



Life After Land Acquisition In The Urban Fringe Of Mysuru City: Some Insights From The Field

G. R. Divyanandan¹ and Prof. M. H. Krishnappa²

¹Research Scholar, Department of Research and Studies in Sociology, Karnataka State Open University, Muktagangotri, Mysuru 570006 & Assistant Professor, GFGC, Zalaki, Indi Taluk, Vijayapura District, Karnataka

¹Prof & Head (Rtd.), Department of Research and Studies in Sociology, Karnataka State Open University, Muktagangotri, Mysuru 570006

ABSTRACT

All over the world, urban areas are passing through a process of speedy growth and expansion, not by increase in fertility or migration, but by land acquisition and merger of villages in their fringe. While greater space is required for the metropolitan cities to accommodate several industrial/technological, service, manufacturing, and commercial sectors, the fact that agricultural lands are acquired by law to enable the same is leading to a complex sociological process of rehabilitation and resettlement of the displaced people.

The present paper is based on sociological research carried out in Mysuru City, highlighting several constraints and challenges faced by both the landowners and landless wage earners in the selected urban fringe villages of Mysuru City. Inadequacy of, delays, and absence of transparency in the procedure and absolute lack of participation by the local organization, the Grama Panchayat in the whole process of land grab and compensation, have pointed towards the need for a thorough revision in Rehabilitation and Resettlement Laws and Implementation from a people's perspective in development.

Key Words: Rural-Urban Fringe, Land Acquisition, Special Economic Zones, Liberalization, Inequality

¹Research Scholar, Department of Research and Studies in Sociology, Karnataka State Open University, Muktagangotri, Mysuru 570006 & Assistant Professor, GFGC, Zalaki, Indi Taluk, Vijayapura District, Karnataka

²Prof & Head (Rtd.), Department of Research and Studies in Sociology, Karnataka State Open University, Muktagangotri, Mysuru 570006

1. The Setting

The two major branches of sociology, viz., 'Rural Sociology' and 'Urban Sociology', have maintained a distinctive subject matter from the time of their genesis in the early decades of the 20th century. However, certain sociological processes of the post-war period, the end of colonial rule, and, especially, the introduction of Structural Adjustment Policies (SAP) in the 1990s have led to an inevitable blend of the two disciplines within the broader subject of Sociology. This is caused by the changes that have occurred in rural areas through both directed and impacted changes. The growth and development of cities and towns in the latter part of the 20th century and the years in the New Millennium have proceeded beyond industrialization and the consequent urbanization to celebrate the latter (urban expansion) with added features. The policies of liberalization and privatization are chiefly responsible for bringing in several structural and functional transformations in the lives of communities in both locales – villages and the city.

2. Agrarian Economy, Globalization and Urban Expansion: Commodification of Agricultural Land

The agrarian economy (worldwide and in India) has experienced a noticeable transformation ever since economic liberalization was introduced in the 1990s. Along with the globalization process, it has signalled a shift from slow growth processes to market-driven ones. As a result, the government policy for agriculture has undergone many transformations. The significant shift here has been one where the ***“land that was the source of food and other products itself has been commodified”***.

Urbanization following industrial, commercial, and other forms of development is defined as an important process of socio-economic development and cultural transformation, especially in developing societies such as India. This is because urbanization leads to an increase in the size and density of the population and the proportion of non-agricultural workers to total workers in any given area or region.

In India, the urbanization process exhibits, among other features, the tendency to capture large cities and towns because of the favorable situation or presence of such factors. Its cities are undergoing rapid expansion, hosting diverse economic activities, and large-scale migration of people from far and near. This has placed a heavy toll on the available land resources in the cities, failing to accommodate the demographic and economic expansion that is after SAP. There came to be considerable pressure on them (the cities) for residential, business, industrial, educational, commercial/trade-related activities demanding physical space in terms of buildings.

The Fringe, Core, and the Periphery

The inevitable outcome has been the expansion of the cities towards the rural-urban Fringe (RUF), possibly haphazardly and spontaneously: circumferentially or radially. There is a glaring absence of governing bodies and any planned or balanced transformation of rural society into an urban or semi-urban area (Kohli 2012). Suddenly or gradually, the rural landscape of the fringe is replaced by the city's urban expansion, transforming the former (rural) with urban-like features. Unplanned urban expansion in the past has had many positive impacts on the people of the RUF. But, the problems relating to land use and

demographic and socio-cultural influences outnumber them. Mysuru city in southern Karnataka is no exception as it has experienced much unplanned transformation in the lives of the people in the RUF area.

3. About the Paper: Objectives & Methodology

This paper is based on a broader, ongoing study of the RUF area of Mysuru City, which has been undertaken for the first author's Ph.D work. The aims and objectives of the main research are to understand the sociological implications of the process of urban expansion cutting into the surrounding rural – fringe – area and on the people in these villages. The paper uses the data collected for the study using qualitative and quantitative data collection methods from a sample of 200 rural fringe area families in four selected villages located in the four directions of Mysuru City (@ 50 respondents per village).

The objectives of this paper are to:

- (a) Trace the socio-economic background of the farmers who lost land due to land acquisition (LA);
- (b) Understand the process of LA by the affected farmers represented in the sample
- (c) Learn about the process of LA and Compensation, and
- (d) Critically reflect upon the formation of livelihoods by the affected people

4. Understanding the Concept of Land Acquisition

At the outset, scholars believe that Land Acquisition (hereafter LA) is not new to Indian farmers as it has been in vogue right from the time of independence in 1947 till today. Yet, one can make a historical break up of this long period into:

- (a) Pre-Globalization and Liberalization period and
- (b) Post-1990s

The first reference period has been researched well i.e. on LA and Compensation Inequality (Bardhan 2010; Dwivedi 2006; Nilsen 2010). Many instances of the voices of farmers who demanded higher compensation being suppressed by the authorities are also documented (Struempell 2014). Kohli (2012) has called the decade 1990s the "Key Turning Point" as far as LA in India's liberalization process or period is concerned. The post-1991 years witnessed increasing demand for land because of privatization initiatives in the sectors of Industry, Commerce, Infrastructural, and Other Development projects (Chandrashekar and Gosh 2002). The role of the public sector diminished after liberalization, while private investment increased, becoming dominant by the year 2000 according to scholars like Kohli (2012). Liberalization boosted the service sector due to the rise of Information Technology (IT), Bio-Technology (BT), and Business Products Outsourcing (BPOs) initiatives, all of which bloomed largely in the upcoming urban, metropolitan cities (Bardhan 2010; Kohli 2010, 2012). The central government introduced a series of policies promoting private investment in:

- ✓ Power (1992)
- ✓ Roads (1997)
- ✓ Ports (1997) among others

Public-private Partnerships (PPPs) became the preferred method of building infrastructure. According to Gulati (2011), by 2000, as much as 37 percent of infrastructure investment had been made by the private sector. The land market became the only way of fulfilling this demand.

The Era of Engines of Growth, the SEZs & Foreign Direct Investment (FDI):

Studies have brought out certain supporting factors regarding the resistance offered by the concerned villagers to the LA move by the government. The ability of the government to acquire land was questioned³. While the LPG (Liberalization, Privatization, and Globalization) process was introduced in the 1990s, special economic Zones (SEZs) were introduced in the year 2000⁴. They had the objectives of:

- (1) Generating additional economic activities;
- (2) Promoting exports of goods and services;
- (3) Creating employment opportunities; and
- (4) Development of infrastructure

The SEZs were characterised by "Single-Window Clearance" of projects and established links between the state governments and foreign investors. The private sector came to play a major role here. By 2010, according to government sources, around 25843 ha of agricultural land in the country had been acquired to create 195 SE Zones. Further, 581 SEZs were slated to be in 2011. The IT & BT enabled services formed about 61 percent of these SEZs (Biotechnology, Pharmacy, Textiles, and Multiple others. The SEZs became known as "the Engines of Growth" by the Commerce Ministry of GoI.

Implications of the Privatization and Related Processes

What happens when a farmer's land is acquired when he is not keeping it for sale?

Mahanta (2010) puts forth that several problems arise:

- Falling production of food grains is the first significant impact affecting not only the owner of the acquired land but also the consumers for whom food grains form a major source of their daily food requirement.
- Loss of traditional occupation of farmers
- Unemployment and loss of livelihoods of landless labourers working on those lands.
- Lack of Information Flow and Resistance by Villagers
- Lack of specialisation in non-agricultural work created a conflict between the government and the affected communities.
- Loss incurred by the agricultural labourers is not compensated through employment in the SEZs.
- Lakhs of hectares of irrigated and multi-cropped areas producing food grains are lost.

Legislation for Land Acquisition

Before going into the details of the LA Act, let us understand what it means. Land Acquisition (LA) is defined as the process of acquiring privately owned land and promoting it for public purposes to implement planned development for the welfare of Human Settlements (Henssen 1988).

Which sectors of development require such land?

- Large Highways;

³Example here is how the protests by villagers led to the shifting of the TATA Motors from West Bengal's Singur to Gujarat, after the farmers protested and a land war resulted between the two states

⁴The SEZ Act was passed June 23, 2005

- Chemical Plants;
- Power Plants;
- Infrastructural Development – Buildings for Housing Complexes, Offices and Commercial Complexes;
- Manufacturing and Processing Units; etc

All these require large land sizes at suitable locations in various areas. State-owned land is not enough for these. It must be acquired from private sources by developers. Although the farmers have not kept land for sale, the government is authorised to force land owners to sell such land which it considers suitable for a said purpose (FAO 2008). Once the government releases a notification to that effect it cannot be avoided under any circumstances. Every country has its Laws and Procedures for LA (Ding 2007).

LA Act in India

It was during the Colonial/British Rule that the LA Act was passed for the first time in India in 1894. This Act forms the basis but there have been several Amendments to the Act. Scholars have identified a few loopholes in the Land Acquisition Amendment Bill 1988 that was passed in 1988. The important defect in this law is that ***the losers can forfeit their land even before compensation is settled*** (Asif 1999). Real Estate Developers grab land in the name of SEZs (Chandrashekar and Ghosh 2007). LA issue in India made even the World Bank turn its attention (2012) because around 60 million or more farmers and others have been displaced right from the time of independence; the Liberalization era has increased its pace (Fernandes 2008). The role of the State in acquiring land from farmers also gained momentum in the 1990s⁵.

Box 1: LA Acts

- Land Acquisition Act, 1894
- The Land Acquisition Amendment Bill, 1988
- National Policy on Rehabilitation and Resettlement Amendment Act, 2003 (implemented in November 2004)
- The National Policy on Rehabilitation and Resettlement Amendment Act, 2007 (October 31st, 2007; passed on February 25, 2009, replacing the earlier Acts)
- The Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation & Resettlement Act, 2013 (effective from January 1, 2014) and
- Right to Fair Compensation and Transparency in Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resettlement (Amendment) Bill, 2015

Source: Government of India, Commerce Ministry

Even after independence from the country, the 1894 LA Act continued to hold sway over the matter as the Indian Constitution, under its Art.372, allowed the Act (all British Laws) to remain in force unless they were explicitly repealed (ibid). This Act simply defined LA as “acquiring land for any public purpose by the government/government agency through Law, from the individual land-owner, after paying a compensation “fixed” instead of losses incurred by them by surrendering their land to the government.

⁵The Left Front Government was thrown out of power in West Bengal in March 2007 after about 10,000 acres of land acquired by foreign investors in Nandigram; there were reports of massacre of protesting farmers, rape, and assault etc on them (Bag 2011).

Box 2: Stages of Implementation of LA by the Government

Stage One: Announce the Notification through the District Collector or the Deputy Commissioner (the DC), who thereupon will/can take over the land for surveying; the landowner cannot make any investment on his land thereafter notification, without the permission of the authorities;

Stage Two: Hearing of any objections about Acquisition;

Stage Three: Declaration of Intended Land Acquired for Public Purposes;

Stage Four: Order passed by the DC or the Collector;

Stage Five: Landmarked out, measured, and planned for a plan of execution;

Stage Six: Notice announced about inviting any interested persons to make claims on land measurement, Compensation amount, and to whom compensation is payable;

Stage Seven: Enquiry and Award by the Collector or DC

Stage Eight: The government obtains power to take possession of the acquired land; and

Stage Nine: Reference sent to Court

Source: Commerce Ministry, GoI 2002

5. Discussion based on the Study's Findings

The number of people evicted from villages acquired by the government or those which got submerged during the building of a dam etc runs to thousands in various states. The livelihoods of skilled workers and artisans are also affected tremendously besides the livelihoods of those directly dependent on agriculture for survival like the small and marginal farmers. This holds good for the study area based on which the following findings are relevant for our discussion.

The following is a critical presentation of the findings of our study carried out in Mysuru City covering four villages located on the City's fringe in all 4 directions.

5.1 Caste Profile of Respondents

Like any other village in the state and district, the villages in our sample also have dominant castes and the SCs in large numbers. However, the socio-economic vulnerability of the respondents who lost their only source of livelihood and economic asset, agricultural land for land acquisition is startling. Of the total sample of 200 land-lost villagers in the study area, 33 percent of affected people have hailed from the Scheduled Caste and 10.5 percent from the Scheduled Tribe background. A majority (29%) were also from the constitutional category of 2B which refers to Muslims. Category 2 A includes important service

communities like Potter, Shephard, Toddy Tapper, etc. Put together, those from Other Backward Classes were 56.5 percent and those from SC and ST backgrounds constituted 43.5 percent of the sample (refer to Table 1).

Table 1: Village-wise Caste Profile of the Affected Families in LA

Caste Category	Maratikyathana Halli		Ramana Halli		Belavattha		Kuppalururu		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
SC	7	14.0	14	28.0	14	28.0	31	62.0	66	33.0
ST	0	0.0	20	40.0	1	2.0	0	0.0	21	10.5
2A	1	2.0	3	6.0	9	18.0	0	0.0	13	6.5
2B	0	0.0	3	6.0	2	4.0	0	0.0	5	2.5
3A	40	80.0	6	12.0	12	24.0	0	0.0	58	29.0
3B	2	4.0	1	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	1.5
OBC	0	0.0	3	6.0	12	24.0	19	38.0	34	17.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	50	100.0	50	100.0	200	100.0

Source: Field Survey

Land Ownership after LA

The finding that agricultural land which was acquired by the government from the urban fringe villages was the only or chief source of livelihood and a valuable economic asset is proved when we find that 72 percent of our respondents have lost their whole land for LA. Table 2 shows that only 28 per cent of the total sample of 200 affected families have some marginal extent of land left in their ownership. This includes the families from the dominant/upper castes which were able to buy land elsewhere with the compensation money or only a part of their land was acquired. The prevailing caste-based inequality is clear when we find that the vulnerable and marginalized communities such as SC, ST and Muslims are among those whose 1-2 acres of marginal lands have been completely acquired.

Table 2: Ownership of Agricultural Land

Ownership	Maratikyathan	Rammanahall	Belavattha	Kuppalururu	Total
-----------	---------------	-------------	------------	-------------	-------

of Agricultural Land	a halli		i							
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Yes	27	54.0	9	18.0	5	10.0	15	30.0	56	28.0
No	23	46.0	41	82.0	45	90.0	35	70.0	144	72.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	50	100.0	50	100.0	200	100.0

Source: Field Survey

Occupational Profile of Respondents

The table below provides some insights about the dependence of the respondents on land as cultivators and wage workers. While 62.5 per cent had only land as their source of livelihood, 37.5 per cent had their caste occupation also to substitute for some earnings. Only in Rammanahalli we find a sole respondent engaged in 'some other' activity. One can notice that in Kuppaluru none was dependent on agricultural land, while in Maratikyatanahalli, only one did so.

Year of Land Acquisition

The study found that the process of LA began more than 20-25 years ago, when MUDA was established and the government began to encroach agricultural lands on the rural urban fringe area for purposes of constructing lay outs and roads. The people in the villages were not aware of these factors except a few who were from powerful families with links with the higherups in politics and administration. As the village's outlying areas are generally dry, unfertile and lack irrigation, it was thought that acquisition would not affect the owner. But sadly, these lands were belonging to the poor and weaker sections. Their knowledge about the whole acquisition or SEZs etc was nil. This is evident from table 3 which shows that the process began 10-20 years ago and 20-25 years ago according to 41.5 per cent and 35 per cent of respondents respectively. 12.5 percent of them have claimed beyond that span (30 and above years back) also. This indicates the gradual process in which land was acquired in the study area.

Table 3: Years When Loss of Land Began Due to Urban Expansion

Years	Maratikyathana	Rammanahalli	Belavattha	Kuppaluru	Total
-------	----------------	--------------	------------	-----------	-------

	halli									
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Don't Know	5	10.0	1	2.0	1	2.0	0	0.0	7	3.5
5 to 10 Years ago	10	20.0	3	6.0	0	0.0	1	2.0	14	7.0
10-20 Years ago	35	70.0	14	28.0	8	16.0	26	52.0	83	41.5
20-25 Years ago	0	0.0	19	38.0	36	72.0	16	32.0	71	35.5
30 and Above Years ago	0	0.0	13	26.0	5	10.0	7	14.0	25	12.5
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0	50	100.0	50	100.0	200	100.0

Source: Field Survey

5.2 Involvement of Village-Level Institutions in Decision-Making

The study has revealed that the village-level institutions were not involved in any form of decision-making. This is upheld by studies also (Sharma 2007). In other states, the displaced and affected people have taken to protests and demonstrations against the injustice meted out to them by LA. Raigarh, in Maharashtra state, is notable for even getting the notification about LA cancelled also, following a rigorous protest from the farmers there.

Table 4: Land Acquisition in Grama Panchayat Limits During Respondent's Term in Office

Land	Belavattha	Kuppaluru	Maratikyata	Rammanahall	Total
------	------------	-----------	-------------	-------------	-------

Acquisition during Term in GP					nahalli		i			
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	3	20.0	0	0.0	1	6.7	4	26.7	8	13.3
No	12	80.0	15	100.0	14	93.3	11	73.3	52	86.7
Total	15	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	60	100.0

Source: Field Survey

The local Panchayats and other village-level organizations like Farmers' Clubs, Raitha Sangha's, etc were not consulted before the move. The respondents have also added that proper Rehabilitation and Resettlement schemes for the displaced people are not in place. The Act has stated that the compensation to be fixed has to be based on the market value of that land, on the date of preliminary notification. If compensation is delayed the landowner should be given an interest amount of 15 % per annum.

Role of Interest Groups

Land use conversion from agricultural to non-agricultural purposes is in huge demand for industrial, residential, and infrastructural facilities. As a result, powerful interest and lobbying groups are working in collusion with officials and political representatives. Ordinary people lose out to such interest groups. Yet, the absolute power of the state is unchanged (as granted under Art.31A, plus Art.14 to Art 19 of the Constitution). Thus, any land, including wasteland, forests, pastures, agricultural and non-agricultural purposes, building sites, etc are in huge demand.

Dissatisfaction with Compensation Amount

Our study has supported the outcome of several other studies in this context which have emphasised that the land losers and others whose livelihoods are affected by LA are suffering from widespread anxiety. This is true all over India. There is no scope for negotiations to get the best price. About 40 percent of our respondents said that anyway, they were not keen on continuing agriculture as it is not productive like before. But at the same time, they consider it as their only asset and demand a high compensation amount so that they can invest the same in other businesses/vocations.

Some questions are pertinent in this context, as coming from our study:

- Only monetary compensation; no rehabilitation (employment) is given;
- No alternative job or Land in another place is given;
- Farming provides livelihood to many types of social groups. Compensation is given only to the landowner.

Although the Amendment of the LA Act in January 2014 was made, and the definition of "affected families" was changed to tenants, including various forms of tenancy, agricultural labourers, sharecroppers, artisans, etc – all of whom are working for at least 3 years before LA and whose primary source of livelihood is affected by LA.

Table 5: Compensation amount Received (in Rs.)

	Belavattha		Kuppaluru		Maratikyatanahalli		Rammanahalli		Total	
Compensation	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Nothing	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Less than Rs. 1,00,000	3	10.3	8	28.6	6	60.0	3	18.8	20	24.1
Rs. 1,00,000 to 3,00,000	11	37.9	9	32.1	0	0.0	9	56.3	29	34.9
Rs. 3,00,001 to 6,00,000	3	10.3	8	28.6	1	10.0	2	12.5	14	16.9
Rs. 6,00,001 to 15,00,000	2	6.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	12.5	4	4.8
Rs. 15,00,001 to 31,00,000	6	20.7	2	7.1	3	30.0	0	0.0	11	13.3
Rs. 31,00,001 to 50,00,000	4	13.8	1	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	6.0
Rs. 51,00,001 and above	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	29	100.0	28	100.0	10	100.0	16	100.0	83	100.0

Box 3: Entitlements for Land Losers

The land losers are entitled to the following:

- Those who are residing in that affected area for minimum period of 5 years are eligible for obtaining a house or Time Annuity Grant in lieu
- Annuity or employment or One Time grant of Rs.5 lakhs or Rs. 2000 per month for 20 years
- Subsistence allowance of Rs. 3000 per month for one year with training and skill development
- Minimum of Rs.2500 to small traders, and self-employed persons as One Time financial assistance. The District Collector will take possession of the concerned land only after ensuring full payment plus rehabilitation and resettlement.

New Livelihoods, New Risks and Threats

The respondents who were not owners but depended on acquired land as artisans and labourers have felt that they are the most affected. The land owner is not jobless and had an assured capital in the form of his agricultural land, for which he has received compensation amount. Land is something like “Insurance” to the owner; farming has given livelihood to many families they argued. The respondents who were marginal land owners felt that land owners feel ‘Food assured’ with their land but beyond that they do not find agriculture productive. But for them (landless workers), land acquisition amounts to total loss of livelihood, having to shift from one’s village (one’s land for the owner), settle in a new environment, face new threats and strategies for new occupations, new risks, and uncertainties for the whole family.

Inequality in Compensation

Literature survey has shown that there is inequality in payment of compensation amount to land lost families and those dependent upon them not receiving anything. It holds good in our study area also. Landless labourers who were engaged in agricultural and livestock rearing to owner households from generations (before during their ancestors’ times as part of the Jajmani system) have nothing in their hands now. There is no compensation for them. In some cases where a substantial portion of the village is acquired, then a large number of landless workers and along with them, artisans (smiths, carpenters, etc), and service professionals (barbers, washermen, weavers, potters etc) also need compensation they have argued.

Common Property Resources

When LA has involved a whole village or its public lands (Common Property Resources) then a whole lot of professionals who used to draw their raw materials from the natural resources have been affected. For example, the potters and brickmakers depend on the village pond or tank for mud and water; the fisherfolk depend on the same water source for their fish; the cowherds and shepherds need the CPRs for grazing the livestock; and so on.

Table6: Reasons for the Government’s Decision

Reasons	Belavattha		Kuppaluru		Maratikyatanahalli		Rammanahalli		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Used for building a temple	0	0.0	14	93.3	6	40.0	1	7.1	21	35.6
Used for other purposes	3	20.0	0	0.0	2	13.3	5	35.7	10	16.9
Used as graveyard and govt. Ayurvedi	3	20.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	28.6	7	11.9

c hospital										
Other Purposes like school, graveyard, hospital	4	26.7	0	0.0	6	40.0	2	14.3	12	20.3
Used then sold to others	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	14.3	2	3.4
Used as a play ground	5	33.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	8.5
Land was less in extent	0	0.0	1	6.7	1	6.7	0	0.0	2	3.4
Total	15	100.0	15	100.0	15	100.0	14	100.0	59	100.0

Source: Field Survey

An interesting finding is that despite having CPRs in the village the government went ahead to acquire land from private owners. Why? The table below provides the reasons. The CPR is encroached already by the powerful sections in the village for other/personal purposes.

Reinvestment of Compensation Amount

The table below gives details of how our respondents have invested their compensation amount to earn a living in the post Land Acquisition days. We must bear in mind that we have a mix of relatively better-off land losers vis-à-vis marginal farmers on the one hand; on the other, we have a caste-based distinction between the land losers hailing from the affluent dominant caste of Vokkaligas, Lingayats as well as a few middle-level caste groups who are much better economically as compared to the land lost farmers (marginal farmers) from the vulnerable sections such as the SC, ST and Muslims.

Table 7: Reasons for Post-land Acquisition Income is Not Better

Reasons	Belavattha		Kuppaluru		Maratikyatanahalli		Rammanahalli		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Agriculture is livelihood to a farmer; we had Varuna water	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	1	25.0
Sold for very low prices as RBI was coming up; now there is very high price in crores	3	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	75.0
Total	3	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	100.0	4	100.0

Source: Field Survey**Present Occupations after being pushed out of Land and Land Based Wage Work**

An interesting outcome of the study which this paper wishes to highlight is the satisfaction among most of the respondents (who lost land for land acquisition) is that they do not regret the taking away of land. They are sad that the compensation is far too less than what they expected. Some of them who lost their land several years before, felt that current prices were very high but they never got that much. Their progressive thinking is evident in the responses. They prefer to be on the fringe area which has several benefits such as proximity to the City, awareness, availability of casual labour, scope to market their produce such as milk, fish, and vegetables or offer caste-based services like hair cutting, pottery, laundry shop, or earn a living through tea stall or roadside petty sales or street hawker.

Table8: Availability of Jobs in Houses, Shops & Market Places in Urban Fringe Area

Responses	Belavattha		Kuppaluru		Maratikyatan ahalli		Rammanahalli		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	14	93.3	15	100.0	15	100.0	13	86.7	57	95.0
Selling Milk, Greens and Vegetables	3	20.0	15	100.0	14	93.3	15	100.0	47	78.3
Women go to work as housemaids	12	80.0	15	100.0	14	93.3	13	86.7	54	90.0
Gardening Work	2	13.3	15	100.0	14	93.3	11	73.3	42	70.0
Construction wage Work	12	80.0	15	100.0	14	93.3	15	100.0	56	93.3
Casual Labour in Market, Bus Stand and in Shops	12	80.0	15	100.0	14	93.3	13	86.7	54	90.0
No Transport available, very far	2	13.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	60.0	11	18.3
No Job	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	6.7	1	1.7
Total*	15	-	15	-	15	-	15	-	60	-
Other Responses										
Selling fish by importing it from Kerala; plus fruits selling	1	6.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	33.3	6	10.0
Fruit business	1	6.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	66.7	11	18.3
Road work	13	86.7	0	0.0	2	13.3	0	0.0	15	25.0
No Response	0	0.0	15	100.0	13	86.7	0	0.0	28	46.7
Total*	15	-	15	-	15	-	15	-	60	-

Note: *Multiple Answer (Yes only Considered), so Total Percentage no need to be added 100.

Source: Field Survey

Opinion about being in an Urban Fringe Village

The respondents have expressed mixed reactions about their village being merged into the expanding Mysuru city. Table 9 shows that those who felt negatively about the process are a minority. A considerably large part of our land-lost urban fringe villagers have opined positively, that by looking forward to benefiting from whatever has happened, it is all for development only. Earlier mentioned that about 40 percent were already out of farming as the only source of livelihood. For reasons explained earlier, such as the worsening scenario of agricultural productivity, these (48.5%) optimists have felt that living on the margins of the growing city is beneficial to them. It offers a wide range of non-farm occupations such as

self-employment in the service sector, petty trade of essential food, and other requirements of city dwellers. The presence of IT and related firms have offered wage work, service occupations like house-keeping, laundry, gardening, security guards, fast food supply chains, etc.

However, not all are happy. There are those who feel that lifestyle has changed for many but not for 'us' (SCs). The cost of living has increased for 7.5 percent of respondents while 8.5 percent felt that the crime rate and social disorganization have increased due to mixed population; traditional rural culture is at stake (5.5%) and the history of their village is lost in the urban milieu. Thus, the impact is both positive and negative. Sociologically, one can conclude that the process of assimilation and acculturation are at work while a state of helplessness cannot be hidden from the sociological lens.

Table9: Opinion on Fringe Villages Merging with the Expanding Cities

Opinion	Maratikyathanahalli		Rammanahalli		Belavattha		Kuppaluru		Total	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
A lot of development, many jobs available/ want to merge with the city	20	40.0	19	38.0	30	60.0	28	56.0	97	48.5
No change we are the same as SCs Before we used to get land for lease, but not now We are not improving	5	10.0	2	4.0	4	8.0	4	8.0	15	7.5
Lost the history of our village Cannot imagine this was our village in the	5	10.0	0	0.0	4	8.0	2	4.0	11	5.5

future Facilities have improved that much										
Got good value for our land Due to RBI, Varuna Canal, and Railway Track, our lands have lost their productive value	2	4.0	1	2.0	1	2.0	2	4.0	6	3.0
Mixed population, people are disorganized ; Got cheated as land bought for very low prices by real estate and Govt. which they later sold to others at a high cost	7	14.0	5	10.0	1	2.0	4	8.0	17	8.5
Life costly, Pattana Panchayat so tax raised The city is	3	6.0	8	16.0	1	2.0	3	6.0	15	7.5

closer to nice										
Lifestyle has changed, but our status has not changed No improvement	2	4.0	6	12.0	0	0.0	1	2.0	9	4.5
Good and bad-both; Our village is merged with the city No option, it had to merge	0	0.0	3	6.0	9	18.0	1	2.0	13	6.5
Don't Know	6	12.0	6	12.0	0	0.0	5	10.0	17	8.5
Total*	50	100.0	50	100.0	50	100.0	50	100.0	200	100.0

Note: *Multiple Answer (Yes only Considered), so Total Percentage no need to be added 100.**Source:**

Field Survey

Conclusions

The paper is based on part of the findings of ongoing research for my doctoral degree to evaluate the socio-economic impact of the agricultural land acquisition in Mysuru City in Southern Karnataka state. It provides insights into the process of land acquisition from farmers residing in the urban fringe region of the expanding city and its impact on their livelihoods. The paper highlights the problems encountered by the land owners who have lost their agricultural land. Alternative employment, payment in time of the compensation, its adequacy, timeliness, and related matters have been also discussed. It gives us a picture of the grassroots realities of the strategies adopted by the farmers, landless agricultural labourers, artisans and other professional/service personnel to cope with the emerging challenges of earning their livelihoods, constraints, and implications of urbanization.

The paper reflects upon inherent social and economic inequalities among those who lost their lands as well as the landless dependents. Many marginal farmers have lost whatever little extent of land they own and have spent the compensation money on day-to-day needs. The majority of them are living by daily wage labour and petty trade and/or services. While the medium and large farmers have expressed opposition to land acquisition, the landless and marginal landowning people who are working in the construction sector and other wage labour are in Favor of city expansion into the rural region.

Indebtedness is high after LA as the losers were not able to comprehend the expenses of family maintenance and issues regarding the availability of work.

By way of suggestions, the respondents have sought the provision of alternative employment and skill development to the landless labourers against LA. Thus, the acquisition of land in the urban fringe has affected rural society both positively and negatively. The delivery system for compensation was slow and inefficient in terms of time and adequacy. Local decentralized bodies have not taken any responsibility in delivering justice in these regards. The respondents have sought attention to these lacunae.

References

1. Asif, M. (1999). Land acquisition act: Need for an alternative paradigm. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 1564-1566.
2. Bardhan, P. K. (1973). On the incidence of poverty in rural India of the sixties. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 245-254.
3. Béteille, A. (1974). Studies in agrarian social structure.
4. Chandrasekhar, C. P., & Ghosh, J. (2009). *The market that failed: Neoliberal economic reforms in India*. Leftword.
5. Dwivedi, R. (2020). *Conflict and collective action: The Sardar Sarovar project in India*. Routledge India.
6. Fernandes, Walter (2008). Sixty Years of Development-Inducement in India, in India Social Development Report 2008: *Development and Displacement*, Ed Hari Mandir Mathur, New Delhi: Oxford University Press
7. Ghatak, M., & Ghosh, P. (2011). The land acquisition bill: a critique and a proposal. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 46(41), 65-72.
8. Jodhka, S. S. (1998). From “book view” to “field view”: Social anthropological constructions of the Indian village. *Oxford development studies*, 26(3), 311-331.
9. Kohli, A. (2012). *Poverty amid plenty in the new India*. Cambridge university Press.
10. Kumar, D. (1965). *Land and caste in South India*. Cambridge University Press.
11. Mahanta (2010). SEZ and Impact on Agriculture and Employment in India, in Arunachalam (ed) “SEZ in India. New Delhi: Serials Publications
12. Nilsen, A. G. (2010). *Dispossession and resistance in India: The river and the rage*. Routledge.
13. Saldanha, L. F. (2018). A review of Andhra Pradesh’s climate resilient zero budget natural farming programme. *Bangalore: Environment Support Group*.
14. Strümpell, C. (2014). The politics of dispossession in an Odishan steel town. *Contributions to Indian Sociology*, 48(1), 45-72.
15. Wiser, W. H. (1969). The Hindu jajmani system: A socio-economic system interrelating members of a Hindu village community in services.