

**INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW
MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES**
[ISSN 2581-5369]

Volume 6 | Issue 3

2023

© 2023 International Journal of Law Management & Humanities

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.ijlmh.com/>

Under the aegis of VidhiAagaz – Inking Your Brain (<https://www.vidhiaagaz.com/>)

This article is brought to you for “free” and “open access” by the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities at VidhiAagaz. It has been accepted for inclusion in the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities after due review.

In case of **any suggestions or complaints**, kindly contact Gyan@vidhiaagaz.com.

To submit your Manuscript for Publication in the **International Journal of Law Management & Humanities**, kindly email your Manuscript to submission@ijlmh.com.

Representation of Jharkhand Movement in India

DR. PRAKASH HARSHWARDHAN¹

ABSTRACT

Jharkhand movement in India has golden specie in the books of Indian history. The adverse effects of Jharkhand movement has been seen in multiple social issues and seating. Subsequently, this movement brought the numerous challenges for indigenous people, in pursuance to same, the present study was intended to explore the agricultural policies and property right in consonance to Jharkhand movement. Keeping the evidence of secondary sources under consideration the researcher found that migration policy itself, as well as in the substantive issues that migration affected: property rights, forest policy, agricultural policy and industrial policy. Each of these specific policy areas was very much resource-based. Each generated contests over defining 'economic and social resources' as well as contests over distribution over those resources. Each divided ethno-national groups as well as forged coalitions among members of different ethno-national groups. Besides, it was found that Third, the state government's consistent approach to the region focused more on migration (as a means of diffusing potential social conflict in northern Bihar) than on promoting good economic or social conditions in the Jharkhand area. This was true in migration policy itself, as well as in the substantive issues that migration affected: property rights, forest policy, agricultural policy and industrial policy. Each of these specific policy areas was very much resource-based. Each generated contests over defining 'economic and social resources' as well as contests over distribution over those resources. Each divided ethno-national groups as well as forged coalitions among members of different ethno-national groups.

Keywords: *Jharkhand movement, Agricultural policies, Property rights.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Although Indian's Jharkhand movement exists classification as an ethnic or on environmental movement. It has mobilised in different stages and has frequently emerged as violent. The land alienation, forest right and property rights were the burning issued of Jharkhand movement. Many studies in Jharkhand were conducted mostly during the British period. However, a few references of the region are also found in literature before the Britishers came to India. The

¹ Author is a Teacher at Middle School, Kishanpur, Chatra, Jharkhand, India.

region acquired greater importance after independence due to the political movement for separate statehood under the Indian Union. Even a memorandum was submitted to the State Reorganization Committee (SRC) in 1953. But the demand was put aside by the commission and the movement also slackened. With the implementation of Jharkhand Area Autonomous Council (JAAC) in 1995, it has again risen and a number of scholars have started contributing to the literature on Jharkhand. Tribal, being among the backward section of the society attracted the attention of policy makers, planners and social scientists. Socio-economic data for tribal groups was generated by Census of India and other Government agencies. All these factors led to an increase in tribal studies of India and Jharkhand is no exception in this regard. The published material in tribal are in the form of administrative reports like District Gazetteers or the articles which were based on material collected from secondary sources. The geographical studies on the issue of Jharkhand movement are a few. However literature written by Sociologist, Anthropologist, Political Scientists, Administrators, Economists and even Journalists are extensively available. To understand and analyse the socio-political movements among the tribes of India it is appropriate first to discuss the definitions and types of such movements. Almost two centuries ago, Mundas took up arms against the local landlords and the British administration. The leader was Binsu Manki. The reason of discontent is transfer of Jharkhand to East India Company in 1771. The movement confined to Bundu area of Ranchi district. With limited influence, this movement was subjugated but it gave enough recognition to Britishers. Within a short span of time other movements arose in other part of region like Bhumiji Revolt of Manbhum (1798-99); Chero uprising of Palamu (1800) under the leadership of Bhukan Singh, and two uprising of Munda in Tamar region during 1807 and 1819-20 under the leadership of Dukan Mank and Bundu and Konta. Not many references are found on these movements due to their localization. Kol insurrection, under the leadership of Singhhray and Binray Manki during 1830-33, was considered as the earliest rebellion with more influence and effect. The Munda tribes took up other tribes like Oraon and Hos by which lot of area came under the contact. Even this was the first united rebellion against the “outsider” in the region. The main uprising which has made an impact on the tribal as well as non-tribal population was Santhal Rebellion during 1855-57. The leader was Sidhu and Kanu. They rebelled against the landlords who exploited them for many years. This has opened the eyes of Britishers who’s Contractors and Zamindars were employed to collect tax from the local people. This movement got momentum due to mass support. But soon the Britishers with their power subjugated the movement. While Santhal’s were on fire, another tribal group, Mundas again geared up their movement under the leadership of Birsa Munda during 1896-1901. He was versatile and

efficient in taking whole tribal people in unidirectional. His main idea was to reintroduce tribal religion and opposing the Christianity. But since, the movement did not get a mass support due to anti-Christian attitude it suffered a setback with the arrest of Birsa Munda in 1901. This early uprising among the different tribal groups does help in learning lot of lessons. It was further rectified in their political movement after independence. There are many reasons for the tribal unrest in this region. It can be categorized into four basic issues viz. Land and forest Alienation, Training and Job Deprivation, Cultural submergence has unbalance development. It appeal to the non-tribal it was essentially a tribal pacify. The region had always been exposed to the operation of pan-Indian forces.

(A) Identification of research gap

The Jharkhand movement issues have been explored in by number of the national and international researchers. Various researcher studies are conducted by; Anonymous (1971), Anonymous (1994), Areeparampil, M. (1991), Areeparampil, M. (1992), Baviskar, A. (1994), Chandrakanth, M.G. and J. Romm (1991), Corbridge, S. (2000), Gautam, M.K. (1973), Guha, R. (1983), Icke-Schwalbe, L. (1974), Jha, S. (1990), Kulkarni, S. (1982), Lal, B. (1979), Mahapatra, S. (1986), Mandal, B.B. (1975), Mullick, S.B. (1991), Poffenberger, M. and B. McGean (1996), Prasad, S. (1972), Saez, L. (1999), Saha, S.K. (1996), Sengupta, N. (1980), Singh, K.S. (1987), Sivaramakrishnan, K. (1987) and Stuligross, D. (2001) However, limited research studies have been carried in context of the composite representation of Jharkhand movement. Accordingly, the investigator located the research gap and explored the below mentioned research study:

(B) Research problem

The statement of the problem under exploration is reported as under:

(C) Purpose behind study

The purpose of the study was to explore the impact of Jharkhand movement on property rights of people. Further, this study was intended to examine the role of Jharkhand movement in agricultural policies.

(D) Methodology

The existing study was carried in context of Historical research. So trend analysis was used for generalising the results.

- a. **Data collection:** The researcher has collected the secondary data for generalising the results of this study.

II. REPRESENTATION OF JHARKHAND MOVEMENT IN INDIA

(A) Grievances and the rise of the Jharkhand movement:

Migration and limited integration of the Jharkhand region with India's broader economic system generated a persistent set of grievances. Sectorial and sub-regional analyses often point towards economic transformation as a source of a variety of specific grievances. However, such grievances were overwhelmed by a common political, positional relationship between all Jharkhand is and their state government. All Jharkhandi groupings were weaker than their northern Bihari counterparts. Not only did each Jharkhandi subgroup fail to be meaningfully integrated into the new economy, but tribe's people also were effectively – and commonly – dislocated from their traditional economic and social institutions. This sounds ethnic, and it is, with three caveats. First, not all tribe's people lamented this loss. Modernisation is partly about individuals choosing which economic and social communities they will associate with; whichever the choice, the non-chosen community might offer punishments and inducements to change one's mind. Second, 'traditional economic and social institutions' were ethnically heterogeneous, and became more so during the twentieth century. More than 75% of the migrants who entered Jharkhand seeking urban or mining employment found none there, were absorbed in Jharkhandi villages, and were similarly affected by governmental policies hindering the village economy. Third, the state government's consistent approach to the region focused more on migration (as a means of diffusing potential social conflict in northern Bihar) than on promoting good economic or social conditions in the Jharkhand area. This was true in migration policy itself, as well as in the substantive issues that migration affected: property rights, forest policy, agricultural policy and industrial policy. Each of these specific policy areas was very much resource-based. Each generated contests over defining 'economic and social resources' as well as contests over distribution over those resources. Each divided ethno-national groups as well as forged coalitions among members of different ethno-national groups.

- **Property rights:** The graph of the incessant conflict between the state and the people in Jharkhand on the issue of ownership and the usage of livelihood resources has once again shoot up in recent years. Consequently the governance of the state has entered into a critical phase. Resource alienation by both state and private parties has created social unrest, at a scale unprecedented in the post-independence period. People's struggle for survival exhibits two dimensions. The struggle without has as usually an impact on the struggle within. Thus, it can be said that the Mundari Khuntkati system of Ranchi is not the same as that of Singhbhum. In Ranchi the Khuntkattidars enjoy such rights as fixed

rent, rights in forests and waste. But in Singhbhum the rent could be enhanced and there are no khuntkatti rights over unreclaimed land. (Singh, 1985) Adivasis (not just the Scheduled Tribes) have walked a long way in their interaction with the colonial and Indian nation state. But they could not be integrated with the state system of either kind. Is it their fault or they have been systematically kept outside the state process by the builders of the state? This is a big question in-front of the democratic government. And it is essential to make specific policies for their development, so the present context of pathalgarhi kind of act can be stopped.

- **Agricultural polices:** The agricultural economy affects far more Jharkhandis than any other economic sector. By the late 1960s, the transformation from shifting to 'settled' agriculture was nearly complete. However, the transplant of plains-type agriculture to the mountainous Jharkhand landscape was far from smooth. Agriculture in Jharkhand is dependent on rainfall; large-scale irrigation is difficult and, with a few exceptions, has not even been attempted; as late as 1991, merely 12% of agricultural land was irrigated. Unlike northern Bihar, the Jharkhand region has not benefited from the green revolution. Although 67% of the population is involved in agricultural production only 27% of the land is cultivable. Agricultural population density is nearly as high in Jharkhand as it is in northern Bihar. Worse, because irrigation and fertiliser use is limited (the latter because of the former, 29 kg/hectare in Jharkhand, 87 kg/hectare in Bihar), productive value in Jharkhand is much lower than that in northern Bihar in both per capita and per-hectare terms. Jharkhand's challenging agricultural environment is at the base of the more direct grievances – land alienation, moneylending, and social dislocation – as voiced by every generation of Jharkhand activists. Nearly 30% of the Jharkhand population, tribe and non-tribe alike, is now classed as agricultural labour. Double and triple cropping is possible only on the 12% of agricultural land that has irrigation facilities. Labourers who work the rest of the land are unemployed for much of the year. Some take out loans and must suffer both high interest rates and, occasionally, legal or illegal appropriation of their land by moneylenders. Others seek employment in the cities or mining towns but, as will be shown below, few are successful. Many migrate to green revolution areas in search of short-term employment. All feel the pain of economic dislocation, which is at the heart of the Jharkhand movement. Many believe that government action could enhance their condition (more irrigation wells, more seed research relevant to hill agriculture), yet agricultural labourers of all ethnic backgrounds are quiescent regarding their condition, have few financial resources to contribute to a

statehood or any other political movement, and generally choose not to devote time to political activities. In this regard, two groups of people supported Jharkhand statehood: those who sought to strengthen 'tribal community' by further restricting land sale by individual tribes people, and those tribes people and non-tribes people who sought to broaden the property market – including those who believed that this could be accomplished without compromising 'tribal culture' if property rights were well supervised by a Jharkhand state government.

III. CONCLUSION

Thus, it can be stated that the movement was through different phases of development. There was earlier the educated Christian tribal who dominated the area which shifted to non-Christian tribal. For many years of political activities, the parties of the region got accustomed with power politics. This was the main reason in fulfilment of the demand. Besides, there was a lack of coordinated strategy which makes each and every party to go in their own way. Disintegration of the major parties like Jharkhand Party and Jharkhand Mukti Morcha further added to it. Of the main setback of the movement was the joining of hands with parties like Jharkhand Party did with Indian National Congress in 1963 and Jharkhand Mukti Morcha with Janta Dal in 1989. Even today the parties are un-united. Although their aim and goal was similar but still a coordination was needed between them. Jharkhand Co-ordination Committee (JCC) was formed in 1991 to have a combined effort instead of disintegrated approach between the political parties. But still lot of parties did not show interest to join the committee. Those include the major party such as Bhartiya Janta Party and Jharkhand Mukti Morcha (Soren) group. If these parties could join the on-going movement and had a combine approach and plan, then this movement would have got the demand fulfilled long back. Finally Jharkhand tribal people got separate statehood in the year 2000 but rarely very soon they realised in the name of Jharkhand people were displaced in the name of Jharkhand state. Apart from this the government has successfully created an illusory perception of development that has alienated the middle class from the plight of tribal. As a result the government ruthlessly exploits tribal population.

IV. REFERENCES

1. Anonymous (1971) Liberation of coal mine slaves. *Journal Of Historical Research*. Vol. 10(12), 47-48.
2. Areeparampil, M. (1991). Development versus struggle for human rights in tribal areas, in S. Bosu Mullick (ed.), *Cultural Chotanagpur: Unity in diversity*. New Delhi: Uppal.
3. Areeparampil, M. (1992) Forest Andolan in Singhbhum, in S. Narayan (ed.), *Jharkhand movement: Origin and evolution*. Delhi: Inter-India.
4. Asha. (2010). Indigenous Movement for a Seperate State-Jharkhand During The Twentieth Century. In Asha Mishra & Chittaranjan Kumar Paty (Eds.) *Tribal Movements in Jharkhand, 1857-2007*, New Delhi, Concept Publishing Company Pvt. Ltd.
5. Baviskar, A. (1994). Fate of the forest: Conservation and tribal rights, *Economic and Political Weekly* 39(38).
6. Bohannan, Paul J. 1963. „Land“, „tenure“ and „Land Tenure“ in Danial Biebuyck (ed.), *African Agrarian Systems*. London.
7. Centre for Monitoring Indian Economy (1997). *Profiles of states*. Bombay: CMIE.
8. Chandra, B. (1979) *Socio-economic life in Chotanagpur, 1858–1935*. Delhi: B.R. Publishing Company.
9. Chandrakanth, M.G. and J. Romm (1991). Sacred forests, secular forest policies, and people's actions, *Natural Resources Journal*, 3(41), 37-54.
10. Corbridge, S. (2000). Competing inequalities: The scheduled tribes and the reservations system in India's Jharkhand, *Journal of Asian Studies* 59(1), 35-81.
11. Das Gupta, Sangjukta. 2011. *Adivasi and the Raj: Socio-economic Transition of the Hos, 1820-1932*. Orient BlackSwan, New Delhi
12. Deogharia, P.C. (1994). Land alienation in Jharkhand, *Journal of Social Change*, 24(12), 37-41.
13. Ekka, William, & Sinha, R.K. (2004). *Documentation of Jharkhand Movement*. Kolkata, Anthropological Survey of India.
14. Gautam, M.K. (1973) Theoretical reflections on the traditions and legends related to the Santal migrations. *Journal of Analytical Research*. 12(25), 30-54.

15. Government of India (1991) Bihar provisional population totals. Census of India. Patna: Secretariat Press.
16. Government of India (2001) Census of India, 2001. Retrieved 15 December 2004, from Website: [http:// www.censusindiamaps.net](http://www.censusindiamaps.net)
17. Guha, R. (1983) Forestry in British and Post-British India: A historical analysis, *Economic and Political Weekly*, part I: 29 October; part II, 6 November.
18. Habib, Irfan. 1982. The Cambridge Economic History of India: Volume 1, c.1200-c.1750, University of Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
19. Hoffman, J. B. in collaboration with Emelen, A. V. 1950. *Encyclopaedia Mundarica*. Government Printing Press, Patna.
20. Icke-Schwalbe, L. (1974) Historical-ethnological classification of the Munda and Oraon in Chotanagpur. *Journal of Social Research*, 22(2).
21. Jain, F. K. (2015). The role of tribal community in Jharkhand Movement in India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 29(18), 12-14. Jha, S. (1990) Talking tough: Jharkhand leaders warn of violence, *The Week*. Kabiraj, S. (1988) Agitation for Jharkhand state in West Bengal, *Folklore*.
22. Keshari B.P, Munda, R.D. (2003). Recent Development in Jharkhand Movement. In R.D.Munda & S.Bosu Mullick (Eds.) *The Jharkhand Movement : Indigenous People Struggle for Autonomy in India*, IWGIA.
23. Kujur, Ignese.(2003) Jharkhand Betrayed. In Ram Dayal Munda & S. Bosu Mullick (Eds.) *The Jharkhand Movement : Indigenous Peoples Struggle for Autonomy in India*, Copenhagen, IWGIA. 12. Mishra, Kulkarni, S. (1982) Encroachment on forests: Government versus people, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 15(31), 37-41.
24. Lal, B. (1979). Ferment among adivasis of Chotanagpur. *New Age* 27: 17–18.
25. Leonard, D. (1991) Choosing among forms of decentralization and linkage, in D. Leonard and D. Marshall (eds.), *Institutions of rural development for the poor*. Berkeley, California: Institute of International Studies.
26. Mahapatra, S. (1986). *Modernization and ritual: Identity and change in Santal society*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
27. Mandal, B.B. (1975) Are tribal cultivators in Bihar to be called ‘peasants’? *Man in India* 55(4). Mahapatra, P.P. (1985) Coolies and colliers: A study of the agrarian context of

- labour migration from Chotanagpur, *Studies in History* 1(2).
28. Mullick, S.B. (1991) Jharkhand movement through, *Time Religion and Society* of 38: 3–4. Munda, R.D. (1988) The Jharkhand movement: Retrospect and prospect, *Social Change* 18(2).
29. Mullick, S.Bosu. (2007). State Forest policy and Adivasi Selfrule in Jharkhand. In Chittaranjan Kumar Paty (Eds.) *Forest, Government and Tribe*, New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company Pvt. Ltd.
30. Munda, R.D, Mullick, S.Bosu (2003). *The Jharkhand Movement, Indigenous Peoples Struggle for Autonomy in India*. IWGIA.
31. Narayan, S. (1988). *Movement, Development, Police and Judiciary in Tribal World*. New Delhi, Inter India.
32. Nigh.K.S. (2004) *Ecology, Ethnicity. Regionalism and State Formation: An Exploration of the Jharkhand Movement*. In Rajib Balakrishnan (Eds.) *Jharkhand Matters: Essays on Ethnicity, Regionalism and Development in India*, New Delhi, Konark.
33. Pathak, Akhileshwar. (1994). *Contested Domains, The State, Peasants and Forests in Contemporary India*. New Delhi, Sage.
34. Poffenberger, M. and B. McGean (1996) *Village voices, forest choices: Joint forest management in India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
35. Rana, L.N. (1996). *Political Consciousness in Jharkhand, 1900-1947*. Indian History Congress Proceedings, 57th Session.
36. Rana, Santosh. (2003). *The Jharkhand Movement*. In S.Bosu Mullick R.D.Munda (Eds.) *The Jharkhand Movement : Indigenous Peoples Struggle for Autonomy in India*, IWGIA.
37. Rangarajan, M. (1996) *The politics of ecology: The debate on wildlife and people in India, 1970–95*, *Economic and Political Weekly*. 35(44), 23-41.
38. Roy, Amit. (2003). *Second phase of Jharkhand Movement*. In S.Bosu Mullick R.D.Munda (Eds.) *Indigenous Peoples Struggle for Autonomy in India*, IWGIA.
39. Roy, S.C. 1912. *The Munda and their country*, Asia Publishing House, Calcutta.
40. Saez, L. (1999). *India's economic liberalization, inter-jurisdictional competition and development*, *Contemporary South Asia* 8(3).

41. Saha, S.K. (1996). Early state formation in tribal areas of East-Central India, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 37-41
42. Saxena, N.C. (1987). Women in forestry. *Journal of Social Action*, 37(2), 41-44.
43. Sengupta, N. (1980). Class and tribe in Jharkhand, *Economic and Political Weekly*.
44. Sharma, Usha. (1998). The Background and Nature of the Congress-Jharkhand Merger(20th June 1963). *Indian History Congress proceedings*, 59th Session.
45. Singh, K.S. (1982) Transformation of tribal society: Integration vs. assimilation, *Economic and Political Weekly* 17(33).
46. Singh, K.S. (1987). The Munda epic: An interpretation, *India International Center Quarterly* 19(1-2).
47. Singh, V.B. and S. Bose (1987) *State elections in India, 1952-85*. New Delhi: Sage.
48. Sinha, A. (1976) Exploited builders of Bokaro, *Economic and Political Weekly* 11(27).
49. Sinha, S. (1962) State formation and Rajput myth in tribal Central India, *Man in India* 42(1).
50. Sivaramakrishnan, K. (1987). Forests in development, *Seminar* 330.
51. Stuligross, D. (1999) Autonomous district councils in Northeast India, *Alternatives* 24(4): 497-525.
52. Stuligross, D. (2001) A piece of land to call one's own. PhD Dissertation, Political Science, University of California, Berkeley. Williamson, O. (1985) *The economic institutions of capitalism*. New York: Free Press.
53. Vidyarthi, L.P. (1972). An appraisal of the leadership pattern among the tribes of Bihar." In K.S Singh (Eds.) *Tribal Situation in India*, Shimla, IAS
