



*Review Article*

**Spatial Impact of Development on Refugees blocks of Tibetan  
Refugees prone areas of Orissa– A Geographical Analysis on  
accounts of non profitable organization**

***Kishan Digal<sup>1</sup> & Prof. Pradyot Keshari Pradhan<sup>2</sup>***

<sup>1</sup>Asst. Prof. In commerce, Govt. College (Auto.) Angul, Odisha

<sup>2</sup>Professor, Department of commerce, Utkal university, Bhubaneswar, Odisha

---

***Abstract***

---

*The difference between the development level of Refugees society/area, and forward society/area, shows the need of development planning on territorial basis. So for the present study seeks to focus on the holistic picture of level of development attended in Refugees Blocks of Phuntsokling Tibetan Settlement, Odisha. The study compares the contemporary situation of Tibetan Refugees prone Blocks with the average situation of non-Refugees Blocks of selected Tibetan Refugees prone districts. The present analysis reflects that literacy level, female literacy, No. of school and colleges, land utilization system, net irrigated area and facilities provided by Governments, Number of distribution centers, facility of health transport and industries is quite low in the Area in comparison to national and state ratio. In view of planning and perspective on the basis of present study the backward Blocks having higher Refugees population and low level of development so they should be given first priority in the process of development.*

---

Copyright©2017, Kishan Digal. This is an open access article for the issue release and distributed under the NRJP Journals License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

**INTRODUCTION**

Being a melting pot of civilization India has an extensive system of society. 8.1 percent peoples of India are living in isolated areas of the country. Their techno- economic status and politico-cultural consequences are very low, so that the founding fathers of our republic strove to produce an empirical model which could provide a balanced path of integration and development. Article 46 of our constitution becomes the bedrock for the demarcation of scheduled areas and

framing regulation for the development of scheduled Tribe, but the benefits of development could not be achieved to the desired extent. Now inequality is the main environmental and development problem. The Refugees are ranging from primitive stage to modern society. There are few Refugees who have come in contact with industrial life, but majority is dependent on agriculture. The figure is very crucial that only very few Refugees families are

facilitated by government policies while others are living in very rough manner. There agricultural system is primitive and livelihood is supplemented by forest product and other activities.

Indian Refugees are living in two worlds, maximum are in their own Refugees world which is in transition; while others are in new social order which opens up vistas for their Transformation. There clustering in inaccessible tracts and slow change process shows that either Refugees prefer to live in backward areas or they have been pushed into their enclaves by peasant groups. Today also their way of life and economy is linked with their ecological base. Because the agriculture and related activities is main source of Refugees economy, so agricultural development is centrally led to all strategies of planned socio- economic development of region.

The difference between Refugees society and areas shows the need of development planning on territorial basis. So for the present study seeks to focus on the holistic picture of level of development attended in Refugees Blocks of Phuntsokling Tibetan Settlement, Odisha in last five decades. The contemporary situation of these Blocks has been compared with the average situation of non-Refugees Blocks and district.

#### **Research area:**

Phuntsokling Tibetan settlement was set up in 1963 with generous assistance from the Indian Government and other voluntary agency like Swiss Technical Co-operation. According to plan, the settlement was to be developed in two phases.

**Phase I:** Tibetan refugees shifted from road construction labour camps in Chamba, Dalhousie and Bomdila.

**Phase II:** The Tibetan refugees for the remaining camps arrived from all over India inbetween September 1964, to April 1967.

The allocation of the land to individuals began in 1963. The scheme made provision for one acre of land per each adult member of the families.

**Settlement location:** This settlement is situated in Gajapati District at a distance of 80 km west of Behrampur City of Orissa state. It is approximately 3,200 ft. above sea level and has average rainfall of about 26 inches. The temperature ranges from 40° to 80° Fahrenheit. The local inhabitants are mostly tribal.

#### **Settlement population:**

Initial population        2479

Present population:    2792

**No. of villages in the settlement:** Phuntsokling Tibetan settlement is divided into 5 villages at a distance of about four to five kilometers from one another. The population and the size of the village are very uneven. Each village has two leaders, elected by the villagers themselves for the period of one year.

**Settler's livelihood:** Most of the families have a small piece of agricultural land for their living. Due to lack of irrigation facilities, the rain fed crop agriculture is practice, which is not sufficient to sustain the families on farming alone. So, besides

agricultural the settlers are engaged in trading, restaurants, shop keeping and seasonal woollen business etc.

Under the management of the Co-operative Societies there are five shops, a dairy farm and a mechanical workshop, truck section, low cost Building Center, Handicraft centers. These sections provide employment, to preserve the Tibetan tradition carpet weaving, and to generate the income for the co-operative societies.

Administrative setup:

**CTA Representative:** Each settlement has a settlement officer who is the Representative of the Department of Home appointed by Central Tibetan Administration (CTA), Dharamsala. Settlement officer is the principle post of the settlement and he is incharged with overall running of affairs in the settlement.

The Representative acts as the liaison between the settlement and the Department of Home (CTA) and it is the main source of information for the settlers on policy of Central Tibetan Administration. Daily tasks for the representative ranges from adjudicating disputes to communicating with settlement's Local Assembly and outside authorities, and generally watching over the running of all aspects of the settlement.

**Local Assembly:** The functioning or structure of every settlements are similar. There are 5 villages in this settlement and all the settlers possess an elected Local Assembly who represents the settlers during the session and can raise the questions to the settlement officer. The actual term for the

these Local Assembly is for five years. They are elect on the basis of their strength and once ability to stand before the interest of their village.

### ***TIBETAN REFUGEES TRIBE IN ORISSA***

The Phuntsokling Tibetan Settlement, Odisha has unique position of being India's most popular state with small Refugees population. There are two Refugees belts 1- Northern Terai, and 2- Southern Plateau, where different racial Refugees are living. The Tibetan Refugees is the largest Tribe of Phuntsokling Tibetan Settlement, Odisha having 67.7 hundred populations. In 1967 the Tibetan Refugees was declared as scheduled Tribe. Tibetan Refugees is little known but widely scattered agricultural Tribe inhabits in Tibetan Refugees hat- the Tarai tract of bengal, orissa, jharkhand and Nepal. The Tibetan Refugees tribe is characterized by the presence of epicanthic fold in Eyes, flat face, and pale brown skins, stocky body, sagged Mongoloid affinity. In spite of joint family and patriarchal system, the dominating role of women in Tibetan Refugees family cannot be denied. Their hut structure, mosquito replace smoke and valued drink make them malaria proof, but now a days this habit of drink performing the role of destroyer. They are cheated by forward peoples who occupied there land and destroyed their severity, culture and family. It is poor group with main occupation of agriculture looking for the flow of corruption less development winds towards them.

**Demographic profile-** Having 8.8 million population, the average population density of all blocks is 387 persons per square km, while in Tibetan Refugees prone Blocks 310 per square km, the sex ratio of Tibetan Refugees prone Blocks is 862 out of average of 845/1000 Male. The total literacy and female literacy of Tibetan Refugees prone Blocks is 29.15% and 19.71% out of the 34.63% and 23.27% of average total and

female literacy of area. This shows that at one side the population density is less in Tibetan Refugees prone areas while sex ratio is higher in Tibetan Refugees prone blocks which prove the better position of Tibetan Refugees women's in the society. The touching point is the literacy rate which is very less in Tibetan Refugees prone blocks which reflect the need of educational development in area.

**Table: Demographic profile of study area**

SN	Study group	Average Area	Population density	sex ratio	Literacy%	Female Literacy%
1	Tibetan Refugees prone Blocks	509.53	310.09	852	29.15	19.71
2	Non Tibetan Refugees prone Blocks	332.22	407.02	843	35.52	23.84
3	Average of All Blocks	356.96	387.71	845	34.63	23.27

Source-U.P Statistical hand book 2005- 06

**Education facilities-** In both cases of girls and boys, the average number of schools is much higher in non-Refugees Blocks i.e. in male case out of 217.2 primary schools per blocks 198.67 schools per block in Refugees areas and 220.2 in non-Refugees blocks. And in female case out of 45.6 average primary schools per blocks 46.2 schools per

block in non-Refugees areas and 40.2 in Refugees blocks. The situation is more thinkable for higher studies, technical education and in the aspect of education centers for women's which is very less in Refugees blocks. So it is necessary to develop the higher education facilities in area.

**Table: Education facilities in study area (In number)**

Study group	Primary school		Junior high school		Secondary school		Graduation		Technical education	
	Total	Female	Total	Female	Total	Female	Total	Female	Total	Female

Tibetan Refugees prone Blocks	198.67	40.17	62.83	13.50	38.83	3.67	0.67	0.00	0.05	0.00
Non Tibetan Refugees prone Blocks	220.14	46.19	70.11	15.41	47.11	6.03	1.00	0.24	0.27	0.03
Average of All Blocks	217.14	45.35	69.09	15.14	45.95	5.70	0.95	0.21	0.03	0.02

Source-ORISSA Statistical hand book 2005- 06

**Land use pattern-** Land use pattern is the mirror of development in an area. Table 3 shows that the per block average percentage of area under forest, barren land and nonagricultural land is higher in Refugees Blocks while net shown area , gross shown area, net irrigated area , and area shown more than one time is higher in non-Refugees Blocks. This explanation shows that Refugees Blocks are backward in proper land utilization and having more chances for agricultural development.

**Irrigation facilities** –The Irrigation facilities are the base of agricultural development. Table 4 shows that per block average percentage of area irrigated by canal, government tube wells and wells is quite low in Refugees Blocks in comparison to

non-Refugees Blocks. While average percentage of area irrigated by Private Tube wells and ponds are higher in Refugees Blocks.

This explanation shows that, even thaw area irrigated by private tube wells is higher in Refugees Blocks, but pump set needs high expenditure so the required water for crops is not fulfilled by farmers while canals and government tube wells so cheaper than private pumps. So government should make effort for the development of canal and tube well in Refugees Blocks. This on one side fulfills the needs of irrigation facilities on the other side a canal will also be helpful in environment conservation and flood management.

**Table4:Irrigation facilities in Area**

Study Group	Irrigated land	Percentage of Area irrigated					Number o of sources		
		By canal	G Tube well	P Tube well	Well	Tank	Canal	Gov. Pump	Pvt. Pump
Tibetan Refugees	15416.3	2.55	3.76	89.73	0.59	3.48	52.33	12.33	440.7

prone Blocks									
Non Tibetan Refugees prone Blocks	15756.3	5.54	9.51	75.06	7.96	1.70	70.70	41.22	1208.4
Average of All Blocks	15708.8	5.13	8.72	77.07	6.95	1.93	68.14	37.19	1101.3

Source-U.P Statistical hand book 2005-06

**Industries** – The industries are heart of development. The following Table 6 shows that per block average number of registered and other small industries in study area is quite low in comparison to other areas. In this area this scenario is quite poor in Refugees Blocks in comparison to non-Refugees Blocks, the area is sound in **Table: Industries in area**(In numbers)

agricultural and forest resources so forest, agriculture based and foot loose industries must be developed in area. While the development of large scale industries in area will improve the whole socio-economic situation of Tibetan Refugees, rather than other efforts.

Groups	Registered industries		Small scale industries		Khadi Gram udyog	
	Number	worker	Number	worker	Number	Worker
Tibetan Refugees prone Blocks	3.00	14.17	137.83	386.0	41.67	109.83
Non Tibetan Refugees prone Blocks	6.62	25.80	189.03	559.05	54.30	134.20
Average of All Blocks	6.12	24.23	181.88	534.9	52.53	130.81

Source-U.P Statistical hand book 2005-06

**Transport, communication and financial facilities-** Table10 shows that per block average number of Transport, communication and finance facilities is quite higher in Refugees Blocks in comparison to non-Refugees Blocks. There are 69.9

percent villages were electrified, which was 85.8 percent in Refugees blocks. The average length of roads in Refugees blocks was 147.83 KM while 121.27 in non-Refugees blocks. The average no. of post office in Refugees blocks was 31.17 while

18.62 in non-Refugees blocks. The average no. of telegram centers in Refugees blocks was 0.67 while 0.05 in non-Refugees blocks. The average no. of PCO in Refugees blocks was 26.33 while 27.03 in non-Refugees blocks. The average no. of banks in

Refugees blocks was 4.0 while 2.92 in non-Refugees blocks. This explains that the facilities are higher in Refugees blocks but they are centralized to some extent which needs to decentralize.

**Table: Transport communication and financial facilities in area** (In numbers)

Groups	%of electrified village	Length of roads in KM	No. of post office	No. of telegrams	No. of PCO	No. of Telephone booth	No. of Nationalized banks
Tibetan Refugees prone Blocks	85.83	147.83	31.17	0.67	26.33	1030.83	4.0
Non Tibetan Refugees prone Blocks	66.97	121.27	18.62	0.05	27.03	470.5	2.92
Average of All Blocks	69.6	124.98	20.37	0.14	26.93	548.7	3.0

Source-U.P Statistical hand book 2005-06

**Conclusion and suggestions-** It seems that concentration of Refugees population have positive relationship with high proportion of area under forest and backward situation. In view of planning and perspective on the basis of present study the backward Blocks having higher concentration of Refugees population and low level of development should we given first priority in the process of development while it is necessary to develop the agricultural and infrastructural facilities in the area located far from the urban centers. The communities living in Tibetan Refugees areas rather than Tibetan Refugees, snatches the facilities and land from Refugees, So Refugees peoples reveals

in bottom thus there is urgent need to generate inner urge of development among Tibetan Refugees. The government should effort by not giving the reservation but by the development of education health and industries in area.

#### References-

1. Atkinson: **The Himalayan gazetteer**, Cosmos publications, New Delhi.
2. Singh RL, **India: A Regional geography** Utis publishers

3. Sharma.B.D., *Planning for Tribal development*, Prachi publication New Delhi, 1984.
4. Bhaduri J.S. - *Present dimensions of Tribal so cites in India*, the eastern anthropologist vole 31(3), 197
3. Hansa Jain: *Scheduled Tribes: changes in socio-economic condition, classic* publication company New Delhi 2004
4. Pathak.A.K; *Tharu janjati ki samajik arthik pariwartan shiltaav omsam vikas – Uttar Pradesh ke terrain kshetrakaekpratikadhhayan* unpublished thesis Lucknow university Lucknow, 2006.
5. Jafri S.S.A. - *Socio cultural profile of AO Tribal village of Nagaland: A case study Chagatai village*, Geographical review of India, Vol56 no4 Kolkatta, 1994.
6. Visshwakarma.D- *Spatial impact of development in Tribal Blocks –A study of Chhindwara M.P*, geographical review of India 69(3) September-2007