

Anjana Singh

Globalisation, Environmentally Non-sustainable Growth and the Plight of the *Adivasis* of India

In this article the attempt will be to analyse the long-term and current challenges of the *adivasis*. The problem is twofold: on the one hand economic development is a necessity for India; on the other hand the attitude of the Indian government towards the *adivasis* in an increasingly connected and competitive world, ignores the minorities. Poorer countries must transition from traditional to modern economies to alleviate poverty. The processes of modernization and globalization need to be analysed critically, though.

Introduction

We are entering the age of Anthropocene (anthropo, for “man,” and cene, for “new”). An age wherein human-kind has caused mass extinctions of plant and animal species, polluted the oceans and altered the atmosphere, among other lasting impacts.¹ If we go long back in time, say two million years ago and study the evolutionary history of humans, we learn that our ancestors came either out of Africa or Asia.² Yet, in early modern times (roughly between 1450s and 1800s), a Euro-centric view of the world labelled certain people as “indigenous”. The word squarely means “existing naturally or having always lived in a place; native”.³ When used for plants and animals, it is apt, but when the adjective is applied to people, it starts to become problematic. The reason for this is that “indigenous” people who are often also called “primitive”, “native” or “tribal” have been at the receiving end of prejudice and exploitation. Whether they are the aborigines of Australia, the Amerindians of America or the *Adivasis* of India, in the past centuries, the word “native” has been used in derogatory ways to describe these communities. Is globalisation

the cause behind the plight of indigenous people throughout the world?

In India, the word *adivasi* is Hindi for “original or old inhabitants”. Hindi is one of the major languages spoken in India. *Adi* means the beginning, old or ancient and *vasi(s)* refers to resident(s). At the time of the drafting and adoption of the Indian Constitution, between 1947 and 1950, people belonging to certain communities and living a particular way of life were accorded a special status, official name and legal designation: Scheduled Tribes (STs).⁴ This collective legal identity would ensure that people belonging to this group would have special rights and receive a special status in order to improve their social and economic condition. At least, these were the declared noble aims of the nation’s founding fathers. Adivasis inhabit various parts of the Indian sub-continent. In the updated list of STs currently recognised by the Government of India, there are 622 “tribal” communities.⁵ They live throughout the Republic of India in different States and Union Territories. Their total population is estimated to be about eighty-four million.⁶ About seventy million live in Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Gujarat, Rajasthan, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, West Bengal and Odisha (formerly Orissa).⁷ About fourteen million live in north-east India in Arunachal Pradesh, Mizoram and Nagaland. They are a heterogeneous group with distinct cultures, languages and histories, spread throughout the subcontinent and islands of Lakshadweep, Andaman and Nicobar. They mostly inhabit hilly areas, perhaps because over the years they have been driven away from the fertile plains. They have undergone extreme changes in their way of life and rights that they traditionally considered natural. Growth in population, so called development works like road-building, damming of rivers, mining, industrialization and urbanisation has forced them out of their land and territories. This has forced them to change their way of life and abandon their rights on the forests.

For centuries, adivasis have lived in resource-rich regions, depending on forest produce for their livelihood. Their food gathering method ensured a high level of food security for their community. In-built cultural restraints ensured that their methods were sustainable, safeguarding against extracting too much from their environment. Unique and orally passed traditions and ideas have helped them sustain themselves through the centuries. Unwritten codes of conduct ensures environmentally sustainable living. Useful and reliable knowledge about nature enables them to live in harmony with nature. Adivasi culture does not see nature as just matter, but always as a matter of spirit. In the last few decades, rapid invasions and dispossessions of adivasi

lands and forests by machineries of State, mining corporations and companies have seriously destabilized their food security and way of life. While once they lived in harmony with nature, the majority now suffers from chronic malnutrition and suffer mental health problems due to extreme interventions into their living areas. They are being dispossessed of their traditional lands and living areas as these forests and mountain regions are rich in minerals and are heavily demanded by the world's mining companies and traders of ore, minerals and metals.⁸

Seventy years since India's independence, the plight of the adivasis remains marginalised and severely exploited. They have no voice on matters concerning their lands, milieu and their future. Is this pressure on the adivasis caused by local Indian capitalistic developments, or are they being created by multinational corporations generated by a process of globalisation?

The People: Historical and Current Circumstances

The histories of the adivasis have largely been neglected in the last seven decades. What generally goes around – emerging from colonial historiography – is that about three thousand years ago there was a wave of people (referred to as Aryans) migrated into the lands east of the River Indus. These newcomers displaced the “original inhabitants” and settled in the Indo-Gangetic plains, pushing the adivasis up-hill. The term adivasi came into being in the twentieth century and refers to a non-homogeneous spectrum of communities who do not necessarily conform to the majority. In intellectual, spiritual, cultural, philosophical and religious thought, they differ from the rest. This heritage is in danger of being extinguished. Processes like urbanisation, bureaucratisation, institution- and state building impede the adivasi way of life.

With the establishment of interventionist and exploitative British colonialism, the adivasis lost their secluded condition which they had perhaps preferred and chosen. Previously they lived independently by means of subsistence seasonal-farming, animal taming, hunting and gathering. They used barter-systems and practiced communal living. They lived in tax-free territories away from densely populated towns and cities. From the mid-eighteenth century onwards, inroads were made into their territories by tax seeking state officials, zealous Christian missionaries, profit-minded traders, land-grabbers, money-lenders and the like.

In 1757, after the Battle of Plassey, the English East India Company (EIC)

received the *diwani*, i.e, rights to collect taxes from the inhabitants of Bengal. The extraction from the adivasis during the so-called Company Rule is well documented. In order to expand their empire, maintain standing armies as well as maximise profits, the EIC levied heavy taxes. A community of people called Chauras, who were living in Jungle Mahal, north-western Midnapur joined the *Zamindars* (landed nobility) in revolts against the EIC. Similar revolts in the nineteenth century have been recorded by the Kols, Bhils and Mundas of the Chota Nagpur plateau region. Their main resentment was excessive taxation and the oppressive tactics used to exhort payment of it.

Some of the earliest recorded revolts or uprisings by the adivasis against pressures to conform to the mainstream were recorded during the late 1760s to the 1790s, when large parts of Bengal came under the rule of the EIC. During 1816 and 1818, the Kol Revolt took place in the Western Ghats. The Khond Revolt of 1835 and Manipuri, Khasia and Garo uprisings in the north-east after 1826 are similar and comparable chain of events. Although these revolts have been recorded, the oppression, torture, violence and death faced by the adivasis remain undocumented.

The history of the Santhals has to an extent been recorded but the narrative has been one of revolt and uprising. The Santhals lived in the semi-forest areas of Birbhum, Chota Nagpur and Palamu. To escape oppression, they were forced to move to the hill tracts of the Rajmahal Hills. In the mid-nineteenth century the Santhals of the eastern region stood up in mass uprisings against abuse and exploitation under the ploy of Company administration. Local powerful tax-collectors, greedy money-lenders, deceitful shopkeepers and British soldiers kidnapped their young children and looted their livestock. They were enslaved and forced to work without payment. The Santhal uprisings were characterised as peasant inobedience but in essence these were revolts of people from lower socioeconomic strata from many different professions – potters, blacksmiths, weavers, leather workers, cleaners, etc.– that joined forces against the exploitation and excessive taxation and against the newly emerging colonial state. These mid-nineteenth century movements were an immediate reaction to the Permanent Settlement of the EIC (1793). Historians are yet to write the histories of the adivasis in terms of the adivasis defending and fighting against colonial injustice.

Under British colonialism, the adivasis first lost their rights to the forests. In 1894, the British enacted the Land Acquisition Act. Using the principle of “eminent domain” they claimed the state’s right on any land including private property, which it wished to use for public purpose. With the Indian Forest

Act of 1927, the British used the legal principle of “*res nullius*” to bring under their control all lands to which people had no legal documentation to prove ownership. The adivasis with their community-based oral culture and having no concept of private property were declared illegal residents on “government property”. After independence these laws and acts have been continued and used indiscriminately to acquire land of the adivasis for development projects.

During the nineteenth century, their situation only worsened. Under a cloak of civilising, modernising and economic development, the traditional rights of the adivasis were encroached upon and their ways of living labelled primitive. British colonial administrators aiming to impose their idea of modernity on the adivasis, often through the agency of Christian missionaries, gathered intimate knowledge of the everyday living conditions and family structures of the adivasis. They were forced to undergo a process of change, for example from polygamy to monogamy. Their transformed interiority had to be discernable in their new mentality and settled living.⁹

After India’s independence, in the Constitution, as mentioned earlier, the adivasis were recognised but their mistreatment continued. Being a minority –except in a few north-east states– they are never really able to participate in the decision-making process. Both in the National as well as in the various State assemblies, nominal seats were reserved for their representation. In order to increase political representation and provide a state apparatus for grievance addressal, a special commission was set up for STs and Scheduled Castes (SCs) in the Indian Constitution. They publish annual reports on the condition and avenues for empowering adivasis.¹⁰ Also among their goals is reserving places in higher education and offering public sector jobs. However, as most adivasis are unable to finish their education at the school level, reaching the reserved seats in higher education, public sector or government jobs remains a far cry. Various State governments have also set up similar commissions to ensure that assistance accorded to them in terms of reservation of jobs is implemented. Yet the impact of these efforts has been negligible. These efforts remain notional and symbolic. In reality the adivasis often cannot avail of these as they live in remote areas in extreme poverty. They face social prejudices and exclusion.

In order to promote local self-governance, in the Nehruvian era a *Panchayat Raj* system was introduced throughout India. The idea was that a board of five people (mostly men; *panch* in Hindi means five; *raj* means rule) could assess and resolve local conflicts at the village level. Only when the complainant was not satisfied, could she approach the legal courts.

In 1996, the Panchayat Raj (Extension to the Scheduled Areas) Act was introduced, so that areas in which adivasis lived could also move toward self-governance. It was meant to assist adivasis in formulating responses to various local issues and to organise themselves at a local level by building local political institutions. In 1999 the Ministry of Tribal Affairs was established. Legislative empowerment in the form of the Forest Rights Act of 2005, which recognizes traditional rights of the people to the land, and the Panchayats' Extension to the Scheduled Areas Act of 2006, which recognizes their right to 'self-rule', have been put in place.¹¹ Yet, there has in fact been little positive impact in securing and improving the lives of the adivasis. The impact of these legislations are still to be reported and recorded.

On the contrary, the condition of the adivasis has further deteriorated. There is a clear continuity of their abuse, exploitation and intervention from earlier colonial structures of domination and now (since independence) by Indian development agencies propelled by the national and state governments. And therefore the adivasis continue to be driven to armed rebellion from time to time. In the next section, some of the distressing problems that the adivasis face have been considered.

The Problem: Environmental Degradation and Lack of Inclusive Sustainable Growth

The forests and hilly tracts of India are at the same time the richest and poorest parts of India, and in some cases the world. The adivasis, who inhabit this region, see abundance in the forests, streams and rivers. They have sustained themselves for centuries from the flora and the fauna without degrading the milieu. Outsiders saw wealth, first in timber and in the last few decades in the minerals and ores that lie beneath the forest and the hills. Poverty comes from modern methods of computation and standards of wealth: people who live on less than a dollar a day, are considered poor. The main challenge faced by the adivasis is the encroachment of their land and intervention from machineries of the State on their area and method of living. The State wants to use forest resources and bring about economic development in the region.

It may seem as if globalisation and Indian economic development have caused the problems of the adivasis but this is not the case. Globalisation and the economic benefits emanating from it lead to an insatiable hunger consumption in global markets. Multinational mining corporations have managed to gain access to the lands of the adivasis for mining purposes.

This has substantially contributed to the social and economic plight of the adivasis. They have been gradually displaced from their habitat and traditional lands. They are not seen as legal owners of the land. The central and State governments allow multinational mining companies to unleash highly environmentally degrading and polluting mining activities, that has deforested the natural homes of the adivasis. They have been forced to abandon their ways of living, social identity and are forced to migrate to other settled rural or semi-urban areas. The devastation is of a scale of cultural genocide. The people are robbed of their identity and forced to assimilate with other communities, languages, and cultural practices. Unable to cope with these radical changes many take to alcoholism and/or die of diseases previously unknown to them. The affected communities have little resources to fight against the harsh forces of change.

In the late 1980s the then Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi visited Odisha and flagged off what was hailed as development through mining and industrialization. Odisha is one of the poorest regions of India. The Prime Minister's trip was followed by the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and United Kingdom's Department for International Development (DFID) with their fundamentalist propaganda of increasing Odisha's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in order to reduce poverty. Thus, the mining-based development of Odisha started. The adivasis had no say in the process. Their needs, traditional land rights, etc. were totally ignored. Since the 1990s, the World Bank has been supporting this kind of interventionist approach.¹² The reasoning was that since Odisha is rich in minerals, mining and industrialization would lead to growth and poverty alleviation. This kind of capitalist theorizing dates back to the nineteenth century when attempts were made to explain the colonial process of appropriating land. Ironically, at that time too, the theorizing was done by another profit seeking company: the EIC.

The most serious problem that adversely affects the adivasis and many comparable communities globally, is the co-operative nature of nexus forming between global organizations like the World Bank, IFAD, DFID, various mining companies and national governments who are blind to the rights and security of the minorities.¹³ These organizations collude with the mining industries in pursuit of profit and power. Laws and governments—dictatorial and democratically elected—are managed through corruption so that people's resistance is violently crushed, legal systems fail and millions are brutally uprooted, displaced, silenced and killed. This scenario has become

clear through a detailed study of the history of bauxite mining and aluminum industry in Odisha.¹⁴

Odisha and Chhattisgarh are two mineral rich-areas of India. Odisha has one-fifth of India's iron ore, a quarter of its coal, a third of its manganese, half of its bauxite and almost all of its chromite. The extraction of these has increased manifold in the past five decades as different metals can be made from these rocks, ores and minerals. From Odisha and Chhattisgarh, bauxite is mined in large quantities. Bauxite is the main raw material for making aluminium. Aluminium, a light, bright and malleable material is widely used in the manufacturing of cars, boats, aircrafts and weapons, especially bombs. It is used in laptop computers, phones, aluminium-lined packaging (Tetra Pak) and a variety of other products that we use every day.¹⁵ It has a high global demand and as many more people escape poverty and can increasingly afford to pay for these commodities, new mines are being opened up, especially in India. The adivasis are being severely affected by the mining. They are losing their land and access to it. They are being forced to move out and make place for the mining multinationals. Places like Dantewada, Kalinganagar, Kashipur and Niyamgiri in Odisha and Chhattisgarh have witnessed bloody armed resistance of the adivasis and other local inhabitants against mining.

According to Padel and Das, the nexus of multilateral and bilateral financial institutions, global finance capital, the ruthless mining industry, corrupt or short-sighted governments, donor agencies and NGOs together form a successful and intricate quagmire that serves the mining lobby and the metal cartel. This malevolent joining of forces displaces the adivasis from their land. The adivasis of Odisha have been paying a very heavy price for this so-called development. Their book clearly takes the side of the adivasis. Its main aim is the voicing of the objective and subjective experiences of the adivasis. It critiques neo-liberal and dominant development paradigms. Padel and Das describe their understanding of the process at play as the world's "most dangerous fundamentalism" and "neo-liberal flat-earthism".¹⁶

The problem is that costs and benefits are appreciated differently by different parties. Costs for adivasis include loss of land, impoverishment, relocation etc., but on the other hand development economists and planners argue that moving from a communal society to a capitalistic mode wherein an individual based society is generally beneficial. This unleashes powerful changes that eventually lead to a substantial increase in welfare. Against the lack of environmental sustainability, the capitalists argue that actually the profit from the wealth of natural resources that these adivasis are "blocking"

could be used for improving their standards of living, although this may not be viable for the adivasis. In a capitalistic world, blocking access to natural resources reduces welfare development and if resources are depleted, new ones will be found.

Globalization is not the real problem. The Company-Government nexus based on a capitalist mode of economic growth that forced the liberalizing of the mining industry in India is. The bauxite-aluminium cartel functions among governments, banks and multinational corporations in order to prevent a “free-market” in raw material, minerals and ores. The aluminium industry is inextricably linked to EU and US based military-industry. It is nothing but corporate imperialism. Aided by neo-liberal regimes of so-called developing economies, the mining companies were invited in the name of foreign investment and development. In India they are heavily subsidised and marketed as creators of jobs in a globalising world. No doubt, the companies create jobs, transfer technologies and invest capital. These add to economic growth. Yet, this growth does not take into account the life and cultural practices of the adivasis. They are excluded from the process and removed from the scene forcefully. The environmental degradation and lack of inclusive sustainable growth means that the region is paying a very heavy price for this development which in the long run it is not sustainable at all.

In order to fend criticism about environmental degradation and pollution, DFID funded *Ekta Parishad*.¹⁷ Similarly, to avoid large scale criticism, some compensation and rehabilitation schemes have been launched by the Central and State governments. But these have had little positive impact. Adivasis traditionally “own” land communally, not individually. Land is also prescribed to ancestors and successors. The adivasis are faced with many more challenges. For example, the aforementioned introduction of the Scheduled Tribes (Recognition of Forest Rights) Act in 2005, recognised STs as legitimate stakeholders in the management of forests. Yet, the implementation of this Act in the community’s rights to collect forest produce, graze cattle, etc. continues to be violated as it often conflicts with the region’s development plans and mining contracts. When illegal mining and logging takes place, some police actions takes place but the culprits often escape by means of corruption. The adivasis, on the other hand, do not have access to this kind of social and economic capital, which ropes in police protection. They neither have the resources to bribe police to take action in their favour nor the social status to influence them.

There is a clash between two fundamentally different modes of thinking:

the adivasis' traditional lifestyle and the capitalist mode of developing into modern economies. The second does not take into account the impact of profit-maximisation on nature, environment and milieu. Environmental sustainability, in this mode, disappears as a guiding principle. Extinction of 'primitive forms of living' is seen as a requirement for economic development.

Thus, the problem is not globalisation but environmental degradation and lack of sustainable inclusive growth both on part of the state as well as the multinational companies. Adivasis could benefit from economic development if it would take into account their relation to their land and their other rights. While early modern economic nationalism in the form of mercantilism led to colonialism, today's nexus is leading us to Anthropocene. The irreversible impact of this process is already being felt by global warming and climate change, which lead to extreme weather conditions.

A Solution?

Having recognised the core problems of the adivasis being environmental degradation and lack of sustainable inclusive growth plans on the part of the central and state governments, let us consider some solutions. From the perspective of the adivasis, the legislations and various governmental and non-governmental organizations put in place and efforts to aid the adivasis, do not seem to be working in their favour. Examining the effects of perhaps well-intended development, it becomes clear that it has only been detrimental to the adivasis. On the contrary, these methods of regional development are a source of all the problems of the adivasis: dispossession of land, poverty, malnutrition, displacement and loss of livelihood and identity. In desperation, they are driven to picking up arms.

Conflict with the machineries of the state resulted in adivasis having been forced into organised rebellion and into arming themselves in order to have their voices heard and demands met. The institutional exploitation of centuries has met growing resistance, as stated earlier in the Santhal Rebellions of the 1850s. Post-independence armed resistance, first emanated from Bengal in the 1960s. Backed by left-wing student groups, known as 'Naxalities' (from the village Naxal in West Bengal) the people needed and wanted higher wages and payments. The movement spread to Bihar, Madhya Pradesh and Andhra Pradesh and sporadic incidents of violence, sometimes against police, forest guards etc. and at other times against land and factory owners took place. The adivasis were being victimised both by the police's

counter-insurgency steps, including random arrests and imprisonment, as well as the rebellious Naxals.¹⁸ Right-wing Hindu nationalists have joined the movement now, claiming that the adivasis are Hindus and need protection from Christian missionaries. Thus the adivasis suffer multiple tragedies: the state has treated its adivasi citizens with contempt and condescension and their presumed protectors, the Naxalites, offer no long-term solution. New right-wing Hindus claim them, further erasing their identity. Violence is definitely not the solution.

Since the 1980s, globalisation and the economic opportunities that it has brought about worldwide by integrating markets and making goods and services cheaper and therefore more widely accessible, has changed the lives of the adivasis too. In many ways these changes have been beneficial. New technologies for mass dissemination of information helps their voices reach more people. They can connect with the wider community of minorities all over the world and have access to information about their rights, privileges, laws ,etc. The internet offers a platform to complain and inform at a global scale, in anonymity. Nonetheless, it is a very small minority within a minority that has access to these technologies.

On 29th June, 2006 the United Nations (UN) Human Rights Council adopted the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.¹⁹ They recommended that the UN General Assembly also adopt it. This was partly a result of a wider move to provide a universal system of protecting indigenous rights that has been gaining global prominence since the 1980s. In the globalised world that we live in, local appropriation and experiences of global discourses can maintain a class system that further marginalises the poorest.²⁰

We need to acknowledge, emphasize and bring into mainstream discourse the ecological-cultural wisdom of the adivasis. We need to learn and accept their social systems, kinship, and environmental knowledge and understanding of the fragility of nature. We need to learn to value their pure simplicity of life expectations. We need to have new definitions for human progress and economic development; definitions that are inclusive of the adivasis. Only with this open-mindedness can we hope to diminish the self-destructive violence the adivasis have had to resort to and can we aspire for a shared future.

Ten years ago the Nobel Peace Prize for 2007 was shared by the IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) and Al Gore, environmentalist and former vice-president of the United States. The IPCC was founded in

1988 in New York by the United Nations General Assembly. The Nobel Award was for “their efforts to build up and disseminate greater knowledge about man-made climate change, and to lay the foundation for the measures that are needed to counteract such change.”²¹ Hopefully this awareness on environmental degradation and climate change will not be ignored and knowledge of the adivasis about nature and planet incorporated into our modern scientific knowledge systems. We need to learn from their attitudes towards nature which is far more sustainable and inclusive.

In terms of legal actions, earlier mentioned archaic laws rooted in colonial times and thoughts, need to be repealed. Legalisation on oral claims and recognition of communal ancestral ownership needs to be undertaken. The territories of the adivasis need to be protected from the multinational mining corporations and their rights to mine should be revoked. Subsidies offered to the multinational companies must be withdrawn.

With the creation of three new states—Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh and Uttarakhand—it may seem as if adivasis are gaining autonomy, and are acquiring possibilities to organise themselves politically and charter their own path of development and resource allocation. However, nepotism, corruption and lack of inclusive planning cause the adivasis to remain fragmented and exploited. Within the community sections have emerged who are educated, professional and now part of the state apparatus and those surviving in extreme poverty. Thus increasing their political representation has at least, to an extent, decentralised the decision making process and provided some platforms for the minorities to exert political influence.

Globalisation is the process by which our world is becoming increasingly interconnected as a result of massively increased trade and cultural exchange. Although it has been taking place for hundreds of years, there has been a substantial increase in the production of goods and services, and movement of goods and people. In the last half-century, the process has speeded up manifold. We live in a huge global economy with integrated markets. Globalisation has led to increased international trade, multinational companies and an increased dependence on the global economy. Although the process increasingly creates more wealth (both in so-called developed and developing countries), it has not helped in closing the gap between the world's poorest and richest countries. At an individual level, globalization is a state of being many of us are forced into, including the adivasis.

Conclusion

In this article the attempt has been to analyse the long-term and current challenges of the adivasis. The problem is twofold: on the one hand economic development is a necessity for a poverty prone country like India; on the other hand the attitude of the Indian government towards the adivasis in an increasingly connected and competitive world, ignores the minorities. Poorer countries must transition from traditional to modern economies. This is vital for poverty alleviation. The process of modernising needs to be analysed critically.

Developed modern economies pressurise local and national governments of developing countries to increase the speed and profundity with which the transition to modern economies must take place. International pressure and greed of rapid economic development on western model meant that the rights and needs of the minorities become overshadowed. NGOs attempting to assist and protect the indigenous communities are after all only able to empower the victims of economic transition to enable them to survive in a capitalistic world.

In the last two decades transnational connections among indigenous people and concerns regarding their rights, development etc. has led to several debates. I have tried to analyse the pros and cons of the globalization process, keeping the adivasis central. It is not an objective assessment but one that strongly favours the adivasi minorities against profit seeking and environment-damaging multinational giants and exploitative neo-liberal governments and their agencies. Critiquing capitalism, corporate-financing neo-liberals and the dominant development paradigm, I have defended globalisation as a social and economic process, which when implemented and managed, keeping in mind the needs, values and knowledge of the minorities as well, can lead to overall social and economic equality.

Notes

1. <http://www.smithsonianmag.com/science-nature/what-is-the-anthropocene-and-are-we-in-it-164801414/> accessed on 14-06-2017.
2. <http://www.nature.com/news/how-china-is-rewriting-the-book-on-human-origins-1.20231> accessed on 13-05-2017.
3. <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/indigenous> accessed on 13-5-2017.
4. A more appropriate terminology for “tribe” would be communities; because it is in

the context of India a legal term, where necessary, I have had to use it. Similar to STs is the concept of Schedules Areas wherein certain regions of India, due to their biodiversity and the fact that STs live there, are earmarked.

5. Information from Ministry of Tribal Affairs, Government of India website: <http://tribal.nic.in/Content/StatewiseListofScheduledTribesProfiles.aspx> PDF with state-wise list of STs is available at: <http://tribal.nic.in/WriteReadData/CMS/Documents/201212010250456513671File939.pdf> referred to on 20-03-2017.
6. The census record of 2011: data from the Office of the Registrar General & Census Commissioner, India, Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India: <http://censusindia.gov.in/> referred to on 20-03-2017.
7. Minority Rights Group International's World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples: <http://minorityrights.org/minorities/adivasis-2/> accessed on 27-03-2017.
8. Felix Padel, "How Best to Ensure 'Adivasis' Land, Forest and Mineral Rights?" in *IDS Bulletin*, vol. 43, 2012: pp. 49-57.
9. Marine Carrin and Harald Tambs-Lyche, *An Encounter of Peripheries; Santals, Missionaries, and Their Changing Worlds, 1867-1900* (New Delhi, Manohar, 2008).
10. National Commission for Scheduled Castes, Government of India, <http://ncsc.nic.in/> accessed on 18-02-2017.
11. <http://tribal.nic.in/> and <http://tribal.nic.in/Content/ForestRightActNewLink13102016.aspx> accessed 18-05-2017.
12. Report No. 39878-IN World Bank. 2007. *Towards Sustainable Mineral-Intensive Growth in Orissa: Managing Environmental and Social Impacts*. Washington, DC. © World Bank. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/7657> License: CC BY 3.0 IGO." Accessed on 22-05-2017.
13. To name a few, aluminium giants like Alcan, Alcoa, Kaiser, Rio Tinto and Vedanta functioning in Australia, Brazil, Chile, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Jamaica, Sierra Leone, Surinam, the United States and United Kingdom. The poor countries are rich in bauxite and the rich nations are home to the multinational mining companies.
14. Felix Padel and Samarendra Das, *Out of This Earth: East India Adivasis and the Aluminium Cartel* (New Delhi: Orient BlackSwan, 2010).
15. Padel and Das, *Out of This Earth*, passim.
16. Padel and Das, *Out of This Earth*, passim.
17. Other examples of Janus faced philanthropy are: Alcoa's funding of World Wide Fund (WWF) and Sterlite's funding of Action Aid. C.R. Bijoy, Review of Padel and Das, *Out of This Earth* in *Dialectical Anthropology*, vol. 35, no. 3 (September 2011), pp. 373-375. Ekta Parishad is a Hindi name, literally in English it means "united council". For more details see: <http://www.ektaparishad.com/en-us/about/history.aspx>
18. Ramachandra Guha, "Adivasis, Naxalites and Indian Democracy." *Economic and Political Weekly* 42, no. 32 (2007): 305-312. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4419895>. Accessed on 22-05-2017.
19. The Declaration, is not binding, but functions as an internationally sanctioned legal instrument aiming to advance the codification of indigenous rights in national constitutions and legal systems. It was preceded by the formation of the UN Working Group on Indigenous Populations (WGIP) in 1982, a Permanent Forum on Indigenous

Issues in 2000, and the 2001 appointment of a UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights and Fundamental Freedoms of Indigenous People.

20. Alpa Shah, "The Dark Side of Indigeneity?: Indigenous People, Rights and Development in India" in *History Compass*, Vol 5, Issue 6, pages 1806–1832, November 2007; DOI: 10.1111/j.1478-0542.2007.00471.x Accessed on 18-05-2017.
21. http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/2007/ipcc-facts.html Accessed on 20-03-2017.