

RURAL POOR AND DEPENDENCE ON SEASONAL COMMON PROPERTY RESOURCES (SCPRS)

Arunkumar R. Kulkarni

Assistant Professor,

Centre for Multi-disciplinary Development Research (CMDR), Dharwad, Karnataka

ABSTRACT

The significance of Common Property Resources (CPRs) is getting increasingly recognized in the livelihood and well-being of the rural poor. The poor also enjoy certain informal rights of access to the fruits of private property resources (PPRs). A major gap in the CPR literature is an analysis of CPRs that are gathered from private lands, such as the collection of fodder, crop residues, fallen grains, dung, etc. This paper is concerned with rural households' use of SCPRs for meeting the requirements of fuel and fodder, where the availability of CPRs is low. The paper is based on a comprehensive survey of 100 households in four selected villages of Dharwad district in Karnataka (India). It reveals that the resources collected from PPRs for meeting fuelwood and fodder requirements are vital to the survival of the rural poor. Earlier households were collecting these resources from PPRs without any restriction. The landowners happily used to offer the resources to the poor. Due to commercialization and increasing population, the mutual co-operation among the people has declined and poor people find it difficult in getting those resources.

Keywords: SCPRs, PPRs, Livelihoods, Rural Poor

INTRODUCTION

The studies conducted by Jadha 1986, Iyengar 1997, Ghose and Beck 1998, Singh et al 1996, Pasha 1992 and NSSO 2000 have found that CPRs are crucial resources for the sustenance of the livelihoods of the rural people, especially for the poor, despite regional variations and differences in the methodology employed. There is hardly any other information source that provides benefits of a similar scale to the poor. CPRs provide the required biomass resources, income and employment for the rural people. According to a recent survey by NSSO (2000), around 48 per cent of the households collected some material from CPRs, 20 per cent of the households used these resources for grazing their livestock, about 23 per cent of the households reported use of water for irrigating their land, 30 per cent of the households used them for livestock rearing, and about 3 per cent of the households reported use of CPWR for household enterprises. According to NSSO the proportion of common land varies from 1 to 32 per cent of the

geographical area in various states of India. The extent of the CPR area mainly depends upon ecological conditions, and partly on the present and past land settlements and land tenure systems (Iyengar 1989). Most of the studies conducted have, however, been done in areas having a higher proportion of CPRs. Little attention has been paid to the areas having fewer CPRs, wherein private property is used commonly. These studies have adopted two different approaches in the study of common property resources. These approaches are; the *de jure* approach and the *de facto* approach. The *de jure* approach is used while estimating the size of CPRs, and the *de facto* approach is used while estimating the benefits of CPRs. In the *de jure* approach, only those resources are treated as CPRs that are within the boundary of the village and are formal, (i.e. by legal sanction or official assignment) held by the village panchayat or a community in the village. In the *de facto* approach, the coverage of CPRs is extended to include resources such as revenue land not assigned to a panchayat or a community in the village, forest land, or even private land used by the community by convention. The common use of private property may be confined to particular seasons as in the cases where cultivated land is used for grazing between crops, fields submerged during monsoon are used for fishing, etc. Chopra and Gulati (2001), Jodha (1986), Ghosh (1995), Thompson 1963: Quoted by Tony Beck and Cathy Nesmith 1999) and Beck 1994 have identified issues of common access of Private Property Resources (PPR). Chopra and Gulati (2001) estimated the magnitude of CPRs for 16 major states using land-use classification data. In these states, the study found that 10454 thousand hectares (about 15.6 per cent of total CPR land) of private land may have common access. In Karnataka, this type of land is about 202000 hectares. A study of three villages (Beck 1994) in West Bengal, which do not have relatively large areas of common land ((Murshidabad in West Bengal is having 98 per cent of private land and only 2 per cent of common land) shows the gleaning¹ of paddy grain, fuel and wild fruits as major contributions of CPRs for the sustenance of the poor. It is found that gleaning provided more grain (about 13 Kg of paddy during one *aman* season, i.e., harvesting season) than the government supply (2.3Kg of wheat) during the 1986-87 floods. This shows that the poor people's efforts are likely to yield more resources than government relief. In the study area, access to many village resources is not clearly defined legally but depends on a process of negotiation, bargaining or conflict between the poor and the rich, and on a system of customary rights. While some resources are open access (for example, stubble left after harvesting or wild plants that grow in drainage ditches), other important CPRs (such as gleaned grains or fallen fruits) should be defined as products that are found mainly on private land controlled by richer villagers, and to which the poor have customarily negotiated access. While from the perspective of the rich these latter resources may be privately owned, from the perspective of the poor these resources are common in that the poor have attempted to maintain a right of access to them. A study in a village in Gujarat (Chen 1991: Quoted by Tony Beck and Cathy Nesmith 1999) found that, unlike CPRs to which villagers

¹ Collection of fallen paddy grain during harvesting season

have rights as citizens of the village, PPRs are offered as concessions to the public by their owners only under certain conditions and at certain times. Generally, private owners withdraw these concessions whenever there are shortages, often in un-seasonal years and usually in drought years. Chen notes that because of the strain placed on common property resources during droughts or other crises, areas of traditional reciprocity or cooperation become areas of conflict. Conflicts over the right to collect weeds, grass or leaves from fields and field boundaries were also reported. However, such conflict over what Chen terms open access PPRs has probably always been common in rural societies (Thompson 1963: Quoted by Tony Beck and Cathy Nesmith 1999). A major gap in the CPR literature is the analysis of CPRs that are gathered from private lands, such as a collection of fodder, crop residues, fallen grains, dung, etc. From the perspective of landowners these resources are privately owned but from the perspective of the poor, these are common. Therefore, the poor attempt to maintain a right of access to them. In this context, the paper shows the importance of seasonal common property resources in the livelihood of the rural poor and how mutual co-operation among people helped to get these resources and in recent years how mutual co-operation among the people declined. The paper has 5 sections. Section 2 defines the meaning of seasonal common property resources. Section 3 provides the methodology of the study. Section 4 provides the findings of the study. Section 5 concludes.

MEANING OF SEASONAL COMMON PROPERTY RESOURCES

Seasonal common property resources (SCPRs) can be defined as those resources which originate from private property resources (PPRs) accessible for a limited period, in a particular season, and without any condition/under certain conditions set by the landowners when an alternative permanent CPR is not available (or available in lower quantities).

In dry regions of North Karnataka, common lands include, Grazing lands (*Gomal*), tank foreshores, banks of streams and canals, sides of roads and pathways and C and D wastelands (*Pothkharab*) are all used informally as CPRs. People, especially the poorer members of the community use these CPRs for collecting fuelwood and fodder and for grazing their livestock. The Area under CPRs is very insignificant. The cultivable wasteland is highly degraded and is under the control of the rich and hence is of no use to the poor households. On these common lands, *Peek Jali* (*Prosopis juliflora*) and *Jali* (*juliflora*) trees grow in plenty along with grass. People use the twigs of these trees as fuelwood and also graze their livestock here. Anybody can go and cut the twigs of these trees and graze their livestock; there is no restriction on the quantity or the season of extraction. But cutting twigs and their collection usually requires two persons and it also requires a day for collecting a bundle of fuelwood. However, the availability of such land is very low and the nature of products available on these lands also doesn't meet all the biomass requirements of the poor households. The poor are therefore compelled to depend on individual farmlands to meet

their unfulfilled requirements, especially after the crop season. Thus, the poor households (especially the landless) collect the required fuel and fodder and graze their cattle on all the patches of village land (including farmland owned by individuals). The net sown area, boundaries of the land and current fallow land constitute private land. Since the area of common land is very small and it is difficult to collect enough fuelwood from these alone, most of the households in the selected villages practically depend on private land for meeting most of their fuel and fodder requirements. Around 92 - 96 per cent of land in the dry region (Dharwad district) is cultivable and is owned by private individuals. This land is mainly used for growing crops. However, large quantities of residues are generated every year by the crops themselves. Cotton, Chilli, Maize, Jawar, Sunflower, wheat are some examples of crops that generate considerable amounts of residue. Crop residues are available in abundance as natural resources during the cropping season. Further, these permit easy collection and procurement and long-term storage. Many private lands are seasonally open for grazing, livestock can normally freely graze on cropland after the crop is harvested, providing animals access to stubbles, crop residues and grass growing on the boundaries, while twigs can be lopped off available fodder trees. Private pasture lands, too, are normally open to all after the grass crop has been harvested. The agricultural land is held by only a few households and we can find two classes of people here, agriculturists and agricultural labourers. Agriculturists can get their fuel and fodder from their private cultivable land but agricultural labourers have to depend on others' private land. For marginal and small farm households the crop residue produced from their lands is just enough for their requirements and they are not in a position to give/allow others to collect their crop residue. Medium and large farm households (not marginal and small farmers) allow labourer households to collect crop residues from their private lands. During certain periods of the cropping season, the labour requirement is very high. At that time, the labourer households ask/demand crop residues. Limited access is given to the collection of these resources under certain conditions. These conditions are not written but depend on socio-economic factors.

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

The state of Karnataka is one of the largest states in the country, having an area of 1.91 lakh sq. km. There are three climatic regions in Karnataka. They are 1) Region with arid climate 2) Region with a semi-arid climate and 3) Region with per humid climate. Most of the area of Karnataka falls in the arid and semi-arid regions. It is found that poverty is more concentrated in the arid climatic area. The districts under this climatic area are Belgaum, Bellary, Bijapur, Dharwad, Gulbarga and Raichur, which also happen to be the districts of north Karnataka (ACRPU: 1991). Based on the land use data we found that a large portion of the area in the Dharwad district is having very little CPR area, therefore, we are interested to know the living conditions of weaker sections of the people. Dharwad district in Karnataka state has been selected

for the empirical analysis of the study. The district is situated in the western sector of the northern half of the Karnataka State. The district encompasses an area of 4263 sq. km lying between the latitudinal parallels of 15°02' and 15°51' North and longitudes 73°43' and 75°35' East. The district is bounded on the north by the district of Belgaum, on the east by the district of Gadag, on the south by Haveri and the west by Uttara Kannada district. All these districts that surround the Dharwad district are in the Karnataka state itself. Dharwad district comprises five taluks- Dharwad, Hubli, Kalaghatagi, Kundagol, and Navalgund. Based on the agro-climatic conditions, the district can be divided into *Malnad*, *Maidan* (dry tract) and the transitional belt. The annual rainfall in the *Malnad* tract varies between 838 mm and 939 mm. The transitional belt receives rains less than 777 mm per annum, the lowest being 612 mm in Navalgund. *Malnad* is marked by a chain of low hills and valleys, comparatively heavy rainfall, paddy crop, monsoonal forests and streams. The greater part of this region remains sparsely populated. The villages in this tract are often of a dispersed pattern. The *Maidan* or the black soil plain to the eastern belt is an extensively cultivated area. Cotton, jawar, chilly and wheat are the main crops. The area supports a sizeable population residing in large and compact villages. Households in *Malnad* heavily depend on forests and other common lands for meeting their daily biomass requirements. In the villages of the *Maidan* tract, households depend on both public land as well as private land. Kalaghatagi and some parts of Hubli and Dharwad come under *Malnad*. Navalgund and Kundagol come under *Maidan* and the remaining part of Hubli and Dharwad are in the transitional belt. Based on the land-use classification, we have estimated the availability of CPRs and PPRs in the Dharwad district. The land under forest, barren and uncultivable land, cultivable waste, pastures and other grazing land and fallow other than current are included in the area of CPRs. In the PPR area, net sown area and current fallow land are included. On average, Dharwad district has 12.6 per cent of land area under the common property. The land under CPR varies across taluk from 0.7 per cent to 33 per cent. Navalgund and Kundagol have very little land under CPRs. The extent of the common use of private lands is more in low-CPR taluks. Therefore, we have selected Navalgund and Kundagol taluks which fall in the *Maidan* region of the district.

After selecting the taluks based on the lesser availability of CPR area, the sample villages have been selected based on the proportion of SC/ST households. There are 57 villages in Navalgund and Kundagol taluk. The poorer households here depend more on common resources for meeting their fuelwood and fodder requirements. Poverty is more pronounced in socially backward communities, i.e. SC and ST communities. Therefore, we selected villages having higher a proportion of SC and ST population for the study. Thus, we selected Belligatti and Inamkoppa in Kundagol taluk and Shanwad and Saidapur in Navalgund taluk. The details are given in the appendix tables.

The study is based on primary data collected from a household survey conducted in four villages spread over two taluks in the Dharwad district. From each selected village, 25 households have been chosen for getting detailed information about the use of seasonal common property resources. The socio-economic characteristics of the households influence their dependency on common resources. While selecting the households, optimum care has been taken to select more SC and ST households. In total 100 households have been interviewed using the household schedule. To know the use of SCPRs and terms & conditions laid down by landowners, we have selected 12 households to belong to semi-medium and medium landowners among 100 households. In each selected village we selected 3 households from these landowners (Shanwad; only 2). A Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) method has also been used to get in-depth information about the availability and use of seasonal CPRs, the impact of the declining quantity of CPR products, etc. We have also collected secondary data about the village-wise CPR area, village maps, total number of households in the villages, SC and ST population, cropping pattern, and land use data from the village panchayat office, Taluk Panchayat office, the *Tahsildar* office and the land record office.

Table: 1 Profile of the Selected Villages

Sl No	Particulars	Kundagol Taluk		Navalgund Taluk	
		Inamkoppa	Belligatti	Saidapur	Shanawad
Population.					
1	No of HHs (census 2001)	184	38	174	352
2	Persons (census 2001)	961	258	1001	1846
3	Household Size (census 2001)	5.2	6.8	5.8	5.2
4	Sex ratio (census 2001)	877	1016	1039	958
5	SC Population (census 2001)	232	229	21	214
6	ST Population (census 2001)	232	3	253	243
7	% of SC & ST Population (census 2001)	48	90	27	25
8	Population (0-6 years) (census 2001)	136	45	134	247
9	Sex Ratio (0-6 years) (census 2001)	838	1045	1030	871
Area.					
10	The total area of the village (Hectares) (census 2001)	308	338	565	926
11	Forest (Ha) (census 2001)	0	0	0	0

12	Irrigated area (Ha) (census 2001)	3.24	0	0	474.71
13	Un-irrigated (Ha) (census 2001)	293.3	213.17	554.03	393.86
14	Culturable waste (including gauchar and groves) Ha (census 2001)	0	110.52	0	0
15	Area not available for cultivation (Ha) (census 2001)	9.05	14.33	11.13	51.89
Economic Condition					
16	Agricultural workers (census 2001)	436	96	235	207
17	Marginal workers (census 2001)	432	63	167	648
18	Total number of BPL households (year 2005-06) (Figures in brackets indicate % to total HHs)	54 (29)	16 (42)	165 (95)	210 (60)
19	Net sown area (Ha, year 2005-06)	298.54	293.00	561.18	216.74
20	Net irrigated area (Ha, year 2005-06)	3	91.25	1	23.40
21	Total Income of Households	12000	168000	18620	82898

Source: Census, 1991, 2001 & ZP Planning Department

Table: 2 Land Use Pattern of Selected Villages (2008-09) Area: in Acre

Particulars	Shanawad	Saidapur	Bellikatti	Inamkoppa
Cultivable area	2146 (94.5)	1369.1 (96.6)	451.2 (54.0)	696.4 (91.7)
Roads and pathways	28.02 (1.2)	16.13 (1.1)	35.4 (4.2)	22.4 (2.9)
Stream	22.08 (1.0)	11.08 (0.8)	75.3 (9.0)	11.1 (1.5)
Pond and Well	4.37 (0.2)	Area not available for cultivation (Potakharab) 21.2 (1.5)	Culturable waste (including gauchar and groves) Ha (census 1991) 273.0 (32.7)	5.2 (0.7)
Grazing land	1.38 (0.1)			24.7 (3.3)
Gavathana	17.36 (0.8)			
Burial ground, school, buildings and religious institutions	38.36 (1.7)			
Vacant land/Playground	14.14 (0.6)			
Total	2271.7 (100.0)	1417.5 (100.0)	834.9 (100.0)	759.7 (100.0)

Source: Village Accountants

Note: Figures in brackets indicate percentage to total geographical area of the village

Table: 3 Cropping Pattern of the Selected Villages 2008-09 (Area in Acre)

Crops	Bellikatti	Inamkoppa	Shanwad	Saidapur	Season	Sowing	Harvesting
Paddy	250	10			Kharif	July-August	November-December
Maize	180	30	2165		Kharif	June/July	November-December
Green gram	15	270		150	Kharif	June/July	October
Chilly	5	400	14	220	Kharif	July-August	February/March
Groundnut	4	700	34		Kharif	June/July	October/November
Soybean	25	40			Kharif	June/July	November.
DCH Cotton & BT Cotton	20	40	1022 *	300	Kharif	July-August	January/February
Onion & Garlic	5	22			Kharif	July-August	November/December
Wheat			700	50	Rabi	October-November	January/February
Jawar	50	40	850	100	Rabi	October-November	January/February
Sunflower			1210	180	Rabi	August/September	December/January
Tordal	25	15			Rabi	August/September	March/April
Horsegram			1800	60	Rabi	October.	January/February
Kusubi			24		Rabi	October	March/April
Mango & Chikku	16	0			All	All Season	April/May
Total	595	1567	6797	1060			

Source: Village Accountants

* = Mixed crop: Onion, Chilly and Cotton

PROFILE OF SELECTED HOUSEHOLDS

Out of the total 100 households surveyed it is interesting to note that about 90 per cent belong to the 'poor' category (Table 4). The poor were identified based on BPL cards, which can be considered the official indicator of being poor. Most of these poor households (82 per cent) reside in the Kutcha houses. The distribution of households according to religion shows that 88 per cent of the households are Hindus and the remaining 12 per cent Muslim. If we look at the caste-wise distribution of households, 73 per cent belong to the SC and ST communities. The distribution of households according to landholdings varies across villages. On average, 52 per cent of households are landless, while marginal and small landholders account for 18 per cent, and 9 per cent respectively. Other categories account for 3 per cent, consisting of medium and large farmers.

Table: 4 Profile of Selected Households

Particulars	Saidapur	Shanwad	Belligatti	Inamkoppa	Total
<i>Households by Religion (No and Percentage)</i>					
Hindu	15 (60)	24 (96)	25 (100)	24 (96)	88 (88)
Muslim	10 (40)	1 (4)	0 (0)	1 (4)	12 (12)
<i>Households by Caste (No and Percentage)</i>					
SC	0 (0)	16 (64)	25 (100)	15 (60)	56 (56)
ST	11 (44)	6 (24)	0 (0)	0 (0)	17 (17)
OBC	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (4)	1 (1)
Others	14 (56)	3 (12)	0 (0)	9 (36)	26 (26)
<i>Households by Occupation (No and Percentage)</i>					
Agriculture	13 (52)	8 (32)	7 (28)	5 (20)	33 (33)
Agri- Labor	11 (44)	16 (64)	12 (48)	20 (80)	59 (59)
Non-Agri- Labour	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (20)	0 (0)	5 (5)
Service/Business	1 (4)	1 (4)	1 (4)	0 (0)	3 (3)
<i>Households According to Landholdings (No and Percentage)</i>					
Landless	13 (52)	15 (60)	11 (44)	13 (52)	52 (52)
Marginal	5 (20)	4 (16)	2 (8)	7 (28)	18 (18)
Small	4 (16)	4 (16)	8 (32)	2 (8)	18 (18)
Semi-medium	3 (12)	0 (0)	3 (12)	3 (12)	9 (9)
Medium	0 (0)	2 (8)	1 (4)	0 (0)	3 (3)
<i>Households having BPL Card (No and Percentage)</i>					
BPL HHs	20 (80)	22(88)	25 (100)	23 (92)	90 (90)
<i>Households by Type of House (No and Percentage)</i>					
Hut	1 (4)	4 (16)	2 (8)	1 (4)	8 (8)
Kutchra	21 (84)	18 (72)	21 (84)	22 (88)	82 (82)
Semi Pucca	1 (4)	2 (8)	0 (0)	2 (8)	5 (5)
Pucca	2 (8)	1 (4)	2 (8)	0 (0)	5 (5)

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

In the selected villages, except village Belligatti, more than 90 per cent of the land is under cultivable land. In these villages, about 50 per cent of the cultivators belong to marginal and small cultivators and they hold only 20 per cent of the total cultivable land. This land is unequally distributed and only a few persons are holding large areas of land. Land under, grazing land, Gavathana land, potakharab land, burial ground, roads and pathways, lines of the canals, banks of the streams/ponds constitute common property resources. The magnitude of common land is very less in these villages, i.e. about 2 per cent of the total geographical area. On these lands, Jali & Peek Jali (*Prosopis juliflora*) are available throughout the year. People use *Jali & Peek Jali* as fuel.

They also use these lands for grazing their livestock. As the common land in these villages is very little, the households have to depend on private lands for getting fuel and fodder. Table 5 shows crops grown and crop residues available in the village.

Table 5 Flow of SCPRs in Selected Villages	
Private Property Resources (PPRs)	Seasonal Common Property Resources (SCPRs)
<i>Paddy & Wheat</i>	Paddy is grown in Belligatti and wheat is grown in Shanwad village. Labourers (who came to remove the weeds) are allowed to take the grass which is grown in the field. Many times the labourers bring cattle with them and feed the available grass
<i>Jawar</i>	In Shanwad and Saidapur villages, while cutting the cob from the stalk, the plants which are not fully grown are allowed to be cut and fed to the cattle of the labourers. In Belligatti and Inamkoppa the landowners have full control over crop residues.
<i>Maize</i>	Maize is mainly grown in Shanwad and Belligatti villages. This crop gives plenty of crop residue, in the form of stalk and cob, the labourers who work in these fields are allowed to take some quantity of crop residue
<i>Sunflower</i>	Sunflower is grown in Shanwad and Saidapur villages. After removing the corns, the flowers are allowed to be taken. The stalks on the field are allowed to be taken by anybody. This saves labour and money for the landowners. The landowners who have enough of this residue allow others to collect them.
<i>Tordal</i>	Tordal is grown in a very limited area in Belligatti & Inamkoppa villages. The crop residue of this crop is mainly used by the landowners themselves.
<i>Green gram</i>	The crop residues of this crop are mainly used by the landowners themselves as fodder.
<i>Horsegram</i>	The crop residues of this crop are mainly used by the landowners themselves as fodder.
<i>Chilly</i>	Chilly is grown on a large scale in Inamkoppa and Saidapur villages. It produces a lot of crop residue and is available for collection in common. The stalks after removing the chillies are allowed to be taken from the field by the labourers who work in the field.
<i>Groundnut</i>	The crop residue of this crop is mainly used by the landowners themselves as fodder.
<i>Soybean</i>	The crop residue of this crop is mainly used by the landowners themselves as fodder.

<i>DCH Cotton & BT Cotton</i>	Cotton is grown mainly in Shanwad and Saidapur villages. It produces a lot of crop residue and is available for collection in common. The stalks after removing the cotton are allowed to be taken out from the field by the labourers. In Bellikatti and Inamkppa also cotton is grown in a limited area. Therefore, only in certain cases, the stalks are allowed to be removed by others.
<i>Mango & Chikku</i>	These are grown in Belligatti village in a limited area. Only the labourers who enjoy the trust of the owners are allowed to take out twigs and the dead skin of the tree.
<i>Onion & Garlic</i>	These crops do not produce many crop residues. Only grass grown in the field is allowed to be removed by the labourers while weeding. Onion is mainly grown in Shanwad village.
<i>Kusubi</i>	Kusubi is grown only in Shanwad village in the only limited area. There are no reports of using this residue as a common resource.
Current Fallow	Grazing is allowed with some restrictions
Fallow other than current fallow	This type of land is very less in the selected villages

Crop residues of cotton, chilly, sunflower and other oil seed plants are mainly used as fuel. A major part of the crop residues of Jawar, Maize, Paddy, Wheat, Green gram, Horse gram and groundnut are used as fodder. The waste/ remaining fodder are used as fuel. The number of agricultural residues depends on crops grown and the extent of crop production.

Table 6 shows the percentage of HHs collecting SCPR items in the selected villages. It shows that on average, 91 per cent of HHs collect these items for meeting their fuel and fodder requirements. This indicates that the level of dependence of the rural population on SCPRs for meeting their daily requirements is high.

Table: 6 Number of Households Collecting SCPR Items

Households	Saidapur	Shanwad	Belligatti	Inamkoppa	Total
Landless	12	15	8	13	48
	92.3	100.0	72.7	100.0	92.3
Marginal	5	4	1	7	17
	100.0	100.0	50.0	100.0	94.4
Small	4	4	8	2	18
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Semi-medium	2		2	2	6
	66.7	0.0	66.7	66.7	66.7
Medium	0	2			2
	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	66.7

Total	23	25	19	24	91
	92.0	100.0	76.0	96.0	91.0

Note: Bold figures indicate the percentage of households collecting SCPRs in the village

Table 7 shows the quantity of CPR and SCPR products collected during the year 2008-09. It shows; on average, households in the selected villages collected 1020.5 Kg of resources from common property whereas they collected 2332.0 Kg of seasonal common property resources (SCPRs). The collection of CPRs and SCPRs varies across the villages and the quantity of collection depends upon the landholdings of the family, the extent of crop area in the village, availability of labourers in the village, family size, family income (especially from other sources), and many other factors.

Table: 7 Quantity of CPR & SCPR Products Collected (Kg/Household/Annum)

Village	Common Property Resources (CPRs)				Seasonal Common Property Resources (SCPRs)									
	Wood	Grass/Fodder	Animal Dung	Total CPR	Wood	Grass/Fodder	Animal Dung	Crop Residues of						Total SCPR
								Chilly	Maize	Cotton	sunflower	Jawar	Tordal	
Saidapur	878	0	24	902	87	976	6	624	96	1017	1720	24	0	4550
Shanwad	1537	0	6	1543	391	1272	8	320	418	453	120	0	0	2983
Belligatti	492	0	15	507	30	124	9	254	12	236	8	14	12	699
Inamkoppa	1067	64	0	1131	0	194	0	246	8	580	56	12	0	1096
Total	993	16	11	1021	127	642	6	361	134	571	476	13	3	2332

Table 8 shows the value of CPR and SCPR products collected by the selected households. The total value of CPRs/SCPRs has been estimated by multiplying its quantity with the local market price quoted by the households. On average the households collected CPRs to the value of Rs. 732 per annum and SCPR products to the value of Rs. 748. Though the number of SCPR products was higher, the value of these products was lower compared to that of CPR products. This was mainly because of the abundant availability of crop residue as fuelwood in these villages and also because of its lower quality as fuel.

Table: 8 Value of CPR & SCPR Products Collected (Rs/Household/Annum)

Village	Common Property Resources (CPRs)				Seasonal Common Property Resources (SCPRs)									
	Wood	Grass/Fodder	Animal Dung	Total CPR	Wood	Grass/Fodder	Animal Dung	Crop Residues of						Total SCPR
								Chilly	Maize	Cotton	sunflower	Jawar	Tordal	
Saidapur	694	0	4	698	24	232	4	150	28	213	146	3	0	800
Shanwad	1115	0	2	1117	176	790	4	98	168	164	38	0	0	1438
Belligatti	498	0	44	542	22	74	4	140	8	134	4	5	4	395
Inamkoppa	535	38	0	573	0	111	0	56	4	157	25	4	0	357
Total	710	10	12	732	56	302	3	111	52	167	53	3	1	748

Households were collecting these resources from PPRs without any restriction, but now due to commercialization and increasing population, people find difficulty in getting those resources. The commercialization of agriculture has resulted in a decline in the mutual co-operation of people. Households, especially weaker sections, face more uncertainties in obtaining these products.

CO-OPERATION BETWEEN POOR HOUSEHOLDS AND LAND OWNERS

In the selected villages, the households used to share the available resources among themselves without considering any socio-economic differentials. Farmers grew those crops that would give the family sufficient food for men and livestock. The poor households contributed the labour and collected the required crop residue from the landowners. There was absolutely no restriction on the collection of SCPRs, instead, landowners helped the poor households in the collection. Due to the commercialization of agriculture (in the last 10 - 15 years), the farmers have started to think in terms of maximizing their cash returns. The demand for crop residues from nearby cities and demand from local industries have also increased. To maximize their cash returns, farmers have adopted new cropping patterns (cash crops). Now every part of the crop has value. Presently, the terms and conditions related to the exchange of SCPRs depend largely on their demand and supply. The demand for SCPRs depends upon the availability of CPRs and the total population of landless and marginal & small-farmer households. The supply of SCPRs

depends on the extent of private land (which would produce crop residue) and the number of medium and large-farmer households in the village. If SCPRs are available in large quantities then there would be no / fewer restrictions on their collection but when they are scarce there would be more restrictions. On the other hand, labour is a critical input required in certain stages of crop production, is in short supply. In this situation, farmers expect the agricultural labour families to work continuously in their fields without fail. And the labourers expect to get a sufficient quantity of crop residue (enough to meet the total household needs for the year). SCPRs collected are not part of the wages of the labourers. The general rules followed are as follows;

- a) Household members should work on the owner's field whenever there is a need.
- b) Only some quantity of crop residue is allowed to be taken with the permission of the landowner.
- c) While collecting the crop residues/grass/weed, the collectors should not harm the standing crops (if any)
- d) Crop residues and weeds in the standing crop should be collected from one side to clean up the field in the process. This would help the landowners to save on labour.
- e) Even if more than one person from a labourer family works in a field only one person is allowed to collect the crop residues.

These rules may vary depending on specific instances. Belligatti and Inamkoppa villages have less agricultural land (compared with Shanwad and Saidapur) and these villages are nearer to the city. Therefore, these villages have migrant labourers and getting labour is a very difficult task in these villages. Therefore, the labourer families are in a position to demand the required crop residue for fuel. In Belligatti to take the stalk of jowar one has to first cut the part of the plant which has seeds (*Tene*). Only after cutting and collecting these can one get the Jowar stalk. Even if more than one person from a landless family comes to work for the agriculturist, only one person can get the crop residue for fodder/fuel-wood. None of the others will get the residue / fuel-wood. Because of the scarcity of labour, farmers have been adopting crops that require fewer labourers and that are useful for fuel and grazing purposes.

Households in the villages still live based on mutual co-operation. They would be happy to share the available resources with others. In times such as harvesting (*Rasi*), storing fodder (*Banavi*), and weeding (*Yedekinte*) labourers ask for some quantity of crop residue. At that time labourers are ready to work for free. Many instances of generosity are also reported from the villages. The owners of fields allow households headed by women (consisting mainly of women and children) to collect crop residues generously.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

In the selected villages, 91 per cent of the HHs depends on SCPRs and on average they collected 2332 Kg of fuel and fodder. As common lands are scarce most of the rural households depend on SCPRs for getting fuel and fodder. Earlier, there were absolutely no restrictions on the use of these resources. But in recent days, households face uncertainties in obtaining these products due to the commercialization of agricultural residues, crop failure, adoption of labour-saving machines or methods of cropping, drought, etc. Mutual co-operation among the people has also been declining. Now, landowners allow the collection of SCPRs under certain conditions only. Decline in the availability of SCPRs adversely affect poor rural households. Therefore, the policies should aim at the adequate and regular supply of these resources to poor households. The government should think of allocating a certain piece of land for every village for fulfilling community needs; such as fuel, fodder, burial ground, playground, etc. The government may also promote roadside tree planting on a large scale in such villages. Incentives should be given to encourage the use of alternative fuels.

REFERENCE

- Agro Climatic Regional Planning Unit (1991): "Agro Climatic Regional Planning at State Level" ACRPU, Ahamadabad
- Beck, Tony (1994): "Common Property Resource Access by Poor and Class Conflict in West Bengal" *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol.29, No.4, Pp-187-198
- Beck, Tony and Ghosh, Madan G (2000): "Common Property Resources and the Poor- Findings from West Bengal" *Economic and Political Weekly*, January, 15, Pp. 147-153
- Beck, Tony and Nesmith Cathy (1999): "Building on Poor People's Capacities: The Case of Common Property Resources in India and West Africa" Paper presented at a World Bank Conference on "Poverty, Environment, Growth Linkages" Washington DC, 24-25th March 1999
- Beck, Tony and Nesmith Cathy (1999): "Building on Poor People's Capacities: The Case of Common Property Resources in India and West Africa" Paper presented at a World Bank Conference on "Poverty, Environment, Growth Linkages" Washington DC, 24-25th March 1999
- Bromley, Daniel W (1992): "The Commons, Common Property, and Environmental Policy" *Environmental and Resource Economics*, Vol.2, Pp. 1-17

Chilundo, Arlindo Gancalo and Cau, Boaventura Manuel: "Traditional Forms of Common Property Rights: A Case Study in Southern Mozambique" Nucleus for Land and Development Studies, Eduardo Mandlane University. Mozambique. Internet

Chopra, Kanchan and Gulati, S C (1997): "Environmental Degradation and Population Movements: The Role of Property Rights" *Environmental and Resource Economics*, Vol.9, Pp. 383-408

Chopra, Kanchan and Gulati, S C (2001): "Migration, Common Property Resources and Environmental Degradation" Sage publications, New Delhi

District Statistical Office, Dharwad District Statistical Handbook, 2006-07

Ghosh, Madan Gopal (1995): "Common Property Resource Use by Poor in West Bengal" Internet.

Iyengar, Sudarshan (1989): "Common Property Land Resources in Gujarat: Some Findings of their Size, Status and Use" *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol.24, No.25, Pp. A-67.

Jalal and Niraja, Gopal (1994): "Rights, Justice and Common Property Resources" *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol.29, No.28, Pp. 1810.

Jodha, N S (1986): "Common Property Resources and Rural Poor in Dry Regions of India", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol.21, No.27, pp. 1169-1181.

Layard, Richard and Glaister, Stephen (1996): "Cost-Benefit Analysis-Local and Global Commons" Cambridge University Press- 2nd edition, Pp. 330.

McCay, Bonnie J (1996): "Common and Private Concerns" in 'Rights to Nature' Ed by Hanna, Susan et al, Island Press, Washington.

Morathia, Dinesh K (2002): "Institutionalizing Common Pool Resources" Concept Publishers, New Delhi.

National Sample Survey Organisation (2000): "Sarvekshana" Government of India, Vol.24, No.1

Ostrom, Elinor (1992): "Community and the Endogenous Solution of Commons Problems" *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, Vol.4 No.3

Pasha, Syed Ajmal (1992): "CPRs and Rural Poor- A Micro-Level Analysis" *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol.27, No.46, pp. 2499-2503.

Radhakrishna R (edit; 2008); "India Development Report 2008" IGIDR, Oxford University Press.

Rathore N S and Panwar N L(2007): "Renewable Energy Sources for Sustainable Development" New India Publishing Agency, New Delhi. (Pages; 172-176)

Saravanan, Velayutham (1999): "Commercial Crops, Alienation of Common Property Resources and Change in Tribal Economy in the Shervaroy Hills of Madras Presidency During the Colonial Period" *Review of Development and Change*, Vol.4, No.2, pp. 298-316.

Singh, Karam, Singh, Nirmal and Singh, R P (1996): "Utilisation and Development of Common Property Resources – A Field Study in Punjab" *Indian Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol.51, No.1 and 2, Pp. 249-259.

Singh, Katar and Ballabh Ed (1996): "Cooperative Management of Natural Resources" Sage Publications, New Delhi.

Stevenson, Glenn G (1991): "Common Property Economics: A General Theory and Land Use Applications", Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Swanson, Timothy M, Ed (1996): "The Economics of Environmental Degradation-Tragedy for the Commons?" UNEP, Edward Elgar Publishing Company, Cheltenham, UK. Brookfield, US.

United Nations (1996): "Rural Poverty Alleviation and Sustainable Development in Asia and the Pacific" United Nations, Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, Pp. 11-12 and 54-66