

Open Access

Research article

State in Development: De-codify the Cultural Politics of Will to Develop the Adivasi of Jharkhand

[†]DHIRAJ KUMAR
*Shri Shankar College, Sasaram
India*

[†]Corresponding author: dhirajsociology@gmail.com

[Received: December, 1, 2019; Accepted: December 10, 2019]

Thinking of State in development illustrates that social life of an individual, community, society or territory becomes the subject of multiple interventions. The theology of development assumes that intervention is needed to reform the social life of an individual, community or society. State intervention in the name of development has a social and ecological cost for the indigenous community. State in Development is a series of events and actions as well as a particular discourse and ideological construct that demands examination to understand how state constructs the aesthetic deception which strengthened the State capacity to govern the unruly region of Indigenous population. It functions as a hegemonic order to order, control and represent the regions or populations where indigenous community are predominating in nature. This paper is about the issues and questions regarding the development intervention mediated and facilitated by State and the changes it has brought to local ecology of Jharkhand. By using the literature of political ecology this paper shows that development facilitated ecological degradation at local level while also induced State building and State formation among the local community.

Keywords: Development, Political ecology, State, Indigenous, Change.

Introduction

This article shows how the developmental project of State can be used for many different political purposes, including some, and perhaps most, that conflict with its essentially egalitarian ethic (a better life for all). It is necessary to understand and de-codify the meaning of development when the cries of development echo all around in the forms of displacement, ethno genocide, marginalization and dispossession. Placing local and regional environmental problems of the indigenous community due to development activities has been a core of environment-society research. It needs a 'chain of explanation' as mentioned by Blaikie and Brookfield (1987). They phrase:

"Starts with the land managers and their direct relations with the land (crop rotations, fuelwood use, stocking densities, capital investment and so on). The next link concerns their relations with each other, other land users, and groups in a wider society who affect them in any way, which in turn determine land management. The state and the world economy constitute the last links in the chain. Clearly then, explanations will be highly conjectural, although relying on theoretical bases drawn from natural and social science (Blaikie & Brookfield, 1987, p. 27)"

Political ecology as a method and tool will rarely carry all these elements in a specific singular link. Research of this subject focuses on the way State authorities accumulate and extract natural resources through the economic pressure and regulation associated with developmental activities. The other dimension in the same research context focuses on the way local communities respond to this developmental activity and its institutional arrangement. The political ecology perspective of the development focuses on 'trialectics' that helps to understand the dynamic character of the State in the articulation of local productive system of a particular society. The trialectics understanding rejects the binary and inflexible dialectical interpretation. State abilities to mediate and negotiate or regulate the socio-nature rejected the common dualism of State and society as well as of the western dichotomy of nature and society. The strategic and relational understandings of the State are necessary because State corresponds, reshapes and evolves, with nature and society and also an integral element of socio-nature. Thirdering or trialectics helps to understand the dynamic and politicized interaction between socio-nature and state (Ioris, 2015). State's 'will to improve' indigenous society is based on developmental narratives or cultural scripts (Hoben, 1995) that came through the legitimate kind of intervention popularly known as governmentality (Lemke, 2010). The three categories, State, society and rest of the nature, form trialectical continuum which are integrally connected factors of some contested and relational reality (Ioris, 2015). State is an integral element of the socio-nature that is existent and attached to society through its ability to mediate and regulate socio natural process. State co-evolves with socio-nature and society in a truly trialectical relationship in which processes of change (development) are simultaneously reproduced on nature, society and State. This reproduction and contested form of change is the locus of political ecology. Political ecology research narrates the uneven reproduction of the socio-natures through case study and participatory observation. Robbins (2012) mentions that political ecology describes how uneven power controls the flow of value from the environment and enhances the unwanted process of accumulation, within the shifting systems of political economy that perpetuate both. Political ecology of developmental research traces the contextual forces that constrain and direct outcomes, and write an explanation of that outcomes, in a way that deal how value flows out of landscape, through local communities to the other and how process of accumulation works.

Nature may exist outside society, but through State's social investment in natural resource, nature gets social life (Appadurai, 1988). The social life of natural resource and its effect on local community is a subject of State description. Additionally, State's operational and political sensitivity for development depends upon its structural determination, its strategic orientation and its relation to accumulation (Jessop, 2009, 2016). The intention of this paper is to give more focus on the description of State in 'development' to understand the connected factors of the three categories that form trialectics. It gives description about the concept of development engaged with State facilitation of capitalist development as process and activity. The succeeding section tries to conceptualise the developmental project of State as process and activity.

Development as Process and Activity

This section engages development as an 'immanent process of capitalism' and an 'intentional activity' (Cowen & Shenton, 1996). It helps to understand the conceptual differentiation of development as process and activity. Development for State as a term of 'political economy of resource-use' is a process and project that intersects with and affects the local environment. The word development is itself contested and ambiguous (Peet & Watts, 2004). As an idea it has served many purposes for State. The term and meaning of development have been unchanged; but development as concept has undergone a series of transformations defined by shifting ideas about the relative role of the State, civil society and the market (Peet & Hartwick, 2009; Peet & Watts, 2004). Other scholars like Nandy and Visvanathan (1990) conceptualized development as an idea and a community which has served as a reason of the State.

"The idea of development has served many purposes in our times. It has served as reasons of state, as a legitimizer of regimes, as part of vision of good society, and, above all, as a shorthand expression for the needs of the poor. It has produced a new expertise and created a new development, new community of scholars, policy makers, development journalist, and reader of development news, development managers and activists- who together can be said to constitute the development community' (Nandy & Visvanathan, 1990, p. 145)."

Ideologically, as a term, it is constructed at positivist level to signify qualitative change at all spheres of life. But ironically it demands an examination because the way it has been practiced is highly contested and politicized. As a process, development has a root in uneven evolutionary paths of historical capitalism. Historical capitalism transforms its feature into actually existing capitalism (Sanyal, 2007). Whereas development as an activity shows how State or its governing bodies, and apparatus deliberately projected specific models to enhance the historical process of capitalism. These activities are consciously dominant in form of discourses, planning and operation. Development that was conventionally used to refer it as qualitative processes of economic and social change that has been used by the State and other developmental agencies as a recipe for social change (Pieterse, 2000). However, the State has set arts, new developmental plans, policies and agendas of prestige in the name of nation building (Nandy, 2002).

Development plans and policies are thus the site of contest between the place and State apparatus. Foucault (1978) focuses upon the field of knowledge, such as economics, natural history, that is codified and classified and represented in particular periods (Gordon, 1991). State has represented these developmental interventions as objective and politically neutral; but Foucault shows that these areas of knowledge are socially, historically and politically constructed. Social realities in these accounts are multiple and change according to the context. This illustration of development provides an insight to

understand how developmental projects territorialize resource rich region to control the resources and discourses. The wider systematic forces of State have arranged and attracted private industrial players to enhance developmental projects that formed a complex web of relation. The practices of development projects are based on domination (Escobar, 2011) that has politicized the operational process of development. Development projects should not be viewed in isolation as those are politically constructed and are perceived as an ideal (Baviskar, 1997; Dwivedi, 2006).

The rhetoric of development as a part of the neoliberal project is linked with the wider nation making developmental project in which State's role is so important to understand the full correspondence between the developmental responses of the State and the socio-ecological interest of the community and other classes. Indeed, Mildavin (2007) argues that, the entrance of coercive State and new markets results in the appropriation of communal capital from the locals and into the hands of the non-residents and distant parities. Moreover, placing the cost of the development at the feet of the local community where developmental project was once come to deliver bunches of promise in term of providing job, eradicating illiteracy and hunger. Exploration of the ways developmental activity works and the ways it brings socio – economic changes became fundamental to the political ecology of developmental research.

Development was – and continues to be for the most part – a top-down, ethnocentric, and technocratic approach, which has treated and continues to treat people and their culture as abstract concepts and statistical figures to be moved up and down in the charts of progress. As a linear theory of progress, it is bound up with capitalism and western cultural hegemony (Adams, 2001, p. 6). It often works for the economic growth. Development is interested not so much in the growth of an economy but rather the conditions under which production occurs and the results that flow from it. In terms of conditions, development pays attention to the environments affected by economic activity and the labor relations and conditions of the actual producers of wealth – the peasants and workers who produce growth (Peet & Hartwick, 2009).

By taking insight from above statement of (Peet & Hartwick, 2009) this paper talks about the conditions under which production occurs and impacts environment by economic activity. Development as a process and activity has continued on a resource-intensive path. It has seriously disrupted ecological stability of local ecosystem. The issue of sustainability, environmentalism and production of nature or social construction of nature is associated with the larger corpus of developmental issues (Castree, 1995, 2008). It argues in favour of creating the capital-oriented markets for exchange of natural resource and consumption. It requires privatization and commodification of resource-use and control. Immediate resource use to generate surplus to meet the global resource demand also transform the traditional productive relation. It is in this context, understanding the development is necessary, because it ignores the pluralities of ecological relations (Padel, 2016; Parajuli, 1996). Its premises assume that once economic growth is achieved then all sections of society will be equally benefited. This linear assumption ignores the heterogeneity and completely neglected the socio-historical and political factors of the region (Baviskar, 1997). Additionally, it also induced ecological movements. The ecological communities which are at the receiving end of the larger development projects started to assert their voice against the ecological changes. In resource rich region of global south, the seed of cries of development is linked with the environment and local communities, mainly Adivasi and Peasant. Discussion of capitalism in form of developmental projects and 'indigeneity' are important in this regard. Li argued that 'indigeneity' is a political category and space that is co-merged with the discussion of capitalism (Li, 2000). As a label

or class, they resist against the expanding nature of capitalism and market system facilitated by the State. As a political slot, they remained outside the market and capitalist system. Additionally, they can be positioned and understood as a counter movement to capitalism. As a historical fact, it can be argued that tribe in context of development is understood and treated as a political category with an understanding of primitive 'vanvasi' and native (Rycroft & Dasgupta, 2011). Development discourses reinvented 'indigeneity' that can be also observed as the 'invention of the primitive' (Kuper, 2005). In global south, in general, and India, in particular, it is a recognizably distinct identity treated by different groups differently based on their embedded interest of articulation. The articulation of tribe or indigenous who resists the developmental projects provides a temporal imperative and a political aesthetic 'other'. Sometimes, they are literally called by others through a process of social self-recognition and 'interpellation'.

As a series of events and interventions development not only affected environment but also reconstituted human-environment relationships. These developments raise a new set of questions about how environments are created, sustained and transformed in such a context and the role of the State and corporates in these processes. Secondly, it also claims to an investigation of the historical processes to examine the claims of changes in socio economic process. These changes enhance ecological conflicts, resistance and ecological movement that challenge the quick snapshots of development that is facilitated by the State.

In the social sciences, concerns of environment in developmental discourse has come into vogue since the late 1960s, and the field of environmental history offers a powerful model for the political ecologists interested in change over time. The resulting changes in human-environmental interactions at local levels due to developmental intervention became a central focus for political ecology research. Political ecology research is interested in understanding the unintended consequence of modern development (Jewitt and Kumar, 2000). The consequences and changes of ecology and human-environment relation need an empirical examination. It is true that varieties of approaches and traditions to the politics of development over environment and society are an eclecticism body of research frame of political ecology. A significant change has occurred after the discovery of environment in development that has been engaged with the discussion of sustainable development. Escobar in his seminal writing titled 'Constructing Nature: Elements for a post structural Ecology' talked about the politics of sustainable development. He stated that the discourse of sustainable development and conservation of environment strategies plays a crucial role in development project (Escobar, 1996). The productive conditions are transformed by the capital. Sustainability, nature conservation and environmental issues may be placed in the broader context of what Haraway (2013) calls it as 'the reinvention of nature'. Changing production systems, transformation and changes that come due to developmental activity falls into the aesthetic politics of 'civilizing the indigenous'.

Development as Modernization

Development projects as legitimised projects of State began to deal after 1945 were numerous and varied. Capital investment is seen as the most important ingredient in economic growth to define development. The term development has been the central concept of today's world. In modern time, for new nation states, the core meaning of development was economic growth. As time went, the elements of modernity, i.e., mechanization, technology and industrialization became part of this concept. After the end of Second World War, thinking of development was based on the notion of linear progression or a notion of a straight forward route leading upwards to the goals of the

modernity that can be seen in the work of Rostow's stage of Economic growth. Gradually, development broadened and encompassed by adding modernization, GDP and economic growth. Development is also represented as modernity. A noted theorist, Rostow (1991) in his seminal writing 'Stages of Economic Growth' has outlined a series of evolutionary levels to achieve the modern condition. Started from 'traditional form' as per Rostow, all societies had to pass through these stages of 'preconditions for take-off', 'take off' and 'the drive to maturity' to achieve the final condition of 'high mass consumption'. These stages are characterized by high productivity, advanced technology, service sector and urbanization. The advocates of modernization thesis proposed that development efforts are needed to tackle the problem of underdevelopment. Underdevelopment is seen as a historical condition and through re-orientation of its conservative norms and values can move towards the capitalist form to achieve developed condition. The State has invested huge in capital intensive infrastructure, i.e., irrigations projects, road building and heavy industry. Guided by modernization theory and focused on rapid economic growth, these projects have created profound social dislocations in the region with "destabilizing" socio and cultural effects. Advocators of this school argue that the repository of 'tradition as a socio-cultural obstacle' in a road to achieve the goals of development.

They conceived modernization as a cluster of interrelated social changes—industrialization, urbanization, commercialization of agriculture, and technological advancement—that produced a deepening differentiation of social structure (Lerner, 1958; Parsons, 1991; Smelser, 2013). The structural adjustment programmes were started to tame the imbalance of macroeconomics. As this practicality of centralised development policies get criticised after the undelivered promise of high modernist development projects.

Failures in development projects have proliferated the critiques of development and its consequences. It has divided advocates of development into two groups. First group believed that the redefining of development is necessary and there is a need for the 'alternative development'. They emphasize that the State's role should change to address the developmental failure. State shifts its conservative role and facilitate inclusive neoliberalism in which inclusion, participatory democracy, empowerment and equality has become more fashionable. Some scholars like (Chambers, 2006; Harriss-White, 1997; Kothari, 1990; Sen, 1999) showed the failure of top-down development and mentioned that there is a need to redefine and understand the development through empowerment, participation and inclusion. Whereas second group argued that development as an idea did not work as promised (Sachs, 2010). He thinks that 'the idea of development stands like a ruin in the intellectual landscape'.

Delusions and disappointments, failures and dispossession, marginalization and displacement are common factors and companion of the development process. As rhetoric of development, empowerment, freedom, capabilities, inclusion and participation co-opted with capital centric discourse of market and due to that the potentiality of these narratives is always in question. Next section follows the different representations of the development.

Different Representations of Development

This section provides a glimpse into different representations of development. It carries the discussion of how development is a form of control, governmentality and neoliberalism. It also shows how development in the form of neoliberalism works.

Development as control

Through development, State is able to impose its interest, values and belief onto the other actors. It advocates that development is a continuation of colonialism by other means (Kumar & Puthumattathil, 2018). As Apffel-Marglin & Marglin (1990) mention that development process helps man to control his environment through the logo-centric mode of thought. This definition of development is embedded in the opposition between man and his culture on the one hand and the environment on the other (Apffel-Marglin & Marglin, 1990). This school argued that capitalist development necessitated the transfer of surplus from periphery to core. It only vaguely specified the exact mechanisms of this transfer. While the plunder of natural resources was part of Dependency theorists like Frank's analysis of underdevelopment (Foster-Carter, 1976). These theorists have focused, almost exclusively, on "unequal exchange" through trade or the repatriation of profits within multi-national corporations (Amin, 1976; Baran, 1957; Emmanuel, 1972). They mainly focus on the lateral transfer of surplus from periphery to core, irrespective of how it got generated and how it has created dispossession and change.

Development as modernity and linear progression was dismissed as historical and political by the Neo-Marxists theorists. Neo-Marxists such as (Frank, 1977, 1978; Wallerstein, 1974) adopted a political economy approach to show the negative effects of the development as a historical process. Their works challenge the evolutionary assumptions of modernization theory. They argued how in the name of development forced dependency has been created across the globe. Their work comes under dependency theory that recognized one's development is being based on other's underdevelopment. The colonial paraphrase of civilizing mission became modernizing mission and it is used as a mean to exercise the power. Exercising power, in the name of development, is to control the regions and masses. The thinking of development as power to control requires a new understanding. In succeeding discussion, it is enumerated how development as discourse is a kind of governmentality. Through developmental projects, powerful actors have imposed their interests, value and beliefs onto other people (Crewe & Axelby, 2013). It is a continuation of the colonialism. Development as control challenges the essential impression of modernization theory and argues that there is a need to understand the relationship between development and underdevelopment.

State in Development

Every State is known by the "rights that it maintains" (Laski, 2010, p. 97). The right to develop the regions and communities became a primary task of the modern State. Focusing on the role of State is important to understand what is intended by the development and how State decides what type of development should be for the natural resource regions, community and the ethno people. In this thread, it is important to understand the role of State that decides what kind of development should be carried out in the resources of rich areas and what its results is. Harvey (2014) finds it as a 'political economy of development as the mindless extension of capital's ecology into our life world' (p. 262). There is always a form of specialisation and risk associated with the kind of development. This risk is conceptualized as Interdependent development (Corbridge, 1982). As Brookfield (1975) puts it as the real cost of the risk associated with the development.

The risk associated with the development has been particularly strong in the third world countries. State using development as a process and activity served as a strategy of controlling the resource rich regions by integrating them in a global capitalist system in which they were in a relatively disadvantaged position. Justifications have been often

made for their disadvantage position. Their position has been justified as necessary “sacrifices for the nation development.”

Sanyal (2007) deconstructs the development ideology and mentions how development as ideology is being employed for a systematic transition. For example, from its 1950s- 60s avatar of being “development as a systemic transition” the discourse came to be known as “development for improvement” during the 1970s (Sanyal, 2007). Yet another view on development has been validated by scholars like (Bardhan, 2011; Chakravorty, 2013; Kumar & Mishra, 2017b; Padel et al., 2013) and others who perceive the marginalisation of certain sections is the “necessary cost of development”.

Developmentalism in global south is merely a neoliberal project and capitalist constructed discourse of the State. It is not only about the economics but it also ensures to promote political and ideological condition for capitalists to tackle the other economics and political institutions in the name of nation integration and growth. Associated with the ideology of market fetishism, this capitalist form of State mediated development only promotes the policy of capital. This paper deals how State (colonial to post-colonial) development policy for Adivasi was a means of the resource control of the region that even continues till date through developmental discourses and projects that has been protested and resisted by the Adivasi of the region around the global south in general and Hos community in particular.

Colonial Model of Development

There was no discourse of development before the arrival of British Raj in Hos region of Jharkhand. British made their appearance only in the 1830 after the several pervasive rebellions due to irregular increase in taxation and tribute (special nazarana from each village in forms of cash and livestock) against the Zamindari system of the Singhbhum Raja. To see it as an opportunity, British extended their administrative system and articulated these rebellions merely as problem of governance. Gradually, after seven years, British also represented themselves as liberators of the Hos and in this thread, they created Kolhan Government Estate in 1837 and it was placed under the direct administration of the company's government. The establishment of Kolhan Government Estate gave new ties to this region with the outside and modern state (Streumer, 2016). As Hos village community as a system started to integrate more within British Raj, their livelihood patterns and socio-economic organization started to get affected. British colonial policy of development of the tribal was very conservationist and it was based on the approach of protectionism and isolation (DasGupta, 2011) but they also sought to civilize the unruly Hos through their colonial modernization schemes and development projects that enhanced their imperial agenda. At the same time, they also pursued a policy of non-interference in the working of Hos village at local level and paradoxically enhanced the land revenue system and forest policy to generate more surplus to British Raj. It was the historical fact that the land system of these areas was not similar to other parts of Bengal Presidency. Although, British policy of development of tribal areas, mainly the Hos region, was contradictory because this new kind of State formation among Hos community had transformed Hos from adivasi to tenant (DasGupta, 2011). The introduction of fixed uniform rent without any distinction between original settlers (Khuntkattidar and later settlers) started to change the socio-economic equilibrium of the Ho society. The commercial interest of British towards forestry and timber was also felt in a significant manner. Large scale interference in the forest by the British raj was to regulate, control and tap the forest resources. British development activities were guided by the system of exploitation that consisted two interlinked processes enacted by colonialism and outsider's

(dikus) encroachment into the territory and space of Hos. Following folk song of Baiga tribe portrays the impacts of State led development that came in form of colonialism for tribals:

In this land of the English, how it is to live
 How hard it is to live
 In the village sits the landlord
 In the gate sits the kotwar
 In the garden sits the patwari
 In the fields sits the government
 In this land of the English how hard it is to live
 To pay cattle tax we have to sell cows
 To pay forest tax we have to sell buffaloes
 To pay land tax we have to sell bullocks
 How are we to get our food?
 In this land of the English¹...

One of the important impacts of the colonial model was formation of the modern state and the increasing control of the lifeworlds of the Adivasi people by colonialism, landlords/ moneylenders, markets and middlemen (DasGupta, 2011; Pati, 2011; Sen, 2011). They also mention that the problem of dispossession was also started due to colonialism. It induced large scale migrations and forced labour. Singh (2002) opines that the Kol songs that deal with the burden and pain of forced labour as follows:

Alas! Under [the grind of] forced labour
 Blood trickles from my shoulders
 Day and night the emissary from the zamindars,
 Annoys and irritates me, day and night I groan
 Alas! This is my condition
 I do not have a home, where shall I get
 happiness? Alas... (p. 4)

Not only forced labour, migration also became a gloominess of colonial development. The migration of Adivasi to tea plant sites, mines and factories was in much unpredicted manner (Pati, 2011; Sen, 2011). The nature of migration also stimulated the development of colonial capitalism. In fact, the question of integration and isolation was debatable under the aegis of colonial capitalism and State formation.

Migration, dispossession, tax increase and the State interference in day-to-day life of tribe were also challenged by the tribe in the form of rebellion and movement. This movement was tribal way to confront the reality of colonial development model. Some of the uprisings were Kol rebellion 1831-32, Santhal Hul movement 1855, Birsa Munda movement 1890 and alike. The movement and protest were against the increasing exploitation, erosion of customary institutions and alien space formation. The adivasi of

¹ Cited in (Elwin & Hivale, 1944, p. 316).

this region drew the essence of moral economy to challenge the model of colonial development interference. As discussed earlier, the continuous rebellion against the colonial modernity and Raj forced British administrators to safeguard the Adivasi interest over land, forest and local resources. The making of Wilkinson law, establishment of Kolhan Estate system, Chotanagpur tenancy acts 1908 were a few laws to safeguard the Adivasi's interest. Post-colonial state also followed the colonial line along with capitalist path (Sundar, 2009a). State undermined and crossed the protective boundary of Schedule 5, Schedule 6 of Indian Constitution and others legal provision like Chota Nagpur Tenancy Act (CNTA) and Provision of Panchayati Raj Extension to Scheduled Area (PESA) to facilitate the developmental and State building programmes (Sharan, 2009; Sundar, 2009a; Upadhyay, 2009). These acts and provisions are the products of popular struggle against the colonial development model, but now these laws and its manipulations are located in developmental politics of political economy of State. State takes an advantage of internal contradictions within the law to favour the few industrialists and pauperizing many of Adivasi. Certain questions remain unanswered till now, even after the formation of Jharkhand as a post-colonial state within the Nation state of India are: which 'public' these Acts address and for what purpose they are implemented remains (Sundar, 2009b, p. 8). The Hos region of Jharkhand serves as an ideal site in many ways to understand State promoted capitalism which entered into ecological phase where law manipulation, violations, politics over access and control of resources, protests, resistance against developmental projects and activities are going on that needs more elaboration which has been depicted the succeeding section of this paper.

Post-colonial Model of Development

The post-colonial idea of State in development popularly in the vernacular context known as *vikas*, refers to be accepted by most of the Indians as a legitimate activity promoted by the State (Rangan, 1997). The postcolonial model of development in India is based on two interrelated processes: one is related to the immediate use of the natural resources and the other is to transform the people and communities against their will, into a hegemonised, dispossessed class (Baviskar, 1997). This model is based on achieving the four basic goals: a) integration of the diverse social structure into one homogenised discourse of national integration, b) economic development in terms of raising the standards of living of the larger section of the society, c) social equality in an unequalitarian social order, and d) political democracy in a culture that had valued authority based on status and power concentrated in the hands of the minority elite (Kothari, 1990).

Additionally, in case of developing resource rich regions of Ho Adivasi, postcolonial Indian State's stated objectives of Adivasi 'development' policies and programmes focus on to bring in national mainstream by reconfiguration them as margin, primitive and backward and or in need of development (Karlsson, 2004; Srivastava, 2008). The configuration and definition of Adivasi as margin and their place in need of development is a part of the dynamic of modern State formation to restructure their relation with the ecology and capital (Damodaran, 1997; DasGupta, 2009; Grove, 1990). Additionally, questions like who rules or defines, whose interest is served, what constitutes the mainstream, why should Adivasi or tribal be brought into it, and what does it mean for them to be brought into mainstream, have often been fundamental to the hearts of State-system, institutions and capitalist process for resource accumulation guided by modernization thesis.

The premises of modernization thesis are based on beneficial effects of capital, science and technology. The certainty of modernization thesis was first critiqued by the

dependency theorists. It is because the crisis of modernization as a way to deal development can be seen as a general crisis of the modernity (Crewe & Axelby, 2013). This crisis of modernity has opened other possibilities for the development but India has chosen the capital centric path of development. The first five-year planning was a classic example which was based on heavy industrialization but soon it started to fall out in term of dispossession, displacement and other discontents of development. Since 1950s onwards by the 1950s, In India, the several legal instruments like land tenure reforms, 'territorialization' were being used more effectively to dispossess millions of people for dams, steel plants, mining, industrial townships, and public infrastructure. The capital centric growth model to achieve the objectives of development was predominant in developmental discourse of post-colonial state but the intellectual roots of modernization thesis have started to fall after 1970.

As capitalism started to consolidate, the primacy of the State as the provider has been started to replace by the market discourse. Urban expansion and industrialization have deepened the inequality and poverty. In the name of modernizing or developing the place or region, State is using the several ploys and tactics to dispossess land to establish industry or extract resource.

Additionally, post-colonial State started to restructure its relation with capital. For India, like the third world countries, the primary task of developmental was to forge constructive relationships with capital (Amsden, 2000; Chibber, 2003; Evans, 1995; Kohli, 2004) and sometimes with labour (Chibber, 2003; Heller, 1996), but State dispossession of land from peasants was never considered a significant aspect of this relationship. This is an oversight of the "high-modernist" (Scott, 1998) projects that concretely instantiated these developmental states entailed profound transformations of the physical environment, demanding significant dispossession of rural land. Through developmental projects, the State imposes the prerequisite condition of capitalism to pursuit the goals of Lakshmi (Rudolph & Rudolph, 1987) and assumes that it will benefit all section of society. In reality, development activities and projects have generated malignant growth (Bhaduri, 2016).

The implementation of Developmental projects and schemes is based on the 'web of domination that is embedded in the developmental politics of the State. For extracting the natural resource, acquisition of land, deforestation and giving lease of a land to the public and private industry by State shows how state - society relation is based on the nature of availability of resource. Acquisition and lease of the land and areas have been given to extractive companies where other rural and agro forestry-based communities lived since immemorial time. These land and areas serve as an ecological niche where local communities and other species fulfill their day-to-day requirement from the ecology. State has a determining role to allocate and distribute the resources. Jharkhand is called a 'Ruhr' of the India. Resource extractive industry had started from 1907 with the establishment of Tata Iron and Steel Company at Singhbhum (now in East Singhbhum).

The demand for separate State from Bihar was a kind of ethno regional movement that showed the failure of postcolonial developmental model of India. This ethno-movement was the result of one-hundred-and-fifty-year struggle by the Adivasi of South Bihar to restore their economic, political and cultural hegemony over a region from where they, the original clearers of the land, have progressively been displaced by non-tribal outsider and State for developmental projects. Industrialization and capital formation in the form of developmental intervention have developed a kind of internal colony in these regions where economic capital generates only few positive outcomes (Corbridge, 1988, 1993b). Next section talks about the continuation of neoliberal developmental politics and

activities in Jharkhand that undermines the ideological base of bifurcation of Jharkhand from Bihar.

Post Jharkhand and Neoliberal Politics of Development

The State that was bifurcated from Bihar in 2000 has chosen post neoliberal path of development. The State has an option to promote ethno (indigenous ideology) and its model of development that engages with living well with nature and society. But despite its lay, actual history of conflict, resistance and movement against the capitalist penetration, Jharkhand has chosen export led growth model. It has introduced mechanism for social inclusion and politics of welfare for assimilation and integration of Adivasi in linear progress model. This action and policy of new government of Jharkhand successively led by all the major political parties at once has forgotten the ideological base of Jharkhand movement that claimed that Jharkhand was for the Adivasi. The Adivasi self-aspiration of 'Humara Raj', 'Swaraj' and 'Abub Raj' does not come in reality and it has left far behind in ideological space and discussion.

After getting branched off from Bihar in 2000, the adaptation of neo-liberalization has deepened the structural unevenness among different sectors of the economy. In Jharkhand, the neoliberal agendas opened up the valuable natural resources for immediate use. New laws and corporate friendly regulations have been enacted to favour the corporates. Importantly, it also has tremendous ecological impacts in terms of deforestation, displacement, migration and land degradation. Interruption came in the ways of state developmental ideology and projects. People resist against the state projects and extractive industries as a means to defend their ecological base of livelihoods (Sundar, 2005, 2009a). Resistance in these areas is also designed to articulate their indigenous identity through the issues of water, forest and land. (Jal, Jungle and Jameen) (Parajuli, 1996). In terms of economic policies, it is associated with state's ability to enhance and manage market. State has chosen this path because it ensured capital centric growth and also allowed State to spend in welfare schemes. It is rooted in the local traditions of communities that show how State re-structures society towards a linear progression model of development.

This new model of governance has been described as politics not policies (Bebbington, 2000, 2010, 2011; Kaltwasser, 2011). At policy level it was an intent move beyond the Washington Consensus that enhanced the neoliberalism. Civil society, environmentalists have also chosen different mechanisms to deal with this emerging form of post neoliberal politics of State. Although the history of Jharkhand is a history of ethno resource conflict and statehood movement but after formation of Jharkhand, its emerging nature of post neoliberal State seeks to retain element of export of the world's vital major and minor minerals, including iron ore, to limestone, to get growth model, whilst also introducing government mechanism for social welfare and inclusion.

Scholars like (Bryant, 2004; Bury, 2005; Cuveller, Vlassenroot, & Olin, 2014; Omeje, 2013; Shade, 2015) mention that how in post neoliberal state, resource extractive industry in global south is becoming more aggressive and face minimal opposition. It also deals with how state nexus with extractive industries helps them to employ ploys and tactics in the everyday life of the Ho Adivasi (a dominant community of the west Singhbhum) that raised questions whether development is for the wellbeing of the community or it is for the capital centric growth, where environment and issues of Adivasi have been ignored. How extractive sites became a key site of conflict, debate and negotiation and how State and other extractive players deal these issues differently. Mining in West Singhbhum also has divided people into for and against of the mining that increasingly is causing clashes and degraded the organic structure of the Adivasi society. At discourse level, both groups

advocate for nature and environment, but the increasing resistance needs more exploration because in West Singhbhum there has been a number of disputes and resistance is going on against the developmental project of State. As a matter of fact, the increasing disputes between the State and mining companies with local people is also a dispute related to the way's development project is implemented, whilst ignoring the local Adivasi issues of livelihoods and justice.

Despite calls to define post neoliberalism as anti-neoliberalism (Sader, 2009), one has to face many difficulties to understand the politics and policies by using the binary of neoliberalism and post neoliberalism. In Jharkhand all successive governments claimed that they are the true representatives of the Adivasi. Celebrating the 'Jharkhand Momentum' in 2017 as Gujarat has celebrated 'vibrant Gujarat' for inviting industrialists to invest in State, Chief minister's tour of foreign countries to attract Foreign investment is one aspect, and the other aspect is recognizing the customary institutions, celebration of Adivasi diwas, sharing the sympathetic views on Adivasi impoverishment and destitution, giving recognition to the Adivasi leaders who fought against the British and colonial state, shows the complexities of State character. State's control over 'cultural signs' (Chomsky, Meyer, & Maldonado, 2010) is a post neoliberal character of State. As an ideology, neoliberalism is implemented and contested in policy and practice. Jharkhand is a particularly interesting point to study how neoliberal development as process and activity deals with the local ecology. Jharkhand once formed on a promise of new ethno kind of development paradigm which will be away from the growth centric model but development projects and environmental policies cannot be easily separated. State development as project and activity has been shaping local environment and ecosystem that induced change. State's continuing promotion of establishment of extractive factories to extract natural resources surround the commodity boom transforms the harmonious place of Hos into a conflict zone. The class-based struggle over the control and access of natural resource and distribution of rents is predominant in these areas which also illustrates the ways state engages, negotiates and manages the ecology to promote commodity boom. As mentioned in earlier discussion, looking to resistance and protest against the State is vital element for understanding the State development projects.

Conclusion

This article has reviewed how the State employed different representation of development that reproduced the cultural slot of indigeneity. It shows how development as a discourse and projects is a kind of governmentality that authorizes the State to define development on the basis of a projected desirable society. Thus, development as a vision shows that as a process it takes account of the constant growth and desirable improvement, modernisation, control and resource exploitation which also facilitated migration, dispossession and marginalisation. It is mainly concerned with the capital centric growth and linear progress model. Colonial State also sought to civilize the unruly Ho through the colonial modernization scheme which enhanced colonial state formation. Whereas Post-Colonial State has treated development in a 'vernacular form of vikas' which is based on two interrelated processes: one is related to the immediate use of the natural resources and the other is to transform the people and communities against their 'will', into a hegemonised, dispossessed class.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. (2001). Culture and economic development in south Asia. *The American Academy of Political and Social Science (AAPSS)*, 573, 152–176.
- Althusser, L. (1971). *Lenin and philosophy and other essays*. London: New Left Books.
- Amin, S. (1976). *Unequal development*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Amsden, A. (2000). Comment: Good bye dependency theory, hello dependency theory. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 38(1), 32–38.
- Apffel-Marglin, F., & Marglin, S. (Eds.). (1990). *Dominating knowledge, development, culture and resistance*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Appadurai, A. (1988). *The social life of things: Commodities in cultural perspective*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Baran, P. A. (1957). *The Political economy of growth*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Bardhan, P. (2011). Industrialization and the land acquisition conundrum. *Development Outreach*, 13(1), 54–57.
- Baviskar, A. (1997). In the belly of the river: Tribal conflicts over development in the narmada valley. Retrieved from <https://books.google.com/books?id=R6uwQgAACAAJ&pgis=1>
- Bebbington, A. (2000). Recountering development: Livelihood transitions and place transformations in the andes. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 90(3), 495–520.
- Bebbington, A. (2010). Extractive industries and stunned state: Conflict responsibility and institutional change in the Andes. *Comparative Critique Palgrave Macmillan*, 97–116.
- Bebbington, A. (2011). An Andean avatar: Post-neoliberal and neoliberal strategies for securing the unobtainable. *New Political Economy*, 16(1), 131–145.
- Bhaduri, A. (2016). *Malignant growth*. New Delhi: Aakar Publication.
- Blaikie, P. M., & Brookfield, H. (1987). *Land degradation and society*. Retrieved from https://books.google.co.in/books/about/Land_Degradation_and_Society.html?id=oxY0AAAAQAAJ&pgis=1
- Brookfield, H. C. (1975). *Interdependent development*. London: Methuen.
- Bryant, R. L. (2004). Putting politics first: the political ecology of sustainable development. *Global Ecology and Biogeography Letters*, 1(6), 164–166.
- Bury, J. (2005). Mining mountains: neoliberalism, land tenure, livelihoods, and the new Peruvian mining industry in Cajamarca. *Environment and Planning A*, 37(2), 221–239. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a371>
- Castree, N. (1995). The nature of produced nature: Materiality and knowledge construction in marxism. *Antipode*, 27(1), 12–48.
- Castree, N. (2008). Neoliberalising nature: Processes, effects, and evaluations. *Environment and Planning A*, 40(1), 153–173. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a3910078>
- Chakravorty, S. (2013). *The price of land acquisition, conflict, consequence*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Chambers, R. (2006). *Poverty unperceived: Traps, biases and agenda*. In IDS Working Paper. Sussex.
- Chibber, V. (2003). *Locked in place: State-building and late industrialization in India*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Chomsky, N., Meyer, L., & Maldonado, B. (2010). *New world of Indigenous resistance: Noam Chomsky and voices from North, South, and Central America*. San Francisco: City Lights Publishers.

- Corbridge, S. (1982). Interdependent development? Problems of aggregation and implementation in the Brandt Report. *Applied Geography*, 2, 253–265
- Corbridge, S. (1988). The ideology of tribal economy and society: Politics in the Jharkhand, 1950-1980. *Modern Asian Studies*, 22(1), 1–42.
- Corbridge, S. (1990). Post-Marxism and development studies: Beyond the impasse. *World Development*, 18(5), 623–639. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X\(90\)90014-O](https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(90)90014-O)
- Corbridge, S. (1993a). Marxisms, modernities, and moralities: development praxis and the claims of distant strangers. *Environment and Planning: Society and Space*, 11(1976), 449–472. <https://doi.org/10.1068/d11044>
- Corbridge, S. (1993b). Ousting Singbonga: the struggle for India's Jharkhand. In *Dalit Movements and the Meanings of Labour in India* (pp. 87–121). London: Oxford University Press.
- Cowen, M., & Shenton, R. W. (1996). *Doctrines of development*. London: Routledge.
- Crewe, E., & Axelby, R. (2013). *Anthropology and development: Culture, morality and politics in a globalised world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cuveller, J., Vlassenroot, K., & Olin, N. (2014). Resources, conflict and governance: A critical review. *Extractive Industries and Society*, 1(2), 340–345.
- Damodaran, V. (1997). Environment, ethnicity and history in Chotanagpur, India, 1850-1970. *Environment and History*, 3(3), 273–298. <https://doi.org/10.3197/09673409777955585>
- DasGupta, S. (2009). Accessing nature: Agrarian change, forest laws and their impact on an adivasi economy in colonial India. *Conservation and Society*, 7(4), 227. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0972-4923.65170>
- DasGupta, S. (2011). *Adivasis and the Raj: socio-economic transformation of the Hos*. Hyderabad: Orient Blackswan.
- Dwivedi, R. (2006). *Conflict and collective Action: The Sardar Sarovar Project in India*. Retrieved from <https://books.google.com/books?id=mlG7AAAAIAAJ&pgis=1>
- Elwin, V., & Hivale, S. (1944). *Songs of the Maikal Hills*. Bombay: Oxford University Press.
- Emmanuel, A. (1972). *Unequal Exchange: a study of the imperialism of trade*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Escobar, A. (1992). Imagining a post-development era? Critical thought, development and social movements. *Social Text*, 31/32, 20–56.
- Escobar, A. (1996). Construction nature: Elements for a post-structuralist political ecology. *Futures*, 28(4), 325–343.
- Escobar, A. (2011). *Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the Third World*. Retrieved from <https://books.google.com/books?id=Z887lsgjLuwC&pgis=1>
- Escobar, A. (2014). Imagining a post-development era? Critical thought, development and social movements. *Duke University Press*, (31/32), 20–56.
- Esteva, G. (1992). Development. In *The development dictionary: A guide to knowledge as power* (pp. 6–25). London: Zed Books Ltd.
- Evans, P. (1995). *Embedded autonomy: States and industrial transformation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *Security, Territory, Population*. Basingstoke, Hants: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ferguson, J. (1994). The Anti-politics machine: Development and bureaucratic power in Lesotho. *The Ecologists*, 24(5), 176–181.
- Foster-Carter, A. (1976). From Rostow to Gunder Frank: Conflicting paradigms in the analysis of underdevelopment. *World Development*, 4(3), 167–180.

- Frank, A. G. (1977). On so-called primitive accumulation. *Dialectical Anthropology*, 2(1), 87–106. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00249476>
- Frank, A. G. (1978). Development of underdevelopment or underdevelopment of development in China. *Modern China*, 4(3), 341–350.
- Gordon, C. (1991). Governmental rationality: An introduction. In *the Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality* (pp. 1-53). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press <https://laelectrodomestica.files.wordpress.com/2014/07/the-foucault-effect-studies-in-governmentality.pdf>
- Grove, R. (1990). Colonial conservation, ecological hegemony and popular resistance: Towards a global synthesis. In J. MacKenzie (Ed.), *Imperialism and the natural world* (pp. 15–50). Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Haraway, D. (2013). *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The reinvention of nature*. London: Routledge.
- Harriss-White, B. (1997). Informal economic order, shadow states, private status states, states of last resort and spinning states: A speculative discussion based on South Asian. In Queen Elizabeth House, Working Paper Series, Retrieved from <http://www.cs.odu.edu/~dlibug/ups/rdf/remo/qeh/qehwps/qehwsp06.pdf>
- Harvey, D. (2014). *Seventeen contradictions and the end of capitalism*. London: Oxford university press
- Heller, P. (1996). Social capital as a product of class mobilization and state intervention: Industrial workers in Kerala, India. *World Development*, 24(6), 1055–1071.
- Hoben, A. (1995). Paradigms and Politic: The cultural construction of environmental policy in Ethiopia. *World Development*, 23(6), 1007–1021.
- Ioris, A. A. R. (2015). *The Political ecology of the state: The basis and the evolution of the environmental statehood*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Jessop, B. (2009). Redesigning the state, reorienting state power, and rethinking the state. In J. Jenkins & K. Leicht (Eds.), *Handbook of politics: State and society in global Perspective* (pp. 41–61). New York: Springer.
- Jessop, B. (2016). *The state: Past, present, future*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Kaltwasser, R. C. (2011). Toward post neoliberalism in Latin America. *Latin American Research Review*, 46(2), 225–234.
- Karlsson, B. G. (2004). *Beyond integration: Indigenous assertion in India*.
- Kohli, A. (2004). *State-directed development: Political power and industrialization in the global Periphery*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kothari, R. (1990). *State against democracy: In Search of human governance*. New Delhi: Aspect publication limited.
- Kumar, D., & Mishra, N. R. (2017). Observing developmental intervention in mineral-rich adivasi subsistence economy: An ethnographic account from West Singhbhum (Jharkhand). *Contemporary Voice of Dalit*, 9(1), 73–86.
- Kumar, D., & Puthumattathil, A. (2018). A critique of development in India's predominantly adivasi regions with special reference to the Hos of India's Jharkhand. *Contemporary Voice of Dalit*, 10(1), 10–27.
- Kuper, A. (2005). *The reinvention of primitive society: Transformations of a myth*. London: Routledge.
- Laski, H. J. (2010). *A grammar of politics: Works of Harold J. Laski*. London: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Lemke, T. (2010). Foucault, governmentality, and critique. *Rethinking marxism: A Journal of Economics, Culture & Society*, 14(3), 49–64.

- Lerner, D. (1958). *The passing of traditional society: Modernizing the Middle East*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Li, T. M. (2000). Articulating indigenous identity in Indonesia: Resource politics and tribal slot. In *Berkeley Workshop on Environmental Politics*.
- Mildavin, J. S. S. (2007). The politics of transition: Critical political ecology, classical economics, and ecological modernization theory In China. In J. Robinson & K. R. Cox (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Political Geography* (pp. 247–262). London: Sage Publications.
- Nandy, A. (2002). *The romance of the state and the fate of dissent in the tropic*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Nandy, A., & Visvanathan, S. (1990). Modern medicine and its non-modern critics. In F. A. Marglin & S. A. Margin (Eds.), *Dominating Knowledge: Development, Culture, and Resistance* (pp. 145–184). London: Oxford University Press.
- Omeje, K. (2013). Extractive economies and conflicts in the global South: Multi-regional Perspectives on rentier politics. Retrieved from https://books.google.com/books?id=_IKUXro-4wsC&pgis=1
- Padel, F. (2016). In the name of sustainable development: Genocide masked as tribal Development. In *First Citizen: Studies on Adivasis, tribals and indigenous peoples in India* (pp. 159–178). New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Padel, F., Dandekar, A., & Unni, J. (2013). *Ecology, economy: Quest for a socially informed Connection*. Retrieved from <https://books.google.com/books?id=hqqioAEACAAJ&pgis=1>
- Parajuli, P. (1996). Ecological ethnicity in the making: Developmentalist hegemonies and emergent identities in India. *Identities*, 3(1–2), 14–59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.1996.9962551>
- Parsons, T. (1991). *The Social system*. London: Routledge.
- Pati, B. (2011). *Adivasis in colonial India: Survival, resistance and negotiation*. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan.
- Peet, R., & Hartwick, E. (2009). *Theories of Development: Contention, Arguments, Alternatives*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Peet, R., & Watts, M. (2004). *Liberation Ecologies: Environment, development and social movements*. Retrieved from <https://books.google.com/books?id=lgSdlm7XExQC&pgis=1>
- Peet, R., & Watts, M. (2016). Introduction: Development theory and environment in an age of market triumphalism. *Economic Geography*, 69(3), 227–253.
- Pieterse, J. N. (2000). After post development. *Third World Quarterly*, 21(2), 175–191.
- Rangan, H. (1997). Indian environmentalism and the question of the State: Problems and prospects for sustainable developmen. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 29(12), 2129–2143.
- Robbins, P. (2012). *Political Ecology A Critical Introduction* (2nd ed.). Retrieved from <http://books.google.com/books?id=NixJcZnSsv8C&pgis=1>
- Rostow, W. W. (1991). *The stages of economic growth: A non-communist manifesto*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rudolph, L. I., & Rudolph, S. H. (1987). *In Pursuit of Lakshmi: The political economy of the Indian State*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rycroft, D. J., & Dasgupta, S. (Eds.). (2011). *The politics of belonging in India: Becoming Adivasi*. London: Routledge.
- Sachs, W. (Ed.). (2010). *The Development Dictionary: A guide to knowledge as power*.

- New York: Zed Books Ltd.
- Sader, E. (2009). Postneoliberalism in Latin America. *Development Dialogue*, 51(1), 171–179.
- Sanyal, K. (2007). *Rethinking capitalist development: Primitive accumulation, governmentality and post-colonial capitalism*. London: Routledge.
- Scott, J. (1998). *Seeing Like a State: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as Freedom*. Retrieved from <https://books.google.com/books?id=NQs75PEa618C&pgis=1>
- Sen, A. K. (2011). *Representing Tribe: The Ho of Singhbhum Under Colonial Rule*. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company.
- Shade, L. (2015). Sustainable development or sacrifice zone? Politics below the surface in post-neoliberal Ecuador. *The Extractive Industries and Society*, (AUGUST 2015). <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2015.07.004>
- Sharan, R. (2009). Alienation and restoration of Tribal land in Jharkhand. In N. Sundar (Ed.), *Legal Grounds: Natural resources, identity, and the law in Jharkhand* (pp. 82–112). New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Singh, K. S. (2002). *Birsa Munda and his movement: A study of millenarian movement, 1874-1901*. Calcutta: Seagull Books.
- Smelser, N. J. (2013). *Essays in sociological explanation*. Retrieved from <https://books.google.com/books?id=hAEWt9L7uF4C&pgis=1>
- Srivastava, V. K. (2008). Concept of 'Tribe' in the Draft National Tribal Policy. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 43, 29–35.
- Streumer, P. (2016). *A Land of Their Own: Samuel Richard Tickell and the Formation of the Autonomous Ho Country in Jharkhand 1818-1942*. Houten, the Netherlands: Wakkaman.
- Sundar, N. (2005). Custom and Democracy in Jharkhand. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 40(41), 4430–4434.
- Sundar, N. (2009a). Framing the political imagination: Custom, democracy, and citizenship. In N. Sundar (Ed.), *Legal Grounds: Natural resources, identity, and the law in Jharkhand* (pp. 189–216). New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Sundar, N. (2009b). Law, policies and practices in Jharkhand. In N. Sundar (Ed.), *Legal Grounds: Natural resources, identity, and the law in Jharkhand* (pp. 1–29). New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Thomas, A. (2000). Introduction. In T. Allen & A. Thomas (Eds.), *Poverty and Development in the 1990s* (pp. 1–9). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Upadhyay, C. (2009). Law, custom and Adivasi identity: Politics of land rights in Chotanagpur. In N. Sundar (Ed.), *Legal Grounds: Natural resources, identity, and the law in Jharkhand* (pp. 30–55). New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Vandergeest, P., & Peluso, N. L. (1995). Territorialization and state power in Thailand. *Theory and Society*, 24(3), 385–426.
- Wallerstein, I. (1974). Dependence in an interdependent world: The limited possibilities of transformation within the capitalist world economy. *African Studies Review*, 17(1), 1–26.