Trans-local rural solidarity and an anticolonial politics of place: Contesting colonial capital and the neoliberal state in India

Dip Kapoor

Abstract

Lok Adhikar Manch (LAM), a nascent trans-local rural solidarity network of 15 social movements or struggles in South Orissa including Adivasi (original dweller) and Dalit ("untouchable" out-castes) marginal and landless peasants, nomads, pastoralists, horticulturalists and fisherfolk in defence and affirmation of place-based ruralities (Zibechi, 2005) and enduring histories, advance a critique of post-colonial capitalist colonizations (Sankaran, 2009; Sethi, 2011) and a global/national coloniality of power (Quijano, 2000; Mignolo, 2000) exercised through a state-market-civil society nexus predominantly committed to the reproduction of a capitalist-modernity / development. LAM also identifies productive directions for anticolonial movements addressing capital, given the predominance of current capitalist colonizations.

The emergent analysis is instructive for parallel and amplifying activisms cognizant of the significance of an anticolonial politics of place against and beside the dominant cartesian-capitalist colonial conception of global space as terra nullius or as space emptied of histories, peoples and cultures and subsequently free for capital to exploit. Place-based rural anticolonial movements "as bearers of other worlds" (Zibechi and Ryan, 2012: 12) contest the process of capitalist accumulation typified by rural displacement and accumulation by dispossession (Harvey, 2003), subsequently problematizing death of the peasantry (and other rural social groups, communal and indigenous modalities subsumed under and/or erased by this term) prognostications predicated upon Europe's experience with the enclosure movement and then proferred (by simple extension from the metropole outwards) as the inevitable fate of the contemporary global rural experience in all locations touched by capital.

Introduction: Coloniality, capitalism and rural anticolonial social movements/struggles

The complexity, peculiarity and differences of societies fragmented by colonization and neocolonization (postcolonial colonization) and related social struggles are not entirely comprehensible through European and North American social histories of working/peasant class cultures and movements. With reference to the Latin American experience and the trajectory of the *seringueiros* (rubber tappers in Brazil's Amazon forests) for instance, Raul

Zibechi (2005: 17-18) notes how new subjects emerge by instituting new territorialities, as Indians and landless peasants engage in prolonged struggles to create or broaden their spaces by seizing millions of hectares from estates or landowners or consolidating the spaces they already had (as in the case of indigenous/Indian communities) by recovering control over their own communities. He also observes that the "new urban poor movements are in tune with the indigenous and landless movements (and are in fact living through what rural movements have already experienced), operating with a very different logic from that of narrow interest-based worker associations" (2005: 18). Their political subjectivity is determined by its subordination to capital, i.e., as new urban occupants (*asentados*) they create forms of organization closely tied to territory while relying on assemblies of all the people in the urban settlement (*asentameinto*) to decide on the most important issues. The anti-systemic disposition and militancy of these movements is made possible by their partial control over the re/production of their living conditions (also see *Interface, 2012, Volume 4, issue 2* and the related question of wider movements of labour raised by Dae-Oup Chang with respect to urban workers' movements in the East Asian development context and similar deliberations in this issue around crucial questions facing workers' movements in the 21st century).

The revolt against capitalism and imperialism has much to learn and understand from these new urban-poor movements and social activism contesting colonial relations and accumulation by dispossession in rural geographies (Guha, 2001; Sarkar, 2000; Zibechi and Ryan, 2012) or "subaltern and indigenous mobilizations, their articulation with new and old political traditions, their amalgamation of democracy and collective interests and their simultaneous deployment of reform, insurgency and rebellion". This is what Peruvian Marxist Jose Carlos Mariategui described in the 1920s "as the fruit of confluence between socialist objectives and indigenous political traditions and struggles" (Renique, 2005: 9) and Anibal Quijano references as the "anti-colonial ideological flags (*of the indigenous communities*) vis-a-vis both the national problem and democracy" (2005: 73). That said, there are significant differences between indigenous concepts like the communal and leftist notions of the commons and communes; differences that need to be acknowledged or by reading them from "within leftist and European logics, we perpetuate forms of violence and coloniality that indigenous movements have been fighting against" (Walter Mignolo http://turbulence.org.uk/turbulence-5/decolonial/). Indian leader Fausto Reynaga (1906-1994), an admirer of Karl Marx whom he called 'the genius Moor', drew clear lines between the project of the Bolivian left influenced by Marx's *Communist Manifesto* and his book on *The Indigenous Revolution* wherein the indigenous revolution is against western civilization as such, including the left which originated in the west, while Marxist revolution confronts the bourgeoisie from the perspective and interests of the working class and proposes a struggle within western civilization (a critical colonial analytic reminiscent of the works of Aime Césaire and Frantz Fanon, who for instance recognized the complicity of the European working class with the bourgeoisie "in their support of racism, imperialism and colonialism" Kelley,

2000:24), i.e., according to Walter Mignolo (referenced above), perhaps it is more accurate to speak of an indigenous de-colonial as opposed to an indigenous left. This political analytic is apparent in the contemporary context as indicated in a statement on land redistribution by the world's largest network of peasant and indigenous organizations, Via Campesina, which says, "No reform is acceptable that is based only on land redistribution. We believe that the new agrarian reform *must include a cosmic vision of the territories of* communities of peasants, the landless, indigenous peoples…who base their work on the production of food and who maintain a relationship of respect with Mother Earth and the oceans" (Available at: http://www.viacampesina.org/en/index.php/main-issues-mainmenu-27/agrarian-reform-mainmenu-36/165-final-declaration.)

In keeping with this line of analysis, it is generally understood that rural and indigenous anticolonial movements, with their respective contextual specificities and historical variations, have germinated in relation to a system of power which began to form five centuries ago and has become (variously) globally hegemonic since the 18th century--a global coloniality of power (Quijano, 2000; 2005: 56-57) defined by:

a) a new system of social domination built around the idea/foundation of 'race' (a modern European mental construct bearing no relation to previous reality) and racialization of relations between European colonizers and the colonized in order to normalize the social relations of domination created by conquest and the new system of capitalist exploitation;
b) the formation of a new system of exploitation (capitalism) which connects in a single combined structure all the historical forms of control of work and exploitation (slavery, servitude, simple commodity production, reciprocity, capital) to produce for the capitalist world market--a system in which a racialized division of labour and control of resources of production is foundational; and
c) a new system of collective authority centreed around the hegemony of the state or a system of states with populations classified in racial terms as "inferior" being excluded from the formation and control of the system.

In relation to the global coloniality of power and the foundational character of race (and racialization), according to Frantz Fanon (1963: 32), "When you examine at close quarters the colonial context, it is evident that what parcels out the world is to begin with the fact of belonging to or not belonging to a given race, a given species. In the colonies, the economic sub-structure is also a superstructure and the cause is a consequence." Stuart Hall (1980: 320) takes this further when explaining why pre-capitalist modes of production (e.g. slavery) persisted despite the emergence of industrial capitalism, i.e., what he alludes to as "an articulation between different modes of production, structured

in some relationship of dominance", given that the latter continues to benefit from older forms of exploitation (e.g. global coloniality and the racialized relationship between pre- and capitalist modes of production made evident in Adivasi/marginal rural-dweller ways of existence and the hegemony of the capitalist state in India and the selective imposition of modernization and capitalist development on the former). A racial project includes an effort to restructure the political economies of subordinate races in an effort to siphon, divert, destroy and selectively re-integrate resources along particular racial lines, subsequently helping to create and/or reproduce racialized relations (and associated essentialized race categories). As Fanon (1963:76) suggested, "Europe is literally the creation of the Third World...an opulence that has been fuelled by the sweat and the dead bodies of Negroes, Arabs, Indians and the yellow races". Others (Alavi, 1972; Galeano, 1972; Rodney, 1982) have demonstrated how the economies of the colonized were restructured to produce the requisite imbalance necessary for the growth of European industry and capitalism; a unique characteristic of modern European capitalist colonialism as distinguished from earlier pre-capitalist colonialisms.

In the latest round of colonial capitalist globalization, it is peasants (landless/marginal), indigenous peoples, nomads and pastoralists and fisher-folk belonging to racially marginalized social classes, groups and ethnicities (e.g. see -http://www.oaklandinstitute.org/omo-local-tribes-under-threat) that continue to be disproportionately targeted in the global South. For instance, "this period has witnessed a vast expansion of bourgeois land rights... through a global land grab unprecedented since colonial times...as speculative investors now regard 'food as gold' and are acquiring millions of hectares of land in the global South" (Araghi and Karides, 2012: 3); a process that has explicitly targeted these racially marginalized social classes/groups/ethnicities on a global scale (GRAIN, 2012) and in India (Menon and Nigam, 2007; Patnaik and Moyo, 2011). According to an Oxfam (2011) study some 227 million hectares--an area the size of Western Europe--has been sold or leased in the decade since 2001, mostly to international investors, the bulk of these taking place over the last two years alone (e.g. in Africa 125 million acres have been grabbed by rich countries for outsourcing agricultural production). International development aid (e.g. see- http://www.waronwant.org/about-us/extra/extra/inform/17755-the-hunger-games) is implicated in the process of dispossession of small and marginal peasants (including land grabs) through private-public partnerships (DfID (UK government's Department for International Development)-Monsanto, Unilever, Syngenta, Diageo, SABMiller) which continue to extend the power of TNC agri-business in agriculture in Africa, Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean and exacerbate global inequality.

In the Indian context more specifically, the global coloniality of power was first realized under British colonization in the 1880s and the detribalization and de-peasantization or restrictions of tribal/subaltern rights over land and forest through the various Forest Rights Acts reducing them to encroachers on their own territories (Davis, 2002; Guha, 1997). In the post-independence period, the reproduction of this power has relied on an internal political-economic class

and caste elite (Alavi, 1972) who are not "white" nor "European" (Fanon's, (1963), warning in the African context) but are none-the-less associated with a global bourgeoisie (and civil society) "whose hegemony is European and white" (Quijano, 2005: 58). Subsequently, rural subaltern anticolonial movements and rebellions were faced with the daunting challenge of addressing what Ranajit Guha (2001: 11) identified, as the "double articulation" where dominance is predicated on two types of governance. One was by the British and the other by the Indian class-caste elites, as Hamza Alavi (1972) also noted in his analysis of the complicity of internal class elites and external western and corporate interests in continuing to perpetuate underdevelopment and colonial control in the postcolonial period. This remains the case today as the "double articulation" ties the politics of the local (national) to the global (international, colonial, imperial) and the old and new agents of the globalization of a colonial capitalism, i.e., "the colonial experience has outlived decolonization and continues to be related significantly to the concerns of our time (Guha, 2001: 41-42). Or, in the words of a Kondh Adivasi activist from the Niyamgiri Bachao Andolan (NBA) contesting Vedanta/Sterlite's (UK) bauxite mining project in Lanjigarh, Orissa, "We know all our problems today are because of colonialism (*samrajyobad*) and capitalism (*punjibad*) and these MNCs, NGOs, DfID/UK and the government are its forces" (L, NBA activist, interview notes, February, 2011). Adivasis and Dalits constitute 22 per cent of the population in Orissa while accounting for 42 per cent of Development Displaced Peoples (DDPs in state terminology) while Adivasi alone account for 40 per cent of DDPs at a national level (Fernandes, 2006: 113). The liberalization of agriculture has meant land and seed grabs (for example, Monsanto currently has patent control over 90 percent of the cotton seed supply in the country) and the neoliberal agro-industrial model approach continues to decimate peasants in India as the corresponding debt burdens have prompted some 198,000 to 250,000 farmer suicides since 1998 and up to 2008 and beyond (over a third clearly attributed to being debt-driven), based on different estimates (Patnaik and Moyo, 2011: 40).

Caste and tribe together impose an institutionalized system of discrimination and oppression (often based on pollution-purity divides and constructions of barbarism/primitives on the margins of civilization), potentially intensifying the foundation of racial discrimination and exploitation which continues to justify the redirection, redistribution and reorganization (in the interests of class-caste-urban-industrial dominance) and the destruction (via displacement and dispossession), of the material base and relations of so-called backward and polluted peoples or 'untouchables' in the interests of an Indian conception of Eurocentric-progress and modernization first imposed under British rule. Scheduled Tribes/Adivasis and Scheduled Castes/Dalits (in state parlance) and rural subalterns in India continue to experience the "colonial difference" (Mignolo, 2000: 7) and the global coloniality of power (Quijano, 2000), as the Indian state simultaneously works to establish alliances with metropolitan colonial powers (a process that has been accelerated since the adoption of the New Economic Policy or neoliberalism in 1991) while deploying an internal

colonial politics (Alavi, 1972; Guha, 1997; 2001) towards Adivasis and Dalits.

This is expressed in the words of a Kondh Adivasi elder from the east coast state of Orissa (the research context for this paper) who says, "We fought the British thinking that we will be equal in the independent India" (interview, January 2007). According to a Dalit leader, "where we live, they call this area *adhusith* (akin to a pest infestation) ... we are condemned to the life of the *ananta paapi* (eternal sinners), as *colonkitha* (dirty/black/stained), as *ghruniya* (hated and despised)" (interview, February 2007). An estimated 150 million semi-nomadic or nomadic tribes belonging to some 400 groups are still criminalized, harassed and humiliated by dominant society and the agencies of the state under the De-Notified and Nomadic Tribes Act, which replaced the Criminal Tribes Act devised by the British colonialists and is used to similar effect (Munshi, 2012). The Dilip Singh Bhuria Commission's Report (2000-01) unequivocally concluded that the state, which is supposed to protect tribal interests as per Constitutional guarantees, has contributed to their exploitation through the location of industries and other development projects in tribal areas which are rich in natural resources. It estimated that 40 percent of related displacement of 9 to 20 million people is accounted for by tribals alone (quoted in Munshi, 2012: 4) while some 75 per cent were still awaiting "rehabilitation" at the turn of the century (Bharati, 1999: 20). The colonial mentality and neoliberal response of the current class-caste elites towards these occurrences has been described as follows:

> There is no understanding of communities as the subjects of dislocation or ways of life that are destroyed. There is an abyss of incomprehension on the part of the Indian elites toward rural and tribal communities. Ripping them out from lands that they have occupied for generations and transplanting them overnight in to an alien setting (which is the best they can expect) is understood as rehabilitation and liberation from *their backward ways of life* (Menon and Nigam, 2007: 72-73).
>
> ... they are presented as inhabiting a series of local spaces across the globe that, marked by the label "social exclusion" , lie outside the *normal civil society*... their route back is through the willing and active transformation of themselves to conform to the discipline of the market (Cameron and Palan, 2003: 148)

These processes of colonial exploitation and capitalist accumulation by dispossession (including CPI(M)-led ex-Left Front governments in Bengal where recent land reforms under their watch, according to one estimate, have been accompanied by an increase of 2.5 million landless peasants--Banerjee, 2006:4719), exacerbated since the adoption of the New Economic Policy in 1991 (neoliberalism), continue to be contested across the country (Baviskar, 2005a, 2005b; Da Costa, 2009; Martinez-Alier, 2003; McMichael, 2010; Mehta, 2009; Menon & Nigam, 2007; Nixon, 2011; Oliver-Smith, 2010; Pimple & Sethi, 2005; Prasad, 2004; Sundar, 2007) and in the state of Orissa (IPTEHR, 2006; Kapoor, 2011a; www.miningzone.org; Munshi, 2012; Padel & Das, 2010;

www.sanhati.org), prompting one observer to note that these struggles are "moving from resistance to resurgence...reaffirming of tribal self, recapturing the control over resources, reclaiming political domain, and redefining development" (Prabhu, 1998: 247).

This paper advances an anticolonial critique of post-colonial capitalist colonizations (Sankaran, 2009; Sethi, 2011; Goonatilake, 2006) and a global/national coloniality of power (Quijano, 2000; Mignolo, 2000) exercised through a state-market-civil society nexus predominantly committed to the reproduction of a colonial capitalist-modernity/development. The critique is developed by a trans-local solidarity network (Da Costa, 2007) of Adivasi and Dalit marginal and landless peasants, nomads, pastoralists, horticulturalists and fisherfolk social movements and organizations in defence and affirmation of ruralities collectively referred to as the Lok Adhikar Manch (LAM), a network of 15 rural movement organizations and a nascent trans-local solidarity formation in the state (see Table 1). LAM (collectively and/or as specific network participants) also identifies productive directions for parallel and amplifying activisms cognizant of the significance of an anticolonial politics of place against and beside the dominant cartesian-capitalist colonial conception of global space as terra nullius, or as space emptied of histories, peoples and cultures and subsequently free for capital to exploit.

In terms of social movement cartographies and locations, the critique put forward by LAM problematizes (and distinguishes itself from) civil society movements and actors (e.g. NGO-led movements or mainly urban, middle-class/bourgeois ecology, human rights, civic responsibility, anti-corruption movements), including industrial/labour movements and medium-large farmer/agricultural movements (with feudal-capitalist and caste-specific interests) working within capitalist, modern time-space teleologies. In keeping with Zibechi's (2005; 2012) observations, numerous rural, subaltern and indigenous social action formations offer new insights and strategic possibilities in relation to social movement activism and the revolt against capitalist colonizations (Guha, 2001; Sarkar, 2000). Summarily dismissed or trivialized as scattered militant particularities (*read as*: politically impotent) only consumed with the politics of daily survival and the mundane and subsequently incapable of understanding the macro-politics of accumulation by dispossession (Harvey, 2003:168) or as a politics of localism that does not seek capture of the bourgeois state towards revolutionary ends and hence referenced as “anti-Marxist new populist postmodernist movements” (Brass, 2007: 584), such left-ideological positions fail to acknowledge or dodge a politics and a burgeoning critical indigenist anticolonial literature (Alfred, 2011; Bargh, 2007; Grande, 2004; Meyer and Alvarado, 2010; Smith, 2012) aimed at the coloniality of power which implicates the colonial projects (despite their variations and specificities around social/distributive and productive commitments) of both European Marxism and capitalism as externally-imposed alien developmentalisms (replete with the use of development/state-market sponsored violence to secure compulsory industrialization and modernization) (Kapoor, 2011a). Thus the class-warfare of the enclosure movement in Europe is erroneously equated and

conflated with similar processes of accumulation by dispossession in the (post) colonies or in indigenous contexts where the coloniality of power and the racialization of political-economic and socio-cultural relations understandably remains a primary ethico-political preoccupation. Similarly, indigenous, rural and peasant consciousness in colonial societies have also been dismissed by the dominant European (-centered) scholarship on the subject (arguably yet another act of colonial erasure) as being pre-political, automatic/natural phenomena or irrational/mad politics (Jesson, 1999). Hence "the insurgency is considered some thing external to peasant consciousness, and the Cause is presented as a ghost of Reason" (Ranajit Guha quoted in Zibechi, 2012: 61). This colonial position is exposed or at the very least problematized by the likes of LAM's political articulations. A case in point on a global scale, the indigenous and peasant movement of movements, Via Campesina (or *the peasant way*) came into being in 1993, a year before a similar dismissal in Eric Hobsbawm's publication of the *The Age of Extremes: A History of the World 1914-1991*. Paying attention to fallible rural movements and constituencies engaged in networks such as LAM is politically instructive and revealing given the magnitude of the existential crisis being confronted in these rural locations, if not their historical and contemporary experience with an anti/colonial politics now being waged in relation to capital over forests, land, water-bodies and ways of being (Kapoor, 2011a).

The insights and propositions advanced in this paper are based on: (a) the author's association with Adivasi, Dalit and landless/displaced peoples in the state of Orissa, India since the early 1990s; (b) a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) of Canada funded participatory action research (PAR) (Kapoor, 2011b) initiative between 2006-2009/10 (which derived its direction from several previous localized PAR efforts addressing forest, land and agricultural concerns and maturing political and organized assertions over time) contributing towards and simultaneously developing knowledge about social movement learning in Adivasi/Dalit movements in south Orissa; and (c) specific research assignments (e.g. collective examination of civil society/NGO-rural movement political relations with LAM--see Kapoor, 2013) conducted by the Centre for Research and Development Solidarity (CRDS), a rural Adivasi/Dalit people's organization that was established with the help of SSHRC funds in 2005/06.

Anticolonial movement analysis of colonial capitalist development and rural displacement and dispossession

Ranajit Guha (1989) suggests that the Raj never achieved hegemony and was based on coercion and a facade of legality and that the end of the universalizing tendency of bourgeois culture, based on the colonial expansion of capital, finds its limit in colonialism. That is to say that post/colonial capitalist development has relied primarily on violence and coercion, backed by a legalism embedded in colonial relations, to dispossess subalterns. According to LAM's manifesto [people's statement]:

> More than at any other point of time in our lives as traditional communities, today we feel pressurized and pushed hard to give up our ways and systems and give way to unjust intrusions by commercial, political and religious interests for their development and domination (*shemano koro prabhavo abom unathi*). We have been made to sacrifice, we have been thrown out throughout history by these dominant groups and forces for their own comfort and for extending their way of life while we have been made slaves, servants and subordinates (*tolualoko*). (LAM Statement, field notes, April 2009)
>
> We are gathered here today as Adivasi, Dalit and peasant and fisher folk, as people of nature.... We are also burnable [expendable] communities.... With the help of the big companies and industrialists and multinationals, the state and central governments want to continue to exploit our natural resources to the maximum and we know what this means for us. (Field notes, April 2009) They have the power of *dhana* (wealth) and *astro-shastro* (armaments). They have the power of *kruthrima ain* (artificial laws and rules)--they created these laws just to maintain their own interests ... (Dalit leader, interview notes, February 2007). Today the *sarkar* (government) is doing a great injustice (*anyayo durniti*)... and the way they have framed laws around land-holding and distribution, we the poor are being squashed and stampeded into each other's space and are getting suffocated (*dalachatta hoi santholito ho chonti*). This creation of inequality (*tara tomyo*) is so widespread and so true, we see it in our lives" (Kondh Adivasi leader, interview notes, January 2007).

"The advance made by the 18th century shows itself in this, that the law itself becomes now the instrument of the theft of people's land" (Karl Marx quoted in Menon and Nigam:61). "As a matter of fact, the methods of primitive accumulation are anything but idyllic. ... Capital comes [into the world] dripping from head to foot, from every pore, with blood and dirt" (Karl Marx quoted in Whitehead, 2003:4226). Colonial capitalist development is recognized by LAM as violence against nature and people (Kapoor, 2011a). This violence is directly inflicted on Adivasis and Dalits by the state-corporate nexus or encouraged through inciting and dividing rural subalterns.

> We have people here from Maikanch who know how the state police always act for the industrialists and their friends in government who want to see bauxite mines go forward in Kashipur against our wishes, even if it meant shooting three of our brothers; we have people here from Kalinganagar where Dalits and Adivasis are opposing the Tata steel plant and there too, 13 of us were gunned down by police...many people have been killed by the state and industrialist mafias (Field notes, April 2009)

In relation to Kalinganagar, police fired on unarmed protesters on 2 January 2006 and the same incident involved the macabre spectacle of the return of six Adivasi killed by police whose hands were dismembered (see related coverage at www.sanhati.org). Similarly, four anti-POSCO protesters were allegedly killed

by police in a bomb blast on March 4, 2013 (POSCO project land acquisition was re-commenced in Dhinkia panchayat, Gobindpur village) while the police claim that they were blown up by a bomb being made by the victims themselves; a public statement made by Jagatsinghpur Superintendent of police prior to police personnel even making a site visit or investigating the incident (The Hindu, Bhubaneswar edition, March 11, 2013). Similarly, in the case of Chilika *andolan* (movement):

> ...there were some 5000 of us when they fired, I too was one of the 12 injured (pointing to scar) but I never spoke up for fear of police reprisals. I have endured my lot in poverty and silence and could not get treated...even in Chilika, after Tatas got shut down by the Supreme Court decision because they violated the Coastal Regulation Zone with their aquaculture project, their mafias came and destroyed people's fishing boats...it seems we act non-violently and use the law and the courts but they always respond with customary violence and break their own laws. (Focus group notes, February 2008)

As shared by several LAM activists (e.g. struggles related to Niyamgiri, Kalinganagar, Kashipur, Dhinkia/Gobindpur etc.) violence is evident not just through these specific spectacles (obvious displays) but on a daily basis. Operation Green Hunt launched by the Indian government in November 2009, ostensibly in pursuit of Maoists/Naxalites, has meant the constant surrounding presence, pressure and interference by para-military and police in the daily lives of villagers, as has the similar presence of corporate and political-party mafia hired to wear down people and opposition to mining/industrial projects in multiple locations. The constant stress of armed force in close quarters to (or within) civilian areas is a more invasive strategy than the shooting and beating spectacles at sites of protest. The Adivasi/Dalit recourse to human rights in this regard (Kapoor, 2012), which for many in the west has emerged as "the sole language of resistance to oppression and emancipation in the Third World" (Rajagopal, 2003: 172), is of questionable utility in such instances of development repression and market/economic violence as "human rights discourse is not based on a theory of non-violence but approves certain forms of violence (justified violence) and disapproves other forms" (Rajagopal, 2003: 174). Economic/market violence responsible for displacement and dispossession is an example of justified violence explained away as a social cost of capitalist development as colonialism and imperialism are not necessarily problems for international law and human rights which assume imperialism (Williams, 2010).

Where LAM actors have been successful in using the law and/or human rights claims, one of the state-corporate responses has been to move to block these "legal openings" available to movements. This is done by: (a) re-opening the Fifth and Sixth Schedules of the Constitution (Panchayat Extension to Scheduled Areas or PESA Act) which have been used successfully to defend Adivasi rights in Scheduled Areas (e.g. Samatha Judgement); (b) de-notifying

Scheduled Tribes and having them re-categorized as Other Backward Classes who cannot make the same Constitutional claims as Tribes/Adivasi in protected areas (as has happened with Jhodia and Paroja tribes in South Orissa to facilitate land acquisition around the Kashipur UAIL mining project); and (c) nullifying court decisions by passing new Bills (e.g. after the success of the Chilika movements against Tata's aquaculture project in the 1990s as the Orissa High Court decision to ban aquaculture in the Coastal Regulation Zone/CRZ followed by a Supreme Court decision which upheld the same, industry lobbied the state to pass an Aquaculture Authority Bill in 1997 that makes aquaculture permissible within the CRZ).

The state-corporate nexus has, according to LAM participants, also relied on instigating conflict among Adivasi and Dalit or between Dalits and other subordinate caste groups to weaken the prospects for subaltern rural solidarity against developmental imperatives. Some recent examples cited in this context included the *Jungle, Jal, Jameen Hamara* (forest-water-land is ours/for Adivasi alone) campaign asserting Tribal/Adivasi rights in Scheduled Areas post-B.D.Sharma recommendations, instigating Adivasi-on-Dalit violence and a climate of suspicion, as Dalit were scapegoated (directly and indirectly by state departments and NGOs engaged in FRA-related popular education and the Bharat Jan Andolan) as usurpers of these Adivasi rights despite the long-standing Adivasi-Dalit relationship in forested regions of Orissa. The infamous case of the village of Mandrabaju in Mohana Block underscored what this meant as an entire Dalit village took shelter in the Mohana Tehsildar's office (magistrate-level revenue officer) for two years and then mysteriously disappeared without any official explanation for what had transpired. Similar violence was unleashed by Hindu religious right party-political groups and local cadres over Christmas (celebrated mainly by Dalit/Panos and some Adivasi Christians) in the Kandhamal region of South Orissa in 2007. This violence continued well into 2008 (August) with some 40,000 Dalits fleeing the area, while 25,000 were eventually sheltered in relief camps after a long overdue response from the BJD-BJP coalition government at the time, the latter party being known for its Hindu-right credentials. This alleged Adivasi-Dalit communal conflict was analyzed and discussed by ADEA movement activists as being a corporate land grab orchestrated with the assistance of Kondh Adivasis, given that the land in this region produces a unique (lucrative) variety of turmeric and was being considered for the establishment of a Special Economic Zone (SEZ) (as per the SEZ Act of 2005, a key neoliberal intervention) at the insistence of a major Indian grocery retail corporation. According to these activists, given the growing resistance to SEZs, the state-corporate nexus is allegedly not beyond experimenting with other methods to displace subalterns who are in the way of capitalist development (Prasant and Kapoor, 2010:203-205).

> There is communal conflict around land and forests because the political powers, in order to keep control and access to these vital resources, are promoting division and hatred among the communities [Domb/Dalit, Kondh/Adivasi,

> Saora/Adivasi]. Our communities once had equal access to land and forests, which today have been controlled by outside methods of the *sarkar* [government] and the *vyaparis* [business classes] and upper castes [Brahmins]. They want to perpetuate their ways and ideas among us and always keep us divided. We are *garib sreni* [poor classes] and land and forest are vital for our survival. And if they succeed in controlling them, they also end up controlling our lives. As has been the case over the ages, they want us to live in disharmony and difference so that they can be the *shashaks* [rulers] all the time. (Adivasi elder, interview notes, February 2007)

Given that there are some 8000 NGOs (Padel and Das, 2010) operating in Orissa alone, NGOs are significant players in Adivasi/Dalit and rural subaltern contexts. While a majority of NGOs follow a state-prescribed and circumscribed role predominantly in terms of service provision in areas where there are DDPs, a few NGOs claim to support, if not represent social movement activism directed at mining and other industrial development interventions in the rural areas. LAM participants see NGOs as subordinate partners in the state-corporate nexus (Kapoor, 2013), undermining anticolonial movements by engaging in political obscurantism and engaging in active attempts to demobilize and immobilize movements opposed to these projects. "In the beginning there were no people called *sapakhsyabadi* or pro-displacement but after these so-called activist-NGOs worked to raise the amount of compensation, people withdrew from the movement and formed the pro-displacement forum" (PM, Kalinganagar movement activist, Bisthapan Virodhi Manch, interview notes, April 2010). NGOs attempt to demobilize and immobilize movements (Kapoor, 2013: 54-65) by derailing, obstructing, diverting and depoliticizing through numerous avenues including: corporate espionage; sowing the seeds of division in displacement-affected communities; through persuasion as corporate propaganda merchants and projectizing dissent; disrupting movement politics with a staged politics; and disappearing when movements engaged in direct action. In APDAM activist KJ's words, "education, health, Self-Help-Groups/SHGs have no relevance at the moment where we are in the process of losing everything (*ame shobu haraiba avosthare ehi prokaro kamoro kaunasi artha nahi*)" (Kapoor, 2013:59).

> In Baliapal we fought against the missile testing range against the government during my youth. Here I learnt that NGOs are slaves of the system--they bring people on to the roads for small issues, within-the-system issues and not system-challenging issues like what we are talking about here today.... Ours is collective action from the people's identified issues and problems--our action is from outside the institutions and NGO action is institutional action (C, Adivasi Dalit Adhikar Sangathan activist, Focus groups notes, April 2009)
>
> NGOs often try to derail the people's movement by forcing them into Constitutional and legal frameworks and by relying on the slow pace of legal avenues to make it seem like they are working in solidarity with the people but all the while using the delaying tactic to help UAIL. ... they make us into programme

> managers and statisticians concerned with funding accountability and the management of our people for the NGOs...what they fail to realize is that we are engaged in an *Andolan* (movement struggle) and not donor funded programmes (ADEA activist, Focus group notes, February 2008)

Colonial capitalist development imposed by the state-market-civil society nexus is recognized by Adivasi/Dalits as an endless invasion of space--"We measured a hand length but always walked a foot length (make do with less) but even my ancestors would not be able to explain why they insist on the reverse (always try for more)" (Dalit elder, quoted in Kapoor, 2009:19); "...we the poor are being squashed into each other's space and are getting suffocated...our villages are being submerged and we have to leave the place, leave the land and become silent spectators (*niravre dekhuchu*)" (Kondh Adivasi man, quoted in Kapoor, 2009:18); and "They are selling our forests, they are selling our water and they are selling our land and may be they will sell us also..." (Kondh Adivasi woman, quoted in Kapoor, 2009:19). Despite the invasion, the attachment to place is acknowledged with an apparent sense of certitude:

> We cannot leave our forests (*ame jangale chari paribo nahi*). The forest is our second home (after the huts). There is no distance between our homes and the forest. You come out and you have everything you need.... My friends and brothers, we are from the forest. That is why we use the small sticks of the *karanja* tree to brush our teeth--not tooth brushes. Our relationship to the forest is like a fingernail to flesh (*nakho koo mangsho*)--we can not be separated.... That is why we are Adivasi. (Adivasi elder, interview notes, quoted in Kapoor, 2011c)

The concept of abstract space (as opposed to local place-based histories expressed by Adivasi/Dalit anticolonial movement actors), emerged with the rise of colonial capital and the Enlightenment (drawing from Newton, Descartes and Galileo), wherein space was conceived of as homogenous, isometric and infinitely extended (Lefebvre, 1990). This conception provided a geometric template of nature within which western science flourished and a grid upon which the earth's resources could be mapped. As a result, place was disempowered and all power now resided in space devoid of content. As LAM participants have exposed in their own way about the space-place colonial dynamic, in processes of primitive accumulation (or accumulation by dispossession), concepts of abstract space are often forcibly imposed on local places, i.e.,

> Primitive accumulation involves a rearrangement of space, since it constitutes an annihilation of pre-existing property and of customary ways of relating landscapes and waterscapes. It is usually accompanied by an erasure, or at least a denigration of pre-existing ways of relating to such resources, which are often defined as nomadic, unsettled, uncivilized etc. The concept of abstract space enables developers to maintain a highly objectified and external relationship to

> the landscape, which becomes emptied of people, history, entitlements, myth and magic (Whitehead, 2003:4229)

Colonialists adopt a stance of *terra nullius* (empty space or land of no-one) towards territory inhabited by people whose social or political organization is not recognized as 'civilized'; an example of an extreme version of colonial racial objectification enabled through non-recognition and erasure, as opposed to asymmetrical recognition, which also characterizes racialized social relations (Fanon, 1963). Whitehead (2003: 4229) notes "that most of the maps of the areas surrounding the Sardar Sarovar Dam do not contain the names of villages that hold historical importance for the Tadvi, Vassawa, Bhils and Bhilalas, even ones they consider centres of their cultural history" (Narmada Bachao Andolan in western India--see Baviskar, 2005a). This act of erasure, expressed and acknowledged by LAM in the Orissa context was referenced in several ways. These include examples of state officials taking measurements of land in pre-displacement villages without explanation nor permission, "walking through their square/mandap or even through people's hutments going about their business as if there was nobody there", or in statements like "we are nothing to them, so they think they don't need to ask before taking and going ahead" (Kondh woman leader, quoted in Kapoor, 2009:19). The ensuing cultural violence is acknowledged as follows:

> After displacement we stand to lose our traditions, our culture and own historical civilization...from known communities we become scattered unknown people thrown in to the darkness to wander about in an unknown world of uncertainty and insecurity (Adivasi leader, field notes, April 2009)

Da Costa (2007: 292) points to the importance of "recognizing the dispossession of meaning as a core struggle uniting" these movements, a dynamic that does not find a place in Harvey's (2003) materialist-analysis of accumulation by dispossession nor the related implications pertaining to un/freedom of labour and the full extent and import of this un/shackling. An anticolonial politics of place is informed by a sense of the sacred and the spiritual, and a unity of the sacred and the political, often the subject of colonial dismissals as being an ineffectual pre-political anti-politics or an irrational mad politics (Jesson, 1999), euphemistically speaking, which fails to comprehend the political vitality of historical connectivity between ancestral anti-colonial struggles and current movement politics. Furthermore, spiritual oversight tempers an exaggerated sense of political mission and recognizes the limits of politics; a pedagogy of limits in relation to the political (material) -- an antithetical stance or understanding to an allegedly rational and informed politics characterizing an unrelenting (endless accumulation) capitalist/material colonization of place, people and ecology (Kapoor, 2011c: 140), i.e., a failure to appreciate self-restraint and self-imposed boundaries (and hence the coloniality of power) is also a mad politics/irrationality of sorts.

> We, the people's movements present here representing people's struggles from South and coastal Orissa have discussed and debate our issues and are hereby resolved to stand as a broad-based platform known as Lok Adhikar Manch (LAM) in support of the following manifesto (people's statement):
>
> ...we have nothing to gain from *mukto bojaro* (liberalization), *ghoroi korono* (privatization) and *jagathi korono* (globalization), which are talked about today. We want to live the way we know how to live among our forests, streams, hills and mountains and water bodies with our culture and traditions and whatever that is good in our society intact. We want to define change and development for ourselves (*amo unathi abom parivarthanoro songhya ame nirupuno koribako chaho*). We are nature's friends (*prakruthi bandhu*), so our main concern is preserving nature and enhancing its influence in our lives (LAM, People's Manifesto, April 2009).

Anticolonial contestations and claims on the Indian state

Anticolonial movements like LAM are primarily located outside and against the state-market-civil society nexus. This nexus (despite competing visions within capitalist/other versions of Euro-American modernity and commitments to a post-industrial society) constructs and strategically deploys laws and institutions (as per LAM's preceding analysis) to 'legalize' and normalize displacement and dispossession (colonize). It also encourages post-displacement disciplining into welfare, re-settlement and rehabilitation and related market-schemes or subjects Adivasi/Dalits and rural subalterns to abject poverty in urban slums and constant migration in search of precarious and exploitative work (re-colonize) (Kapoor, 2011c: 134). In the words of an ADEA leader, "They are fighting against those who have everything and nothing to lose. We will persist and as long as they keep breaking their own laws--this only makes it easier for us" (Focus group notes, February 2008).

> We are giving importance to land occupation (*padar bari akthiar*) and land use (*chatriya chatri*). We are now beginning to see the fruits of occupations. Before the government uses vacant state land (*anawadi*) to plant cashew, eucalyptus or virtually gives the land to bauxite mining companies, we must encroach and occupy and put the land to use through our plantation activities and agricultural use. This has become our knowledge through joint land action. This knowledge is not only with me now but with all our people--what are the ways open to us--this is like the opening of knowledge that was hidden to us for ages (Kondh Adivasi man, interview notes, 2007).
>
> ..we will fight collectively (*sangram*) to save (*raksha*) the forests and to protect our way of life. ...this is a collective struggle for the forest (*ame samastha mishi sangram o kariba*)...our struggle is around *khadyo, jamin, jalo, jangalo o ektha* (food, land, water, forest and unity) (Kondh Adivasi woman, interview notes, 2007)

Since the agents of colonial capital rely on splintering the possibility of

solidarity between Adivasi, Dalit and rural subaltern social classes and groups, LAM (and specific movements in the network, like the ADEA) consciously engages people in popular and informal education directed at the importance of *ektha* (unity) as education and organizing mutually reinforce a movement development process that has matured and penetrated to different extents in and among the various and related rural movements as part of a continuous ongoing process. The knowledge and pedagogical basis for this process is primarily informed by "own ways learning" (Kapoor, 2009) and popular education efforts by Adivasi/Dalit activists from the movement villages, politically disillusioned by their engagements with civil society organizations for the most part or party-political experiences in formal political organizations at the state level. The emphasis on a political strategy of systematic pre-emptive direct action (e.g. occupations) and a politics of measured-confrontation in relation to mining activities that displace and dispossess Adivasi/Dalit and rural subaltern classes and social groups have already been alluded to, and remains front and centre in terms of political action and the deepening of organization, unity and learning. In the words of a Saora Adivasi leader (Kapoor, 2009: 26-28):

> If the government continue to control lands, forest and water that we have depended on since our ancestors came, then ...we will be compelled to engage in a collective struggle (*ame samohiko bhabe, sangram kariba pahi badhyo hebu*)... and building a movement among us from village to panchayat to federation levels. I think this movement (*andolan*) should spread to the district and become district level struggle. The organization is always giving us new ideas (*nothon chinta*), new education (*nothon shikya*), awareness (*chetna*) and *jojana* (plans). We believe this will continue (*ao yu eha kari chalibo amaro viswas*).
>
> We have to teach each other (*bujha-sujha*), explain to each other and that is how education has happened and made things possible for us...we organize workshops and gatherings and have created a leaning environment for all our people--I feel so happy and satisfied, I can not tell you--we have been creating a political education around land, forest and water issues and debating courses of action. We are expanding in terms of participation and we need to keep generating more awareness on more issues that affect us.
>
> We have taken up the need for unity between us. We have seen that if we have unity, nobody can take away anything from us, be it our trees and leaves, our land and *bagara* areas (shifting cultivation zones). ... we have been actively spreading the message that we must have communal harmony (*sampro-dahiko srunkhala*).

The claims on the state (which vacillate between being anti-statist and/or statist) are in relation to recognition, local control and autonomy and state support for development on local terms and in sync with a local political-economy which caters primarily to the rural regions and villages. Clearly LAM and similar rural movement formations in defence and affirmation of rurality are challenging the neoliberal Indian state's conception and power of eminent domain (Mehta, 2009) and questioning its predominant deployment on behalf

of colonial capitalist interests subsequently equated with the preferred 'public' interest. According to a Kondh Adivasi leader and a Domb/Dalit woman activist (Kapoor, 2009: 27):

> ...we are laying a claim on the government who is supposed to serve all the people in this land. We are demanding a place for ourselves--we are questioning the government and asking them to help us develop our land using our ways...our livelihood should be protected and our traditional occupations and relationship to the land and forest need to be protected as community control over land and forests in our areas and this is our understanding of our Constitutional rights too. There is no contradiction. Once this is understood we can cooperate and when necessary, work with the government to take care of the land and forests. If they can help the *shaharis* (moderns/urbanites) destroy the forests, then they can help us protect it and listen to our story too.
>
> In relation to land and forest and water, we want that the government must not have control or rights over our natural resources (*ame chaho je sarkar amo prakrutic sampader opera adhkar kimba niyantrano no kori*). For example, village organization has the right to manage forests. The land that people have occupied and need, the government should not put pressure for eviction. People have a right to cultivable land which they have been using in accordance with their knowledge and traditions. The government should rather help us to develop our agriculture by finding ways to support us. And instead of big dams, it should erect check dams (small scale irrigation) to help us in our cultivable land for irrigation.

Concluding reflections: Coloniality, trans-local solidarity and the defence and affirmation of rurality

In terms of the relationship between struggle and the disalienation of colonized subjects attempting to address an "arsenal of complexes" to restore their "proper place", authentic freedom in this regard cannot be achieved when colonized peoples "simply go from one way of life to another, but not from one life to another", i.e., become "emancipated slaves" because the terms of recognition remain in the possession of the powerful to bestow on their inferiors as they see fit. Subsequently, the best that the colonized can hope for is "white liberty and white justice; that is, values secreted by their masters" (read as: white-caste-class elites and consumer classes in the Indian context) (Fanon, 1967: 220-222). To identify with "white liberty and white justice" the colonized would have failed to re-establish themselves as truly self-determining, i.e., as the creators of the terms and values by which they are to be recognized or else they limit the realm of possibility of their freedom (Fanon, 1963: 9). Looking to "own ways learning" (in the words of some of the partners in LAM) and "turning away from master-dependency" from the colonial state and society is the "source of liberation" and transformative praxis that is underscored by Fanon (1967:221) and that proves to continue to be a challenge (for strategic and other reasons, including forms of "dependent thinking"--looking to the other for recognition-- which characterize experiences with sustained subordination) in

LAM contexts, as the concerned movements oscillate between a "complete break" (in practice and theory--anti-statist) or seeking "state recognition" (claims on the state--even racially and caste-motivated asymmetrical recognition as Scheduled Tribes and Scheduled Castes). Self-recognition and anticolonial empowerment is, after all, a long term process of contradictory engagements given the parasitic and penetrating impacts of colonial structures; impacts that are recognizable along with resistances that have always tempered and limited colonial possibilities. The stress on unity (*ektha*), demonstrating strength in numbers and attempting to scale up Adivasi/Dalit and rural subaltern social action (hence the gradual emergence of formations like LAM) are clearly integral to the process of anticolonial contestations as is an anticolonial pedagogy of place and roots (historical, ancestral and/or spiritual) (Kapoor, 2011c). This subaltern domain of politics germinated in the pre-colonial period, has operated vigorously under the British, and continues to develop new strains in both form and content made evident in acts of protest, rebellion and sustained resistance (Guha, 1982: 4; 1997). As subjects and makers of their own history or "movements who are bearers of other worlds" (Zibechi and Ryan, 2012: 12) and who possess autonomy within encompassing structures of subordination (Arnold, 1984), trans-local rural solidarity and anticolonial social movement formations like LAM (as a network and as individual movements with their specificities) are actively engaged in a politics which exposes, derails, disrupts and resists colonial capitalist accumulation by displacement and dispossession in the forested and rural regions; *places* where over 80 percent of 37 million people in the state of Orissa live in 55,000 villages.

References

Alavi, Hamza. 1972. “The State in Post-colonial Societies: Pakistan and Bangladesh.” *New Left Review, 74* (July-August): 59-81.

Alfred, Taiaiake. 2011. “Colonial Stains on Our Existence.” Pp. 3-11 in *Racism, Colonialism and Indigeneity in Canada*, edited by Martin Cannon and Lina Sunseri. Don Mills Ontario: Oxford University Press.

Araghi, Farshad and Karides, M. 2012. "Land Dispossession and Global Crisis: Introduction to the Special Section on Land Rights in the World System." *Journal of World Systems Research on Land Rights, 18*(1): 1-5.

Arnold, David. 1984. "Gramsci and Peasant Subalternity in India." *Journal of Peasant Studies 11*(4): 155-177.

Banerjee, Parthasarathi. 2006. "West Bengal: Land Acquisition and Peasant Resistance in Singur." *Economic and Political Weekly, 41*(46):4718-4720.

Bargh, Maria (ed.) 2007. *Resistance: An indigenous response to neoliberalism*. Wellington: Huia.

Baviskar, Amita 2005a. *In the belly of the river: Tribal conflicts over development in the Narmada valley* (2nd ed.). USA: Oxford University Press.

Baviskar, Amita. 2005b. "Red in Tooth and Claw? Looking for Class Struggles Over Nature." Pp. 161-178 in *Social Movements in India: Poverty, Power and Politics*, edited by Raka Ray and Mary Katzenstein. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bharati, S. 1999. "Human Rights and Development Projects in India." *The PRP Journal of Human Rights 3*(4): 20.

Brass, Tom. 2007. "A World Which is Not Yet: Peasants, Civil Society and the State." *Journal of Peasant Studies 34*(3/4): 582-664.

Cameron, Angus and Palan, Ronen (2003). *The imagined economies of globalization*. London: Sage.

Da Costa, Dia. 2007. "Tensions of Neo-liberal Development: State Discourse and Dramatic Oppositions in West Bengal." *Contributions to Indian Sociology 41*(3): 287-320.

Da Costa, Dia 2009. *Development drama: Reimagining rural political action in eastern India*. New Delhi: Routledge.

Davis, Mike 2002. *Late Victorian holocausts: El Nino famines and the making of the Third World*. London: Verso.

Fanon, Frantz 1963. *Wretched of the earth*. Boston: Grove Press.

Fanon, Frantz 1967. *Black skin, white masks*. Boston: Grove Press.

Fernandes, Walter. 2006. "Development-related Displacement and Tribal Women." Pp. 112-132 in *Tribal Development in India: The Contemporary Debate*, edited by Gobind Rath. New Delhi: Sage.

Galeano, Eduardo 1972. *Open veins of Latin America: Five centuries of the pillage of a continent*. NY: Monthly Review Press.

Goonatilake, Susantha 2006. *Recolonisation: Foreign funded NGOs in Sri Lanka*. New Delhi: Sage.

GRAIN 2012. *The great food robbery: How corporations control food, grab land and destroy the climate*. Cape Town, South Africa: Pambazuka Press.

Grande, Sandy 2004. *Red pedagogy: Native American social and political thought*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Guha, Ranajit 1982. "On Some Aspects of the Historiography of Colonial India." Pp. 1-8 in *Subaltern Studies Number 1*, edited by Ranajit Guha. New Delhi:Oxford University Press.

Guha, Ranajit 1989. "Dominance Without Hegemony and its' Historiography." In *Subaltern Studies Number 6*, edited by Ranajit Guha. New Delhi:Oxford University Press.

Guha, Ranajit 1997. *Dominance without hegemony: History and power in colonial India*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Guha, Ranajit. 2001. "Subaltern Studies: Projects for Our Time and their

Convergence." In *Latin American Subaltern Studies Reader*, edited by I. Rodriguez. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Hall, Stuart 1980. "Race, Articulation and Societies Structured in Dominance." Pp.305-345 in *Sociological Theories, Race and Colonialism*. Paris: UNESCO.

Harvey, David 2003. *The new imperialism*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Indian People's Tribunal on Environment and Human Rights (IPTEHR) 2006. *An inquiry in to mining and human rights violations*. Mumbai, India: IPTEHR publication.

Jesson, Bruce (1999). *Only their purpose is mad*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Kapoor, Dip. 2013. "Social Action and NGOization in Contexts of Development Dispossession in Rural India: Explorations in to the Un-civility of Civil Society." Pp. 46-74 in *NGOization: Complicity, Contradictions and Prospects*, edited by Aziz Choudry and Dip Kapoor. London: Zed.

Kapoor, Dip. 2012. "Human Rights as Paradox and Equivocation in Contexts of Adivasi (original dweller) Dispossession in India." *Journal of Asian and African Studies 47*(4): 404-420.

Kapoor, Dip. 2011a. "Subaltern Social Movement (SSM) Post-mortems of Development in India: Locating Trans-local Activism and Radicalism." *Journal of Asian and African Studies 46*(2): 130-148.

Kapoor, Dip. 2011b. "Participatory academic research (par) and People's Participatory Action Research (PAR): Research, Politicization and Subaltern Social Movements (SSMs) in India." Pp. 29-44 in *Education, Participatory Action Research and Social Change: International Perspectives*, edited by Dip Kapoor and Steven Jordan. NY & London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kapoor, Dip. 2011c. "Adult Learning in Political (Un-civil) Society: Anti-colonial Subaltern Social Movement (SSM) Pedagogies of Place." *Studies in the Education of Adults 43*(2): 128-146.

Kapoor, Dip. 2009. "Subaltern Social Movement (SSM) Learning: Adivasis (original dwellers) and the Decolonization of Space in India." Pp.7-38 in *Education, Decolonization and Development: Perspectives from Asia, Africa and the Americas*, edited by Dip Kapoor. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Kelley, Robin 2000. "A Poetics of Anticolonialism." Pp. 7-28 in *Discourse on Colonialism*, by Robin Kelley. NY: Monthly Review Press.

Lefebvre, Henri 1990. *The production of space*, trans D. Nicholson-Smith. Oxford: Blackwell.

Martinez-Alier, Juan 2003. *The environmentalism of the poor: A study of ecological conflicts and valuations*. NY: Edward Elgar.

Mehta, Lyla (ed.) 2009. *Displaced by development: Confronting marginalization and gender injustice*. New Delhi: Sage.

Menon, Nivedita and Nigam, Aditya 2007. *Power and contestation: India since 1989*. London: Zed.

McMichael, Philip (ed.) 2010. *Contesting development: Critical struggles for social change*. NY: Routledge.

Meyer, Lois and Alvarado, Maldonado (eds.) 2010. *New world of indigenous resistance*. San Francisco, CA: City Lights Publishers.

Mignolo, Walter 2000. *Local histories/Global designs*. NJ: Princeton University Press.

Munshi, Indra (ed.) 2012. *The Adivasi question: Issues of land, forest and livelihood*. New Delhi: Orient Black Swan.

Nixon, Rob 2011. *Slow violence and the environmentalism of the poor*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Oliver-Smith, Anthony 2010. *Defying displacement: Grassroots resistance and the critique of development*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Oxfam 2011. *Land and power: The growing scandal surrounding the new wave of investments in land*. Available at: www.oxfam.org/en/grow/policy/land (accessed 6.1.2013)

Padel, Felix and Das, Samarendra 2010. *Out of this earth: East India Adivasis and the aluminium cartel*. New Delhi: Orient Black Swan.

Patnaik, Utsa and Moyo, Sam 2011. *The agrarian question in the neoliberal era: Primitive accumulation and the peasantry*. Capetown, South Africa: Pambazuka Press.

Pimple, Minar and Sethi, Manpreet. 2005. "Ocuupation of Land in India: Experiences and Challenges." Pp. 235-256 in *Reclaiming Land: The Resurgence of Rural Movements in Africa, Asia and Latin America, edited by Sam Moyo and Paris Yeros*. London: Zed.

Prabhu, Pradeep. 1998. "Tribal Movements: Resistance to Resurgence." Pp. 80-94 in *Towards People-Centreed Development,* edited by Murli Desai et al. Mumbai, India: Tata Institute of Social Sciences.

Prasant, Kumar and Kapoor, Dip. 2010. "Learning and Knowledge Production in Dalit Social Movements in Rural India." Pp.193-210 in *Learning from the Ground Up: Global Perspectives on Social Movements and Knowledge Production*, edited by Aziz Choudry and Dip Kapoor. NY & London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Quijano, Anibal. 2005. "The Challenge of the 'Indigenous Movement' in Latin America." *Socialism and Democracy 19*(3): 55-78.

Quijano, Anibal. 2000. "Coloniality of Power and Eurocentrism in Latin America." *International Sociology 15*(2): 215-232.

Rajagopal, Balakrishnan 2003. *International law from below: Development, social movements and Third World resistance*. Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press.

Renique, Gerardo. 2005. "Latin America Today: The Revolt Against Neoliberalism." *Socialism and Democracy 19*(3): 1-11.

Rodney, Walter 1982. *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. Washington DC: Howard University Press.

Sarkar, Sumit. 2000. "The Decline of the Subaltern in Subaltern Studies." Pp. 300-323 in *Mapping Subaltern Studies and the Postcolonial*, edited by Vinayak Chaturvedi. London: Verso.

Sankaran, Krishna 2009. *Globalization and postcolonialism: Hegemony and resistance in the twenty-first century*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Sethi, Rumina 2011. *The politics of postcolonialism: Empire, nation and resistance*. London: Pluto.

Smith, Linda 2012. *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed.

Sundar, Nalini 2007. *Subalterns and sovereigns: An anthropological history of Bastar (1854-2006)*. Oxford: USA.

Whitehead, Judy. 2003. "Space, Place and Primitive Accumulation in Narmada Valley and Beyond." *Economic and Political Weekly October 4*: 4224-4230.

Williams, Randall 2010. *The divided world: Human rights and its violence*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Zibechi, Raul and Ryan, Ramon 2012. *Territories in resistance: Cartography of Latin American social movements*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Zibechi, Raul. 2005. "Subterranean Echos: Resistance and Politics 'desde el Sotano'." *Socialism and Democracy 19*(3): 13-39.

Table 1: Lok Adhikar Manch (LAM)

Movement participant (year established)	**Location / operational area**	**Social groups engaged**	**Key issues being addressed**
1.Kalinga Matchyajivi Sangathana (Kalinga fisher people's organization) (early 1980s)	Gopalpur-on-sea (center) including coastal Orissa, from Gopalpur in Ganjam district to Chandrabhaga and Astaranga coast in Puri district	Fisher people (mainly Dalits) originally from the state of Andhra Pradesh called Nolias and Orissa state fisher people or Keuta/Kaivartas	• Trawler fishing, fish stock depletion and enforcement of coastal regulations/zones (Trans/national Corporate--TNC--investments) • Occupation of coastal land by defense installations (e.g., missile bases) • Hotel/tourism industry developments along coast (TNC investment) • Special economic zones (SEZ) and major port projects for mining exports (TNC investment) • Pollution of beaches and oceans • Displacement of fisher communities related to such developments
2. Prakritik Sampad Suraksha Parishad (PSSP) (late 1980s)	Kashipur, Lakhimpur, Dasmantpur and adjacent blocks in Rayagada district of Orissa Approximately 200 movement villages	Adivasis including Jhodias, Kondhs and Parajas and Pano/Domb Dalits	• Bauxite mining (alumina) (TNC investments) • Industrialization, deforestation and land alienation/ displacement • Peoples' rights over "their own ways and systems"
3. Jana Suraksha Manch (2007)	Adava region of Mohana block, Gajapati district including sixty or more villages	Saura and Kondh Adivasis and Panos (Dalits)	• Government/local corruption • Police brutality/atrocities • Deforestation and plantation agriculture (NC investment)

4. Adivasi Dalit Adhikar Sangathan (2000)	Jaleswar, Bhograi and Bosta blocks in Balasore district and Boisinga and Rasagovindpur blocks in Mayurbhanj including over 100 villages	Dalits, Adivasis, fisher people and Other Backward Castes (OBCs)	• Dalit and Adivasi land rights and land alienation • Industrialization, port development and displacement of traditional fisher people (TNC investment)
5. Adivasi-Dalit Ekta Abhiyan (2000)	Twenty panchayats in Gajapati and Kandhmal districts including 200 plus villages (population of about 50,000)	Kondh and Saura Adivasis, Panos (Dalits) and OBCs	• Land and forest rights • Food • Sovereignty/plantation agriculture (NC investment) • Industrialization, modernization and protection of indigenous ways and systems • Communal harmony • Development of people's coalitions/forums (no state, NGO, corporate, "outsider", upper/middle castes participants)
6. Indravati Vistapita Lokmanch (late 1990s)	Thirty villages in the district of Nabarangapur	Several Adivasi, Dalit and OBC communities	• Dam displacement (Indravati irrigation and hydro-electric project) (NC investment) • Land and forest rights • Resettlement, rehabilitation and compensation for development displaced peoples (DDPs) • Industrialization and modern development and protection of peoples ways
7. Orissa Adivasi Manch (1993 to 1994)	State level forum with an all-Orissa presence (all districts) with regional units in Keonjhar and Rayagada districts and district level units in each district	Well over forty different Adivasi communities	• Adivasi rights in the state • Tribal self rule, forest and land rights and industrialization (SEZs) (TNC investments)

8.Anchalik Janasuraksha Sangathan (2008)	Kidting, Mohana block of Gajapati district including some twenty villages	Kondh and Saura Adivasis and Panos (Dalits)	• Land and forest rights • Conflict resolution and communal harmony between Adivasis and Dalits over land and forest issues
9. Dalit Adivasi Bahujana Initiatives (DABI) (2000)	Five blocks in the Kandhmal district with ten participating local movements (networks)	Kondh Adivasis, Panos (Dalits) and OBCs	• Land and forest rights • Food sovereignty and livelihood issues • Communal harmony
10. Uppara Kolab Basachyuta Mahasangh (late 1990s)	Umerkote block, Koraput district (includes a thirty village population base displaced by the upper Kolab hydroelectric and irrigation reservoir)	Paraja Adivasis, Panos and Malis Dalits and OBCs	• Displacement due to the upper Kolab hydro-electricity and irrigation reservoir (NC investment) • Compensation, rehabilitation and basic amenities for DDP's • Land and forest rights
11. Jeevan Jivika Suraksha Sangathan (2006)	Three panchayats in the border areas of Kandhmal and Gajapati districts including fifty or more villages with a population of 12,000 people	Kondhs and Saura Adivasis and Panos (Dalits) and OBCs	• Land and forest rights/issues • Communal harmony • Food sovereignty and livelihood issues
12. Adivasi Pachua Dalit Adhikar Manch (APDAM) (2000)	Kalinga Nagar industrial belt in Jajpur district (twenty-five or more villages, along with several participants in the Kalinganagar township area)	Adivasis, Dalits and OBCs	• Industrialization and displacement (TNC investment) • Land and forest rights • Compensation and rehabilitation • Police atrocities/brutality • Protection of Adivasi-Dalit ways and forest-based cultures and community
13. Janajati Yuva Sangathan (2008)	Baliapal and Chandanesar block in Balasore district including thirty-two coastal villages being affected by mega port development (part of SEZ scheme).	Dalit fisher communities and OBCs.	• SEZs (TNC investments) • Industrialization and displacement • Land alienation and marine rights of traditional fisher communities

Source: Kapoor (2011a), p.132-134

Note: In addition to the above LAM movements, leaders from 2 other movements were also included in the research, both of which have expressed an interest in joining LAM. These include: (i) The Niyamgiri Bachao Andolan (NBA), a Dongria and Kutia Kondh (Adivasi) movement against Vedanta/Sterlite (UK) bauxite mine/refinery in Lanjigarh, and the (ii) anti-POSCO (South Korea/Wall Street owned) movement, Santal Adivasi wing from the Khandadhar region and the parent POSCO Pratirodh Manch which includes several wings including small and medium farmers (e.g. Betel leaf farmers), Adivasi, Dalits and fisherfolk affected (or potentially affected) at the plant site or due to port development (Jatadhar river basin area; this includes the Paradip Port Trust which would have to handle iron ore exports) and water-affected areas/groups in Cuttack district as water for irrigation and drinking in these areas is channeled through a proposed canal (going through 5 districts) to the POSCO plant.

About the author

Dip Kapoor is Associate Professor in Education at the University of Alberta, Canada and Research Associate, Centre for Research and Development Solidarity (CRDS), an Adivasi/Dalit organization in South Orissa, India. Recent edited collections from Palgrave Macmillan (London and New York) include: *Learning from the Ground Up: Global Perspectives on Social Movements and Knowledge Production* (with Aziz Choudry, 2013/paperback); *Globalization, Culture and Education in South Asia: Critical Excursions* (with Bijoy Barua and Al-Karim Datoo, 2012); and *Indigenous Knowledge and Learning in the Asia-Pacific and Africa* (with Edward Shizha, 2010). He can be contacted at dkapoor AT ualberta.ca