

BEYOND THE VERDICT: LIVELIHOOD TRANSITIONS IN POST-ACQUISITION SINGUR

Arjun Mukherjee

PhD Scholar

School of Development Studies, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar University Delhi

ABSTRACT

The struggle against land acquisition in Singur became one of India's most prominent conflict over industrialisation, agricultural land and development-induced displacement. While the Supreme Court judgment of 2016 restored ownership of the acquired land to farmers, the long-term consequences of the acquisition for the people affected by it remained insufficiently examined. This paper studies these consequences through qualitative fieldwork conducted in Khasherberi; one of the most severely affected villages during the acquisition process. Drawing on in-depth interviews with landed and landless households, the study examines changes in operational holdings, agricultural livelihoods, women's work and the impact of post-acquisition compensation and welfare measures. The findings reveal a significant gap between the restoration of landownership and the restoration of agricultural livelihoods. Much of the returned land remains uncultivable or difficult to cultivate because of industrial debris, concrete structures, ecological changes and the costs associated with land rehabilitation. Consequently, operational holdings have declined even where ownership has been restored. The reduction in cultivable land has weakened agriculture as a source of livelihood and food security, while pushing both landed and landless households towards insecure non-farm occupations. The study further demonstrates that these transformations have distinct gendered consequences. Women who previously participated in cultivation, livestock management and pre- and post-harvest activities have experienced a loss of such roles and mobility, with few transitioning towards poorly paid and physically demanding home-based work. The findings suggest that displacement must therefore be understood beyond physical relocation or legal dispossession. The Singur case demonstrates how land acquisition can generate prolonged economic, ecological and gendered displacement even after land has formally been returned.

Keywords: Singur; land acquisition; development-induced displacement; rural livelihoods; women's agricultural labour; West Bengal

I. INTRODUCTION

Expropriation of land for industrialisation has far reaching consequences on the ones whose land has been acquired. The consequences arise because often such land was a source of livelihood for the community residing there before the advent of development. Such cases have been highlighted for more than a decade in the development-induced displacement literature. For instance, scholars have cited the English enclosure movements as one of the key examples of development-induced displacement in the earlier times (Sarkar, 2007; Levien, 2017). A movement controlled by the elite to evict around 50,000 cultivators from the land cultivated by them. In recent times, one need not go too far back in time or place to find cases of development-induced displacement and its devastation caused to the displaced. In China, as per a report, 10 million people have been displaced since the 1950s due to hydroelectric projects. And, 20 million farmers were displaced from their lands and livelihood due to acquisition between 1992 and 2005 (Sarkar, 2007). The development projects in India too have caused large scale displacement of its own people. For instance, the Narmada Valley Project alone

displaced 250,000 people and led to large scale loss of livelihoods (Mehta, 2008). The displaced from these projects mostly tend to be the most marginalised too (Mathur, 2013). However, this paper does not discuss a case of government led large scale projects and its impact on the displaced. This paper discusses the case of Singur, wherein a prime agricultural land of 997 acres was expropriated for a private company by the then state government. The state government back then used the 'eminent domain' clause of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 to acquire the land under public purpose. However, it faced huge backlash for carrying out a state led displacement for a car manufacturing factory. The paper documents the transitions in the livelihoods and lives of the people from the field after more than a decade of acquisition.

SINGUR, THEN AND NOW

A lot has happened since land was acquired in Singur in 2006. The farmers and locals of the project-affected area had protested the acquisition for the factory. The areas to be acquired were prime agricultural land on which the livelihoods of many depended. With activists pouring in from across India, the movement received national importance and the TATAs had to finally evacuate the vicinity in 2008. It also led to a movement that saw the downfall of the 34-year-old left front regime in West Bengal. The farmers fight against the forceful acquisition by the then government was seen just and fair by the law, as the Supreme Court verdict in 2016 deemed the acquisition illegal. The farmers had won the legal battle against their land's acquisition and had won their lands back. With years of battle since 2006, the farmers of Singur had redeemed themselves on paper with a landmark judgement in their favour in 2016 (Nielsen, 2018).

During that period of agitation from 2006 to 2008, Singur was at the centre of many scholarly debates too. Singur's case has been seen by scholars from various vantage points. Macro-analysis of the case has viewed it from the lens of a neoliberal charge of development that does not cater to the most in need of development (Bhaduri, 2005; Patnaik, 2007). An idea of development that is promoted on the back of the most vulnerable for the gains of a few. Where land is being appropriated by the state government from the poor at the behest of private investors. Then there are studies that have been an enriching in-depth ethnographic study which have highlighted how the everyday life of the village intertwined itself onto the movement. For instance, understanding how the mobilisation and resistance by the people under the banner of Singur Krishi Jomi Rakhsa Committee was successful and a people's led movement (Nielsen, 2014). Policy and jurisprudence analysts have viewed it from the vantage of fair and just compensations, to the ill-use of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 itself (Ghatak et al., 2012).

However, this paper brings out the changes that the community has gone through over a course of around 20 years. Focussing the study on one of the most affected mouzas (village) in the project affected area, the paper highlights how after many years the livelihood of the people has drastically changed and displaced. Although they did not get displaced from the location itself, and got back their ownership over the acquired land, their operational holding declined. It declined because the land returned was not fit for cultivation. The TATA motors had built the factory's sewage system, laid concrete on the ground, etc. A segment of the industry was built.

Recent studies on Singur's land acquisition have also viewed it from the lens of social movements and current despair amongst the locals regarding industrialisation (Bhattacharyya, 2025). A study tracing the ghosts of development highlights how the resilience of the community has allowed for them to cope with the transition (ibid.). However, in recent times, a livelihood-based assessment of the villagers or the transition they faced due to the acquisition have not been studied or catered to. An acquisition that did not change the land use pattern or result in an accumulation by dispossession, still

changed the livelihood aspect of the acquired areas drastically. The paper first breaks down as to why the study focuses on Singur and then discusses the methodology deployed to understand the lived realities of the people in the project affected area. The paper then via the inferences highlight that an acquisition of this sort leaves the people vulnerable in terms of their livelihoods. And that in today’s time, a space that acquired so much national importance for its resistance, the people of Singur and their plights have only remained an electoral issue with no benefits reaching to the ones who actively fought against the acquisition.

Singur stood as one of the cases against forceful land acquisition where a movement by the people was successful. It was successful in winning access and ownership of the acquired lands. Many compensatory packages were also introduced with the incoming of a new government in West Bengal. However, the land won back by the farmers did not seem fit for cultivation (Nag, 2021). It is because TATA motors had continued with the acquisition and the construction on the land since January 2007 (Dasgupta, 2023). It only abandoned work in 2008. Therefore, the land returned had the remains from the factory. Field visits carried at the end of December 2024 confirmed that there was still concrete in some parts of the acquired land and the land has wild shrubs growing on it. Observations from the field revealed that the land currently has become an ecosystem for wild boars, foxes, and snakes. Most areas require the usage of bulldozers for cleaning the land. An investment which is to be borne by the owners themselves for cleaning the land. This has led to significant shifts in livelihoods for the community. For instance, anecdotal evidences by a prominent leader of the Singur movement highlighted that currently only 10 per cent of land is cultivable in Khasherberi’s acquired area (around 18 acres of land). The paper wants to highlight how an acquisition at one point, leading to changes in land use, still has an impact on the lives of the people after they have won their lands back. This impact has led to a reduction in the overall operational holding of the village. Primarily an agrarian economy, the reduction in operational holding has severely impacted the landscape of agriculture in the village.

II. METHODOLOGY

The paper is a qualitative study inferring the micro-level changes in the everyday lives and livelihoods of the people of Khasherberi. Khasherberi was chosen as the field of study because amongst the mouzas that were affected, it was the most affected in terms of area acquired (see Table 1).

Table 1: Areas where land was acquired

Table 1: Areas where land was acquired			
Mouza (Village)	Total Area	Acquired	Percentage
Gopalnagar	1656.55	399.98	24.15
Beraberi	1043.82	327.21	31.35
Khasherberi	229.62	180.59	78.65
Bajemelia	355.13	47.77	13.45
Sinherberi	310.75	41.56	13.37

Source: Nielsen (2018)

The study is based on in-depth interviews carried out in 15 households of Khasherberi in December 2024 to January 2025 (see Table 2). The aim was to capture the impact that reduction in operational holding has even after 9 years of the land being returned to them. The lack of cultivation on the land has led to lesser reliance on agriculture as the only source of livelihood. Inferences from the field will reveal how the next generation of men and women do not see agriculture as a viable livelihood.

Table 2: Household profile by social category and land ownership

Caste	Total Households	Landless Households (0)	Landed Households (>0)
General	6	0	6
OBC	1	0	1
SC	8	5	3
Total	15	5	10

The spectre of land acquisition and the feeling of being misled was a common sentiment when I entered the study area. The space can be seen echoing the remnants of the conflicts in the past with the state. It is not a space where an outsider in today's time is trusted. This drastic change amongst the people did not exist during the agitation years. This could be attributed to the fact that many outsiders were seen as ally to the movement against the acquisition. However, in today's scenario the outsiders researching them are a constant reminder of them feeling used by the others. Given this reality of the field, the best method was to take up snowball sampling as the tool chosen was of in-depth interviews. The study is not a quantitative study and wants to highlight the change in the people's lives and livelihoods as understood and lived by the respondents themselves. Given the limitation of the field itself, the purpose was to capture the difference in the lives of the landed and the landless. And, how the acquisition impacted their lives and livelihoods differently. Therefore, the IDIs conducted were done with both the landed and the landless, and in one case with a woman headed household. The demarcation of the landed and the landless have been done basis ownership holding of agricultural land and not operational holding.

III. FINDINGS FROM THE PRIMARY SURVEY

1. Decline in operational landholding:

First and foremost task of the study was to understand whether farming is possible on the land returned or not. It was noted from the landed respondents that most of their land in the project affected area were uncultivable. For instance, a respondent named Arindam (names recreated to maintain anonymity of respondents) noted that before the acquisition period he was able to do cultivation on 3.5 bigha land. One acre of land equals to three bigha of land in West Bengal. Arindam used to do tenancy farming on 2.5 bigha land and 1 bigha was his own inherited land. His ownership was of 1 bigha and operational holding of 3.5 bigha land. However, overtime he had bought the land he did tenancy farming on, and increased his ownership to 3.5 bigha land. In this 3.5 bigha land, 0.5 bigha of land was outside the project affected area. The operational holding post-acquisition and returning of the land has reduced for his household. Now cultivation is not happening on 1.5 bigha land, resulting in his operational holding to be of 2.5 bigha land. This reduction in operational holding is felt across respondents. In case of this respondent, he still has some land on which cultivation is happening. However, there were some respondents whose operational holding has come down to zero due to the acquisition.

For instance, Ravi was a willing farmer. The scholarly articles and media reports during the era of the protests had divided the affected people into two groups; the willing and unwilling farmers (Ghosh, 2012). As the words suggests the willing farmers were in favour of the acquisition process, and the unwilling were against it. Ravi, an owner of 5 kata land (20 kata = 1 bigha) also did tenancy farming on 1 bigha of land. He was not a recorded tenant. However, he was in favour of the land acquisition since he believed that an industry would be beneficial for the future generations. He also stated that the then left front government had promised them jobs too and he worked as a civil police volunteer when the factory was being set up. In today's time, Ravi does not take part in any tenancy farming and his

own land is completely uncultivable. He stated, “the land is not fit for cultivation since there are rocks and debris from the industrial setup. If TATAs would have come it would have made our lives better. Now I cannot do farming and rely on my sons and daughters for my daily sustenance.”

The two cases above highlight that the operational holding as a whole has reduced significantly for both the ‘willing’ and the ‘unwilling’ farmers. One fought against the acquisition hoping that agriculture will return to normalcy, and the other was in favour of acquisition hoping for a brighter future via industrialisation. However, the operational holding reduced drastically for both. The future is equally bleak for both of them since farming was not only a means of a livelihood but also a sustainable activity ensuring food security.

The battle against the acquisition was not only waged by the land owners. It was also fought by the landless and the sharecroppers too. Since the livelihood of Khasherberi was directly related to cultivation and farming, a loss of land would impact everyone. Also, the compensation packages, which were only monetary, were to be given only to the landowners or to registered sharecroppers. The landless labours and unrecorded tenants/sharecroppers were to receive no form of compensation. This led to the latter joining the movement too.

Jagdish, a respondent from a landless household stated that they joined the protest since their family relied on farming primarily. His father was an unrecorded tenant and carried out tenancy farming on 1.5 bigha land. He too along with his mother used to help him out in farming. Apart from farming, Jagdish also works as a carpenter and goes for projects as and when available in the city. The work employs him for around 15 days in a month at a wage of 300 rupees per day. He stated that farming mainly provided them with food of their own. And the added income from the non-farm job helped him build his house and educate his two sons. However, now he and his sons do not see any benefit in farming. They do not take part in any farming anymore. It is so because firstly, they did not own land of their own and the overall land available for cultivation has reduced drastically. Therefore, they do not take part in farming anymore.

There are those landless too who were in favour of the industrialisation. An elderly man, Uday stated that he was in favour of industrialisation. He worked as a daily wage earner in an iron casting factory. The work was in a factory in Liluah, Howrah; approximately 40 minutes away via the local train. However, Uday used to work as an agricultural labourer too and had an added income from the iron casting work. Post-acquisition he only had his iron casting work to depend on for income. Currently, he does not take part in farming as, according to him, it is not beneficial at all. His elder son works as a carpenter and earns around 270 per day for that job. However, the job ensures him an employment of around 20 days per month. The younger son goes for training to learn filing jewellery. These are the various opportunities that the younger generations have even after finishing their schooling or having earned a graduation degree.

The above few cases highlight that the reduction in operational holding has led to a decline in farming as an occupation for all; be it the landed or the landless. The inability to cultivate a prime agricultural land after winning against the onset of industrialisation has left the respondents sceptical regarding their future. The ones who were in favour of industrialisation are also hard hit by the same kind of a situation but from a different perspective.

2. Current compensation package of 16 kg rice and 2000 rupees monthly:

To meet the food insecurity and the inability to cultivate the land since 2006, the previous government led by Trinamul Congress (TMC) provided 16 kg rice and 2000 rupees monthly to the households of the unwilling farmers (Bhattacharya, 2023). One of the core conditions for availing this scheme, as

noted from the survey, was that the beneficiary must be an unwilling farmer. The scheme, however, was not limited to the owners of agricultural land but also included landless agricultural labourers and sharecroppers too who were part of the protest.

Given many households also consumed what they produced, the presence of such a welfare scheme does aid the families in coping with the crisis of uncultivable land. However, the scheme does not cater to the landless agricultural labourers who were not part of the protests or were in favour of industrialisation. This leaves them in a precarious position as they rely on rationed goods and the market for their food supply without this aid. Also, in case of a respondent, it was noted that they had to sell the land willingly to the previous government for a medical emergency in the family. However, with no aid and the land being uncultivable, the unavailability of this scheme for them increased the burden of the acquisition. Such a scheme, although justified on various grounds, overlooks the needs of the landless agricultural labourers who withdrew from being part of the protests. Unlike the willing farmers who received monetary compensation from the previous left front government, the landless labourers did not have any land to begin with. Many did not take part in protests in the hope of having an industry nearby to go to work. Their lives are worse off in terms of a loss of livelihood vis-à-vis agriculture, and not receiving this aid makes them even more vulnerable economically.

3. Impact on women:

Studies have shown that women partake in a lot of farming activities (Sen, 1999). Many labouring aspects such as sowing, weeding, threshing, parboiling rice, are all carried out by women. Although their work is often overlooked by the national datasets (Jose, 1989). The reason for this has been attributed to many factors. Some attribute it to the fact that the woman's agricultural activities are often intertwined with her domestic labour, thereby, making it difficult for it to be seen as a distinct form of labour. An activity that is separate from her other forms of activities within the household. And, the other reason being the enumerator bias, wherein, the enumerator themselves, sometimes being men do not recognise those activities as accounted work (Agarwal, 1985). This is even more prevalent for small and marginal landholding households. It is on these family farms that usually family labour is deployed for production (Chakravarty & Chakravarty, 2023). This family labour involves activities carried out by women on the field too.

Within the household too a lot of pre and post harvesting work is also done by women. Women also took care of livestock. It is noted from the women respondents that they used to parboil rice, make puffed rice, prepare the seeds for potato and pluck vegetables as some of the core activities. These activities over time have diminished in the post-acquisition era. A small and marginal landholding family that dependent on agriculture, the role of the woman and her mobility reduced significantly. A household where both the woman and the man used to tend to the fields, the woman lost her reason to go to the fields due to the acquisition. It was a crucial work for her, which resulted in food for the family. This loss of livelihood for the household has resulted in affecting woman's mobility and livelihood. Livelihood options that remain otherwise for women in the field were making bidis and/or work of setting stones on wax casting of jewellery designs. What they referred to as wax-setting.

Some households also ended up giving up their livestock to cope with the economic pressures post-acquisition. This too resulted in a reduction of work for the women. Observations from the field shows that women were the main caretakers of the livestock. A reduction in them resulted in a reduction in woman's mobility and loss of a revenue stream through the cow's milk or the sale of goats. The wax-setting work that exists also for the women is not beneficial to their health. On interviewing the public healthcare centre head, it was noted that this activity harms the eyes and results in causing injuries to

neck and an increase in fatty liver. The alternative livelihood options available for women usually are low paid jobs that has harmful effects on their health.

CONCLUSION

The case of Singur has long occupied a stage of national importance due to its resistance to an idea of development and the success it achieved through it. The movement against land acquisition in Singur was not just a resistance to industrialisation, but a battle over what development ought to mean in a context where agriculture was the mainstay of rural life and identity. This paper began with the recognition that while the farmers and landless labourers of Singur had won a historic legal battle, their victory, in experience remained incomplete. The land may have been returned on paper, but the conditions for its productive use had not been restored. This conclusion seeks to synthesise the findings of the study, draw broader theoretical implications, and reflect on the policy gaps that the case of Singur exposes, especially in relation to livelihood sustainability, agrarian transitions, and gendered displacement.

1. Declining operational holding:

One of the core insights of this study is the gap and the change between ownership and operational holding. While the legal verdict of 2016 restored ownership rights to farmers, the physical and ecological condition of the returned land was mostly unfit for cultivation. In many cases, the returned land was laden with industrial debris, concrete foundations, and sewage infrastructure remnants laid during the brief tenure of the TATA factory construction. Currently, wildlife in the form of wild bushes and habitation of foxes, snakes and wild boars in the vicinity have made it dangerous too for cultivation. The crops grown are often destroyed by these animals and fear of being attacked by them is always there. Therefore, cleaning and maintaining this land required capital and mechanised intervention, like bulldozers, which most small and marginal farmers could not afford.

The narratives of respondents like Arindam, Ravi, and others highlight this sharp rupture between legal rights and material realities. Operational holdings, which in many cases included both owned and tenancy farming land before the acquisition, were significantly reduced post-return. Some had their cultivable area reduce by half and others saw it reach to zero. The acquisition also impacted the formal and informal tenure arrangements that sustained the local agrarian economy. This reveals an important paradox: land acquisition can lead to displacement even when physical relocation does not occur. The displacement here is economic, social, and ecological. The idea that giving the land back resolves the crisis is oversimplification of the loss that the displaced community faces. Land, once converted for industrial use, does not become agrarian simply by a change in ownership on paper.

2. Post-Acquisition Agrarian Transitions

Singur today offers an insight into an evolving agrarian landscape that has been reshaped by both the trauma of acquisition and the erosion of agricultural viability. As operational holdings have declined, so has the centrality of farming in local livelihoods. In household after household, the study observed a primary dependence on other forms of work apart from agriculture. Carpentry, iron casting, jewellery work, construction labour, and seasonal migration to urban centres have become the primary occupations replacing agriculture. Earlier the former acted as a supplement rather than a necessity.

This transition is marked by both agency and compulsion. Some families actively encourage their children to pursue non-farm work, seeing little future in agriculture. Others, especially the landless or those with uncultivable plots, now rely mainly on low-paying, insecure informal sector work by sheer necessity. The aspiration for industrial jobs, which was promised but never delivered, remains a painful memory. For willing farmers like Ravi, who gave up their land in hope of steady employment,

the post-acquisition reality has been one of betrayal and hardship. For unwilling farmers, the post-return scenario brought a landscape of weeds, snakes, and soil rendered infertile.

The result is a profound crisis of trust, not only in the state and its development promises, but in agriculture itself. Farming, which once ensured food security, employment, and social identity, is now seen by many as an unsustainable livelihood. This sentiment is shared across caste, class, and landholding distinctions, cutting across the willing-unwilling binary in Khasherberi. Agricultural knowledge, once passed down generationally, is beginning to fray. The children of those who fought to save their land now often want little to do with it. This raises important questions about the sustainability of agrarian economies in the face of speculative industrialisation. The Singur experience shows that acquisition does not have to result in displacement to trigger a decline in agrarian productivity. The threat, the uncertainty, and the eventual degradation of the land are enough to break the continuity of agrarian life.

3. Gendered Displacement and Invisible Losses

The study also foregrounds the gendered impact of land acquisition, drawing attention to how displacement plays out differently for women. Women's labour, which was central to the pre-acquisition agrarian economy, has been systematically undermined in the aftermath. Women respondents described their involvement in a range of activities such as sowing, weeding, parboiling rice, making puffed rice, managing livestock, and preparing seeds. These activities, often embedded within the rhythms of household and farm life, provided women with a source of autonomy, purpose, and identity, even if they were rarely recognised as 'farmers' in policy discourse.

With the decline in cultivable land and the sale of livestock due to economic pressure, women's roles have contracted significantly. Their mobility has been curtailed. Many now remain confined to domestic work or take up precarious, low-paying alternatives like bidi-rolling or wax-setting within the household premise. These jobs are physically taxing and, as local healthcare worker confirmed, harmful to women's health leading to eye strain, neck injuries, and liver problems. Unlike agricultural labour, which was physically demanding but seasonal and often community-based, these new occupations isolate women and offer little by way of collective identity or skill growth. This underscores the need to view displacement not only through the lens of land but also through the lens of labour, especially the unpaid and invisible labour that sustains agrarian livelihoods. Women's dispossession is not simply about the loss of land, but the loss of space, purpose, and recognition.

4. The Limits of Compensation and Welfare

The findings of this study raise serious questions about the adequacy and design of compensatory frameworks in cases of land acquisition. The previous TMC government's response to post-acquisition distress has been piecemeal. The welfare scheme of providing 16 kg of rice and ₹2,000 per month to unwilling farmers is helpful but far from sufficient. It addresses short-term food insecurity but does little to restore long-term livelihood sustainability.

Moreover, the scheme's eligibility criteria which was tied to protest participation and unwillingness created new hierarchies and exclusions. Some of the willing farmers, who were often driven by desperation, medical emergencies, or false promises of industrial jobs, find themselves excluded. Landless labourers and unrecorded tenants, who received no compensation in the first place, are also often ineligible if they did not take part in the protests. This selection criterion in some cases has worsened the situation of the marginal landholding farmers and the landless labourers.

The absence of support for land rehabilitation (bulldozing, soil regeneration), irrigation rebuilding, or rural enterprise development further limits the scope of economic recovery. What is needed is not just

welfare, but a comprehensive post-acquisition reconstruction plan, one that treats land not just as a property to be compensated for, but as a foundation of life and work. Additionally, the field survey reveals that households with strong SHG participation or links to cooperative institutions were somewhat better equipped to cope. However, even these institutions have limitations like restricted loan amounts, poor training quality, and bureaucratic inefficiencies. There remains a vast policy vacuum when it comes to rebuilding the productive infrastructure of post-acquisition rural communities.

5. The Afterlife of a Movement

One of the more poignant insights from the field is the transformation of Singur from a site of spectacular resistance to a landscape of quiet despair. During the agitation years, the village was alive with hope, solidarity, and national media attention. Outsiders in the form of journalists, activists, academics, were seen as allies. Today, many locals view researchers and outsiders with suspicion, fatigue, or bitterness. As one respondent remarked, “You’ve all taken what you needed from us. Now we’re left to deal with what’s left.”

This shift reflects not only the emotional cost of prolonged displacement but also a deeper sense of abandonment. The movement succeeded in legal terms but failed to bring about a meaningful transformation in material conditions. The same energy that overturned a 34-year-old regime and inspired a national conversation on land rights has now faded into a footnote, revived only during elections.

The villagers’ experience of being politically instrumentalised and then forgotten raises important questions about how social movements are remembered and what kinds of solidarity are truly sustainable. It also suggests that resistance, while necessary, is not sufficient. Winning the right to land is one step; rebuilding life upon that land requires long-term engagement, investment, and policy support.

REFERENCES

1. Agarwal, B. (1985). Work participation of rural women in third world: Some data and conceptual biases. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 20(51–52), A155–A164.
2. Bhaduri, A. (2005). Development with dignity: A case for full employment. NBT India.
3. Bhattacharya, R. (2023, November 3). Singur, 15 yrs on: ‘Tatas awarded compensation, TMC got power, what about us?’ *The Indian Express*. <https://indianexpress.com/article/cities/kolkata/singur-15-yrs-on-tatas-awarded-compensation-tmc-got-power-what-about-us-9011282/>
4. Bhattacharyya, B. (2025). Ghosted by development: The forgotten farmers of Singur, India. *Third World Quarterly*, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2025.2470993>
5. Chakravarty, D., & Chakravarty, I. (2023). *Wives and widows at work: Women’s labour in agrarian Bengal, then and now*. Orient Blackswan.
6. Dasgupta, S. (2023, October 31). Tata Nano timeline: Singur to Sanand in just one year: Journey of India’s smallest car at a glance. *Hindustan Times Auto*. <https://auto.hindustantimes.com/auto/cars/tata-nano-timeline-singur-to-sanand-in-just-one-year-journey-of-india-s-smallest-car-at-a-glance-41698729337324.html>
7. Ghosh, B. (2012). What made the “unwilling farmers” unwilling? A note on Singur. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 47(37), 13–16.
8. Jose, A. V. (Ed.). (1989). *Limited options: Women workers in rural India*. International Labour Organization.
9. Levien, M. (2017). Gender and land dispossession: A comparative analysis. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 44(6), 1111–1134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2017.1367291>
10. Mathur, H. M. (2013). *Displacement and resettlement in India: The human cost of development*. Routledge.

11. Mehta, L. (Ed.). (2009). *Displaced by development: Confronting marginalisation and gender injustice*. SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9788132100959>
12. Nag, S. (2021, April 8). Land stays unusable for Singur farmers. *The Economic Times*. <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/india/land-stays-unusable-for-singur-farmers/articleshow/81957124.cms>
13. Nielsen, K. B. (2014). Women's activism in the Singur movement, West Bengal. In *Women, Gender and Everyday Social Transformation in India* (pp. 203–220). Routledge.
14. Nielsen, K. B. (2018). *Land dispossession and everyday politics in rural Eastern India*. Anthem Press.
15. Parasuraman, S. (2016). *The development dilemma: Displacement in India*. Springer.
16. Patnaik, P. (2007). In the aftermath of Nandigram. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 42(21), 1893–1895.
17. Robinson, W. C. (2003). Risks and rights: The causes, consequences, and challenges of development-induced displacement. *Occasional Paper*.
18. Sarkar, A. (2007). Development and displacement: Land acquisition in West Bengal. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 42(14), 1435–1442.
19. Sen, S. (1999). *Women and labour in late colonial India: The Bengal jute industry* (Vol. 3). Cambridge University Press.