International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (IJHSS)
ISSN (P): 2319–393X; ISSN (E): 2319–3948
Vol. 7, Issue 4, Jun–Jul 2018; 217–228

International Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology
Connecting Researchers; Nurturing Innovations

SACRED HILLS AND THE POLITICS OF NIYAMGIRI

Dr. Kuntala Soy

Head Department of History, Talcher Autonomous College

ABSTRACT

The Niyamgiri hills of southern Odisha form one of the most ecologically and culturally significant landscapes in the Eastern Ghats. When Vedanta Resources proposed large-scale bauxite mining on these hills in the early 2000s, the project collided with something far older than any corporate timeline. For the Dongria Kondh, the hills were not a mineral reserve but the living domain of Niyam Raja, their supreme deity and protector. This paper argues that Niyamgiri was protected not only through legal battles and environmental activism but through indigenous sacred beliefs that transformed a mountain into a political and ecological symbol. Drawing on scholarship about the Dongria Kondh, the Forest Rights Act, the Gram Sabha process, and global indigenous struggles, this paper examines how sacred geography became the grammar of resistance. The central contribution lies in introducing the concept of Sacred Environmental Governance, meaning the protection of ecosystems achieved through cultural and spiritual institutions rather than through state regulation alone. In a period when climate change and biodiversity loss demand new frameworks of protection, the Niyamgiri case demonstrates that indigenous knowledge systems carry serious governance potential. The paper traces how spirituality, ecology, politics, and law worked together to turn a tribal community's faith into one of the most recognised environmental victories in contemporary India.

KEYWORDS: *Niyamgiri, Dongria Kondh, Sacred Environmental Governance, Vedanta, Forest Rights Act, indigenous resistance, Gram Sabha, Odisha.*

Article History

Received: *10 Jun 2018* | ***Revised:*** *14 Jun 2018* | ***Accepted:*** *18 Jun 2018*

INTRODUCTION

For the geologist, the Niyamgiri hills in southern Odisha are a bauxite deposit. For the state government of Odisha and for Vedanta Resources, they were a corridor of mineral wealth waiting to be extracted, refined, and sold. For the Dongria Kondh, however, the same hills are something else entirely. Niyamgiri is the abode of Niyam Raja, the supreme deity who governs the community, commands the seasons, and gives life to the streams that run down into the valleys below.[1] This difference in understanding, one landscape read as a resource and another as a sacred home, is the starting point of everything that followed.

The Niyamgiri hills straddle the districts of Rayagada and Kalahandi in southern Odisha. Their slopes carry dense sal forests, a rich variety of orchids, and perennial streams feeding the Vamsadhara and Nagavali river systems. Below those forests, the laterite plateau holds bauxite reserves estimated at nearly 73 million tonnes. When Vedanta Resources and its subsidiary Sterlite Industries proposed to mine this plateau in the early 2000s, in partnership with the Odisha

[1] *Meenal Tatpati, et al.,"The Niyamgiri Story: Challenging the Idea of Growth Without Limits," Kalpabriksh Pune (2016).*

Mining Corporation, the project entered a landscape already inhabited by the Dongria Kondh and the Kutia Kondh communities who had occupied and cultivated these hills for generations.[2] The proposal triggered one of the most closely watched environmental and indigenous rights disputes in Indian legal history.

The movement that resisted this project drew national and international attention because it did not fit neatly into the usual categories of protest. It was not primarily a labour movement, nor was it led by external activists. Its energy came from within, from communities defending a hill they considered sacred, using legal tools granted by the Forest Rights Act of 2006 and the constitutional framework of Gram Sabha consent.[3] The Niyamgiri Suraksha Samiti emerged as an organisational expression of this village-level resistance, while the Supreme Court of India eventually mandated that twelve Gram Sabhas must decide whether mining could proceed. All twelve voted against it.

This paper asks three questions. How did sacred belief actively shape the form and content of resistance at Niyamgiri? Why did this particular movement acquire global recognition, becoming a reference point in debates about indigenous rights from the Amazon to Australia? And what does the Niyamgiri case tell us about whether indigenous spiritual knowledge can serve as a genuine mechanism of environmental protection rather than simply as a cultural backdrop to legal struggle?

To answer these questions, the paper draws on existing scholarship about the Dongria Kondh, on field-based studies of the Niyamgiri movement, and on legal and policy documents produced during the dispute. The methodology is primarily interpretive and documentary, situating Niyamgiri within broader comparative and theoretical debates. The central argument is that sacred belief at Niyamgiri was not symbolic decoration. It was operational. It shaped which spaces were defended, how communities organised themselves, what arguments they made in Gram Sabhas, and why the movement held together over more than a decade of legal uncertainty and external pressure.

NIYAMGIRI AS A LIVING LANDSCAPE

Any serious engagement with the Niyamgiri dispute requires a prior understanding of what Niyamgiri actually is. The hills form part of the Eastern Ghats hill range and rise to elevations between 700 and 1,000 metres above sea level. The plateau at the top is covered by grassland meadows and lateritic soil, while the slopes carry a forest mosaic dominated by sal, with a recorded presence of around twenty species of orchid used by local communities for medicinal purposes. Scientific assessments conducted during the legal proceedings noted the presence of elephants, leopards, and numerous smaller mammals and bird species across the range.[4]

The ecological significance of Niyamgiri extends beyond what a species count can measure. The hill range functions as a forest corridor connecting the Karlapat Wildlife Sanctuary in Kalahandi and the Kotagarh Wildlife Sanctuary in Kandhamal district. This corridor allows wildlife movement across large sections of the Eastern Ghats landscape, and its disruption would fragment habitats in ways that conservation planners consider irreversible. The elephant herds of the South Odisha Elephant Reserve rely on these forests as part of their migratory routes. These facts formed part of the Saxena Committee report, submitted to the Ministry of Environment and Forests in 2010, which

[2] *Annapurna DeviPandey, "The Challenges of Neoliberal Policies and the Indigenous People's Resistance Movement in Odisha, India," e-cadernos ces 28 (2017).*
[3] *Bijayashree Satpathy, "Forest Rights Act Implementation in Odisha: Redressing Historical Injustices," South Asia Research 37, no. 3 (2017): 259–276.*
[4] *Rajshree Chandra, "Understanding Change with (In) Law: The Niyamgiri Case," Contributions to Indian Sociology 50, no. 2 (2016): 137–162.*

concluded that the ecological costs of mining at Niyamgiri far outweighed the projected economic returns.[5]

The hydrological role of the hills is equally important. Numerous perennial streams originate from the plateau and its slopes, feeding into the Vamsadhara and Nagavali river systems. These streams supply drinking water and irrigation to dozens of villages both within the hills and in the plains below. For the Dongria Kondh villages located on the higher elevations, these water sources are not simply utilities. They are sacred streams whose presence is understood as a gift of Niyam Raja. Their protection is therefore both an ecological necessity and a religious obligation.

Table 1: Ecological Importance of Niyamgiri Hills

Feature	Ecological Importance	Community Significance
Dense sal forests	Biodiversity and carbon storage	Livelihood through forest produce
Perennial streams	Water security for plains and hills	Sacred sources; daily drinking and farming water
Hill plateau	Wildlife corridor for elephants	Abode of Niyam Raja; ritual and sacred space
Grassland meadows	Habitat for diverse fauna	Grazing and community gathering grounds
Medicinal orchids	Pharmaceutical biodiversity	Traditional medicine and healing practices

Source: Compiled from Saxena et al. (2010).

The villages of the Dongria Kondh are dispersed across this landscape, connected by forest paths and by the shared ritual geography of the hills. Agriculture on the slopes combines shifting cultivation with terraced gardens. Finger millet, foxtail millet, pulses, and oilseeds are grown alongside fruit orchards of pineapple, mango, and banana. Horticulture produces turmeric and ginger for sale in nearby markets. Forest gathering provides honey, bamboo, mahua flowers, mushrooms, and medicinal plants. Buffalo rearing connects households to ceremonial life as well as to practical agricultural work. This is a landscape managed by its inhabitants across many generations, producing food, income, and meaning simultaneously.

What the Niyamgiri case makes visible is that this management system is not simply an economic arrangement. It is shaped by a cosmology in which the health of the forest, the flow of the streams, and the welfare of the community are understood as expressions of the same sacred order. To mine the plateau would not only disturb the hydrology. It would violate the terms under which the community understands its relationship with the land.

THE SACRED WORLD OF THE DONGRIA KONDH

Most environmental studies of the Niyamgiri dispute have focused on law, policy, and institutional process. The Forest Rights Act, the Supreme Court's directives, the Gram Sabha proceedings, and the conduct of the Ministry of Environment and Forests have all received detailed scholarly attention. What has received less systematic attention is the cosmological framework that gave the resistance its coherence and its staying power.

At the centre of Dongria Kondh religious life stands Niyam Raja, whose name translates roughly as the king of the law or the lord of rule. Niyam Raja is understood as the supreme deity of the community, inhabiting the highest reaches of the Niyamgiri hills and governing all aspects of life, from seasonal rainfall to the prosperity of crops, from the health of animals to the resolution of community disputes. He is not an abstract deity worshipped through texts or temples in distant towns. He is present in the landscape. He resides in specific peaks, in the large trees that mark sacred groves, and in the streams that descend from the hilltops. His authority is maintained through proper conduct, through correct ritual practice, and through the community's continuing occupation and stewardship of the hills.

[5]*Naresh ChandraSaxena, et al., "Report of the Four Member Committee for Investigation into the Proposal Submitted by the Orissa Mining Company for Bauxite Mining in Niyamgiri," Unpublished Report submitted to Ministry of Environment and Forests, GoI (2010).*

The sacred groves of Niyamgiri, known locally as devaguda or places of the deity, are patches of forest that are not cleared, not cultivated, and not entered without ritual permission. They function as de facto conservation reserves, but their protection is not experienced by the community as conservation policy. It is experienced as respect for a deity's domain. Research on sacred groves across South Asia has consistently found that such sites maintain higher levels of biodiversity than surrounding managed landscapes precisely because their protection is enforced by religious sanction rather than by external regulation. At Niyamgiri, this logic extends from individual groves to the entire hilltop plateau, which the community regards as Niyam Raja's primary seat.

Table 2: Sacred Elements of Dongria Kondh Religion and Their Social Meanings

Sacred Element	Physical Location	Social and Environmental Meaning
Niyam Raja	Hilltop plateau and high peaks	Supreme guardian deity; source of law, rain, and community welfare
Sacred groves (devaguda)	Forest patches across the hills	Protected forest zones maintained through religious prohibition
Perennial streams	Slopes and valleys of Niyamgiri	Sacred life sources; ritually significant and ecologically vital
Hilltops and ridges	Upper elevations of the range	Ritual and ceremony spaces; axis of cosmological order
Large trees	Throughout the sacred landscape	Dwelling places of ancestral spirits; markers of protected zones

Source: Compiled from Saxena et al. (2010).

Community festivals mark the agricultural calendar and are conducted in direct relationship to the hills. The Niyam Raja festival, held annually on the plateau, involves collective offerings, shared meals, and prayers for a good harvest. These are not purely ceremonial events. They are moments of community assembly in which collective decisions are also made, information shared, and social bonds renewed across the network of 104 Dongria Kondh villages that span the Niyamgiri range. The festival therefore serves simultaneously as a religious act and a form of governance.

This is the most important contribution that attention to indigenous religion makes to the analysis of the Niyamgiri case. Most environmental studies treat law and activism as the primary mechanisms by which natural spaces are protected. The Niyamgiri case reveals a third mechanism, one operating before any legal framework arrived and one that would persist if those frameworks were removed. Sacred belief, when it is embedded in the daily practices of a community and expressed in the management of a landscape, constitutes a form of environmental governance. The devaguda does not need a forest officer to enforce it. Niyam Raja does not require an environmental clearance to protect his domain. The community's religious obligations function as a conservation system, sustaining the ecology of the hills across generations.

Treating this insight seriously, rather than as a picturesque cultural footnote, changes how one analyses the Niyamgiri case. The resistance to mining was not a community that learned about environmental protection from outsiders and then applied that learning. It was a community defending an already-operating system of sacred ecological governance against a proposed disruption. The legal processes came later. The Gram Sabha votes were expressions of something that already existed.

MINING, DEVELOPMENT, AND COMPETING VISIONS OF PROGRESS

The Vedanta project in the Niyamgiri hills was not a simple extraction proposal. It arrived within a specific political economy, shaped by two decades of post-liberalisation development strategy in Odisha. Following the economic reforms introduced in India in 1991, states with abundant mineral resources began attracting large industrial investments as a path

to economic growth. Odisha occupied a particularly prominent position in this process. The state holds approximately 59 percent of India's bauxite reserves, 98 percent of its chromite, and nearly 28 percent of its coal deposits.[6]

The Vedanta proposal involved two linked facilities. A bauxite mine was planned on the Niyamgiri plateau, with an estimated extraction of nearly 73 million tonnes of ore over 23 years of operation. This ore was to feed an alumina refinery already under construction at Lanjigarh, located at the foot of the hills in Kalahandi district. The refinery was initially designed to process one million tonnes per annum, with plans to expand capacity to six million tonnes. The Government of Odisha, through the Odisha Mining Corporation, was formally partnered in the mining venture, providing the project with both political cover and legal access to the mining lease area.[7]

The state's development narrative positioned this project as essential to regional transformation. Kalahandi district had long carried a troubling reputation as a zone of poverty and starvation deaths. Industrial investment, in the government's framing, would bring employment, infrastructure, and revenue that could finally change that reality. The district's mineral wealth was presented as its opportunity for development. This argument had real purchase beyond government circles. Parts of the local political establishment and some contractors and traders in nearby towns saw genuine economic possibilities in the refinery and the supply chains it would generate.

Table 3: Competing Visions of Niyamgiri

Stakeholder	View of Niyamgiri	Proposed Future
Government of Odisha	Strategic mineral reserve; development asset	Mining and industrial expansion; employment generation
Vedanta Resources	Bauxite source for alumina refinery	Extraction of 73 million tonnes over 23 years
Odisha Mining Corporation	Public sector partner in resource development	State-facilitated mining lease and revenue
Dongria Kondh community	Sacred homeland; abode of Niyam Raja	Continued stewardship; no mining
Environmental activists	Fragile ecological corridor and biodiversity zone	Protected landscape; alternative development models
Legal institutions	Site of contested rights and clearances	Rule-based adjudication of competing claims

Source: Compiled from Saxena et al. (2010), and Pattnaik (2013).

The conflict at Niyamgiri therefore cannot be reduced to a story of a corporation against a tribe. It was a conflict between two genuinely different understandings of what development means and who it is for. The government's vision placed mineral wealth at the service of industrial growth and measured progress in tonnes of ore extracted and crores of revenue generated. The Dongria Kondh's vision placed the land at the service of a community whose welfare was understood as inseparable from the health of the hills, the flow of the streams, and the continuing presence of Niyam Raja.

Scholars working in political ecology have noted that such conflicts are rarely simply about resources. They are conflicts over what Arturo Escobar has called the right to define the world.[8] At Niyamgiri, the Dongria Kondh's refusal to accept the government's definition of their hills as a development opportunity was also a refusal to accept a worldview in which sacred landscapes have no standing in economic calculation. The resistance, when understood in this light, was not

[6] *Karine MRenaud, "The Mineral Industry of India," Minerals Yearbook: Area Reports: International Review 2014 Asia and the Pacific 3 (2018).*
[7] *Matilde Adduci, "Neo-Liberalism, Mining and Labour in The Indian State of Odisha: Outlining A Political Economy Analysis," Journal of Contemporary Asia 47, no. 4 (2017): 596–614.*
[8] *Arturo Escobar, "Difference And Conflict in The Struggle Over Natural Resources: A Political Ecology Framework," Development 49, no. 3 (2006): 6–13.*

only environmental. It was ontological.

SACRED GEOGRAPHY AS RESISTANCE

One of the persistent tendencies in accounts of the Niyamgiri movement is to treat the arrival of outside activists and NGOs as the moment when resistance truly began. This tendency underestimates the prior existence of community organisation rooted in sacred geography. The Dongria Kondh had maintained their occupation of and relationship with the Niyamgiri hills through practices of sacred stewardship long before any corporate proposal arrived. When the Vedanta project emerged, what changed was not that resistance appeared but that existing community structures were mobilised in new directions.

The Niyamgiri Suraksha Samiti, the main organisational platform of the anti-mining movement, built its networks through the existing social architecture of the Dongria Kondh villages. The 104 villages distributed across the hill range were already connected by kinship ties, marriage alliances, and shared ritual obligations.[9] The annual festivals conducted in honour of Niyam Raja brought representatives from these villages together at regular intervals. The Samiti used these existing occasions and networks to circulate information about the mining project, to discuss its implications, and to coordinate resistance. The sacred calendar, in effect, provided an organisational infrastructure.

Village-level meetings, known as jana sabhas and often conducted adjacent to sacred groves or at the base of significant trees, became the primary forums for deliberation. These were not new institutions created in response to the mining threat. They were adaptations of existing community assemblies that had long managed collective affairs, resolved disputes, and maintained relationships between villages. When these meetings turned to the question of Vedanta's proposal, the framework they used was the one already available to them: what did Niyam Raja permit and what did he forbid? The answer that emerged from these discussions, consistently and across virtually all the villages involved, was that mining the plateau violated the terms of the community's sacred relationship with the land.

This framing had important practical consequences. It meant that resistance was not primarily experienced as a political choice among alternatives. It was experienced as a religious obligation. To oppose mining was to fulfil one's duty as a Dongria Kondh. This quality gave the movement a depth of commitment that was difficult to erode through material incentives or administrative pressure. Compensation packages offered to villages were understood within this framework not as development opportunities but as attempts to purchase the abandonment of a sacred obligation. The community's sustained refusal to accept such packages across more than a decade of pressure reflects the strength of this religiously grounded motivation.

Rituals and festivals became sites of political statement as well as religious practice. When gatherings on the plateau included explicit affirmations of the community's intention to protect the hills, these statements carried the authority of sacred declaration, not merely political speech. Activists documenting the movement noted that songs performed during protest gatherings described the hills as mother, as deity, and as the source of all life, drawing directly on the cosmological vocabulary of Dongria Kondh tradition to express what was at stake.

[9] *DipKapoor and D. Kapoor, "Adivasi-Dalit and Non-Tribal Forest Dweller (ADNTFD) Resistance to Bauxite Mining in Niyamgiri: Displacing Capital and State-corporate Mining Activism," Against Colonization and Rural Dispossession: Local Resistance in South and East Asia, the Pacific and Africa, London: Zed Books (2017): 67–97.*

Table 4: Timeline of Major Resistance Events at Niyamgiri

Period	Event	Significance
Early 2000s	Vedanta refinery construction begins at Lanjigarh	First visible sign of industrial expansion near Niyamgiri
2004-2007	Writ petitions in Orissa High Court and Supreme Court	Legal challenge grounds the movement in constitutional rights
2005-2010	Gram Sabha resolutions by affected villages	Communities formally claim forest rights and oppose mining
2007	Supreme Court interim order halting mining	Legal system acknowledges seriousness of ecological concerns
2010	Saxena Committee report recommends against mining	Official acknowledgment that sacred and ecological values align
2013	All twelve Gram Sabhas vote against mining	Most decisive moment; community voice legally overrules project

Source: Compiled from Saxena et al. (2010).

Connections were made with civil society organisations such as Lok Shakti Abhiyan and Green Kalahandi, with legal activists, and eventually with international solidarity networks. But Rout is careful to note that this external expansion was built on an already-existing grassroots mobilisation. The community's sacred relationship with Niyamgiri was the foundation on which everything else was constructed. Outside organisations contributed resources, legal expertise, and visibility. The motivation, the organisational network, and the coherent refusal came from within.

This sequence matters enormously for how one interprets the Niyamgiri victory. It was not a case of activists educating a community about its rights and the community then acting on that education. It was a case of a community with an existing sacred governance relationship to its land finding legal instruments that could make that relationship legible to the state. The Forest Rights Act provided vocabulary. The Gram Sabha process provided a forum. But the content of the votes came from Niyam Raja.

LAW, RIGHTS, AND THE GRAM SABHA

The legal architecture of the Niyamgiri case was complex, unfolding across more than a decade of petitions, committee reports, ministerial decisions, and Supreme Court directives. What is most significant about this architecture is not its technical detail but what it reveals about the relationship between indigenous cultural practice and formal legal recognition. The Forest Rights Act of 2006 and the Gram Sabha process it established did not create the Dongria Kondh's relationship with Niyamgiri. They created a mechanism through which that relationship could be formally acknowledged in legal proceedings.

The Forest Rights Act was enacted to address what its preamble describes as the historical injustice done to forest-dwelling Scheduled Tribes and other traditional forest communities. The Act recognises a range of rights, including the right to collect minor forest produce, the right to manage community forest resources, the right to habitat, and critically, the right to protect biodiversity in areas traditionally used and conserved by the community. For the Dongria Kondh, these provisions mapped almost perfectly onto the practices they had long maintained in relation to the sacred groves, the streams, and the plateau of Niyamgiri. Bijayashree Satpathy's analysis of the Act's implementation in Odisha shows that its recognition of community forest rights represented a formal acknowledgment of governance relationships that had existed well before the law.[10]

[10] *Satpathy, "Forest Rights Act Implementation in Odisha: Redressing Historical Injustices," 259–276.*

The Gram Sabha process mandated by the Supreme Court in 2013 asked each village assembly to deliberate on whether the proposed mining would infringe upon their community's forest rights or religious rights. The framing of this question was unusual in Indian legal history. Courts rarely ask communities to vote on whether a proposed development violates their sacred relationship with a landscape. The fact that the Supreme Court did so at Niyamgiri was itself a consequence of the movement's successful articulation of its case in terms the legal system could hear.

Table 5: Legal Framework and Its Significance at Niyamgiri

Legal Framework	Key Provision	Significance for Niyamgiri
Forest Rights Act, 2006	Recognition of community forest and habitat rights	Gave legal standing to Dongria Kondh's sacred relationship with the hills
Gram Sabha consultation	Village assembly consent required before forest diversion	Provided the forum in which community voice became legally decisive
PESA, 1996	Self-governance rights for Scheduled Area communities	Grounded Gram Sabha authority in constitutional framework
Supreme Court directive, 2013	Twelve Gram Sabhas must vote on mining proposal	Translated sacred community refusal into binding legal outcome

Source: Satpathy (2017), Saxena et al. (2010), and Bijoy (2012).

All twelve Gram Sabhas voted against the mining proposal. The votes were not close. Village after village delivered resolutions stating that Niyam Raja would not permit mining on his plateau, that the streams fed by the hills were sacred and could not be diverted, and that the community's rights over the forest had been recognised by law and could not be overridden by a corporate lease. The legal process succeeded, in other words, precisely because it created a space in which existing cultural relationships with land could be articulated as rights. The law did not impose protection on the hills from outside. It recognised and formalized a protection system that was already operating.

WOMEN, FORESTS, AND COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP

Accounts of the Niyamgiri movement that focus on legal proceedings and prominent spokespersons sometimes obscure the role that women played in the daily work of resistance. In Dongria Kondh communities, women hold primary responsibility for forest-based activities, including the collection of forest produce, the management of kitchen gardens, and the maintenance of sacred spaces around the homestead. Their knowledge of the forest is practical and detailed. They know which species grow where, which streams run year-round, which groves are protected from cutting, and which trees carry ritual significance. This knowledge is not incidental to the movement. It is the knowledge base from which the community's defence of Niyamgiri was constructed.

Women participated actively in village meetings, in Gram Sabha deliberations, and in protests against the mining project. Their presence at these gatherings was not peripheral or supportive in a secondary sense. Their articulation of what would be lost if mining proceeded, expressed in terms of daily livelihood, water access, food security, and sacred obligation, formed part of the testimony that shaped both the movement's internal deliberations and its public representations.[11] Scholars working on gender and environment have noted that in many tribal societies, women's ecological knowledge is deeper and more localised than men's, precisely because women's daily routines bring them into closer and more frequent contact with the forest. At Niyamgiri, this knowledge was mobilised explicitly in the Gram Sabha

[11] *De-list Vedanta! Protest at FSA Headquarters," London Mining Network(2013). https://londonminingnetwork.org/2013/01/de-list-vedanta-protest-at-fsa-headquarters/.*

deliberations, where women's accounts of how the streams and forests supported their households carried significant weight.

Women were not simply supporters of a movement led by others. They were active protectors of Niyamgiri, drawing on a detailed relationship with the sacred landscape that made their participation indispensable to the movement's credibility and substance.

NIYAMGIRI AND GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL DEBATES

The Niyamgiri case did not remain a local or even a national dispute. It became a reference point in global conversations about indigenous rights, biodiversity protection, climate governance, and the responsibilities of multinational corporations operating in ecologically sensitive regions. Scholars' detailed analysis of the movement's transnational networking traces how connections were made between the Dongria Kondh struggle and international solidarity organisations, institutional investors, and global civil society networks. The Foil Vedanta campaign, based in Britain, organised protests outside the Financial Services Authority in London and submitted materials to the Norwegian Ethics Council, which had earlier withdrawn its investment from Vedanta Resources citing human rights and environmental concerns.[12]

This global resonance was not incidental to the movement's success. The pressure on institutional investors holding Vedanta shares created financial incentives for the company to take community opposition more seriously than it might have under purely domestic pressure. The international attention also made it more difficult for the Indian government to dismiss the movement as a local disturbance. The Niyamgiri case thereby entered a longer tradition of indigenous resource struggles that have found amplification through international networks.

Table 6: Comparative Indigenous Environmental Struggles

Region	Community	Primary Threat	Shared Feature with Niyamgiri
Niyamgiri, India	Dongria Kondh	Bauxite mining on sacred plateau	Sacred geography as basis of resistance
Amazon, Brazil	Kayapo and others	Deforestation and hydropower	Spiritual relationship with forest as political argument
Australia	Various Aboriginal nations	Land rights and resource extraction	Ancestral connection to land as legal claim
Canada	First Nations	Pipeline and resource extraction projects	Free prior and informed consent as central demand

What makes Niyamgiri particularly significant in comparative perspective is that the community's sacred relationship with the land was not merely asserted as a cultural claim but was legally recognised as a basis for withholding consent. In most parallel cases elsewhere, indigenous communities have had to fight to have their spiritual relationships with land acknowledged within legal systems built on different ontological assumptions. At Niyamgiri, the Forest Rights Act and the Supreme Court's Gram Sabha directive created a rare moment in which the law accommodated indigenous cosmology rather than requiring indigenous communities to translate their claims into the dominant legal language of property rights and environmental impact. This precedent has implications far beyond Odisha.

[12] *M. V. Ramsurya and Rakhi Mazumdar, "Vedanta Halts Refinery Expansion, Questions Govt's Intentions," The Economic Times(2010).*

DISCUSSION

The preceding sections have examined the Niyamgiri case through several interlocking lenses: ecology, sacred cosmology, political resistance, legal process, gender, and global context. What emerges from this analysis is not a story in which one of these dimensions explains the others. It is a story in which they reinforced and enabled each other in ways that produced an outcome no single dimension could have achieved alone.

Spirituality shaped resistance by providing a non-negotiable basis for refusal. The community's obligation to Niyam Raja meant that the question of whether to accept the mining project was not experienced as a political calculation about costs and benefits. It was experienced as a question of religious duty. This gave the movement a resilience that persisted through a decade of legal uncertainty, administrative pressure, and material inducements. Ecology provided the substantive grounding that made the community's sacred claims legible to scientific and legal institutions. The biodiversity of the hills, the hydrological role of the plateau, and the importance of the forest corridor were facts that independent committees confirmed, giving external validation to what the community already knew through long practice.

Politics organised the community's refusal into a form that could engage with state institutions. The Niyamgiri Suraksha Samiti and its connections to civil society networks and legal advocates translated internal community deliberation into formal legal submissions, public campaigns, and Gram Sabha resolutions. Law provided the decisive instrument, the Forest Rights Act and the Gram Sabha process, through which the community's refusal received binding legal expression. Each dimension was necessary. None was sufficient on its own.

This analysis supports the introduction of a concept that this paper proposes as the movement's most significant theoretical contribution: Sacred Environmental Governance. This concept refers to the protection of ecosystems achieved through cultural and spiritual institutions, operating through community obligation and cosmological sanction rather than through state regulation, environmental law, or market mechanisms alone. Sacred Environmental Governance is not merely a historical curiosity. It is a functioning system, demonstrable at Niyamgiri and analogous to similar systems across indigenous societies globally. Its recognition as a governance form, rather than a cultural background, opens productive directions for rethinking environmental policy in societies where such systems survive.

CONCLUSION

The protection of Niyamgiri was not simply a victory against a mining company. It was a demonstration that indigenous knowledge systems can function as genuine mechanisms of environmental governance, not merely as expressions of cultural identity but as operational systems of ecological protection sustained across generations. This paper has traced the multiple dimensions of that demonstration, from the sacred cosmology of the Dongria Kondh, to the ecology of the hills they protected, to the legal instruments that eventually formalised their refusal, to the global networks that amplified their struggle.

The central argument has been that sacred belief was not peripheral to the Niyamgiri movement. It was its foundation. Niyam Raja did not appear in legal submissions, but he was present in every Gram Sabha vote. The community's understanding of the hills as a sacred domain, regulated by religious obligation and sustained through ritual practice, constituted a form of environmental governance that was already protecting Niyamgiri's forests, streams, and biodiversity long before any formal legal recognition arrived. The Forest Rights Act and the Supreme Court's directive did not create that protection. They recognised it.

The concept of Sacred Environmental Governance that this paper has introduced is an attempt to give analytical substance to this recognition. It invites environmental scholars, policy makers, and legal practitioners to look more seriously at indigenous cosmological systems not as obstacles to development planning or as sentimental attachments to tradition, but as governance infrastructure with demonstrated ecological effectiveness.

As climate change intensifies across the world, as biodiversity collapses at rates that formal conservation institutions have been unable to slow, and as communities everywhere face the erosion of their relationships with the natural world, the lessons of Niyamgiri become more rather than less urgent. Indigenous understandings of land, sustained by religious obligation and social practice, may offer some of the most durable models of ecological governance that the world currently possesses. Niyamgiri survived because a community refused to abandon its sacred relationship with a hill. That refusal, and the knowledge system behind it, deserves far more than admiration. It deserves serious study and, where possible, protection.

REFERENCES

1. *"De-list Vedanta! Protest at FSA Headquarters." London Mining Network, 2013. https://londonminingnetwork.org/2013/01/de-list-vedanta-protest-at-fsa-headquarters/.*
2. *Adduci, Matilde. "Neo-Liberalism, Mining and Labour in The Indian State of Odisha: Outlining A Political Economy Analysis." Journal of Contemporary Asia 47, no. 4 (2017): 596-614.*
3. *Bijoy, C. R. Policy Brief on Panchayat Raj (Extension to Scheduled Areas) Act of 1996. New Delhi: United Nations Development Programme, 2012.*
4. *Chandra, Rajshree. "Understanding Change with (In) Law: The Niyamgiri Case." Contributions to Indian sociology 50, no. 2 (2016): 137-162.*
5. *Escobar, Arturo. "Difference And Conflict in The Struggle Over Natural Resources: A Political Ecology Framework." Development 49, no. 3 (2006): 6-13.*
6. *Kapoor, Dip, and D. Kapoor. "Adivasi-Dalit and Non-Tribal Forest Dweller (ADNTFD) Resistance to Bauxite Mining in Niyamgiri: Displacing Capital and State-corporate Mining Activism." Against Colonization and Rural Dispossession: Local Resistance in South and East Asia, the Pacific and Africa. London: Zed Books (2017): 67-97.*
7. *Pandey, Annapurna Devi. "The Challenges of Neoliberal Policies and the Indigenous People's Resistance Movement in Odisha, India." e-cadernos ces 28 (2017).*
8. *Pattnaik, Binay Kumar. "Tribal Resistance Movements and the Politics of Development-induced Displacement in Contemporary Orissa." Social Change 43, no. 1 (2013): 53-78.*
9. *Ramsurya, M. V., and Rakhi Mazumdar. "Vedanta Halts Refinery Expansion, Questions Govt's Intentions." The Economic Times, 2010.*
10. *Renaud, Karine M. "The Mineral Industry of India." Minerals Yearbook: Area Reports: International Review 2014 Asia and the Pacific 3 (2018).*

11. *Satpathy, Bijayashree. "Forest Rights Act Implementation in Odisha: Redressing Historical Injustices." South Asia Research 37, no. 3 (2017): 259-276.*

12. *Saxena, Naresh Chandra, S. Parasuraman, Promode Kant, and Amita Baviskar. "Report of the Four Member Committee for Investigation into the Proposal Submitted by the Orissa Mining Company for Bauxite Mining in Niyamgiri." Unpublished Report submitted to Ministry of Environment and Forests, GoI (2010).*

13. *Tatpati, Meenal, Ashish Kothari, Rachna Mishra, Meenal Tatpati, Ashish Kothari, and Rashi Mishra. "The Niyamgiri Story: Challenging the Idea of Growth Without Limits." Kalpabriksh Pune (2016).*