

Popular uprising leading to land acquisition and state atrocities: A Comparative Analysis of Singur Nandigram movement.

Arnab Adhikary

Farming is the primary source of income for the common villagers of India. Still now, more than half of the population is depends on agricultural production. Bengal is not an exception at all. The peasant of Bengal has always been a driving force in the socio-political history of the state. From the medieval eta to colonial times, we found various instances of peasant's insurgency in Bengal. The colonial government initiated economic changes in the countryside both directly through redefining property rights and also indirectly through its effects on the pace of monetization of the indigenous economy and on population growth. The settled raiyat, paying his rent in cash, constituted the backbone of the agricultural population, the small landholding of the peasants being the predominant form of social organisation of production.¹ Due to the direct intervention of the colonial government and subsequent economic and political exploitation Bengal, witnessed series of present rebellions in ninetieth and twentieth century, various tribal insurgencies, Wahabi Rebellion, Indigo Rebellion to Tebhaga movement were the instances. This process of protest continued in post colonial era as well. The years of 1950's and 1960's saw peasant mobilization for their right to live and livelihood.

Socio-political movements in India that have challenged accepted notions of development and political participation have changed since the 1970s. These movements are now sometimes centred on people's concerns, but their participation and impact have perforce been multifaceted given the diversity of constituent population. This was the high time when non-party political entities were started changing the socio-political atmosphere of the country. The challenge had been to counter the new paradigm of modernism and development by proposing alternatives that are not archaic or traditional but rather rely greatly on local cultures, initiatives

and knowledge as key driving forces. The decade of the late 1970s and 80s saw almost all the presumptions of the established development paradigm and political oppression were challenged, by the experiences of development of people, through advanced socio-political-cultural analysis and increased political activity. The issues were not only proper implementation of programmes or distributive justice, but a crisis of development itself, howsoever well implemented the policy was.

We witnessed the upsurges of non party political activities under JP's leadership against the violent state sponsored atrocities, the 'Chipko' movement and the popular agitation of 'Save Narmada Movement' against so called development projects. The questions asked were fundamental: development at whose cost and at what cost, and what constituted development itself. People's movements resisted increasing co modification and monopolisation of natural resources like land, water and forest, their unsustainable use and unequal distribution, exploitative power relations, the centralisation of decision-making and disempowerment of communities caused by the development process.

The state asserted people's rights over natural resources and decision-making processes. Movements of landless, unorganised labour in rural and urban areas, *adivasis*, dalits, displaced people, peasants, urban poor, small entrepreneurs and unemployed youth took up the issues of livelihood, opportunities, dignity and development. Moreover, the process of development itself resulted in large-scale displacement, destitution, centralisation and destruction of resources. All over India, the victims of development fought against their unjust displacement and for dignified rehabilitation and resettlement, questioning the development projects and the policy behind these projects.²

This paper tries to relate argue how the developmental process of neo-liberal state faced popular uprising against forcefully land accusation and state atrocities. The available literature on economic development emphasised the importance of raising agricultural productivity along with industrial growth. The recent experience of West Bengal related to land acquisition and popular uprising testify the above theoretical framework.³

Nature and character of Nandigram uprising

Bengal witnessed a new kind of political tradition with the coming of the left government in power in 1977. Land reform was potentially the most significant programme, the Communist government might be expected to undertake. Communists always acclaimed that they took this initiative on behalf of the landless peasants.⁴ But so far as the industrial development policy, during the early days Left Front Govt. is concerned they had chosen the middle path. The new industrial policy of 1978 gave priority to small and cottage industries and sought to 'curtail the stranglehold of big houses, foreign multinational firms in the organised sector'.⁵

This statement concedes that it is not possible to leave out altogether the MNCs and big houses for they currently account for a sizeable proportion of the output in the organised industrial sector in the state. And then comes the most important rider-*'as long as the laws of the land are not contravened, the state government may however allow the existing MNCs and big industrial houses to plough back their capital, but only along lines previously agreed to and vetted by the (state-level official) Industrial Advisory Council.*⁶

By the 1990s, national and international developments, and the economic and political dynamics of West Bengal, created new constraints and opportunities for the CPI (M). When central govt. changed their track and liberalized the economy, it was fallen to them to make industrialization in Bengal. Now, here comes the fault line, the dilemma of party, a proclaimed communist ruled state how far adjusted with the neo-liberal economy. CPI (M) took two years to clear their stand but the debate still continued within the party and front.

The pro-liberal group of CPI(M) sought their new slogan of 'alternative left relief' (*bikolpo bampontha*). Under such circumstances, Chief Minister Jyoti Basu presented the policy statement on the outline of industrial development in the Assembly house on 13th September 1994. The government announced a renewed Policy Statement on Industrial Development in favor of the private sector and foreign investment. ⁷ The main motto of this policy was to emphasize the process of industrialization throughout the state, encouraging new technologies and investments in certain areas for economic development, reorganizing the illicit industries and modernizing it,

encouraging the domestic and foreign investment by protecting the interests of workers and focused on the incensement of the productivity and progress of industrial sectors.

State government therefore have to adopt the capital-based industrialization policy for development, because creation of state capital is not possible within this limited power.⁸Hans Lofgren is of the opinion that CPI (M) by the 1990s was mightily impressed by China, which had embarked on what seemed to be a form of capitalist industrialization that was dubbed 'socialism with Chinese characteristics'. He said when Buddhadeb Bhattacharya replaced Basu as chief minister in 2001, the pro-capitalist orientation became explicit. The new direction was formalized in an industrial policy adopted in 1994 which 'recognized the importance and key role of private sector in providing accelerated growth'.⁹

The new CM Buddhadeb Bhattacharyya took various initiatives to impose this model of development in the state. It is important to note here that while the govt. was devising this pro-industrial policy, a few dissenting voices within the ruling coalition were audible, which dissensions were absent during the implementation of the other major policies under the Left Front Government earlier. But Mr. Bhattacharyya passed on those dissent voices and implemented various development projects by capturing the agricultural land. Once CPI (M) led Govt. distributed farming lands to the small peasants but now they became the main architect who ablates the lands from the farmers. So, for the sake of protecting their land various voices raised against those forceful land acquisition, especially from Nandigram and Singur. And these protests became the watershed of Bengal politics.

In November 2006 Haldia Development Authority was put forward a notice declaring for land acquisition on behalf of Salim's SEZ project. Authority didn't consult neither with the elected MLA nor panchayat members, local people or opposition leaders. They did not even survey how many people would uproot due to this project. So, result of this kind of misgovernment ship led to a massive mass protest rise against this project and soon it turned against the ruling party and state authority.

CPI (M) did not recognise Nandigram uprising as a popular movement. The government of West Bengal had clearly declared they were not going to implement

the proposed project in Nandigram , though oppositions had been continuously carried out their agitation by creating a violent atmosphere over the entire region. They argued oppositions had created a 'Muktanchal' (administration free area) over Nandigram by taking help from the Maoists. The activists and their sympathisers however are of the opinion that the whole movement had been based on popular mass support. Malini Bhattacharya has argued that this whole movement was baseless and illegal. Krishijomi Rakhsa Committee (Agricultural Land Saving Committee) had always try to impose the fire of land acquisition to the villagers.

Bhattacharya further states that 'they had been swayed by the campaign and by reports in same news , that the assurances were eyewash and land acquisition would start soon as the administration entered the area.' As a result of this kind of negative propagation by the committee, people had lost their fetch to their own elected government, though Chief Minister had clearly said that state was not going to acquire land without proper consent of the people.¹⁰ In to the editorial column of Ganashakti dated 15th March 2007, the ruling party had described how TMC failed to cooperate with the government by avoiding all meetings with the ruling party and also created a horrible and hellish atmosphere over there. They did so by demolishing the bridges, roads and forcefully isolate the region from the outside world. The ruling party further condemns that TMC and their coordinates were instigating the local people against the ruling party.¹¹

Shamal Chakraborty has argued on November 2007, when the recapturing process started in Nandigram Govt. declared that they would repeal their SEZ project from Nandigram, to keep the significance of Krishijomi Rakhsa Committee. Chakraborty has raised vital questions regarding why Nandigram was isolated from the last 10months and who were responsible for this diabolical condition. He further said that the Committee has created this violent 'Muktanchal' by taking help of Maoists. So, it cannot be recognised as peasant agitation.¹²

It was true that Nandigrm uprising never been a non violent movement. Protesters had cut down roads, demolished bridges, pressurised local CPI (M) supporters to leave their village, they did not allow police or administrative officials

in to the Nandigram and created a 'Muktanchal' over there. This situation was continued around 10-11 months. The then Chief Minister, Buddhadeb Bhattachariya said some Maoist came from Jharkhand and they had provided arms and training to the protesters. When CRPF moved to Nandigram they found many illegal arms factory in there. On 13th November 2007, three Maoists were arrested from Sagardeep and police found some leaflets, C.D. and a map of Nandigram from them.¹³ Kabir Suman one of the leading activist and sympathiser of the movement wrote about the guerrilla training process of the villagers. He was also saying about various fire arms which gathered in Nandigram during this period.¹⁴ On 12th June 2009 Maoist leader Somen has clearly declared that Nandigram uprising was an armed struggle and they were very much on the movement. He acclaimed that Maoist helped had the peasants for the movement against state atrocities.¹⁵ Thus it is clear that this movement was far from the so called constitutional non-violent movements.

Role of Peasant and Women

So far as the involvement of the peasant concerned, it can be said that the peasants had participated in this movement. From a fact finding report published by Shalti Research Group, we came to know that these people had formed two non-political organisations namely *Gana Unnayan o Jana Adhikar Samiti* (People's Right and Development Committee) and *Krishijomi o Gonoswartha Rakhsa Committee* (Agricultural Land and People's Right protecting committee).

Social activists Medha Patkar and Siddikulla Chowdhury both came to Nandigram in the month of December 2006 to encourage them. They also delivered speech in a non political public rally and make the public aware about land acquisition.¹⁶ In the writings of contemporary intellectual sympathisers, it was often revealed that these so called intellectuals had appreciated the fact that the protest was spontaneous.

Kabir Suman has briefly described the situation of isolated Nandigram and said that when he joined a meeting, which was held on that disputed area, he did not see any poster or flag of TMC, though leaders like Partha Chatterjee, Shishir Adhikari were present there. He compared these protester farmers who fighting an

armed struggle against the goons of CPI (M), with the freedom fighters.¹⁷ According to Sumit Sarkar and Tanika Sarkar this movement can be described as a peasant movement. Tanika Sarkar argued that the form of this agitation was 'Classical Marxist'. She said the role of the women in this movement was very crucial. They were always in front of any protest marches. Krishna Majumder pointed out that women of Nandigram were politically awarded, and when TMC formally formed the government, they did not take any steps against the peasantry class. Activist, journalist Bolan Gangapadhyay was also appreciated women's influences and sacrifices during this agitation.¹⁸ In the various new channels it had been shown how women and common farmers were in front of 14th March's genocide. They never choked this movement though they were humiliated, raped and cruelly beaten by the police and hooligans of the ruling party. Economist Abhirup Sarkar also admitted the reason of that movement. He said if peasants thought that amount of compassion might not be good enough for their livelihood, then they would resist for saving their land. And they were found doing nothing illegal for this purpose.¹⁹

Except of some CPI (M) party line follower other intellectuals included leftist, Naxalist or liberal thinker, almost everyone had certified the uprising as a peasant movement. Ranajit Guha appreciated the protestant mentality of common people. He said protest is either a necessity to build up a healthy democratic state, or there can be a chance of rise of autocracy and also protest is not spread out only for one issue. There was also a background behind any protest movement. Apathy and ineligibility of the rulers provoked the masses for rebel.²⁰ All these incidents were very much part of the Nandigram issue.

Haldia development authority issued a notice on the basis of 'Land Acquisition Act 1894' and totally disdained the concern of local people. Due to this kind of negligence and audacity of the state Government and ruling party, masses had organised themselves and Bengal witness a spontaneous break out of a movement for protecting for land and life. But one thing was noticeable that after 14th March of 2007, the peasants were not running for protecting their land because government had clearly declared that they were withdrawing the project from Nandigram. Interesting

thing was that Committee continued their agitation on behalf of two agendas firstly they demanded judiciary punishment for the main accused of 14th March massacre and secondly leaders of the committee was successful to convince local people that after winning in the panchayat election, CPI (M) might impose the project in Nandigram. Continuous attack from Khejuri by CPI (M) cadres was helping them to sustain 'Muktanchal' over there. May be CPI (M) was trying to regain their prestige and tried to control the region like before. After the operation 'The Sun Rise' i.e. recapturing Nandigram they had completed their political revenge. But common people of Nandigram rejected them.

This whole violent problem could have been amicably settled through discussion in peaceful democratic manner. But both groups were not ready to lose their political ego. Especially the main ruling party and their leaders were provoked in such a way that the situation became more complex. The tragedy was that general masses and media of the state had totally forgot about the supporters of the ruling party in Nandigram, who were driven out from their land and forced to take shelter in some camps of Khejuri like the refugees.

Nature of Singur movement

Likewise Nandigram movement we found various phases and layers in Singur movement. Various issues like significance of the proposed project, procedure of land acquisition, role of the government and ruling party, nature of the agitation, various debates came to the forefront.

In this case, the ruling party, has been trying to propagate the necessity of industrialisation and also criticised the opposition's negative political agenda because they were arguing land was acquired by following some terms and condition. Nirupam Sen said that the government did not undermine the peasants instead they were repaid higher amount of compensation for the lost.²¹ But according to some intellectuals the government didn't paid enough to the victimised farmers. Amartya Sen argued that government, should paid the money not according to the present price of the land, but, they should compensate peasants on behalf of its values.²²

This whole movement can be divided into three phases. Natures of this agitation were different in these phases. But democratic left thinkers had never acclaimed the popular mass base of this movement. Those farmers who had accepted the compensation cheque, CPI (M) marked them as project friendly interested peasant. Nirupam Sen in his interview was arguing that 10,850 peasants had accepted the cheque and they owned 691.66 acres land where only 2261 farmers who had not accepted their cheque, they were proprietor of only 305.47 acres. According to him most of the peasants were in their favour and they wanted the proposed industry for their better future.²³

Mritunjoy Mohanti said according to the *Krishi Jami Raksha Committee* report, there had been three hundred farmers with landholding of 184 acres (2.5 percent landholders accounting for 18.5 percent of the land to be acquired) who have signed letters stating that they do not want to sell'. So according to Mohanti, 75% of the farmers were willingly giving their land. He divided the rest 25% into three categories – a small proportion of landowners and registered *bargaders*, who are relatively larger farmers having a large proportion of the cultivate area and engaged in capitalist agriculture. Another group of small landowners who might not want to sell their land for livelihood interests and finally a group whose livelihood interests is not threatened who might be holding out for a better deal'.²⁴ But Mohanti did not shown any reference to prove this argument.

In the 1st phase of the movement, the government faced with popular peasants resistance in the project region. Root of this agitation laid in the procedure of land acquisition. Some ministers and party members had also recognised this fact. Former Land Revenue Minister, Rajjak Molla, had predicted that the government had acquired the land like autocratic ruler. It weakened the party's hold among the peasants.²⁵ From a survey report titled '*Singur Uchhed Bonam Protirodh*', based on the peasants of Singur, we came to know that three hundred and fifteen farmers, had lost 237.19 acres of land, due to this project. These small farmers were not engaged with any other occupations and they had no idea about their future plan. According

to the report, some *bargaders* were accepted the cheque because they did not found any alternative. These people were all against the land acquisition movement.²⁶

Ranajit Sau had supported this resistance and said 'When would be peasant be consider free? What constitute his freedom? European literature has laid down three conditions. The peasant is free (a) if no outside interest seigneuril, urban and capitalist comes between him and his land;(b) if he is subject to no bond service;and (c) if his work is productive enough to feed him and leave a surplus to purchase at the very least what he need.' In his point of view, peasants of Singur did not found themselves free that's why they were resisting.²⁷ Activist Bolan Gongapadhay argues that only rich peasants were given their land, because they have other sources of income. On the other hand, the peasants who resisted were the real producer, mainly small tillers or *bargaders*.²⁸ The leaders of the ruling party and democratic left thinkers were always trying to say that more number of land holders had given their land spontaneously. So there was hardly any democratic base of this movement. They said outsiders had provoked them for their own purpose.

It was true that most of the land owners taken their cheque but small peasants and bargaders were not ready to lose their occupation and livelihood. Once the democratic left had called them as real producer who had been fighting for their rights. At present these people were out of notice. The term 'outsider' was meaningless, because in a democratic country like India right to speech and freedom of protest is one's constitutional right. In a documentary on the Singur project titled '*For The Sake of Development*', it has been shown, how people had engaged themselves with the social activist like Medha Patekar, Anuradha Talwar, Masesweta Devi or Kabir Suman, who had not provoked them but tried to encourage them.²⁹ N.G.O.'s like APDR, Sanhati Utyog, political parties like AITMC, Congress came and tried to coordinate with them. Tanika Sarkar found nothing wrong in this. She has argued that in case of 'Save Narmada Movement', Medha Patekar and Brinda Karat had protested jointly in a same podium. But here in Singur CPI (M) lead Left Front Government did not allow Medha Patekar to come here. The government had marked all political parties included the personality like Maheswata Devi as an outsider. She

criticised the government and asked if these people were treated as enemies then TATA's, Ambani's or Salem's were the local people of Bengal.³⁰ Snhati Utyog a well known NGO was very much associated with the movement. They appreciated that TMC was very strong in that region but they did not lead the movement. Peasants resisted on behalf of their life and livelihood. Mamata Banerjee was a factor but she got the support because farmers were intending to be rebel.³¹ In this phase TMC was just following the flow. So it is quite clear that in the 1st phase of the movement, its nature was spontaneous, popular, democratic, peasant resistance. Role of the women were also very crucial during the movement. In television or in documentaries it has been observed that women were joining in various meetings and protest marches. Some time they were leading marches. Though they were brutally beaten, arrested but they never run away from the protest. According to Tanika Sarkar women might not be in to the leading position but they were back bone of the movement.³² Parthasarathi Banarjee appreciated role of women during the movement and said the involvement of women in this movement and the intensity of their participation might only be compared with women's role in the Tebhaga movement in the late 1940's³³

The President of 'Women's Commission of West Bengal', Mrs. Joshodhora Bagchi said women were unhappy about the land acquisition. Their uncertain future had forced them to rebel.³⁴ In those days's Ahalla Prokashani (Ahalla Publication) printed a book of articles, small stories and poems written by the activist women of Singur. It was very clear that they were very well cultured and politically aware. From this book, it has been known that the girls or house wife like Susmita Bag, Santana de, Rimpa Patra, Jhuma Santra had a very clear opinion about the movement and its objectives.³⁵

But towards the end of the 1st phase, the movement became politicised. Main opposition party and some intellectuals high jacked the movement from the peasants. Those who came only to coordinate with the peasants became the leaders. Farmers had moved aside or fall into the second line. This had happened from December 2006 when Mamata Banerjee was going for fast. From this time, onwards Singur

problem became only an issue for debate. Peasants were continuing their protests, marches but they did so under the banner of Trinamool Congress. This was the beginning point of the 2nd phase of the movement.

In this phase protest against the project or marches became totally Kolkata centric. Intellectuals of Bengali society had formed an open forum called 'Sahanagarikder Mukto Mancho' (Open Podium for the co citizens). Kabir Suman said they would gather on every Saturday and raised their voice for the justice and expressed anger against forcefully land acquisition policy. Some people used to recite, some sing songs while some delivered lecture for the peasants.³⁶ Intellectuals and opposition leaders thus formed an organisation for guiding the movement, named Paschimbanga Krishijomi Rakhsa Committee (Agricultural Land Saving Committee of West Bengal), under the chairmanship of Mamata Benerjee. Activist like Kabir Suman, Sunanda sanniyal, Dolla Sen, Purnendu Basu and Mahesweta Devi had been included in the advisory committee of this organisation. Twenty six political parties had participated in this committee and fifty six parties had supported them.³⁷

During this time, all eyes were concentrating on Nandigram. Media, intelligentsia or political parties had focused on Nandigram. Proposed project now became almost complete. The first produced 'Nano car' had been exhibited. Singur region became almost peaceful excepting some incident like attack on the fence of the project or suicide of some peasants etc. This had continued till the middle of 2008. At last the movement became totally politicised. After getting enormous success in Panchayet Election, Mamata Banerjee decided to regenerate the Singur movement. In this 3rd phase of the agitation she sat on a podium (Dharna Mancho) just beside the main gate of the project, blocked Durgapur expressway and demand for 400 acres of land of the disinterested peasants. At last Tata, was withdrawn from Singur. When Mamata Banerjee started her agitation, the project was almost ready. According to many people, this protest was suicidal for our state and Mamata Banerjee was only locking for her political gain.

Amartya Sen has argued that when project was almost ready, during this time, this kind of protest may carry wrong statement for our state. This arrogant face

of Bengal politics, may be harmful for the future investment and that would create some impact on the employment generation .³⁸ Mankambu S. Swaminathan has found a positive angle of this protest. He said this agitation will open up a new debate on necessity of the acquisitions of fertile land and nature of 'development'. He further argues that by the direct interferences of main stream political parties, this movement was no longer been a peasants movement. Nano project according to him, was important for the better image of the state. This movement has become pernicious for the state.³⁹

Debabrata Banerjee found nothing wrong in this movement. According to him Mamata Banerjee was fighting for the rights of the farmers. He blamed the state government for this kind of treaty signed with the TATA's. They did not consult with the peasants, acquired the land forcefully by implementing section 144 into the whole region and when peasants resisted they tried to suppress them. He said both C.M. and Ratan Tata were arrogant and did not want to listen anybody. According to him Mamata Banerjee just propagated the voices of oppressed.⁴⁰

It's true that Mamata Banerjee has launched the movement on behalf of the peasants. But one can easily found the motives behind the movements. Nandigram gave her a fine platform to regain her political carrier once again and she did not ready to lose it. Subrata Mukherjee a well known politician of the state acclaimed this fact and said Singur movement was the fertile political ground for the oppositions. There was nothing immorality to took advantage in the cases like Singur, where ruling party made some horrible mistake. He said it was very clear that if opposition raise their voice against land acquisition and took the side of the peasants then their vote bank will be arising. Result of the Panchayet election had proved it.⁴¹ As an opposition leader, Mamata did so. Ratan Tata clearly said they had to withdrawn the project for the political reason. In his words '*I think two years ago I once mentioned that if somebody puts a gun on my head, you pulled the trigger or you take the gun away because I have not moved my head. I think, Ms. Banerjee has pulled the trigger.*'⁴²

A comparative study of these two movements

The first decade of this millennium is very crucial for the history of contemporary India so far as mass uprising is concerned. These two crucial movements were running in parallel time. Both the movements had been started against government policy of forcefully land acquisition. Both the movements had been started spontaneously; villagers had rejected government's model of development without any provocation from the political parties. In each case protesters were getting sympathy not only from their own region but from the whole state and nationwide. During the first stage of both movements, opposition parties had supported them but they didn't interfere in to this directly but slowly in both cases local villagers had moved aside and main opposition party of the state took the hold of the movement. In the case of Nandigram local peasants had always played important role though TMC leaders like Shuvendu Adhikari, Abu Taher or Sk. Suphian's who had came into the front during the movement. But in the case of Singur, Mamata Benerjee was in the center of the movement, leaders like Bacharam Manna were become inferior. Intellectuals of West Bengals had played very crucial role in these movements. They were promoting these agitations in the whole nation. Participants were also cooperating with them.

One thing is very important in this regard. Both the movements had an impact on each other. Leaders of *Krishijami Rakhsa Committee* said they saw how police beaten common villagers and forcefully acquired land, that's why they tried to isolate the whole region.⁴³ General masses of Nandigram had supported this isolation. Journalist Aninda Jana had written about that Mukhtanchal and said everything was normal, market was open, people engaged with their works and some schools were also open. Only police and administrative officials were not allowed.⁴⁴ Not only the local villagers but common people and media did not blame oppositions for this isolation. Intellectuals had directly supported them. All were against the ruling party, other parties of left front didn't support them. Mamata Banerjee correctly understood the pulse of common people and regenerate the Singur movement. Except

one or two incident , the Singur movement was generally non violent. Though Mamata had conducted a suicidal protest but it was not considered as unconstitutional.

In the case of Nandigram, because of the to the Singur experience and from the Maoist influence protestors had blocked Nandigram for long ten months. Though this isolation had imposed strong mass base and the ruling party had continuously provoked them but the nature of this movement was very violent and undemocratic. Committee members were accused for the violation of human right of local CPI (M) supporters. Around 600 criminal cases were registered in Nandigram and Khejuri police station. Total 2260 people were accused.⁴⁵ Both groups were gathered arms and created war situation over there.

Conclusion

These movements show that Bengali peasants never compromised with their basic rights and continued their struggle despite how much powerful the authority was? From the colonial period to the Congress regime the farmer's agitation against the ruler remained the same. But, here the irony of this protest is, once these peasants who mobilized under the red flag, now they raised their voice against the very same communists, who changed their economic line and started to follow the path of privatization. All these incidents had a connection with globalisation and neo liberal economy. Industrialisation is the main motto of this model of growth. It required land and that should be located near the metropolis region. Here's come the contradiction. Industries need a communicative region and generally these regions were the main food supply area of the metropolises. Now agriculture and industry, these two sectors had been becoming , the main canter of controversy and sometimes violent protest. Not only Nandigram and Singur in resent past , many voices were raised against this neo liberal model of development. Pravat Pattanaik said neo liberal capital forced people to rebel for the sake of their livelihood. State governments had failed to maintain balance between the necessities of the urban people and liability of the peasants.⁴⁶ Government had now realised these issues are very crucial and they have to listen to the voice of common people. State now changed the old land acquisition act and had tried to focus on agrarian areas also. Industrialist wanted to purchase the

land directly from the peasants. The former Governor of West Bengal Sri. Gopal Krishna Gandhi has stated 'Land is limited. Land is precious. Land holds a special value to farmers and their families. It's not an impersonal, dematerialized share certificate that you buy and sell with very swing of the sensex. Therefore we have to be sensitive to the responses of those who lose their land and livelihood to project for industry, housing and infrastructure, knowing that industry needs space.'⁴⁷

¹Das Gupta.Sanjukt (2001), 'Peasant and Tribal Movements in Colonial Bengal: A Historiographic Overview', ed-. SEKHAR BANDYOPADHYAY, *Bengal: Rethinking Histoii Essays in Historiography*,New Delhi; Monohar,P 65.

² Mohanty Manoranjan (SEPTEMBER 17-23, 2011), 'People's Movements and the Anna Upsurge', *Economic and Political Weekly* , Vol. 46, No. 38 , pp. 16-19; Sangvai Sanjay, (Dec. 15 - 21, 2007), 'The New People's Movements in India', *Economic and Political Weekly* , Vol. 42, No. 50), pp. 111-117; Sarkar Abhirup (Apr. 21-27, 2007), 'Development and Displacement: Land Acquisition in West Bengal', *Economic and Political Weekly* , Vol. 42, No. 16 pp. 1435-1442; Kothari Rajni (Feb. 4, 1984), 'The Non-Party Political Process', *Economic and Political Weekly* ,(Vol. 19, No. 5), pp216-224.

³Sarkar Abhirup, (Apr. 21-27, 2007), 'Development and displacement : Land Acquisition in West Bengal,' *Economic and Political Weekly* , Vol. 42, No. 16 , pp 1435-1442.

⁴ West Bengal(January 1985),, Development and Planning Department, Draft Seventh Five Year Plan 1985-90 and Annual Plan 1985-86, (vol. I) Calcutta: mimeographed,p. VI,

⁵Bhattacharya. D, (22nd May 2019), Why the lack of industry in West Bengal?,*Down to Earth*, Kolkata, P 12.

⁶ 'West Bengal 's Industrial Policy' (14 Jan, 1978), *Economy and Political Weekly*,(Vol. 13, Issue No. 2), P 48.

⁷ Basu. Jyoti(1998), *Jotodur Mone Poda*, , Kolkata National Book Agency, pp 513,514.

⁸ Sarkar. Koushik(2006) 'Badha Bhenge Shilpayoner Pothe', *Unnon O Sangram*, Kolkata; Ganashakti, pp147-148.

⁹Löfgren. H(2011), The Communist Party of India (Marxist) and the Left Government in West Bengal, 1977–2011: Strains of Governance and Socialist Imagination, *Studies in Indian Politics*,Sage Publications, (Vol-4(1),p 109.

¹⁰Bhattacharya. M (2008), 'Nandigram and the Question of Development,' *Economy and Political Weekly*, (Vol – XLII, No-21), pp 1895-98.

¹¹ .*Ganashakti* (15th March 2007).

¹² .*Ibid*(10th November 2007).

¹³ The Statesman; Anandabazar Patrika, (15th and 16th November, 2007).

¹⁴ Suman Kabir(2010), *Nihaner Nam Tapasi Malik*, Kolkata; Mitra and Ghosh Publisharsh, pp 142,143.

¹⁵ Mitra Subhasish (ed.)(2011) *Lalgarh: Matamat o Tother Purnanga Dalil*, Kolkata; Deep Prokashoni, p 373.

¹⁶*SEZ in West Bengal (2007)*,Kolkata;Shalti Research Group, pp 32-33.

¹⁷Suman. Kabir(2010), *Nihaner Nam Tapasi Malik*, Kolkata; Mitra and Ghosh Publisharsh, pp. 146-147.

¹⁸Roy Debarati and Banerjee Parthasarathi(2007)Directed,*For the Sake of Development*.

¹⁹*Anandabazar Patrika*(24th june, 2007).

²⁰*Ibid*(23rd January, 2008).

²¹*Ganashakti*(11th December 2006).

²²*Anandabazar Patrika*(21st June 2007).

²³*Ibid*(23st August 2008).

²⁴ Mohanti, Mritunjoy(2008), *Political Economy of Agrarian Transformation: Another View of Singur, Economy and Political Weekly*, (Vol-XLII, No-9), pp 337-341.

²⁵*Anandabazar Patrika*(28th December, 2006).

²⁶ Roy, Gautam(2007) (ed), *Singur Janasamikha, Singur Uched Bonam Protirodh*, Kolkata; o'Dashak.

²⁷ Sau, Ranajit (2008), ' A Ballad of Singur: Progress with Human Dignity', *Economy and Political Weekly*, (Vol-XLIII, No-43), p. 11

²⁸Gangopaghay, Bolan(2007),*Gorib Chashike Bamfronter r Darkar Nei, Singur Anodolaon: Amader VabnaAmader Protibad*, Kolkata; Emancipation, p 24.

²⁹ Roy, Dayabati and ParthaSarathi Banarjee(2008) (directed), *For The Sake of Development*.

³⁰Sarkar, Tanika(2007), 'Krishijami Adhigrahan Du Ekti Chinta', *Singur Andolon; Amader Vabna Amader Protibad, Shilpi, Sahityik, Buddhijibi kormi Narider Rachona Sonkalan*,Kolkata; Emancipation, p11.

³¹*Archive for The Singur*, <http://www.sanhati.com>,ACCESSED ON 21st May 2013.

³² *Ibid*.

³³ Banarjee, Parthasarathi(2008), 'Land Acquisition and Peasant Resistance in Singur',*Economy and Political Weekly*,(Vol-XLII, No-46), P 4719.

³⁴ Interview of Josodhara Bagchi(2007), *Singur Andolon; Amader Vabna Amader Protibad, Shilpi, Sahityik, Buddhijibi kormi Narider Rachona Sonkalan*,Kolkata; Emancipation, p 47.

³⁵ Sengupta, Gargi & Mitra, Chandana (2010) (ed), *Singur: Protirodher Suchana*, Kolkata; Ahalla Prokashan.

³⁶ Op. cit, Suman, Kabir (2010), P 109.

³⁷ Ibid, pp 114-115.

³⁸ *Anandabazar Patrika* (20th September, 2008)

³⁹ *Ibid* (21th September, 2008).

⁴⁰ Bandyopadhyay .D (2008), 'Singur: What Happened, What Next and Time to Pay The Cost', *Economy and Political Weekly*, (Vol-XLIII, No-48), pp. 13,14

⁴¹ *Anandabazar Patrika* (23th September, 2008).

⁴² *The Statesman; The Times of India* (4th October 2008).

⁴³ Mukhopadhyaya, Ladly (2008) (Directed) *Nandigram-THIS LAND IS MINE*.

⁴⁴ *Anandabazar Patrika* (21th March, 2007).

⁴⁵ *Ibid*, (6th February, 2008)

⁴⁶ Patnaik, Pravat (2008), 'In The Aftermath of Nandigram' *Economy and Political Weekly*, (Vol-XLII, No-36), pp. 1893-95.

⁴⁷ *The Statesman* (25th September 2008).