1993 and the third in 1994 (Das, Banerjee and Kumar, 2004). After a few earlier drafts (1993 and 1994), the Ministry of Rural Development has finally come up with the Draft National Policy on Rehabilitation in 1998. This draft policy has some positive features. In the first place it does acknowledge that displacement results

in 'state-induced impoverishment'. It also recognises that 'no developmental project can be justified if a section of society is pauperised by it.' In brief the draft policy seems to correct the shortcomings of the existing legal regime and to a large extent tries to bridge the gap between the constitutional aspiration of social justice and the anti-people and anti-poor law on acquisition. It is significant to note that at about the same time the draft policy was drafted, the same Ministry also finalized the Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill (LAB), 1998 widely regarded as anti-people and which actually ignored the draft policy on rehabilitation. Not unexpectedly, on the 31 October 1998, the Union Cabinet approved the Land Acquisition (Amendment) Bill, 1998; the Union Cabinet rejected the Draft National Policy on Rehabilitation (Global IDP Database, 2001).

Discussion of a draft IDP policy continued for two decades and it was only in 2004 that a National Rehabilitation Policy for Project Affected Families (NPRR) was passed with minimal debate. NPRR only applies to those displaced due to development projects and is primarily meant to safeguard the interests of resource-poor landless agricultural labourers, forest dwellers, artisans and *adivasi* groups. The NPRR should safeguard *adivasis* from arbitrary displacement but has no provisions to consult them. However, the NPRR has grave shortcomings:

1. Financial assistance is restricted to the equivalent of a minimum wage for 625 days: families below the poverty line would much rather have jobs than receive once-off allowances.
2. Cash compensation is inappropriate for people who may have had little experience of the market economy and thus unwisely use cash made available.
3. There is little safeguard against corrupt officials.
4. Provisions for project affected people to participate in grievance procedures are extremely restrictive.
5. NPRR has no provisions regarding multiple displacements although field evidence shows most IDPs suffer from multiple displacements.
6. NPRR procedures are only activated when a set number of people are displaced – at least 500 families in lowland and 250 families in highland areas. Civil servants are tempted to under-enumerate in order to avoid liability to pay compensation (Banerjee, 2004).

4 Conclusions

The paper is an attempt of a brief appraisal based on available literatures of the impact of development projects on the internally displaced populations in India. It cannot be denied that development induced displacement has been an ancient phenomenon. Development projects are mostly targeted towards river systems, mines, forests etc. Moreover, the segment of population which is widely affected is the tribal population which is already a deprived segment in the Indian society. However, displacement became plight of the people and came under notice in post-independence era especially after first dam was constructed under Narmada Valley Development Project. The consequences of displacement are wide and varied. The displacement causes profound economic hardships. Compensation which is assured for the internally displaced population is meagre and hardly suffices to the need of those displaced. There is no infrastructure so to say; there is hardly any opportunity towards income generation. By their high frequency, cumulative magnitude, and destructive socio-economic and cultural effects, forced displacements have come to be recognized as a severe pathology of development, of growing concern and visibility on international and national agendas.

In India, development projects will continue in the years to come. Hence, Indian government should frame a strategy so as to reduce if not eradicate the hardships of those displaced as a result of development projects. There is hardly any nation-wide framework on the issue of internal displacement. The government's response to IDP due to development projects is largely vague, and the displaced are therefore often left unnoticed. Hence there is an urgent need for the government undertakes surveys in affected areas in order to document the magnitude of the problem and to develop a policy for a consistent nation-wide approach for assistance and protection of internally displaced populations. The Government should also strengthen its institutional capacity to assist IDPs. Affected populations should benefit directly and sustainably from the project forcing them off their land. The displaced population should be actively involved while framing the rehabilitation packages. Provision of new land should be the cornerstone of the rehabilitation policy.

Acknowledgement

Presented 'Development Projects VS Internally Displaced Populations in India: A Literature based Appraisal' in Environmental Change and Migration from Vulnerabilities to Capabilities, International Conference held in Bad Salzuflen, Germany in December 2010. The authors are thankful to the participants and other eminent scholars for giving valuable suggestions.

References

- B. Paula (2004) IDP Protection at the National Level in South Asia, www.fmreview.org/FMRpdfs/BrookingsSpecial/11.pdf, date accessed on 21 October 2010.
- C. Michael (1995) 'Social Integration and Population Displacement: The Contribution of Social Sciences' *International Social Science Journal*, XLIII, 1, 91-112.
- C. Michael (1996) Bridging the Research Divide: Studying Development Oustees. In Tim Allen (ed), *In Search of Cool Ground: War, Flight and Homecoming in Northeast Africa*, (London: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, Africa World Press and James Currey).
- C. Michael (1999) 'Why Economic Analysis is Essential to Resettlement: A Sociologist's View', *Economic and Political Weekly*, XXXIV, XXXI, 2149-2158.
- D.K. Samir, B. Paula and K. Madhuresh (2004) *People on Move: How Governments Manage Moving Populations*, Mahanirban Calcutta Research Group, Kolkata.
- F. Walter (2000) Pawns in the Development, in S. Parasuraman and P. V. Unnikrishnan (eds), *India Disasters Report Human - Instigated Disasters*, 276-279.
- F. Walter (2004) 'Rehabilitation Policy for the Displaced', *Economic and Political Weekly*, XXXIV, XII, 1191-1193.
- G. Nancy and N.S. Ganesh (eds) (1995) *National Conference on Development, Displacement and Rehabilitation: Policies and Strategies: A Report*, Mumbai: Tata Institute of Social Science Research and NAPM.
- Global IDP Database (2001) *Profile of Internal Displacement: India* Compilation of the Information Available in the Global IDP: Database of the Norwegian Refugee Council, <http://www.idpproject.org>, date accessed on 23 October 2010.
- Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC) (2007) *India: Large Numbers of IDPs are Unassisted and in Need of Protection: A Profile of the Internal Displacement Situation*, www.internal-displacement.org, date accessed on 22 October 2010.

K. D. Jeevan (2000) Rights of Internally Displaced Persons In The Light Of the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement,
http://repository.forcedmigration.org/show_metadata.jsp?pid=fmo:3044, date accessed on 19 October 2010.

K. Madhuresh (2005) Incorporating Gender Issues in National Responses, compiled for presentation at the Regional Workshop on NHRIs and IDPs Organised by APF, Colombo, October 26-28 2005, www.idproject.org/India, date accessed on 25 October 2010.

H. Mander R. Hemadri and V. Nagraj (1999) Dams, Displacement, Policy and Law in India, working paper of the World Commission on Dams,
unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/.../UNPAN021311.pdf, date accessed on 30 October 2010.

Mohd. Asif (2000) 'Why Displaced Persons Reject Project Resettlement Colonies', *Economic and Political Weekly*, XXXV, XXIV, 2005-2008.

P. Chittaroopa (2004) 'Short-Changing the Displaced: National Rehabilitation Policy', *Economic and Political Weekly*, XXXIV, XXVII, 2961-2963.

Parasuraman S. (1997) The Anti-Dam Movement And Rehabilitation Policy, in *The Dam and the Nation: Displacement and Resettlement in the Narmada Valley*, eds. Jean Dreze, Meera Samson and Satyajit Singh (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 33.

R. W. Courtland (2003) *Risks and Rights: The Causes, Consequences, and Challenges of Development-Induced Displacement*. The Brookings Institution – Sais Project on Internal Displacement, Washington DC, USA,
<http://www.adb.org/water/Topics/Dams/pdf/didreport.pdf>, date accessed on 1 October 2010.

United Nations (2004) *Guiding Principles on Internal Displacements*. Available at:
www.internal-displacement.org/8025708F004BE3B1/.../GPsEnglish.pdf, date accessed on 1 November 2010.