

## ACCESSIBILITY OF CPLRS AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: A CASE EVIDENCE OF SOUTHERN ZONE IN TAMIL NADU

**Dr. A. Kannan<sup>1</sup>**

**T. Veerapandi<sup>2</sup>**

**T. Jeyanthi<sup>3</sup>**

---

### **Abstract**

The present paper is an attempt of the researcher to analyze the extent of common lands is available in the Sothern Zone of Tamil Nadu during the last 20 years. The study finds that, of the eight districts in the Sothern Zone, the availability of CPLRs was observed that an increase in six districts. But in two districts, namely Ramanathapuram and Karur district, it evidenced that a decline in CPLRs from 19.05 per cent in 1998-99 to 13.17 per cent in 2014-15 and 50.39 per cent to 46.89 per cent respectively between 1998-99 to 2014-15. It further estimated that in Ramanathapuram district, the per capita of CPLRs was estimated at 0.05 hectares in 2001 and it has declined to 0.04 hectares in 2011. The remaining district data have shown an increasing trend of the same in the last two census periods.

**Key Words:** Common Property Land Resources, Private Property Land Resources, Livelihood sustenance.

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. A. Kannan, Assistant Professor & Project Director, ICSSR-Major Research Project, Department of Environmental Economics, School of Economics, Madurai Kamaraj University, Madurai-21, Tamil Nadu.

<sup>2</sup> Research Assistant, ICSSR – Major Research Project, Department of Environmental Economics, School of Economics, Madurai Kamaraj University, Madurai-21, Tamil Nadu.

<sup>3</sup> Ph.D., Research Scholar, Department of Mathematical Economics, School of Economics, Madurai Kamaraj University, Madurai-21, Tamil Nadu.

## Introduction

The present paper divulges the issue of Common Property Land Resources (CPLRs) and the role of such vital resources for the livelihood of the local population in general and the rural poor in particular in the Southern parts of Tamil Nadu. CPRs have been misunderstood and often been mistakenly identified with open access resources. In dry zones, CPRs play an important role in the livelihood support of the rural mass. Through the common property resources, the rural poor receive a number of benefits, which make them important sources of employment and income, especially when other opportunities are non-existent (Jodha, 1989). A study conducted by Dadibhavi. (1998) in 15 villages of Karnataka during 1995-96 revealed that the area under forest has decreased in all the regions in the study period. The study found that the most important component of CPRs is pasture and other grazing land, which had declined 37 per cent over the last 30 years. It finds that 62 per cent of sample households, 77 per cent of non-poor households and 57 per cent of poor households reported CPRs as a source for grazing. With respect to fuel requirements, 90 per cent of the poor and 75 per cent of the non-poor households rely on CPRs. At the aggregate level, the average non-poor household derived a sum of Rs.2378 income from CPRs, and the average poor household derived a sum of Rs.2058 as income from CPRs. The author emphasized that the CPRs have not only augmented the income of the sample households, but also they have contributed towards reducing the inequalities of income between the poor and the non-poor. The reason for the decline in the CPR areas has been encroachment by the people for the purpose of cultivation, which is indirectly assessed by the government through regularization of such encroachments in the study areas.

Another evidence by Jodha (1990) found that 49 to 86 percent of the privatized CPRs ended up in the hands of the non poor in different areas. Most of the land received by the poorest households was also given up by them as they did not have complementary resources to develop them. Thus, the rural poor collectively lost a significant part of the source of their sustenance through the decline of CPRs. This loss does not seem to be compensated by the privatized CPRs land given to them. There are three reasons for declining CPRs such as physical loss of resources like submersion of grazing land and constructed dams, roads and building under CPRs area, a transfer of the CPRs to the private ownership and deterioration of physical productivity of resources as revealed degradation of pastures and forest lands.

In this background, the researcher made an attempt to analyze the extent of common lands is available in Sothern Zone of Tamil Nadu during the last 20 years. There are seven Agro-Climatic Zones in Tamil Nadu based on the climatic conditions and monsoon patterns prevailing in these areas. But, the present paper is restricted to study status of CPLRs, Private Property Land Resources (PPLRs) and the per capita availability of the same in the Southern zone in Tamil Nadu during the periods from 1998-99-2014-15.

### **Material and Methods**

This paper is fully based on secondary data which was obtained from the Economic and Statistics, Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India during the periods of 1998-99 to 2014-15. The present study made an attempt of the above manner in the Southern zone of Tamil Nadu. This zone comprises 8 districts and all the districts are characterized by dry land and its agricultural production has mainly depended on the rainfall. For analytical purpose, the simple statistical tool such as a percentage was used to elicit the extent of CPLRs, the categories of CPLRs and the per capita of CPLRs and Private Property Resources (PPLRs) as available in the study districts in particular and study zone in general during the study periods.

### **Results and discussion**

The present section deals about the present status of the CPLRs in Southern Zone in Tamil Nadu is based on the available secondary data which was obtained from the Economics and Statistics, Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India during the periods from 1998-99 to 2014-2015.

In table (1) make clear that the present status of CPLRs and PPLRs in southern districts of Tamil Nadu during 1998-99 to 2014-15. It finds that the availability of CPLRs was increased in six districts, such as Madurai, Pudukkottai, Tirunelveli, Sivagangai, Virudhunagar and Tuticorn.

**Table 1: Status of CPLRs and PPLRs in Southern zone of Tamil Nadu**

District	1998-99		2014-15	
	CPLRs	PPLRs	CPLRs	PPLRs
Madurai	25.35	74.65	44.11	55.89
Pudukkottai	29.59	70.41	37.13	62.87
Ramanathapuram	19.05	80.95	13.17	86.83
Tirunelveli	41.91	58.09	43.90	56.10
Sivagangai	31.65	68.35	40.36	59.64
Virudhunagar	30.74	69.26	51.10	48.90
Tuticorin	22.23	77.77	31.82	68.18
Karur	50.39	49.61	46.89	53.11

**Source: Economic & Statistics, Ministry of Agriculture, Govt. of India**

But in Ramanathapuram district, the availability of CPLRs was reduced from 19.05 per cent in 1998-99 to 13.17 per cent in 2014-15. Besides, in Karur district, it shows that a decline of 50.39 per cent to 46.89 per cent between 1998-99 to 2014-15.

**Table 2: Extent of different types of CPLRs in Southern zone of Tamil Nadu**

District	1998-99					2014-15				
	Forest	Uncultivable land	Grazing land	Cultivable wasteland	Other fallow land	Forest	Uncultivable land	Grazing land	Cultivable wasteland	Other fallow land
Madurai	13.48	4.22	0.06	1.41	6.18	5.17	2.12	1.10	2.39	19.04
Pudukkottai	5.17	2.12	1.10	2.40	5.17	5.05	2.12	0.74	2.10	27.13
Ramanathapuram	1.10	1.12	0.11	1.30	15.42	1.10	1.11	0.04	0.86	10.06
Tirunelveli	17.89	3.99	1.44	10.55	24.24	18.90	4.44	0.76	5.22	26.77
Sivagangai	5.23	1.24	0.33	4.01	20.85	3.95	1.12	0.33	4.37	30.59
Virudhunagar	6.27	1.02	0.19	1.79	21.47	6.24	1.07	0.19	2.25	41.36
Tuticorin	2.40	4.28	1.12	4.31	10.12	2.34	4.22	1.09	9.61	14.55
Karur	2.14	1.0	3.71	23.66	19.89	2.14	0.96	3.73	22.63	17.43

**Source: Economic & Statistics, Ministry of Agriculture, Govt. of India**

The table (2) indicated that the different category of CPLRs is available in the Southern districts such as forest, barren and uncultivable land, permanent pasture and other grazing land, cultivable wasteland and fallow lands other than current fallow during 1998-99 to 2014-2015. It

accounted that the size of forests was high in Thirunelveli district (18.90 per cent) and least in the Ramanadhapuram district (1.10 percent) during the study periods.

The table results further reveals that there has been a continuous increase were observed in the case of the fallow other than current fallow land in all the districts of the study zone as compared to rest of the CPLR categories. Similarly, the extent of the crucial CPLRs such as the permanent pasture and other grazing land shown a constant decline in all the districts during the above two study periods.

Table 3 points out that the per capita availability of CPLRs and PPLRs in Southern districts of Tamilnadu during the last two census periods. For instance, the per capita availability of CPLRs in Ramanathapuram district was estimated at 0.05 hectares in 2001. It has declined to 0.04 hectares in 2011.

**Table 3: Per capita of CPLRs and PPLRs in Southern zone of Tamil Nadu (in Ha.)**

Southern Zone District	2001			2011		
	CPLRs	PPLRs	Population	CPLRs	PPLRs	Population
Madurai	0.05	0.07	30,41,038	0.05	0.08	25,78,201
Pudukkottai	0.08	0.2	16,18,725	0.09	0.22	14,59,601
Ramanathapuram	0.05	0.25	13,37,560	0.04	0.29	11,87,604
Thirunelveli	0.12	0.1	30,72,880	0.13	0.11	27,03,492
Sivagangai	0.12	0.18	13,41,250	0.13	0.22	11,55,356
Virudhunagar	0.07	0.14	19,43,309	0.11	0.12	17,51,301
Tuticorn	0.10	0.15	17,38,376	0.10	0.19	15,92,769
Karur	0.13	0.13	10,76,588	0.14	0.16	9,35,686

**Source: Economic & Statistics, Ministry of Agriculture, Govt. of India**

The remaining district data have shown an increasing trend in the last two census periods. On the other side, the per capita availability of PPLRs is also showing an increasing trend in all the districts exception to Virudhunagar district of the above mentioned periods in the study zone.

## Conclusions

Common property Resources (CPRs) are integral aspects of the social and institutional arrangements made to meet the everyday requirements of village communities. They are of particular relevance to the landless, the agricultural laborers and the rural artisan. Of the eight study districts, the availability of CPLRs was increased in six districts, such as Madurai, Pudukkottai, Tirunelveli, Sivagangai, Virudhunagar and Tuticorn. But in Ramanathapuram district, the availability of CPLRs was reduced from 19.05 per cent in 1998-99 to 13.17 per cent in 2014-15. Besides in Karur district, it shows that the availability of CPLRs was declined from 50.39 per cent to 46.89 per cent between 1998-99 to 2014-15. The per capita availability of CPLRs and PPLRs in Southern districts of Tamilnadu reveals that in Ramanathapuram district, it was estimated at 0.05 hectares in 2001 and it has declined to 0.04 hectares in 2011. The remaining district data have shown an increasing trend in the last two census periods. On the other side, the per capita availability of PPLRs is also showing an increasing trend in all the districts exception to Virudhunagar district in the study zone during the study periods.

*Note: This paper is a revised form of research paper of a Major Research Project funded by the Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR) New Delhi, entitled “Changing Scenario of Common Property Resources (CPRs) and its Impacts on the Local Communities Livelihood: A Study with Reference to Pudukkottai District of Tamil Nadu”(2017-2019) was presented in two days National level seminar on ‘Environment and Sustainable Development’ held on April 26 & 27, 2018 organized by the Department of Sociology, Annamalai University, Chidambaram – 608 002. The authors are grateful to the ICSSR for financial support. The usual disclaimers apply.*

## References:

1. Census Reports in 2001 and 2011.
2. Dadibhavi. R. V. (1998). “CPRs and their Contribution: Evidence from Karnataka. **Indian Economy after 50 years of Independence Experiences and Challenges.** (Eds.) Debendra. K. Das. **Deep and Deep Publications.** F-159. Rajuvri Garden New Delhi-110027-pp-355-368.
3. Jodha N. S. (1989), “Depletion of Common Property Resources in India: Micro-Level Evidence” **Population and Development Review**, Vol. 15, pp. 261-283.

4. Jodha N. S. (1990), “Rural Common Property Resources: Contributions and Crisis” **Economic and Political Weekly**, Vol. 25, No. 26 pp. A65-A78.
5. Reports of the Directorate of Economics & Statistics, Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India.