

The Multiple Displacements of Mangalore Special Economic Zone

IAN COOK, RAMACHANDRA BHATTA, VIDYA DINKER

This paper analyses three different types of displacement – social, cultural and economic – in the lives of three women and their families which have been affected by the creation of the Mangalore special economic zone. Conceptualising the displacements in rhythmic terms, it first details the subversion of progressive land reforms and the reassertion of caste-based oppression, followed by the clash between the dharma of the spirits of the land and the neo-liberal dharma of capitalistic development. Finally, it looks at life in a resettlement colony where families that have been uprooted from the agricultural production cycle are closed off from the urban life they are expected to adopt.

Tulu Nadu is a rich, fertile and narrow belt of land between the Western Ghats and the Arabian Sea. It boasts a rain-washed landscape dominated by coconut groves and paddy fields that are home to ancient spirits and, in recent decades, notifications for land acquisition by the Karnataka Industrial Areas Development Board (KIADB).

The KIADB's marketing slogan is "A Land of Opportunity". While we are not so naive as to believe it means opportunity for the small-scale agriculturalists of the region who are the focus of this paper, we nevertheless want to interrogate the relationship between "land" and "opportunity" with reference to the different forms of displacement that have been caused by land acquisition for the Mangalore special economic zone (MSEZ), which began in 2005.¹ Land is a productive resource on which crops can be grown or oil refineries built, but changing ownership arrangements and differential access to this resource fundamentally alters social, cultural and economic structures that constitute people's everyday lives. Accordingly, we understand the ongoing conflict in the region between SEZs and farmers not only in terms of a struggle over physical pieces of quantifiable land (though that certainly is an issue), but also as a conflict rooted in different understandings of what land is. It is a struggle over both how space and time are used, and over how the specific rhythmic logic of a certain type of development clashes with the multiple rhythms of people's everyday lives that are linked to crop patterns, religious observances, or work schedules (Lefebvre 2004). These rhythms are tied to the landscape of Tulu Nadu, a landscape that is alive with symbolic meaning, histories and ancestors that define the social organisation of different groups and how they access resources (Tilley 1994).

The region of focus, whose current administrative title is Dakshina Kannada, has a long history of land acquisition and displacement.² The district's 4,866 square kilometres is home to 20,83,625 people, or 457 people per sq km, which is more than the state (319) and national (382) averages (GOI 2011) (Table 1, p 41). Mangalore, the district headquarters, has long been an important centre for seaborne trade, but it witnessed very little industrialisation during colonial rule (Rai 2003), with one colonial officer noting, "The same rains which deny it manufactures, give it a succession of never failing crops of rice, which place its revenue and its future prosperity on the firmest foundation, for there can be no danger that the existing demand for surplus produce will ever diminish" (quoted in Fernandes 2006: 25). With Independence came the desire to

The views expressed here do not represent the opinion of the organisations with which the authors are associated. They are grateful for the financial support of DEEDS, Mangalore.

Ian Cook is a PhD candidate at the Central European University and a research scholar at the Department of Sociology, University of Hyderabad; Ramachandra Bhatta (*rcbhat@gmail.com*) is at the National Centre for Sustainable Coastal Management, Chennai; Vidya Dinker is with the Citizens Forum for Mangalore Development.

build the infrastructure that the British had denied the region and, as a part of this drive, the region's first all-weather port was officially opened north of Mangalore in 1975.³ The New Mangalore Port (NMP) was associated with industrialisation from its inception, opening itself to limited traffic a year early to bring in equipment for the state-backed Mangalore Chemicals and Fertilisers (Erdman 1989). Two decades on, the Mangalore Refinery and Petrochemicals Limited (MRPL), a subsidiary of the Oil and Natural Gas Corporation (ONGC) (two of the main promoters of the MSEZ), established its first refinery by acquiring 1,850 acres of crop land during 1994-95 and displacing around 930 households. There are now 22 large-scale and medium-scale industries and 18,009 small-scale industries in the district (Government of Karnataka 2004), mostly concentrated just north of Mangalore.

Table 1: Demographic Profiles of the Coastal Districts of Karnataka

Details	State	Dakshina Kannada	Udupi
Population	6,11,30,704	20,83,625	11,77,708
Decadal population growth rate (%)	15.67	9.80	5.90
Area (sq km)	1,91,791	4,866	3,575
Density of population (persons per sq km)	319	457	287
Literacy level (%)	75.60	88.62	86.29
Percentage of workers to total population	44.30	50.00	44.00
Net district total income in 2007-08 (lakh)			
at current prices	2,11,66,253	9,69,984	4,73,922
Per capita income in 2007-08			
(at constant prices 1999-2000)	36,945	47,151	39,307
Rank based on Human Development Index	7	2	3

Source: Government of Karnataka 2010, Government of India 2011.

Since the NMP's inception there has been a dramatic rise in the area of land used for industrial, educational, recreational, commercial and residential purposes. From 1972 to 1999, the population in the region grew by about 54%, with "developed land" growing by 142% – three times the rate of the population (Sudhira, Ramachandra and Jagadish 2004: 32-33). At a slightly later period, between 1983 and 2008, the "built up" area in Dakshina Kannada tripled, with population increasing by 215% (Bhagyanagar et al 2012). This increasing pressure on land is complicated by the small average size of landholdings in the district, on average 0.96 acres in 2005-06 (Bhatta 2010), making it difficult for industrialists who want to purchase large tracts of land, as they must conclude agreements with each individual landowner.

With the aim of overcoming such difficulties, in 2005, the KIADB published a notification for the acquisition of 278 acres of land for the MRPL-ONGC petrochemical complex taking advantage of the SEZ Act 2005 (Government of India 2005). Export processing zones had been in existence since the 1960s, but were deemed inefficient, and were reformulated and repackaged as SEZs that offered export duty exemptions, tax holidays, and smooth bureaucratic procedures. So far, 588 SEZs have been formally approved, a further 49 approved in principle, and 386 of these notified. In Karnataka, 62 have been formally approved, one approved in principle, and 41 notified. In Dakshina Kannada, seven SEZs have been formally approved.⁴ During the acquisition for MRPL-ONGC, the MSEZ

was formed at the invitation of the Kanara Chamber of Commerce, and the two entities decided to join this larger project, acquiring shares in it. Phase one comprised around 1,800 acres, and phase two was to comprise 2,035 acres in four villages, but the notification order was withdrawn after a strong local campaign against it.

Phase one directly displaced 1,518 families in four village panchayats. In the environmental impact assessment (EIA) report, the state-approved resettlement and rehabilitation package is laid out and it includes land in a resettlement and rehabilitation (R&R) colony; grants for transportation, subsistence and rehabilitation; relocation of places of worship; and jobs in the industries inside the MSEZ, with training provided if necessary. The MSEZ used the Government of Karnataka's definition of project-affected people, which meant those who had lived in, worked on, or cultivated land for at least one year prior to notification. The EIA was in part based on research conducted by the Department of Social Work, Mangalore University, and the Srinivas College of Social Work, Mangalore. This research was severely criticised as it ignored changes over time, failed to include most productive assets, and was devoid of any qualitative contextualisation (Dhakal 2009). We want to go beyond assessing whether the MSEZ has managed to live up to its promise on relocation and rehabilitation. It is quite clear from the data gathered that it has not. Rather we analyse the different types of displacement – social, cultural and economic – that have taken place as a result of the MSEZ's land acquisition. We do so through case studies of three women and their families.

The Reassertion of Caste and Class Hierarchies

In Kudubi Padau Permude, part of a village that was earmarked for MSEZ phase two, Kalyanibai lives on a small piece of land with a complicated history. Unravelling the story behind Kalyanibai's land requires an understanding of how landownership patterns have changed in the region. In the centuries before Independence, land was in private hands with upper-caste landlords paying a tax to sovereigns who rarely interfered in land arrangements. The landlords often rented out their land to the middle castes for subsistence or commercial farming. Meanwhile, labourers, who were often held in bondage, came from the low and untouchable castes. This system was far from stable and poverty was widespread, leading to immense strains and tensions. The British administration, on seizing the region in 1799, adopted the *raiayatwari* system, which formalised and strengthened the role of landlords with whom it dealt exclusively (Bhat 2000: 52-55).

Land reform was high on the political agenda in the decades following Independence, and undivided Dakshina Kannada was subject to the Karnataka Land Reforms Act 1961, amended in 1974. The 1961 Act did little to reduce land-based inequalities as many absentee landlords exploited the ignorance of those who worked on their land. In some parts of undivided Dakshina Kannada, nearly three quarters of the tenants were evicted under the provision of "personal cultivation" before the 1974 Amendment (Damle 1993: 228). However, the land reforms in the 1970s profoundly affected land distribution,

eradicating intermediaries, absentee landlords, and tenancy agreements, as well as handing over a considerable amount of land to the previously landless, a process implemented through often long and expensive land tribunals (Judge 1999: 148-56). Further, the act blocked the entry of capitalists into agriculture as those above a certain income limit (at the time Rs 65,000 per annum, now Rs 2,00,000) could not acquire agricultural land.

The ways in which land was transferred were in part dependent on the landlord's caste and the related system of land use. The intergenerational division of brahmin land, along with the growing tendency for urban employment, made the acquisition of their land relatively easy. However, Bunts often kept land undivided, occupying a central *guttu mane* (erstwhile manor house that was traditionally lived in by the family responsible for collecting taxes) and cultivating sections of the land themselves. They rented out other sections for subsistence or commercial farming to the lower castes. At the time of transfers, some of these Bunt landowners were able to intimidate those who had tilled their land as "the subordination of tenants had been socially legitimated and psychologically established" (Damle 1993: 232).

Kalyanibai's struggle to keep and till her own land must be understood in the context of thousands of years of landlord oppression often aided by exploitative state policies; widespread rural poverty among the landless; past experience or knowledge of lengthy legal battles over landownership; and entrenched caste oppression. As Kalyanibai is from the Kudubi tribal community, we must also add a history of displacement as the Kudubis were forced out from their native lands in present-day Goa by the Portuguese during colonial rule.⁵ Moreover, as Kudubis generally had collective ownership over land, concepts such as landownership were alien to them before land reforms were introduced. Kalyanibai's family, like many Kudubis in the district, received documented land in its name for the first time during the reforms of the 1970s.

In 2007, the MSEZ began the process of acquiring 2,035 acres for phase two, which was to include Kalyanibai's land. Meanwhile, there was an important shift in the laws with the central government directing that no land was to be taken forcibly for SEZs. This was in April 2007. But in May, the KIADB notified land, including Kalyanibai's, but did not serve notices to the Kudubis. Nevertheless, a struggle ensued during which they came into contact with activists and neighbouring villagers and came to know that the proposed acquisition was illegal as the notification was issued after the central government directive. They took the matter to the Ministry of Commerce in New Delhi, which sent a letter to remind the KIADB, the MSEZ, and the district administration that forcible land acquisition for SEZs was not allowed. This rattled the MSEZ officials, who were worried it might jeopardise the MSEZ project.

In 2005, a Bunt family who had lived in a part of the same village had positioned itself as an intermediary between the company and the villagers when the MSEZ began the process of acquisition. Most of the displaced were moved to a resettlement colony, but the erstwhile landlords were not keen on this

and used their influence with the MSEZ to push for better land – the land belonging to Kalyanibai and other Kudubis. One morning, Kalyanibai found the head of the *guttu mane* walking around her land with MSEZ officials, undertaking a survey. Her family challenged them and they left, only to return with goons and the police. The family contacted local activists, who managed to successfully scare them away. However, as Kalyanibai recalls, "The goondas came back and destroyed everything. We were growing vegetables and paddy worth Rs 1 lakh a year. They put soil in the well. We said, 'Allow us to pull up the vegetables first' but they did not listen and destroyed everything." Their house and a small piece of land were left under their control, but the land that was their source of food was forcibly taken.

On protesting, they were told that the land was not for the MSEZ, but for the *guttu* families who had been displaced in phase one and therefore the rule on the non-forcible acquisition of land for SEZs did not apply! The case is now in the High Court of Karnataka, where the KIADB, in spite of contradictory photographic evidence, is claiming that as the land was infertile, it was right to acquire it. The Bunt family has built a new *guttu mane* and temple on Kalyanibai's land and is taking its role as traditional landlord seriously by hosting the annual *kambla* – a traditional bull race through water-filled paddy fields, which "preserves the memories of an orchestrated celebration of socio-political power in the feudal ambience of Tulunadu" (Rao 2010: 170). There could scarcely be a louder announcement that the land is fertile and that it is theirs. Kalyanibai is concerned with more immediate matters, such as how to meet her family's needs from the small piece of land she has left.

How are we to understand the changing relationship between caste and land? The land reforms of the 1970s did not eradicate caste hierarchies, but they did allow the previously landless – who were overwhelmingly from the lower castes – the means to reconfigure the double inequalities of caste and landownership. Some former landlords retain prominent positions in their villages but, crucially, the social structures emanating from caste and land were (for the most part) delinked. However, with the arrival of the MSEZ, the erstwhile landlords reasserted their position as "leaders". There was no longer a colonial power with which to cement dominance for personal wealth, but there was a way to use their position in the social hierarchy to gain access to a resource, in this case fertile land.

It would be incorrect to describe this as "land reform in reverse" as the Bunt family has not returned to its previous position of importance. It is clearly much weaker now because the "uneducated" Kudubis can get the central minister of commerce to write a letter in their support and can take their struggle to court. And the KIADB, working on behalf of the MSEZ, is far more proactive than the sovereigns of the past. Whereas in the centuries before colonialism rulers occasionally gave *inams* (gifts of land) to brahmins or temples in the hope of gaining god's grace, the KIADB is working for a belief system that has an unquenchable thirst for land built

into its internal logic. It is this that will be examined in the next section.

Cultural Displacement: Myths that Bind the Land

At the far end of a churned-up road in Nellidadi, part of a village that is being gradually consumed by the MSEZ, a different guttu mane sits under the gaze of a hollowed-out hillside. The one-time manor house is home to the *bhuta* (spirit) Jumadi. Bhutas or *daivas* are powerful divine beings that can be found throughout Tulu Nadu. Like much of Tulu culture, bhuta worship is built around paddy, coconut and areca production, and is closely tied to the land. While some bhuta's origins are vague, others have long oral narratives (*paddanas*), that are recited during annual bhuta festivals (such as *kola* or *nema*) by a medium possessed by the spirit (Claus 1984). No two rituals are the same, but in general they are all-night affairs in which the medium is made up to look like the bhuta and *paddanas* are sung (Gowda 2005).

The guttu mane of MSEZ-threatened Nellidadi is home to the bhuta Jumadi, also known Dhumavati, and referred to as a *rajandaiva* (royal bhuta). It is presided over by Santosh Chouta, whose family has been in the 800-year-old house for nine generations. Guttu mane-residing bunts like Santosh worship their royal bhuta in a way befitting their position, organising a grand annual *nema* in its name. According to Carrin and Tamms-Lyche (2003), the *nema* organised for a *rajandaiva* is linked to the traditional landlord-tenant-labourer relationship. The *yajman* (host) is understood to be wedded to his land, which he holds as a trustee for the royal bhuta, while the *nema* is associated with the first ploughing of the year. In the past, the *nema* was the main way through which the chiefs of Tulu Nadu reaffirmed their authority. With land reforms, bunts are no longer chiefs of the manor, but the ritual remains important because they make claims to be the natural leaders of the community through it – the *yajman* asks for acknowledgement of his position and, in return for the community's participation, offers it the gift of staging the *nema*. At the *nema*, the community expects to receive the bhuta's justice, and disputes are aired and settled in the sacred ritual. The bhutas do not find solutions to problems or take sides, but they do take a stand to uphold dharma (Carrin and Tamms-Lyche 2003).

The authority of pronouncements of the *rajandaiva* Jumadi during the annual *nema* in the guttu mane of Nellidadi has been tested by the arrival of the MSEZ. Her *paddana* reveals a lengthy association with the land.⁶ A long time ago, the house owner went to a festival to buy bulls, where he heard a voice asking, "Can I come with you?" The house owner said, "I will not reject you if you want to come". On the way back home, he was thirsty and stopped to drink. Once home, the bulls became very sick. He consulted an astrologer who told him that the *rajandaiva* had waited by the water where he had stopped to drink, "You have to believe in this *rajandaiva* and the bulls will be healthy". He believed, the *rajandaiva* came to reside in the house, and the bulls recovered.⁷ Later, a *saana* (a sacred place where bhutas reside) was built and a festival arranged to spread the *rajandaiva*'s power.⁸

In 2006, before the guttu mane was under threat, five officers from the MSEZ attended the annual *nema*. Jumadi told them, "You are not supposed to come here. For the sake of your families, go". A year later a notification came for Jumadi's land. During that year's *nema*, Santosh's family asked Jumadi if she would leave, but she refused. The chief operating officer of the MSEZ at the time agreed that the house and *saana* would not be moved. But, as Suman, Santosh's sister-in-law, explains,

Slowly, bit by bit, the MSEZ attacked other places. They conquered them, but not ours. They said they would not attack this area. Back then there was a different man in charge. He promised that he would protect it [the *saana*], that they would not do it any harm. Then a new man came. He said, 'It is a government order and we want the land'.

Suman and her family refused to be shifted, arguing that the *rajandaiva* had taken her stand in line with dharma.

Then in May 2012 they came. They said they would destroy the house. They came with JCBs. They were shouting, 'Now show your strength!' The goondas destroyed the trees, poured earth over our crops. They harmed us and our children. We complained at the police station, the child welfare committee, but no action has been taken.

Despite the destruction, the guttu mane and *saana* still stand, with local activists and the area's member of parliament (MP) lending their support. As Suman says, "The *rajandaiva* will not leave, and we will not leave".

When Jumadi speaks during the ritual she does so to uphold dharma – to maintain the regular order of the (Hindu) universe. She is invited to do so at the behest of the local landlord, but both the bhuta and the landlord need the support of the community for the *nema* to function. The KIADB speaks by issuing notices (a ritual it neglected in the case of the kudubis). It does so at the behest of industry, and does not need the support of the community to function. We might ask, what is the dharma that the KIADB follows? If it does not draw its authority from the community, then from where?

The authority lies in a number of acts and bills – such as the Land Acquisition Act 1894 and the Karnataka Industrial Area Development Act 1966 – that have at their heart the concept of eminent domain. Drawing on vague definitions of "public purpose", these acts are used to uphold the dharma of development, or rather a specific type of capitalistic development. The KIADB helps capital surmount problems of over-accumulation by dispossessing small-scale agriculturalists to benefit the capitalists – "accumulation by dispossession" (Harvey 2005; Banerjee-Guha 2008; Sampat 2010). The complicated political process is explained by Levien (2011),

Accumulation by dispossession [is] ...a political process through which the state assists capitalists in overcoming the barrier to accumulation presented by not fully capitalist rural land markets. ...The problem for capital arises because the majority of available land in India lies with smallholding peasants who often do not treat their land as a pure financial asset to be bought and sold on the market...[Thus the state] uses extra-economic coercion to expropriate increasing amounts of private and common land for private capital accumulation. Making such land available for industrial, commercial and residential growth is the principal function of industrial development corporations and urban development authorities in India today (479).

This then is what the bhuta Jumadi is up against – a state agency armed with colonial era tools, practised in displacing people for large projects, and driven by capital and capitalists. Such struggles will only increase with Mangalore's industrial growth. Moreover, rising levels of pollution are affecting the way people relate to their land, with agriculture and fishing becoming increasingly difficult in the region.

Economic Displacement: Between the Village and the City

Saraswati moved into her new house in Kulai in 2010, one of the MSEZ's four R&R colonies. She lives with her husband and three daughters, whose future wedding expenses she frequently frets over. Her husband works as a load carrier, while her oldest daughter has completed a training course and is waiting for a job in the MSEZ. Her daughter is not alone, with only 34% of the eligible families having received jobs.⁹ Nevertheless she is confident that her daughter will eventually get one. Her confidence may stem from that the family was able to secure a plot of land for their house – making it one of the 67% of eligible families

Table 2: Socio-economic Profile of Displaced Families Surveyed

	Number of Families	Percentage
Religion		
Hindu	67	73.6
Christian	10	11.0
Muslim	14	15.4
Total	91	100.0
Education		
Primary	126	44.5
High school	64	22.6
Pre-University	33	11.7
Graduate	60	21.2
Total	283	100.0
Age (years)		
0-25	231	49.8
25-60	195	42.0
Over 60	38	8.2
Total	464	100.0
Types of house (before displacement)		
Concrete roof	71	77.2
Tiled roof	19	20.7
Thatched roof	2	2.2
Total	92	100.0

Source: Authors' survey.

surveyed who had received house sites (Table 2). Tulu Nadu villages are typically rambling pockets of land spread across gentle hills and shaded by clusters of coconut trees. The Kulai R&R colony is on a stony, treeless expanse of brown earth clinging to the side of a wide road, the newly built concrete houses baking uncomfortably in the sun. Saraswati was hard hit by the shift from her village because she came to know that the 53 cents of land she had tilled since her marriage was registered in the name of a relative. So she received only the minimum 2.75 cents of land as compensation – enough for a house, but not for growing food. She says, "We did not worry about it before. We did not know it was

going to happen. I did not know anything about this. We did not think about it." Her unawareness is not surprising. Of the 151 families surveyed, only 27% knew in advance about the land acquisition. Only 5% of the sampled families knew of the meetings where the relocation process was discussed. Only 47% of the sampled families have received compensation, of which only 29 families have received all the three instalments to which they are entitled. On an average, each displaced family has visited the KIADB office 20 times and the MSEZ office nine times to pursue their compensation claims.

Before displacement, Saraswati was engaged in cultivation. Two paddy crops (sometimes three) were harvested a year in her village. Many families also cultivated plantation crops like

arecanut, coconut, black pepper, plantain and jasmine. This was usually combined with animal husbandry and small-scale poultry farming, which provided families with milk, eggs and chicken. The self-sufficiency of many families has been lost, and they are now dependent on outside sources, which has led to a sharp increase in expenditure (Table 3).

Table 3: Daily Expenditure Before and After Land Acquisition (Rs)

Items	Before		After	
	Number of Families	Expenditure	Number of Families	Expenditure
Groceries (inc)	82	2,274	83	5,023
Fish	77	890	85	1,805
Milk	46	255	55	500
Vegetables	28	300	28	391
Education	38	21,338	39	45,033
Medicine	71	15,779	72	29,326

The expenses for the first four items are monthly and the last two are annual.

Source: Authors' survey.

Saraswati now lives on dry, unfertile land where she would not be able to grow crops even if she had the space to do so. Removed from the cycles of crop production and animal rearing, her daily rhythm has changed drastically,

Before, there was agriculture. I would milk the cow, and give the milk to other houses. Then I would water the garden. We used to get money from the land. Then I would prepare food and get the kids ready for school. Then I would clean the house, and roll beedis. We used to sell betel leaves and we had coconut trees. Now, nothing. Now I just roll beedis and have housework. I miss it, I'm sad. There we used to get a profit, now there's nothing.

When Saraswati reflects on how her life has changed, she says, "There it was only a village. Here it's a city." Her brother-in-law disagrees. "It is not a city," he says. Saraswati replies, "Okay, it's not a city. We are just living on the side of the road. We built a house and we're living inside it, but it's not city life."

Saraswati's comment is insightful in two ways. First, it reflects the predicament that life in an R&R colony presents. People have been removed from their rural life, and disconnected from the rhythm of agricultural production, they have been told to integrate themselves within the framework of the urban labour market. While this might be possible for some, for many it is traumatic. A study on the R&R colonies set up for those displaced by the MRPL in the mid-1990s (Aranha et al 1996) detailed the harrowing case of an elderly man who had lost his land and cattle, but continued to go round the streets of the colony each day with imaginary cattle and an imaginary plough until he died a few years later.

Saraswati's comment also points to the troubles faced by agriculturalists in Dakshina Kannada in the face of rapid industrialisation, with farming and fishing becoming increasingly unviable due to pollution. Many mega industries have come up in the last few decades (Table 4, p 45), close to the Western Ghats, one of the world's 25 biodiversity hotspots (Ramachandra et al 2007). The results of a recent survey of the wells around MRPL reveal cases of oil leakage and the difficulties faced by the inhabitants to obtain water (Kumar 2010). Further, there are increasing health issues among families, as well as rising incidences of miscarriages among cattle. Industries are already drawing heavily on water resources, a

Table 4: Mega Industries in Dakshina Kannada

Name of the Industry	Year of Establishment	Raw Materials	End Products	Source and Quantity of Water (m ³ /day)	Amount of Effluent Discharged (m ³ /day)	Effluent Contents
MCF	1976	Naphtha, ammonia, phosphoric acid	Urea, ammonium bicarbonate, diammonium phosphate	Nethravathi river, 15,400	7,200*	Ammonia, smaller quantities of chromium and vanadium
KIOCL	1980	Iron ore	Iron ore concentrate, iron oxide pellets	Bhadra river, 40,000	15,000	Non-recovered particulate metals with high pH
MRPL	1996	–	–	Nethravathi river, 20,016	2,880	Non-recovered hydrocarbons with heavy metals and oil and grease
BASF India	1996	–	Dyes and dispersions	Nethravathi river, 273	3,650	Increase BOD, suspended solids, heavy metals such as chromium and cadmium

MCF-Mangalore Chemicals and Fertilisers; KIOCL-Kuduremukh Iron Ore Company, MRPL-Mangalore Refinery and Petrochemicals.

*7,200 cubic metres of water per year with effluents.

Source: Karnataka State Pollution Control Board, Baikampady, Mangalore.

situation that looks to get worse once the MSEZ completes constructing a pipeline to draw water from the Nethravathi river that runs south of Mangalore. Bhatta (2007) shows that the Nethravathi estuary alone generates a direct income of Rs 780 lakh a year for 350 fishermen in a radius of 5 km, and is a source of direct employment of 1,48,200 days per year. Any harm caused to the water quality could lead to a loss of livelihood for those who do not have any alternative income-generating activities, while marine fishing is also suffering (Bhatta, Nayak and Rao 2003).

Villagers have been uprooted from their villages and transplanted to the side of a road and told to be urbanites. In place of their villages, heavily polluting industries are set up. Farmers and fishermen, especially those who operate on a small scale, have been sent a clear message – you are in the wrong space at the wrong time. They are told they must adapt but, at the same time, the productive resources that might allow them to adapt have been acquired for “public purpose” or polluted.

Conclusions

In this paper we have detailed three types of displacement caused by the MSEZ. First that of a Kudubi tribal family, who lost its livelihood when the MSEZ colluded with former landlords of an upper caste to take away its land. The second was that of a bunt family's bhuta, whose attempt to uphold dharma has clashed with the process of accumulation by dispossession. The third was of life in a resettlement colony, where the interlocking links between agricultural land, people's daily lives, and the wider environment have been lost. These three types of displacement – social, cultural and economic – are fundamentally rhythmic in nature. The age-old rhythm of impoverishment due to landlessness, which was in part redressed during the 1970s, reared its head again when social power based on caste hierarchy was used to displace and intimidate the kudubis. The annual rhythm of bhuta worship tied to crop cycles clashed with the rhythm of capital accumulation. Finally, the everyday rhythm of agricultural life, which provided

Economic & Political WEEKLY

REVIEW OF WOMEN'S STUDIES

May 4, 2013

Intersections of Gender and Caste

– Sharmila Rege, J Devika, Kalpana Kannabiran, Mary E John, Padmini Swaminathan, Samita Sen

Revitalising Dalit Feminism: Towards Reflexive, Anti-Caste Agency of Mang and Mahar Women in Maharashtra

– Smita M Patil

Caste and Gender in a Mumbai Resettlement Site

– Varsha Ayyar

Dalit Women as Political Agents: A Kerala Experience

– Rekha Raj

The Mathammas: Gender, Caste and the Politics of Intersectionality in Rural Tamil Nadu

– Anandhi S

The Concept of Honour: Caste Ideology and Patriarchy in Rural Maharashtra

– Manisha Gupta

Cultural Gandhism: Casting Out the Dalit Woman

– Swathy Margaret

Ruptures and Reproduction in Caste/Gender/Labour

– Meena Gopal

For copies write to:
Circulation Manager,

Economic and Political Weekly,

320-321, A to Z Industrial Estate, Ganpatrao Kadam Marg, Lower Parel, Mumbai 400 013.

email: circulation@epw.in

both food and income, suffered an attack of arrhythmia when villagers were moved to R&R colonies.

Dakshina Kannada has long been a land of opportunity. It is blessed with everything a land could need to choose its own destiny – fertile soil, a highly educated population, vibrant and healthy cultures, urban areas free of slums, and good transport connections. The land lives through its caste system, bhuta worship and crop cycles. The land is

intimately involved in the production of social structures, cultural systems and economic arrangements. The land is the repository of multiple meanings, values and products. To parcel it and sell it off to profit-hungry industries is an insult to the people it has fostered. The mSEZ Phase Two has been defeated for now. We hope to have pointed out the disastrous consequences of the displacement caused by Phase One.

NOTES

- This article is based on research undertaken between July 2011 and July 2012. Wherever possible we have indicated the time that the data was gathered. The research involved interviews, field visits, and a survey conducted in July 2011 by a team working at times together and at times independently in both R&R colonies and villages otherwise affected. For this, a list of all the 1,518 displaced families was collected from the regional office of the KIADB. A total sample size of 135 was fixed, which was approximately 10% of the total displaced families, and the samples were proportionately allocated among all farm sizes.
- The colonial name for the region was Canara, and after bifurcation under the British, it became South Canara. Renamed Dakshina Kannada, the district used to include what is now Udupi district until 1997. In this paper, "Canara" or "South Canara" refers to the region at the time in question, "undivided Dakshina Kannada" to the region before the recent bifurcation, "Dakshina Kannada" to the current administrative unit, and "Tulu Nadu" to the cultural region that includes the southern parts of Udupi district and Kasaragod in northern Kerala.
- There is no known record of what happened to those who gave over their land for the NMP.
- For the latest numbers, see www.sezindia.nic.in
- In Karnataka, the kudubis are not a scheduled tribe, although they are in Goa.
- Jumadi is of mixed gender.
- It is a common pattern in origin tales for bhutas to follow their devotees home (Brückner 2009: 21).
- For a detailed analysis of a Jumadi paddana performed in a different village, see Brückner (2009: 13-28).
- At the time of writing, the press reported that 100 new jobs had been created for the displaced families.

REFERENCES

- Aranha, Celine, Sylvester D'Souza, Uppendra Hosabettu and Natesh Ullal (1996): "Struggle at MRPL Site of Desolate Oustees for a Right to Survival", unpublished manuscript, Mangalore.
- Banerjee-Guha, Swapna (2008): "Space Relations of Capital", *Economic & Political Weekly*, 43 (47), pp 51-59.
- Bhagyanagar, Rajagopal, Babita M Kawal, Gowdagere S Dwarakish and Shrihari Surathkal (2012): "Land Use/Land Cover Change and Urban Expansion during 1983-2008 in the Coastal Area of Dakshina Kannada District, South India", *Journal of Applied Remote Sensing*, 6 (1), p 063576.
- Bhat, N Shyam (2000): "Early Colonial Experience: 1792-1862" in M Mukunda Prabhu (ed.), *Poli: A Commemorative Volume for Canara 200* (Mangalore: Commissioner, Dakshina Kannada District).
- Bhatta, Ramachandra (2007): "Estuarine Fishery Stock Assessment by Using Participatory Research Methods: An Empirical Application of

- Parfish. Final Report", College of Fisheries, Mangalore.
- (2010): "Land Rights, Rural Poor and Industrial Development: A Case Study of Coastal Karnataka", Presented at RDI-NALSAR Conference on Legal Aid to Secure Land Rights to the Rural Poor: Role of Government, NGOs and Paralegals, NALSAR University of Law, Hyderabad.
- Bhatta, Ramachandra, Suguna K Nayak and K Aruna Rao (2003): "Marine Fish Production in Karnataka", *Economic & Political Weekly*, 38 (44), pp 85-93.
- Brückner, Heidrun (2009): *On an Auspicious Day, at Dawn ...: Studies in Tulu Culture and Oral Literature* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag).
- Carrin, Marine and Harald Tambs-Lyche (2003): "You Don't Joke with These Fellows: Power and Ritual in South Canara, India", *Social Anthropology*, 11 (1), pp 23-42.
- Claus, Peter J (1984): "Medical Anthropology and the Ethnography of Spirit Possession", E Valentine Daniel and Judy F Pugh (ed.), *Contributions to Asian Studies*, 18, pp 60-72.
- Damle, C B (1993): *Land Reforms and Changing Agrarian Relations* (Jaipur: Rawat Publications).
- Dhakar, Shiva C (2009): *A Report of People's Audit of SEZ Karnataka* (Mangalore: Tata Institute of Social Sciences).
- Erdman, Howard L (1989): *Politics, Economic Development, and Industrial Management in India: The Case of Mangalore Chemicals and Fertilisers* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press and IBH).
- Fernandes, Denis (2006): *The Tulu World in European Writings* (Mangalagangothri: Mangalore University).
- Government of India (1894): "The Land Acquisition Act", available at <http://dolr.nic.in/hyperlink/acq.htm>
- (2005): "The Special Economic Zones Act", available at <http://www.csez.com/documents/sezact.pdf>
- (2011): "Census of India 2011, Provisional Population Totals" (Bangalore: Directorate of Census Operations).
- Government of Karnataka (1966): "Karnataka Industrial Area Development Act", available at

- [http://dpal.kar.nic.in/%5C18%20of%201966%20\(E\).pdf](http://dpal.kar.nic.in/%5C18%20of%201966%20(E).pdf)
- (2004): *Karnataka State Pollution Control Board Annual Report 2003-04* (Bangalore: Karnataka State Pollution Control Board).
- (2010): *Karnataka at a Glance* (Bangalore: Directorate of Economics and Statistics).
- Gowda, Chinnappa K (2005): *The Mask and the Message* (Mangalagangothri: Madipu Prakashana).
- Harvey, David (2005): *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Judge, Paramjit S (1999): *Social Change through Land Reforms* (Jaipur: Rawat Publications).
- Kumar, Vinay (2010): "MRPL's Legacy 500 Metres from Its Boundary Wall", unpublished manuscript, Mangalore.
- Lefebvre, Henri (2004): *Rhythmanalysis: Space, Time and Everyday Life* (London: Continuum).
- Levien, Michael (2011): "Special Economic Zones and Accumulation by Dispossession in India", *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 11 (4), pp 454-83.
- Rai, Mohankrishna (2003): *Urbanization of Mangalore: A Colonial Experience (1799-1947)* (Mangalagangothri: Mangalore University).
- Ramachandra, T V, K V Gururaja, Harish Bhat, Sameer Ali, M D Subash Chandran, Vishnu D Mukri, B Karthick and M Boominathan (2007): *Biodiversity Inventory in and around Tenka Yekkaru Grama Panchayat, Mangalore Taluk, Dakshina Kannada District, Karnataka* (Bangalore: Indian Institute of Science).
- Rao, B Surendra (2010): *Bunts in History and Culture* (Udupi: Rashtrakavi Govind Pai Samshodhana Kendra).
- Sampat, Preeti (2010): "Special Economic Zones in India: Reconfiguring Displacement in a Neoliberal Order?", *City and Society*, 22 (2), pp 166-82.
- Sudhira, H S, T V Ramachandra and K S Jagadish (2004): "Urban Sprawl: Metrics, Dynamics and Modelling Using GIS", *International Journal of Applied Earth Observation and Geoinformation*, 5 (1), pp 29-39.
- Tilley, Christopher Y (1994): *A Phenomenology of Landscape: Places, Paths, and Monuments* (Oxford: Berg).

SAMEEKSHA TRUST BOOKS

China after 1978: Craters on the Moon

The breathtakingly rapid economic growth in China since 1978 has attracted world-wide attention. But the condition of more than 350 million workers is abysmal, especially that of the migrants among them. Why do the migrants put up with so much hardship in the urban factories? Has post-reform China forsaken the earlier goal of "socialist equality"? What has been the contribution of rural industries to regional development, alleviation of poverty and spatial inequality, and in relieving the grim employment situation? How has the meltdown in the global economy in the second half of 2008 affected the domestic economy? What of the current leadership's call for a "harmonious society"? Does it signal an important "course correction"?

A collection of essays from the *Economic & Political Weekly* seeks to find tentative answers to these questions, and more.

Pp viii + 318

ISBN 978-81-250-3953-2

2010

Rs 350

Available from

Orient Blackswan Pvt Ltdwww.orientblackswan.comMumbai Chennai New Delhi Kolkata Bangalore Bhubaneswar Ernakulam Guwahati Jaipur Lucknow Patna Chandigarh Hyderabad
Contact: info@orientblackswan.com