

## Emerging Trends in Village Resource Utilization A Case Study from a Dry Region of Andhra Pradesh

Suvvada Srinivas<sup>1</sup> and P. Venkata Rao<sup>2</sup>

*Department of Anthropology, University of Hyderabad, Hyderabad 500 046, Andhra Pradesh, India*

**KEY WORDS** *Jati* Resources. Traditional Occupations. Dominant Group.

**ABSTRACT** The impending ecological crisis has generated a lot of debate on the use of natural resources. Since the publication of Hardin's (1968) 'Tragedy of commons', there has been a steady increase in the literature on the common property resources, their use, decline, and management. Though the existing literature contributed significantly towards understanding the dynamics of resource use pattern, there is need for better understanding of the empirical reality at micro-level. The present paper focuses on the dynamics of the use of common property resources by different *jatis* pursuing diverse occupations in a village setting. Traditionally different *jati* groups in the village depended on a CPRs for their livelihood and harnessed these resources in a sustainable way. Institutional, developmental, and market factors altered the resource utilization pattern in the village. Resultant depletion of CPR's had its impact on various occupational groups. By delineating emerging trends in resource utilization at microlevel, certain recommendations for sustainable use of these resources are brought out.

Historically, residents of Indian villages collectively owned the natural resources such as village commons, pastures, water resources, near-shore fisheries and many others. The village Panchayats, which managed these resources, consisted of representatives of all the *jatis* in the village. When communal management broke down, these resources have suffered some worst ever exploitation, often leading to the disappearance of these, which are not known as common property resources. Common Property Resources (CPRs) can be broadly defined as those resources in which a group of people have rights for co-equal use. Membership in the group of co-owners is typically conferred by membership in some other group, generally a group whose central purpose is not the use or administration of the resource, such as village or tribe (Jodha N.S., 1991:3). Hardin's (1968) 'Tragedy of commons' stimulated many a debate on common property resources. The physical degradation of CPRs is a product of both over

exploitation and poor up-keep. The reduction in area, and the absence of stringent usage regulations have resulted in over exploitation of CPRs. Panchayat politics also played a greater role in their decline (Jodha, 1985a). Various groups adopted to changes taking place in the availability of CPR resources. Some rich had withdrew from CPR use and invested more on PPR based farming, as their opportunity cost of labour for collecting and using CPR products is higher than the value of the CPR products (Jodha, 1986).

The dominant groups always usurped the profits and benefited from the changes in the user policies. Robert Wade's (1992) study on community irrigation arrangements makes it clear that elite dominate the water distribution council, but denies caste influence on its decisions and on enacting of the decisions by wardens. Literature discusses changes in CPR management at macro level situations pertaining to forestry, fisheries and communal land management (Blair, 1996; Brower, 1995). There is reemergence of autonomous cooperation among herders accompanied by changes in intra community dynamics (Robin Marn, 1996). A study from western Rajasthan points out that nationalisation of land and the creation of modern form of private property for agricultural expansions along with rising population densities have caused continuous decline in the availability of common property resources (Shanmugaratnam, 1986).

Studies discuss the various processes and theoretical aspects on the use of CPR's (Runge, 1986; Robert Wade, 1987; Jodha, 1985, 1986; Iyengar, 1989; Blair, 1996). Few empirical studies also provided substantial data on how CPR's contribute to the livelihood of rural poor, impact of the decline of these resources on various communities, and factors contributing to decline

of CPRs *viz.* government policies, market forces, development programmes, electoral politics, and population growth (Jodha, 1985, 1986; Iyengar, 1986; Pandian, 1987; Damodaran, 1987; Shanmugaratanam, 1986; Robert Wade, 1987).

In the light of above literature an attempt is made in this present study to present an wholistic understanding of changes in Resource utilization process in a multi-*jati* village, and their implications for sustainable resource use in rural areas. Fieldwork was conducted during 1995-96 through anthropological approach, and a historical reconstruction based on the memory of the villagers and available records supplemented it.

### A PROFILE OF THE VILLAGE

The village G. Palli, is located in a relatively dry region of Vizianagaram district of Andhra Pradesh. The total area occupied by the village habitation is 2.5 hectares. The soil in the village are of red and sandy loams with medium fertility. The village is rich in horticultural and plant varieties like palmyra, papaya, neem, coconut, mango and trees like pratino calanura (the In-

dian Bush chat) which are meant for fire wood.

Members belonging to nineteen *jatis* are living in the village. These members follow varied occupations, by maintaining distinct cultural identities of their own by following strictly the rules and rituals. Apart from traditional occupations; labour, agricultural labour, small scale business, employment in private and government offices sustain the villagers. 54.1 per cent families are engaged in agriculture and agricultural labour, 26.1 per cent are in household business and 6.7 per cent are in government employment. The total population of the village is 986 of which males constitute 52 per cent and females being 48 per cent (Table 1). The total cultivated land in the village is 131.75 acres, which is officially registered, of which 16.70 acres is dry and 115.05 acres being wetland. Eighty per cent of farmers are paddy cultivators, others are engaged in cultivation of sugarcane, banana plantations and dry corps. Animal rearing is a subsidiary occupation. Nearly 50 per cent of the villagers derive some income generated by the sale of milk. The buffalo population is 104, and that of cows is 14. Sheep herders constitute only 10 per cent in the total village population. The shepherds

Table 1: Traditional occupations of *jatis*, population and thier distribution in the village

S.No.	Occupation	Jati	Households	Population
1.	Village priests and accounts	Brahmin	4	24 (3.4)
2.	Cultivator <i>jatis</i>	Rajulu,	4	30 (3.0)
		Gavara,	35	150 (15.0)
		Velama,	1	5 (0.5)
		Telaga	1	14 (1.4)
		Kapu,	6	25 (2.5)
		Gamanalu	4	16 (1.6)
		Jangalu	6	24 (2.4)
		Kamma	1	4 (0.4)
3.	Artisanal and other Occupational <i>Jatis</i> :			
	Toddy tappers	Yata	50	226 (22.6)
	Goldsmiths	Kamsali and	7	32 (3.2)
	Carpenters	Vadrangi		
	Petti Business	Komati	1	6 (0.6)
	Oil Pressers	Telakala	1	4 (0.4)
	Shepherds	Golla	26	99 (9.9)
	Fishermen	Jalari	10	38 (3.8)
4.	Service <i>Jatis</i>	Chakali	10	50 (5.0)
		Mangali	2	8 (1.0)
5.	<i>Jatis</i> rendering			
	Agricultural	Mala	37	149 (14.9)
	Labour	Erukula	2	10 (1.0)
6.	Other <i>Jatis</i>	Relli (SC)	17	69 (6.9)
		Christian (SC)	1	3 (0.3)

also depend on agriculture in their subsistence. 5 per cent of the toddy tapper families rear pigs.

G. Palli was endowed with rich flora and fauna along with sufficient river water. The villagers had all the time access to the water for drinking, washing, and for other household needs. There are five water ponds present in the village. Jasmine, Bougainvillea, and other flower varieties were present with a coverage of nearly 9 acres of land. According to elders of the village, good number of rabbits, reptiles, wild fowls, pigs were present in the surrounding of the village. Apart from this, the bushes and trees were present in every corner of the village, catering to the fuel needs to the villagers. There was 170 acres of waste land which was used for the grazing of animals. Vegetation of the village according to official records has been presented in table 2 and 3.

Table 2: Resources base of the village before 1960

S.No.	Name of the tree	No. of trees
1.	Mango	372
2.	Woodapple	23
3.	Teakwood	34
4.	Causiarina	3
5.	Neem	48
6.	Jambuline	2
7.	Custrd apple	4
8.	Bayan	2
9.	Palmira	3010
	Total	3498

Source : Estate Revenue Records of Maharaja of Vizianagaram 1962

Table 3: Animals reared by various *jatis* in the village

S.No.	Jati name	Animals reared	Per cent of households
1.	Toddy tappers	Pigs	50
2.	Relli	Pigs	20
3.	Yadavas	Sheep and Goats	100
4.	Gavaras	Buffalo	10
5.	Rajulu	Buffalo	10

### RESOURCE USE BY DIFFERENT *JATIS* IN THE VILLAGE IN THE PAST

Resource use in the village was traditionally managed by the Panchayat members, who belong to the different *jatis* in the village. This Panchayat body consists of *Kula pedda's* (Local head of the Caste) of the respective *jatis*. As

agricultural communities in the village constitute majority of the population, their role in management of agricultural lands and grazing lands of the village is crucial. Grazing land in the village was used by all the communities like toddy tappers, farmers, shepherds to graze their animals. Yaga who used to rear pigs used this grazing land, along with Gollas who reared sheep. Yata utilized the *Palmyra* (toddy) trees for various purposes ranging from extraction of toddy, cutting and selling leaves, collection of fire wood etc.

With forest (bushy) present on the both sides of the river bed, villagers never faced any problem regarding fire wood. Except few dominant *jatis*, all resort to fire wood collection. Women and men used to collect this fuel wood in the grazing land and surrounding region. This resulted in spending little on purchase of fire wood. Agricultural communities were supplied fire wood by toddy tappers, who in return gave grain and pulses. Occupational *jatis* like carpenters used wood, available in the surrounding forest area and in the village, some times with mutual understanding with owners. Timber derived from waste grazing lands, tank and river beds and palmyra trees are utilised by all the villagers. Wood which is mostly useful for carpenters, helped them in minimizing the cost of production of implements for the villagers use. The leaves of the palmyra are used for roof's of thached houses. Toddy tappers, by procuring the leaves, used to make baskets, country umbrellas etc., which were sold to villagers and outsiders, thus getting additional income. Especially these activities are carried out by the women folk of the toddy tappers

### Water Use

For G. Palli, there were mainly five tanks from which villagers use water for their cultivation and other needs. The pond which is situated at the entrance of the village is known as 'Maharaja Koneru'. Earlier this is used for the supply of drinking water to the palace house, and washing of animals. Villagers also used this water freely for drinking. The other three ponds which are present, two on East side, and one on South are meant for agricultural purpose. Sharing of these waters is based on mutual understanding

of the farmers based on their land size. Service *jatis* like Chakali who's job is of washing clothes, exclusively used one pond in the village for their occupational needs, apart from the river bank. A small pond called 'Butchamma Koneru' was exclusively meant for chakali, whereas 'Panchatodu cheruvu' meant for agricultural purpose but is often used by washer men, with permission from village Panchayat and Cultivator *jatis*.

Maharaja Koneru, otherwise known as Sarkaur Koneru (government pond) served the villagers not only as a source of drinking water but also used for washing and fishing purposes by Chakali and Jalari, respectively. The villagers used this pond freely even after it came under the control of the Panchayat of the village. Fishermen in the village had a customary right over all ponds for fishing. Village panchayat has no right to give these ponds for fishing to Jalaris of other villages. Jalaris were also fishing in the river. Water use in the village was clearly divisioned on the occupational line. This means, sharing of water is based on the need of each community. But, there did not arise any conflicts over the management, as every one obeyed the authority of village panchayat. The significant feature of the use of Koneru water by villagers is that, it is restricted to only socially higher *jatis*, excluding lower *jatis* in the village. But, for other ponds and river water, there are no such restrictions.

### River Waters

In the sharing of river waters, there were often disputes between villagers, but these were solved with interference of the village head. The understanding on water sharing between villagers is based on mutual needs. G. Palli villagers shared river waters with other villagers. They mutually had agreements, according to which each village has to take water in turns by channeling river water with their men. This diversion of river water is taken up by different village groups on fixed days. In an orderly manner, villagers used to go in groups to the stream and stop its flow to divert water to their fields. If any one overutilizes the water, by disobeying norms laid down by inter-village panchayat, they were fined by village heads. For drinking water, most of the villagers depended on stream water due to

close proximity with riverside, Mala *jati* people (A scheduled Caste) entirely depended on the river for their needs like drinking, washing etc. Use of ground water was very less, and entire village depended on the surface waters in the area.

### Land

In G. Palli, lands were under the control of Maharaja of Vizianagaram, till the abolition of Zamindari system in the year 1956. Villagers used to pay revenue to the estate of Vizianagaram Maharaja through the village head. All the lands were under control of local Zamindar who belonged to Gavara *jati*. There were also lands belonging to other *jatis* like Brahmin, Jangalu, Chakali, Mangali and Talayar (village servant). Apart from these, there were also temple lands and waste lands. These lands were given by the Maharaja as *manyams* (gifts) to the respective groups for pursuing their occupation. The grazing and temple lands are under the control of the village panchayat (Tables 4 and 5).

Table 4: Land classification in the village before 1960

S.No.	Name of the category	Land in acres
1.	Wasteland (CPR)* (for animal grazing, fire wood collection)	170.00
2.	Cultivatory land (Ziraiti land)	150.00
3.	Chakali inam (washer men)	15.00
4.	Mangali inam (barber)	4.00
5.	Barika inam (announcer)	14.00
6.	Pujari manyam (temple land)	9.00
7.	Palace land	7.14
8.	Maharajah land (waste land)	8.58
9.	Chervugarbam (tankbed)	4.70
10.	River bed	80.05
Total		462.17

\*Common Property Resources

Source : Village Panchayat Revenue Records

Table 5: Land distribution among different *jatis* before 1960

S.No.	Name of the <i>jati</i>	Total land
1.	Gavara	110
2.	Rajulu	18
3.	Brahmin	9
4.	Jangalu	15
5.	Kapu	5
6.	Chakalu	5
7.	Mangali	4
8.	Barika (village servant)	14
9.	Telaga	2
Total		184

Source : Village Panchayat and Revenue Records

### Physical Products

Fodder generated by the grazing and waste lands in the village benefited the farming communities like Gavara, Rajulu, Golla, Yata in rearing cattle, sheep, and pigs. Fodder is commonly available resource for the cattle, sheep and pigs from grazing lands, waste land, tank and river bed. Villagers used left overs of fodder to prepare green manure. Thus lessening the cost of the maintenance of livestock. This preparation of green manure is an ecofriendly and sustainable method which gave stability to farming. Before the village was exposed to developmental programmes implemented by the Government agencies, shepherds and toddy tappers solely depended on the fodder provided by the grazing lands as they had no farm land. Their partial dependency on grazing lands of the farming communities helped to maintain mutual relations between farming communities and themselves. River, rivulet beds and beds of dry tanks, helped farmers in augmenting their land by using them for off-season cropping during summer season. The farming activities in the tank beds contributed in increasing the area under crops. By cultivating various horticultural and other crop varieties in tank beds, river beds, dry parts of the

edges of the ponds various *jatis* supplemented their income. Various occupational *jatis* like Yatas, fishermen harvested resources, keeping in view the future availability. Thus leading to sustainable use of available resources like tankbeds, rivulets, and others. It provided all together a better micro climate. Acquiring fire wood from various sources in sustainable manner led to renewable resource use (Tables 6 and 7).

### CHANGES IN RESOURCE USE

#### Land

Over decades land fragmentation has taken place in the village, due to partition of land among family members, development schemes, sale, purchase, and illegal occupation by various *jatis*. Initially, most of the land was under control of *Zamindar* of the village. But the division of land among his family members led to fragmentation of the land, and this has been further accentuated with the increase in the nuclear families among the villagers. Significant changes have taken place after 1965. Number of villagers mortgaged their land due to low yields. This is to some extent is a result of the dam construction at a nearby village which restricted the availability

Table 6: Dependence of different *ad* groups on common property resources in the village -

S.No.	Indicator	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
1.	Meeting grazing requirements	*		*	*				
2.	Collection of food (fish) material from ponds	*				*	*	*	
3.	Collecting fodder from CPR Lands	*		*	*				*
4.	Collecting timber from CPRs and PPPs		*						
5.	Using CPR's water for irrigation	*							*
6.	Using CPR's water for washing	*	*	*			*	*	*
7.	Fishing from CPRs					*			
8.	Toddy tapping and basket making				*				
9.	Collecting fuel from CPRs	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

\*Indicates benefitted *jati* from the resources mentioned.

Index : A : Cultivator *jatis*  
B : Carpenters

C : Golla (Shehards)  
D : Toddy Tappers

E: Fishermen  
F : Malas (Scheduled Caste)

G : Washermen  
H : Others

Table 7 : Uses of Common Resources in traditional setting of the village

Uses	Contribution to					CPR's					
	Ag.	A.	To			A	B	C	D	E	F
<b>1. Physical Products</b>											
1. Fodder	b	c	d	h	j	*	*		*		
2. Fuel/Timber	h	b	l					*	*	*	*
3. Water	a	b	c	i	k			*			
4. Food	b	d					*	*			*
5. Manure/land	a	b					*			*	
<b>2. Supplementary Income Employment</b>											
1. Off season activities		c	d						*	*	*
2. Addl. crop activities		m	a	c				*	*	*	*
3. Additional cattle		a	c								
4. Handicrafts		m	d	c							
<b>3. Social Gains</b>											
1. Resource concentration		n					*				
2. Sustenance of landless poor		d					*				
3. Better micro climate and environment		c					*		*		*
4. Renewable resource supply		a	h				*		*		
5. Sustainable agricultural land							*		*		

Index : AG : Agriculture

A : Animal Husbandry

To : Traditional Occupations

1. The uses can be looked at as contributions to occupations of various *jatis*, farming and animal husbandry based activities, and can be divided into :
  - a. Resource augmentation for farming
  - b. Fuller use of environment
  - c. Seasonal buffer and stability of farming
  - d. Nutrition
  - e. Importance in resource centered technology
  - f. Fodder of cattle and sheep
  - g. Resource saving for individual farming
  - h. Occupation for fishing community
  - i. Benefits for sheep and pig herders
  - k. Washermens use
  - l. Carpenters use
  - m. Income generation for various *jati* occupants
  - n. Stability of resource use of various *jatis*
2. CPR's in the village
  - A. Grazing and waste land
  - B. Pond/tank
  - C. River/stream
  - D. River bank
  - E. Tank beds
  - F. Palmyra trees (The owners of these trees are farmers but the traditional rights over them belongs to toddy tappers.)

\*Note : In arranging the data N.S. Jodha's (1983) format is v followed.

of water for farming. Later, due to market pulls, availability of government jobs, and development schemes, the land ownership pattern of the village has changed to some extent. The earlier landless communities like toddy tappers and Malas acquired small pieces of land due to governmental assistance for developmental programmes aimed at these communities. On the

other hand high profitability of banana and sugarcane crops in the market during last 1980-1990 also forced some farmers to occupy more land from CPRs.

#### Decline of CPR Lands

Several households permanently occupied the common properties like riverbeds, tank beds, and grazing lands, to expand their cultivation. These lands were occupied by the Gavara Telaga, Kapu, Yata, Golla, Mala and Rajulu *jati* people. These occupied lands are not officially recorded. They are still shown as common property lands belonging to G. Palli village. This is due to the efforts of dominant communities with the connivance of the officials who are bribed by them. The entire tank bed, nearly 14 acres of land, has been occupied by different communities. Apart from this, due to the governmental scheme for construction of permanent houses for scheduled castes and other backward communities in the village, six acres of common property lands were taken over. For construction of roads and for Public Water Works department office in the village nearly 40 acres of land was taken away by the roads and buildings department. Due to high demand for commercial crops, thirty acres were occupied by Gavara, Yata and Velama communities in the last two decades. Some part of the

land belongs to G. Palli is occupied by a neighbouring villager who is economically dominant in the area. Despite of a legal suit between this person and scheduled caste members of G. Palli, the land occupied by him. In total, more than 170 acres of CPR's lands are occupied by the villagers, resulting in disruption of the stability in resource use. Cultivator *jatis* benefited to the maximum by occupying the occupied CPR lands as their total share in the occupied CPR land is more than 80 per cent (Table 8).

**Table 8: Occupation of common Property Lands in the village and benefited *jati***

Cause of depletion of CPR's lands	Land in acres	Benefitted <i>Jati</i>
Occupation of tank beds	14	GKa
Occupation of river beds	80	G V K
Developmental schemes (House construction)	6	R M V
Exitension of roads	40	Development
Occupation of waste land	30	G Y V

G = Gavara, Ka = Kapu, V = Velama, R = Rajulu, M = Mala  
Y = Toddy tappers, V\* = Vaishya (native of another village)

#### IMPLICATIONS OF THE CPR DECLINE

From 1970 onwards the Statutory Panchayat started auctioning the rights on fishing in ponds thus preventing the poor from using them. Rights over common property resources in the village like ponds, riverbeds, and sand are auctioned. Landless *jatis* were earlier using these resources. Earlier CPRs were used in farming practices like preparation of manure and additional cropping in the river bed areas. They are now under permanent occupations, and intensive cultivation is being practised since last one decade. Reduction in the pig and sheep rearing, and depletion of CPR lands lessened the preparation of green manure, which led to dependency of chemical fertilizers. Villagers started the exploitation of ground water resources, whereas they were using tanks and ponds earlier. There is also increase in cultivation of commercial crops like banana, and teak trees, for sale in the market. As grazing lands in the village vanished, sheep, pig and cattle rearing is reduced considerably in the village. This is evident while looking at the cattle population figures. According to villagers, earlier nearly 15 to 20 households maintained draught animals and cattle to meet their agricultural and

other needs. But now only two families are maintaining them round the year. Villagers purchase oxen at the time of agricultural work and sell them out after the season. If they want to maintain these cattle, they should spare some money for the purchase of feed. Earlier, cattle to a large extent were supported by fodder generated by common property lands in the village. These changes enhanced cost of agriculture with increased expenditure on cattle purchase/rent etc. Depletion of village lands also had their influence on sheep herders and pig rearers (Yatas). Shepherds earlier used these CPR lands without any objection. Sheep were used for 'penning' in the farmers fields. They received grain for providing manure to farmers in this manner. Shepherds started demanding money from farmers as there is no free land for them to feed their animals. Earlier, the harvested fields were given to shepherds to graze their sheep, but due to intensive cropping there is no such opportunity for the shepherds at present. Earlier these harvested fields are also considered as CPR for Gollas. Yatas suffered a lot due to loss of CPRs, by which nearly 11 families stopped pig rearing. Now, they depend on toddy trees and their produce.

As discussed earlier prior to 1970 there is clear cut pattern regarding the use of resources, the village council headed by head man used to supervise the management of resources. In its traditional setting, each community had their own demarcated 'niche' within which they operated. Conflicts, if any, were solved within by the '*jati*' leadership in the village. The village leaders had allocated resources based on the occupational needs of various *jatis*. But after the introduction of Panchayati Raj institutions, the interests of contesting groups and elected members became important, rather than balanced and sustainable use of common property resources in the village. Earlier resource management was based on reciprocity and exchange relations between different *jatis*. This has been replaced by unregulated competition for resource grabbing. All the illegal occupants of CPRs are possessing temporary *patta*, and are protected by the village level officers, and panchayat president. Generally illegal occupation of common property land has to be overlooked by the elected Panchayat members as they need the support

with Rajulu *jati* leaders. They support the former president of the village who belongs to Rajulu community for favouring them in developmental programmes implemented during his tenure. One of the programmes is construction of a housing colony for Malas and Yatas. But Yatas, who are toddy tappers are not supporting Rajulu due to their close occupational links with Gavaras. Yatas supported Gavaras as their dependence on palm trees is important for their livelihood and these are located in the Gavaras' farming fields. Most of the developmental benefits in the village reached Malas and toddy tappers which helped them to enhance their economic position. These two communities who owned negligible land had significantly improved their land holding in the village. After abolition of Zamindari, Gavara leaders dominated the panchayat leadership till 1975. But the choice of villagers to opt for a non Gavara leader made a 'Rajulu' man to occupy the Panchayati head position. Since then there is struggle between these two groups. In this situation, landless *jatis* like Malas, Yatas, Rellis, who constitutes significant number of village population started identifying themselves either with Gavara or Rajulu. Rellis are also partly aligned with Gavara farmers as they need food grain from them. Other communities including shepherds are divided on whom they should support.

#### Population Decline and Modility

There is a decline of population in G. Palli village in the last three decades. This is evident from official data from Mandal, and Gram Panchayat offices. During 1960-70 a total of 309 households with 674 women and 659 men were present. 107 women and 106 men belonged to Scheduled Castes and 14 persons to Scheduled Tribes. The population strength slowly declined during the past 30 years due to migration to other regions. Despite of declining population strength the pressure on common property resources continued. The village is experiencing occupational mobility, among Mala, Gavara, Golla and Relli *jatis* whose dependence on the common property resources is very high. While the farmers occupation is agricultural practices, they started rearing cattle, attracted by lucrative milk business. They also shifted to government jobs. Serv-

ice *jatis* position remained more or less constant. With the increased awareness generated by development assistance and communication channels, some former tenants opted for Government jobs while some went as labourers in other areas. Apart from this, with external demands and growing communication channels, many villagers are moving into new occupations like, brick making, wage labour, private and government employment. Brick making has become a good source of income for landless poor and low income groups.

With frequent, irregular rainfall and decrease in common property resources in the recent decades, the village is experiencing migratory trends. G. Palli's history of migration dates back to 1922. In 1922, Bodeti Ramulu, a Gavara man, was convinced by a mediator from Malaysia, to work in the rubber plantations there. The economic conditions are not goods in those days due to frequent failures of crops. Under these circumstances, Ramulu was compelled to go Malaysia to earn a livelihood. After reaching Malaysia he informed his fellow villagers about the conditions there, Then started the process of migration. Twelve families went there to work in rubber plantations. These families started sending money to their relatives in the village which improved their economic condition. They purchased more lands in the village with this money. This flow of money helped few families (Gavaras) to emerge as dominant group in the village. Since 1975, individuals are migrating to nearby towns and other areas. During 1988-90, 19 families migrated from the village. Migration is high among Brahmin, Jangalu, Telaga, Mala and Relli communities. Partly this can be attributed to altered resource utilization pattern in the village. This migratory trends is still continuing in the village.

#### SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The Resource Utilization in the village has undergone significant changes during last four decades due to various factors. In the past, resources are utilized by various *jatis* according to norms fixed by village panchayat, to which all villagers adhered to. The violation of these



norms resulted punishments through imposition of fines by the panchayat. This utilization was entirely based on traditional *jati* occupational structure. Here user groups were entitled to exploit that particular resource. Thus, interdependency between *jati* groups has led to exploitation of these resources in a sustainable way without any conflict. The exploitation of these resources in turn led to mutual exchanges with the other occupational groups. There is enough scope in the traditional management for all *jatis* groups to benefit from the CPR products. The authoritarianism involved in the *jati* organisation sometimes kept the occupational, service, and other lower *jatis* who followed the panchayat order at a disadvantaged situation. Thus to a greater extent the rights of usurpation of resources always vested with village leadership, who basically belong to dominant cultivator *jatis*. But, every one had a claim and access to CPRs needed by them.

After introduction of Panchayat Raj system and abolition of Zamindari system, resource utilisation pattern has taken a different turn with the depletion of the C.P.Rs, which resulted from developmental activity, fragmentation, sale and purchase of land, market pulls etc. Considerable extent of CPR lands of the village are occupied by various *jatis*. In the changed political set up even the less powerful landless are also able to usurp some land resources with active support of leadership. The developmental activities like agricultural subsidies, animal husbandry schemes, and other measures like privatization of fishing ponds benefited majority of those people who are potential exploiters of resources with a strong base of private property farming. These made some occupational groups to remain economically backward, with forcible alienation from resource use. Resource decline on the other hand's followed by migration of various *jatis* in the village, who basically belonged to occupational *jatis*. With shortage of resources and with coming up of new opportunities of work like brick making and other daily wage labour works in nearby towns, large number of villagers changed their occupations and some became labourers. Earlier firewood consumed by villagers were obtained from the CPR lands but with changed situation, firewood is sold to other *jatis*

by toddy tappers. Poor and landless are spending more time in collecting firewood.

With these changes in resources use pattern, cultivators *jatis* and few landless *jatis* emerged as dominant groups in the village, who exploit the resources, manage them and influence the village life. With the socio-cultural, political, and economic changes sweeping the village, new factions and identities are emerging among the dominant and less powerful, thus leading to competition and conflict over resource use, management, and usurpation. The observation in the study support the finding of Jodha (1983). On the basis of the study, the following suggestions are made for sustainable use of CPRs and their management.

1. Common properties should be identified and preserved. There should be strict ban from the Government side on further occupation of CPR lands. Violators need to be punished severely.
2. There should be proper management based on occupational needs of specific groups, which can be attained through allocating specific resources to them for managing themselves, eg. ponds to fishermen, palm trees to Yatas, etc.
3. Developmental schemes should be oriented towards regeneration and sustainable use of resources which are potential productive means of livelihood.
4. Villagers need to be sensitized through proper means about ecological degradation and the need for sustainable utilization of resources.

## REFERENCES

- Damodaran, A.: Structural dimension of fodder crisis: A village study in Karnataka. *Economic and Political Weekly*. Vol. XXII, No. 13. pp. A16-A22 (1987).
- Hardin, G.: The tragedy of the commons. *Science*, 162 : 1243-1247 (1968).
- Harry, W. Blair.: Democracy, equity and common property resources. Management in the Indian subcontinent. *Development and Change*, 27 : 475-499 (1996).
- Iyengar, Surdarshan : Common Property Land Resources in Gujarat : Some findings about their size, status and use. *Economic and Political Weekly*, A67-A77 (1989).
- Jodha, N.S. : Market forces and erosion of common property resources. *ICRISAT Economics Programme*, 24-28 October (1983).
- Jodha, N.S. : Population growth and the decline of common

- property resources in Rajasthan, India. *Population & Development Review*, **11**(2): 247-264 (1985).
- Jodha, N.S. : Common property resources and rural poor in dry regions of India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. **XXI**, No. **27**: 1169-1181 (1986).
- Jodha, N.S.: Rural common property resources : A growing crisis. *IIED GATEKEEPER* Series No. 24 (1991).
- Pandian, M.S.S.: Peasants, natural resource use and state intervention in Nanchilandu, (1850-1940). *Economic & Political Weekly*, Vol. **XXII** No. **26** 1032-1040 (1987).
- Robert, Wade.: The Management of common property resources: Collective action as an alternative to privatisation or state regulation. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, **11**: 95-106 (1987).
- Robert, Wade.: *Village Republics. Economic Condition for Collective Action in South India*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1987).
- Robin, Mearns.: Community, collective action and common grazing the case of post socialist Mongolia. *Journal of Development Studies*, **32** : 297-339 (1966).
- Runge, C.F. : Common property and collective action in economic development. *World Development*, **14** No. **5** : 623-635 (1986).
- Shanmugaratnam, N.: Nationalisation privatisation and the dilemmas of common property management in Western Rajasthan. *Journal of Development Studies*, **33** : 163-187 (1986).
- Shanmugaratnam, N. : The natural resources management problem in the Arid Areas. A case study from western Rajasthan, India with reference to policy and institutions. *Development & Environment No. 13 NORAGRIC Occasional Paper Series C* (1994).