

# Tribal Development in the North Eastern Part of India: Reality and Constrains

—Ajeet Jaiswal<sup>1</sup>

## ABSTRACT

*The idea of “tribes” is particularly complex in the Indian subcontinent, where indigenous/primitive inhabitants were neither eliminated, nor quite absorbed, by the rising civilization in the course of history. It is plain enough that the demography of tribal people cannot loom large in India’s overall demographic scene (the former’s relative size being only a little more than 8%). The ‘practice’ of tribal development started with the British but they never concealed their motive in following the ‘tasks of mercy’. The gravity of situation was well realized at the dawn of independence. In the beginning itself, it was realized that tribals must be ‘integrated’ into the national mainstream—they should neither be assimilated, nor isolated. This paper attempts to investigate Tribal Development in the North Eastern Part of India and try to explain its reality and their constrains. For this the researcher discuss about the concept of tribal development, meaning of Tribal and Development, features of Tribes in the North-East, Barriers or Constrains to Tribal development.*

**Key Words:** North Eastern, Tribal development, Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes

## INTRODUCTION

The *practice* of tribal development started with the British (though some may claim that emperor Asoka was the first one to initiate the process by creating the post of *Anta-mahamatya*—the minister to look after the downtrodden—but nothing is known about the steps taken in this regard.) But they never concealed their motive in following the ‘tasks of mercy’. The aim was either to keep the tribals isolated from the ‘national’ mainstream, thus keeping them away from the menace of freedom-struggle; or by the

<sup>1</sup> Assistant Professor at Department of Anthropology, Pondicherry University, Puducherry; India. E-mail: [rpgajeet@gmail.com](mailto:rpgajeet@gmail.com)

same process, to convert them to the religion of Christ so that they identify themselves more with the Crown and its interests in the country. Though they were quite successful in achieving their motives, the tribals, because of their inherent psyche of never being subservient, at will blasted into minor or major revolts. Upto 1920s our national leaders had no incling about the plight of these ‘sons of the soil’<sup>1</sup>.

The gravity of situation was well realized at the dawn of independence and Articles 38 (State to secure a social order for the promotion of welfare of the people) and 46 (Promotion of educational and economic interests of Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and other weaker sections)<sup>2,3</sup> were incorporated into the Constitution not only for the weaker sections of the society to be protected against exploitation but also to help them in economic development. We must, however add that the task of development was to be implemented by the same bureaucracy within the same normative structure as was existing in the pre-independence times. There had to be a clash between the formal apathetic attitude of bureaucracy and the humanitarian angle envisaged in the Constitution—the resultant mess, thus created, is understandable<sup>27,28</sup>.

In the beginning itself, it was realized that tribals must be ‘integrated’ into the national mainstream—they should neither be assimilated, nor isolated. Without realising the odds heavily weighing against the STs, the task was approached as a routine work. Some of the STs (mostly the vocal and influential among them) cornered the fruits of tribal development in the early Plans— enhancing their position and further accessibility to resources. The very STs have been gaining substantially during every subsequent Plan. These tribal ‘elites’ have changed their habitats and life styles and live mostly in the urban centers enjoying the best facilities available. They have got assimilated into rest of the society but have retained the tag of ST to garner the benefits that should have gone to their really needy brethren. They, sitting in their luxurious apartments or five-star hotels, harp on the poor state of tribals and claim to be the spokesmen of STs in general<sup>3,4,5</sup>.

Against this is a vast ocean of humanity being fed on the promises. These poor STs have, since decades, been looking for the governmental measures while toiling, to survive. These also include the STs who were better off but have reached this sorry state because of the wrong deeds of government or exploitation through private individuals/groups. In the name of tribal development roads were constructed and these “roads of development” turned out to be “roads to exploitation”. Through these road money-lenders, forest contractors, government officials etc.

entered the tribal world to claim their own shares of tribal resources. Forest policy was reoriented dissociating tribals from land which is not only their source of livelihood but also a very vital aspect of their cultural and psychological make-up. Gradually, they were uprooted—socially, culturally, economically, politically, ritually, psychologically and physically. Today's tribal has a hazy future, dark future, no future at all.

Even though the preference of Anthropologist to the study of tribal development and the consequent prolific growth of literature on the subject, one has reasons to feel dissatisfied with the status of tribal research in India, which is marked, by and large, by a low level of sophistication<sup>6</sup>. No serious attempts have been made even to conceptualize the term 'tribe', and social scientists have willy-nilly accepted a legalistic definition. For them tribes -are those which are included in the Scheduled Tribes list in the Constitution of India. The 414 tribes listed following the 1956 Presidential Notification differ greatly in their habitats, modes of production, degree of isolation, degree of acculturation, level of development, social customs, beliefs and so on<sup>7</sup>.

## TRIBAL AND DEVELOPMENT

Starting with the issue of tribal development we must first try to define the two terms 'tribal' and 'development'. Tribals are the people, who in anthropological literature, are characterized generally by majority of the following features: isolated ethnic groups, low density of population, primitive economy, primitive technology, primitive political organization, primitive religion and lack of script of their language. Truly speaking, hardly any of the population groups on the Indian mainland can lay claim of being a 'tribal' group. The tribals in India comprise of the groups which are declared tribals as per an order of the President. In other words these are the Scheduled tribes<sup>4,5,6</sup>.

The anthropologist's conception of a tribe as a small, culturally distinct and economically self-sufficient community with a language of its own and an autonomous political organization is utterly inappropriate to the so-called tribal groups in India<sup>7</sup>. Some go to the extent of stating that the concept of a tribe is an anachronism in the present-day world, since there is no criterion to divide humanity into two branches, tribes and non-tribes. In the present day world, smaller, isolated, technologically backward communities have either become extinct or have become part of one or the other greater civilizations of the world<sup>8</sup>. It is unfortunate that,

following classical colonial anthropology, Indian anthropologists have depicted tribes as small, self-contained, self-sufficient and autonomous communities practicing subsistence economy with the lack of or limited external trade, in which exploitation and social conflict have no place. They have attempted to demonstrate the non-existence of any differentiation among the tribal population and, thus strengthened and propagated the same myth of homogeneity held and propagated by political leaders and populists<sup>9</sup>. Failure to take cognizance of the uneven distribution of assets among tribal households, expansion of trade, political centralization and emergence of an exploiting group based on antagonistic production relationships has been responsible for evolving inappropriate strategies for tribal development. Another superficial approach to the problem of tribal development emanates from equating tribal areas with any other economically backward area and recommending identical packages of measures for their uplift. Tribals, as a class, are viewed as poor<sup>10</sup>; they are described as constituting the matrix of Indian poverty<sup>11</sup>. Quite apart from the fact that scantiness in some tribal societies, particularly those living in inaccessible regions, may just represent a mode of living in their natural setting, rather than being reflective of their poverty,<sup>12</sup> the approach oversimplifies the complex problem of tribal development by making it a purely economic one. The problem is more basic and includes, apart from economic development, preservation of ethnic identity, ecology, language, culture, style of living, indigenous practices, etc. A mere plan of economic development would be utterly inadequate. Along with economic planning, there should be social and political planning in an integrated manner.<sup>13</sup> Tribes in India are not only numerous, but also differ widely in their habitat, level of development, modes of production, exposure to the wider world, traditional values, customs, beliefs, etc. There are tribes living in inaccessible hill tops, having minimal contact with the world beyond them. There are tribes in the plains living with non-tribal population and obviously having a large degree of interdependence. There are tribes practicing diverse modes of production, right from hunting, fishing, fruit-gathering to being engaged as industrial-urban workers. Some tribes have gone far ahead of others educationally. There are tribes with collective ownership of land and forest resources ensuring an egalitarian and unstructured social set-up and exhibiting a strong sense of solidarity. There are also tribes having individual ownership of property leading to a structured society akin to our own. While there are tribes which have been coming into the fold of the Hindu cultural pattern, there

are those which are moving in the opposite direction. <sup>14</sup> The movement from the tribal to the peasant has not been a unidirectional one<sup>14</sup>. With such diversities, attempts to evolve a general scheme of tribal development, having universal application to all tribes in India, are bound to be abortive. Tribal development, because of the diverse situations, has to be area-specific.

Defining 'development' is quite a tricky preposition. There is no consensus on the definition because different sciences interpret it differently. In layman terms, development is a change in the positive or progress direction. But these terms 'positive' and 'progressive' are value loaded. We should consider development as "Change in the desired direction". The connotation may not much be disputed if one is talking about his/her development. However, when we talk about as sensitive an issue as tribal development, the question that automatically comes is: whose desires- those of the planners, of implementers or of tribals themselves. The question becomes more relevant when we realize that in the name of 'tribal development' others have tried and have imposed their will on tribals <sup>5,15</sup>.

There is another dimension of development, especially when we talk about economic development, because without any proper time frame economic development is meaningless. In full, therefore, development should be defined as the "change in desired direction within stipulated time." And it is a well known fact that we have neither cared for the desire of tribals nor adhered to any self-imposed time limit.

The problems and prospects of tribal development north-eastern region of India may be considered along two axes: (a) as ethnic entities and (b) as status-class <sup>16</sup>.

## TRIBES IN THE NORTH-EAST

Diversity is also a characteristic of the tribal population of the north-eastern region of India. However, tribes of this region may be divided broadly into hill-dwelling and valley-dwelling with distinct economic problems.

The economic problems of the valley-dwelling tribes are not basically different from those of the Indian peasantry in general. Because of their long exposure to the national economy, polity and society, they have retained very little of their indigenous economic and political practices and institutions. Save some social practices and physical features, they are

(in Lakhs)

S.No.	India/North Eastern State	1991 Census			2001 Census		
		Total	ST	ST Population Percentage of Total	Total	ST	ST Population Percentage of Total
1	India	8443.24	806.64	9.55	10286.10	843.26	8.20
2	Assam	222.94	32.68	14.65	266.56	33.09	12.41
3	Manipur	18.37	5.80	31.75	21.67	7.41	34.20
4	Meghalaya	17.61	16.08	91.32	23.19	19.93	85.94
5	Mizoram	6.86	6.50	94.75	8.89	8.39	94.46
6	Nagaland	12.16	9.72	79.93	19.90	17.74	89.15
7	Sikkim	4.06	1.09	26.85	5.41	1.11	20.60
8	Tripura	27.45	8.73	31.80	31.99	9.93	31.05
9	Arunachal Pradesh	8.58	6.59	76.80	10.98	7.05	64.22

Source: Ministry of Tribal Affairs, GOI, Annual Report, 2009-10<sup>7</sup>

indistinguishable in their modes of production and pattern of consumption from the non-tribal peasant class. Money has made inroads into these societies. Division of labour on the basis of skill has taken place.

Private ownership of resources has taken firm roots resulting in social stratification. Because of non-insulation from stronger national forces, the areas inhabited by plains tribes have become, by and large, more impoverished economically. Barring the case of the elite, members of which are extremely limited in number, the great majority of the plains tribal population has been reduced to a position of poor peasants. As a class, they probably represent a classic case of poverty within poverty. As geographical areas, they are grossly deficient in infrastructural facilities. These tribes suffer from land alienation, landlessness, land fragmentation and outmoded agricultural practices<sup>1,3,5</sup>.

Comparison of Scheduled Tribals Population of North- Eastern States of India: 1991 and 2001

Here the strategy for tribal development must be both area-specific and household-specific. Apart from creating additional infrastructural facilities like transport and communication, education, health and hygiene, irrigation etc, specific family-oriented schemes for the uplift of those living below the poverty line must be initiated. Utmost importance should, however, be placed on the formation and development of local skills so that the tribals can diversify their occupations and partake increasingly of the benefits of national developmental measures. Legislative measures granting them some special concessions can also be of some help, although too much of protection for too long a period may prove detrimental to them in the long run<sup>1,4</sup>.

Tribes living in the hills, with some minor exceptions, are not yet integrated into the national, economy. Their contacts with the national economy have been minimal largely because of the difficult terrain of their habitation and partly because of deliberate policy measures. Only recently they have been exposed to the national economic system to some extent. Attempts to extend the national economy to these communities in haste in the name of tribal development are likely to be counter-productive of development, besides setting in motion waves of social unrest. In fact, the emergent tribal identity or the recent trend towards retribalization can be attributed to a large extent to their sudden exposure to the national economic forces. Let me elaborate this at some length.

The national economy of India is money controlled and dominated substantially by mercantile and industrial capital. It has links with the

world economy, which, in its turn, is dominated by multinationals of industrial capitalist countries. The multinationals have their stronghold in all the developing countries, including India. Being a money economy with private ownership of the means of production, individualism ailed profit motive are the mainsprings of Indian national economy<sup>2,5</sup>. The tribal communities, on the other hand, are far from being fully monetized. A large volume of transactions still takes place within these communities through barter. Money as a medium of exchange is used mostly to settle transactions with the non-tribals, which are analogous to external trade. Money has not emerged in the tribal communities as a store of value (status symbol), measure of value and standard of deferred payments. Although periodic markets exist in these societies where small quantities are bought and sold, often without the use of money in faceto- face transactions at the market site, the market mechanism as the resource allocative device has not developed. A market for factors of production has not come up. In fact, the entire tribal setting is different<sup>5,18,19</sup>.

Production is meant primarily for self-consumption, not for transactions. All members of a tribal family, including children, take an active part in production. The technology used is indigenous which fits well into the ecological surrounding. There is a complete absence of machine technology. Collective endeavor is a strongly developed feature in such a society, which can be observed in many economic activities. Here the tribals live in a world of their own. Life is one of great physical hardship, but the tribal life in the hills is also one of gaiety and merriment. Being an insulated society, a tribal community hardly produces any surplus over what is required for self-consumption. The sense of solidarity and strong community feelings preclude anything like poverty in such societies.

It is these tribal societies which are expressing their agonies of transformation with the entry into the national economy. Development, to a non-tribal, means more roads, more industrial units, more production and consumption, more saving and investment. But when roads (railway lines) are constructed linking tile long isolated hill tribal areas, more people come from outside, not for sight-seeing, but for gaining economic advantages. There is land grabbing; tribal land gets alienated. The tribals develop a taste for industrial products<sup>5</sup>. Not having the means to get their wishes fulfilled, they get indebted to the traders and moneylenders, who begin to gain effective control over the tribal resources. Whenever an industrial unit is set up in a tribal area, there is again an inflow of people from other areas to man it, since local expertise for this kind of work is

lacking. The tribals uprooted from their soil, become, at the most, wage earners in the factory. The national market is extended. Money takes a firmer grip, making the earlier style of life, indigenous economic, social and political institutions irrelevant. There is even a threat of the tribal population becoming a minority. The fear of losing their ethnic identity looms large on the horizon. If development entails turning the masters into slaves to some modern gadgets, will it not be wiser not to extend the national developmental measures to these tribal societies by legally insulating them from the rest of the national economy? The answer is in the negative. First, the hill tribal areas constitute a segment, and a very important segment, of the national economy. It is here that the mineral, forest and water resources are located and national economic development demands utilization of these resources<sup>18, 19</sup>. However, haste must be avoided. The pace and intensity of utilization of resources must be in a manner which produces the least adverse effects on the tribal societies. Secondly, measures to insulate these societies are not going to work for long.

Capitalism represents too strong a force to be contained by legislative devices. Getting themselves integrated into the larger economic order appears, therefore, to be the only way out even in the interest of the tribals themselves. What should be emphasized in the development strategy for hill tribal areas is softening the impact of the changeover and preparing the tribals to accept the challenge with greater ability and vigor. Some of the indigenous institutions will become irrelevant; they will die down. Some will be adjusted to the new economic order and some retained as they are.

The strategy of tribal development also requires defining in clear terms the contents of development for the tribals. These are bound to be different from the national contents. Economic development for the tribals, and also for the north-eastern region, as I have defined elsewhere, it is a persistent rise in per capita income in real terms emanating from increased domestic factor productivity without accentuating economic disparities. This must be achieved while minimizing the adverse effects on future resource availability and ecology and without jeopardizing, ethnic identity<sup>21</sup>.

Development, whether tribal or otherwise, is a value loaded term as it signifies a process of change in the desired direction. It is an indivisible whole, although for the sake of convenience it is decomposed into economic, political, cultural, educational, spiritual and the like. It is a

harmonious, balanced progress in different spheres of individual and societal life. Lop-sided progress in one sphere is often at the expense of progress in another (others). When this happens, overall development, which we want to maximize, becomes a casualty.

## **BARRIERS OR CONSTRAINS TO TRIBAL DEVELOPMENT**

North-east India is the meeting point of south Asia, south-east Asia and East Asia. Strategic, political, economic and ideological developments in each of these subcontinents have bearing on one or the other part of north-east India. Besides many of the tribes in north-east India have their counterparts in the adjoining countries. Policy planners in north-east India will require having awareness and sensitivity about the happenings in the neighboring countries of the three subcontinents of Asia.

Most of the tribal communities of north-east India have traditions of migration from east or south-east Asia, either directly or through stages. In post-independence period during all crisis situations, one or the other interest-group in India and outside has tried to take up these grey areas of tradition, to weaken national cohesion. In the face of it, and in the context of the fact that the tribal communities tend to constitute marginalised status-class, national unity in north-east India can be cemented only by emphasising the significance of India as the vanguard nation against colonialism and as one committed to non-capitalist path of development. There must however be consistent and continuous manifestation of these. Ideological dimension must be there in addition to emotional and material dimensions. The density of population per sq km in north-east India was 151 compared to 324 at the all India level during 2001 census. But these figures do not represent the whole of reality. In north-east India as a whole, particularly in Arunachal, practically the entire indigenous population lives on agriculture. On the other hand, Net sown area (NSA) in the region has increased from 31.61 lakh ha in 1977 to 38.05 lakh ha in 1995-96. The proportion of net sown area to total area is as low as 15 per cent as against 46.6 per cent for all-India average. Thus population per sq km of gross cultivated area was much higher in north-east India (587) than that in India as a whole (398)<sup>20</sup>. This reality is to be kept in view in determining population policy and in habitat planning and production planning. In Manipur and Tripura, it is claimed that the king was the owner of all lands in the property sense. Hence, it is asserted that with accession of

these princes' states to India, all lands other than those on which personal ownership rights can be established are owned by the state. Even the Law Research Institute of Guahati High Court has accepted these claims without further scrutiny. A careful study of the histories of Manipur and Tripura shows that these claims are not based on incontrovertible facts. On the other hand, land policy of virtual expropriation, based on such claims tends to stifle participatory development process and rationalise bureaucratic intervention. There are two approaches to law-one is legal positivism which considers 'command law' of the political authority as the source of legitimisation; the other is legal pluralism which accepts the law in terms of which the people live their life as the source of legitimisation. During the colonial dispensation the command law of the rulers prevailed. Now there is a growing awareness even among a section of the judiciary, about the incongruity of the command law orientation in a democratic society. Unfortunately, the initiative taken by the North East Council for appraisal of the legal systems in the different states, particularly in matters relating to land and land-based resources have tended to augment the legal positivistic orientation, notwithstanding some advocacy in favour of the legal pluralism in dealing with inheritance, succession, trusts and minor crimes. This will be a source of trouble in future.

Land reform in India, correctly envisages abolition of exploitative intermediaries between the state and the individuals. But in north-east India most of the tribal communities derive only a part of their income from cultivation. They also earn substantially through collection of roots, tubers, leaves and other jungle products. They have access to these resources as members of their respective communities. Hence if on the analogy with other areas, community as 'intermediary' between the state and the individual householders is removed, the tribal households will be actually dispossessed of much larger resources, though their rights over small areas of settled agricultural land will be consolidated.<sup>22</sup> The current practice in some parts of the country is to confine cadastral survey to nine degree slope only, because of technical difficulty of accurate survey, beyond that at a reasonable cost. This has adversely affected the rights of tribal landholders in those areas. The exact position in north-east India is to be checked. As against the targeted expenditure of Rs 154.00 crore in the North Eastern Region, the actual expenditure was only Rs 134.19 crore (87.1%). With the aim of creating cultural awareness in the North Eastern Region and identifying/promoting vanishing folk art traditions in rural/semi-urban areas the North East Community Support Group

(NECSG), North Eastern Zillmere Community Centre (ZCC) has been set up at Dimapur. The progress under the scheme of Multipurpose Cultural Complexes (MPCC) has been slow and the scheme not yet been evaluated in any of the States. The MPCC did not meet any criteria for a CSS and only about 25% of the projects sanctioned have been completed. As per the Zero Based Budgeting (ZBB) exercise, the scheme was discontinued in Budget 2007–08. Initiatives were taken to set up the Central Institute of Himalayan Cultural Studies at Dahung AP for promoting traditional Buddhist Studies<sup>25,31</sup>.

The approach towards utilization of earmarked funds, save for few activities listed above, was far from satisfactory. It is essential that the 10% earmarked resources are not only invested for the NE States but also in the NER. It is obvious that the statistical parameters will have to be suitably modified to reflect the realities of the region and planning strategy will have to be adjusted accordingly. Land-man ratio in most areas of north-east India is such that by reorienting production schedule many of the basic needs can be satisfied locally. If after ensuring that, massive commercialisation is attempted, the population will be less vulnerable to market manipulation by speculators and monopoly concerns. But in many areas an opposite strategy has been adopted and development outlay has been planned accordingly. Thus not infrequently, 'development' is suspected to have provided ability for siphoning of resources from the region<sup>29</sup>. National Committee on Development of Backward Areas has recommended individualisation of communal ownership in the north-east for the sake of 'progress'. As a result, attempts are made to implement development programmes by short circuiting the community. But only powerful individuals within the community can do it, with the support of bureaucracy. This is creating neo-feudal rights where such rights do not exist or exist only in incipient form. In terms of political economy what is taking place is anti-development, through 'development'. The dimensions of constraint indicated in earlier section do not exhaust the list. But these suggest the need of reorientation of approach. In that case it will be found that the poverty alleviation programme as implemented in north-east India is artificial in content; it will also bring out the fact that the schemes meant for the poor are not always compatible with their socio-cultural specificities.<sup>23</sup> Besides this will highlight the problem of balanced operation of various sources of institutional finance.<sup>24,30</sup> Lastly it will give an indication of ancillary legislation for the community organisations to function as channels for the flow of institutional finance.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

An author grateful for the assistance and encouragement of my supervisor Prof. A.K. Kapoor and co-supervisor Prof. Satwanti Kapoor Department of Anthropology, University of Delhi and Dr. Sahin Sultana, Department of Social Work, Pondicherry University. An author is also thankful to Department of Anthropology and Department of Social Work, Pondicherry University for giving all types of assistance to carry out the present work.

## REFERENCES

1. Bhagabati A. C. (2001). *Emergent Tribal Identity in North-East India*. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company.
2. Burman B K R (1988). Land Reforms in North- east India. *Mainstream*, Vol.1 (8)
3. Burman B K R (1989). *Towards Poverty Alleviation Programme in Nagaland and Manipur*. New Delhi: Mittal Publishers.
4. Burman B. K. R. (1972). "Integrated Area Approach to the Problems of the Hill Tribes of North East India", in K Singh, (ed), *Tribal Situation in India*. New Delhi: Inter-India Publications.
5. Burman, B K R (1990). Problem of Institutional Finance in Northeast India. *Mainstream*. Vol.3 (5)
6. Burman, B.K.R. (1989). Problems and Prospects of Tribal Development in North-East India. *Economic and Political Weekly*. Vol. 24 (13), pp. 693-697.
7. Chaudhuri, B. (1982). *Tribal Development in India*. New Delhi: Inter-India Publications.
8. Chaudhuri, B. (1992). *Tribal Development in India: Economy and Agrarian issues*. New Delhi: Inter-India Publications.
9. Goswami A. (1984). Tribal Development with Special Reference to North-East India. *Social Scientist*. Vol.12 (8), pp. 55-60.
10. Hooja, M. (2004). *Policies and strategies for tribal development: Focus on the central tribal belt*. New Delhi: Rawat Publications.
11. Majumdar D. N. (1982). An Appraisal of the Tribal Situation in North East India, In Pankaj Thakur (Ed.), *India's North East*. Tinsukia: Prakash Publishing House.
12. Mehta P. C. (2004). *Ethnographic atlas of Indian tribes*. New Delhi: Discovery Publishing House.

13. Ministry of Tribal Affair (2010). *Annual Report 2009-10*. New Delhi: Government of India,
14. Ministry of Tribal Affair (2011). *Annual Report 2010-11*. New Delhi: Government of India.
15. National Council of Applied Economic Research (1978). *Report on Socio-Economic Conditions of Primitive Tribes in Madhya Pradesh*. New Delhi: National Council of Applied Economic Research
16. Pathy, Jaganath. (1974). An Outline of Modes of Production in Tribal India, In Buddhadeb Chaudhury (Ed.): *Tribal Development in India*. New Delhi, Inter-India Publications.
17. Patli J. (1974). An Outline of Modes of Production in Tribal India, in Buddhadeb Chaudhury (Ed.): *Tribal Development in India*. New Delhi: Inter-India Publications.
18. Planning Commission (2011). *Annual Report 2010-11*. New Delhi: Government of India.
19. Rath G. C. (2006). *The Tribal Development in India*. New Delhi: Sage Publication. 12-18.
20. Ratha S. N., Pfeffer G, Behera D. K. (1999). *Contemporary Society*. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company.
21. Ratha S. N., Pfeffer G, Behera D. K. (2002). *Concept of tribal society*. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi.
22. Sachchidananda, R. R. P (1996). *Encyclopaedic profile of Indian tribes*. New Delhi: Discovery Publishing House.
23. Sharma B. D. (1978). *Tribal Development: The Concept and the Frame*. New Delhi: Praclii Prakashan.
24. Singh P. K. (2004). Tribal Development in India: What Went Wrong. *J. Soci. Res.*, 26: I & II, 26-32.
25. Sinha S. (1974). Rethinking about Tribes and Indian Civilisation, in Buddhadeb Chaudhury (Ed.), *Tribal Development in India*. New Delhi: Inter-India Publications.
26. Thakur D. (1994). *Tribal Life in India: Tribal agriculture and animal husbandry*. New Delhi: Deep & Deep Publications.
27. Vaid N.K. (1992). *Who Care for Tribal Development*. New Delhi: Ashtam Publication
28. Vidyarthi L. P. (1974). Problems and Prospects of Tribal Development in India, in Buddhadeb Chaudhury (Ed.), *Tribal Development in India*. New Delhi: Inter-India Publications.
29. Vidyarthi L. P. and Rai B. K. (1985). *The Tribal Culture in India*. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi, 24-39