



RELIGIOUS BELIEF PROTECT THE NATURE: A CASE EVIDENCE OF HOUSEHOLD IN AND AROUND NATIVE TEMPLES, VEDASANDUR BLOCK, DINDIGUL DISTRICT

Mrs. P. Kavitha

Guest Lecturer, Department of Economics,
M.V.Muthiah Government Arts College for Women,
Dindigul.



ABSTRACT :

The common property resource (CPR) is a part of environmental resources. Temple forest is one of the common property resources. Research in the area of common property resources is to unfold many facts of natural resources and its problem thereof. The proposed study would bring the knowledge of the use and access to temple forest; these resources were largely under the control of local god temple's administration such as Madurai Veeran, Iyyanar, Karuppanaswamy, Muniyappaswamy ect.. There will be an encroachment of resources ultimately degrading the CPRs and depriving the rural poor. But in case of temple forest is protected due to some values. The natural resources is a free rider for the over exploitation of CPRs.

KEYWORDS : Common Property Resource, Temple forest, religious value, non-rivalry, vedasandur, dindigul, Free rider problem.

INTRODUCTION

The common property resource (CPRs) is a part of environmental resources. Resource accessible to and collective owned/ managed by an identifiable community and on which no individual has exclusive.cpr is the major important to the poor. In the dry region of India, they include village pasture, community forests, temple forest wastelands, common threshing grounds, waste dumping places watershed drainages, village ponds, tanks, rivers/rivulets and riverbeds ect.. Institutions based on the CPRs helped socially beneficial roles in natural resources managed from economic pre- history up to the present. The availability of common property resources in the form of land water, forests are facing a declining trend. Many reasons for that amongst the village people and the poor are depend on CPRs for their daily livelihood is the most important reason. And unsustainable exploitation of natural resources takes low availability of CPRs by the poor people becomes insufficient over a time. The temple is one of the common property resources hence people are collecting resources from the forest temple.

NEED FOR THE STUDY

Presents study was designed to assess distance, time spent, degradation to temple resource if any and its impact on the poor income and their livelihood. The study helps to understand their economic problem of the poor are village people and this also helps to protect the nature of environmental awareness. In addition the presents study proposed to understand how religious beliefs (values) protect the nature.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In India, people depend on the natural resource for their livelihood. India was rich in its natural resource in terms availability of resources before few decades. But at present the natural resources are lost due to over exploitation and increased deterioration of quality as well as quantity due to population growth pressure. There is a large number of issues involved pertaining to CPRs in general and native temple CPRs in particular. Lacks of institutional arrangements breakdown of the local authority system were except worship spot. In addition, environmental degradation caused considerable hardships to fuel wood collectors in rural areas. There are different religion people who depend on the natural resource for their livelihood. But the forest at around the native temples such as Veerananar, Ayyanar, Karuppanaswamy, Muniyappan, Pattani kovil and Madurai Veeran are not degraded. In this backdrop, whether the Hindu religious values protect the nature or trees, particularly on temple land?

OBJECTIVES

1. To account the collection of CPRs materials from native temple with the help of the primary and secondary sources.
2. To explore the socio-economic, environmental and institutional aspects of (household in around the) native temple forest (CPRs) with the help of primary sources.
3. To identify the factors of protection (religious value) of the native temple forest (natural resources).

HYPOTHESES

Type Quantity and Value of Material collection from the native temple forest.

Material collection from CPR is varying between temple forest land (local god) and other CPRs.

METHODOLOGY

In order to realize the set of objectives, the studies were used purposive and proportionate random sampling methods to select the village and sample 10% (76) households. Veda sandur Taluk in Dindigul District was chosen which comprise 10 villages and 10 temples.

TOOLS AND ANALYSIS

Simple statistical tools such as Regression model and Paired t' test, Mean, Standers Deviation. The regression model is used to estimate material collected from the temple land.

COMMON PROPERTY RESOURCES

The human like depends upon the environment for its survival. Environment factors such as "air, water, mineral, organism" and all other factors surroundings and affecting a given organism at any time". The environment can be described a natural conditions surrounding us. The environment is the base for all human and economic activities. Any resource of property, whether material or non – Materials, used by every individual in the society for the benefit of one and all without having any characteristic future of" private ownership" can be known as CPR. Resource accessibility to and collectively owned, held, managed by an identifiable community and on own which no individual has exclusive property rights are called common property resources.

Public goods

Non-excludability

It is not possible for any individual to prevent the use of these resources. That is it will not be possible to alienate the resources to ascribe exclusive ownership of a private entity. Nor, it will be possible to prevent access of these resources to the public.

Non-rivalry

Non-rivalry is the consumption of the resources is not restricted. There is lack of consumption among the users unlike in the case of a private good, where everybody is competing each other making the best use of the resources. One can make use of the resources is required quantities, while at the same time anyone else can make use of it according to his needs. Since there is non-rivalry in consumption there is no pressure on the consumer to make the limited use of it.

Free rider problem

Free riders are those who consume more than a fair share of a public resource, or shoulder less than a fair share of the costs of its production. Free riding is usually considered to be an economic problem only when it leads to the non-production or under-production of a public good (and thus to pareto inefficient), or when it leads to the excessive use of a common property resource. The free rider problem is the question of how to limit free riding (or its negative effective) in this situation.

Guardian deities or local gods

Village deities are always found in the outskirts of the village. The maintenance of the temple of these deities is taken care of the whole of the village. It is believed that these gods shoo away all evils and devils from entering the village. These temples are usually in the open space and will not have traditional Gopuram like any other temples. In that temple one can see big statues of gods with weapons like bow, arrow, swords and knives and other protective weapons. They're also protected animals in the temples which usually associated with the god. But there are some restrictions followed by the temple arrangements.

Forest protected for spiritual reasons:

Despite high levels of deforestation Ghana contains many areas of forest set aside by traditional communities- variously called sacred groves, fetish groves or community's forest that remain well preserved although outside the official system of protected areas. Local people still consider them to have important spiritual values. Some of these forests are designated burial grounds for tribal chiefs but in other cases they have been conserved also to maintain watershed values are wide species that are valuable community.

Common property resources Collected from the temple land for domestic purpose

Income of the Respondents per Month	Statistics	Qty of tree leaves (in kg)	Value of tree leaves (in rs)	Qty of tamarind (in kg)	Value of tamarind (in rs)	Qty of aloevara (in grams)	Value of aloevara (in rs)	Qty of neem seed (in kg)	Value of neem seed (in rs)
Below 5000	Sum	48	240	4.40	228	200	24	375	3495
	Mean	1.60	8	.14	7.60	6.66	.8	12.50	116.50
	S.D	8.76	43.81	.56	32.21	25.37	3.04	40.57	376.59
5000-10000	Sum	288	1440	12.00	480	--	--	480	4320
	Mean	7.20	36	.30	12.00	--	--	12	108
	S.D	38.50	192.53	1.39	52.97	--	--	51.20	460.80
10000-15000	Sum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Mean	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	S.D	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Above 15000	Sum	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Mean	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	S.D	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total	Sum	336	1680	16.40	708	200	24	855	7815
	Mean	4.42	22.10	.21	9.31	2.63	.31	11.25	102.82
	S.D	28.45	142.27	1.07	43.27	16.11	1.93	44.84	407.66

This table represented that collection of cpr in the temple area. The aloevera is collected only in the low income group. People do cut the tree leaves for cattle in grazing time. They do not store in their home. So they collect maximum in terms of value of tree leaves. Middle income group respondents are collecting the high quantity of tamarind because their house is near by the temple. so comparatively the middle income group people are getting more value of tamarind then the low income group. There is minimum difference in low income value of tamarind than the low income group and middle income group in the collection of neem seed. There is two level of price fixation to the neem seeds. Primarily, the seed with the cover costs Rs.8 and the seed alone costs Rs.12. It is important to note that third and fourth income group does not collect any of the resources from the temple, at the same time second group collects resources at the maximum followed by the first group.

Regression result- Value of Material Collection from Temple CPRs

Sl.No	Independent Variabl	Regression co-efficient	Std.Erro r	't' value	Sig
1	Constant	437.872	83.207	5.262	.000
2	X1	-218.936	43.833	-4.995	.000
3	X2	7.929	.381	20.785	.000
N=76, r= .915, r2= .913 Significant at 5% levels					

Fuction : $y = a \pm bx$

$Y=437.872 -218.936(\text{caost})+7.929(\text{nsc})+ \text{ERROR}$

X1=collection of any other source from temple forest (caost)

X2= neem seed collected (in grams) (nsc)

Table -represents the regression analysis of the factors that determine value of material collection from temple CPRs. The results shows that collection of any other source from temple forest and neem seed collected (in grams) are statistically significant at $P > 0.05$ level. The R square value turns on to be 0.91. This shows that 91 percent variations are explained by the variations in the independent variables. How many grams neem seed collected is positively related to value of material collection from temple CPRs. Collection of fuel wood is not significant at 5% level. Exclusively, the people were collecting medicinal plants like aloevera and neem seed and leaves for own use from the temple CPRs. People fear to collect fuel wood from temple land because of Hindu value system and they believe god punish them if cutting the tree from temple forest.

'T' TEST (PAIRED SAMPLE STATISTICS)

Pair 1	Mean	N	Std.Deviatio n	Standard Error Mean
Total value resource Collection from other CPRs	223.28 95	76	140.40312	16.10534
Total value resource Collection from Temple CPRs	129.52 63	76	425.80560	48.84325

't' test results confirmed that the null hypothesis get rejected. Collection of the resource is more than the temple CPRs. The mean difference showed 223 kg collected from cprs and 129 kg collected from temple CPR only. People do not collect fuel wood from temple land. Only herbal medicine like aloevara, neem leaves for own use.

FINDINGS

In the foregoing chapters the objectives set out in the introductory part, have been released with the help of secondary and primary household survey. This chapter intends to make a presentation of the actual conclusion that has emerged in this study. It is estimated the value of collection of temple resource materials, 10 sample temples and 76 household were selected through adopting multi stage sampling method for investing. Sampling was used for selection of study temples, Hindu belief system and household income pattern, Education, value of temple materials collection and other cprs collection. The findings of the study are presented below. About 20% of the sample (temple) was concluded to be managed by the scheduled caste. And 80% of the samples (temple) were owned and managed by the backward community. The temple taken for the study has a higher land area with a number of trees, due to poor maintenance of temple land, the shrubs and bamboo tree and grow throughout the area. Higher income group people also collecting fuel wood and firewood for their household's purpose. The reason is that the unwillingness to purchase any cooking material sources from outside. Nearly 95% of those who are involved in the collecting cooking material are females. Many products has been collected by the poor people from the temple for various usages like medicine, sales, feeding the cattle act..

CONCLUSION

Most of the temples are managed by the backward community people compared to the scheduled caste managed the temple. Breakdown of the village administrative setup and collapse of local level both formal and informal management system have also been the major cause for the degradation of the commons. This study tries to explain that the degradation of CPRs can be control in certain circumstances where in the proper institutional support from the management and at the same time value system maintained by the people. According to the literature, it is said, that, we can control the resource degradation without the help of institutional management in particular around the temple. People are using the other natural resources viz, leaves, aloevara, neemseed grass from the temple, but no one cut the trees from around the temple land. Because of the Hindu value system protects the temple trees. So, the temple trees are protecting from the nature.

REFERENCES

1. Kannan, Ravichandran, Boopathi (2011) **Environment: Issues in Common Property Resources (cprs) in India**, Abijeet Publication. Delhi.
2. Chandrakanth M.G Gilless J.K, Gowramma V, Nagaraja M.G (1990) '**Temple forests in India's forest development**' Agroforestry system, vol.XI
3. Siva prakasam v. (2003) '**Temple lands in the Agrarian Reforms of Tamilnadu**', land reforms in India,
4. Rajentran T, Palanisamy.K and Jegadeesan M (2008) **Technical Efficiency of temple Owen lands in Tamilnadu, India**, Journal of Agricultural Science and Technology, vol.X
5. T.Eugine, **Environmental Economics**, Vrinda Publications (p) Ltd.
6. Jose Apestequia And Frank .P. Mair-Rigaud(2006), "**The Role Of Rivalry (Public Goods) Versus Common -Pool Resources**". The Journal Of Conflict Resolution, Vol-(L).
7. Bhim Adhikari Et.Al (2004). "**Household Characteristics And Forest Dependency. Evidence From Common Property Forest Management In Nepal.**" Ecological Economics, Vol-XXXVIII.
8. Anil Rupasingha & Fred O. Boadu (1998) "**Evolutionary Theories and Community Management Of Local Commons**". A Survey, Review Of Agricultural Economics, Vo-XX.
9. Arun Agarwal (2001) "**Common Property Institutions And Sustainable Governance Resources**" World Development, Vol-XIII.
10. Catherine M. Hill (2002) "**Primate Conservation and Local Communities - Ethical Issues and Debates**", American Anthropologist, New Series, Vol-(CIV).

**Mrs. P. Kavitha**

Guest Lecturer, Department of Economics, M.V.Muthiah Government Arts College for Women, Dindigul.