

Locked Horns

Conflicts and their Resolution in
Community Based Natural
Resource Management

Edited by
Astad Pastakia



Case 12

Neighbours Who Refused to Be Excluded!

An Inter-village Conflict Arising from Exclusion of
Traditional Users of Forests from JFM in
Udaipur district, Rajasthan

Prakash Kashwan and Pemaram Patel

Introduction

This case documents a conflict between three villages: Kojon Ka Guda, Saharia and Padtal located 48kms from Udaipur city in Rajasthan. While Khojon Ka Guda belonged to Bemla Panchayat, the two other villages belonged to Lalpur Panchayat. After coexisting peacefully for decades, the communities found themselves pitted against each other, when one of the villages started enclosing the forest that was traditionally common to all. The conflict can be attributed to the fact that two of the villages which had been traditional users of the forest were deprived of the opportunity to participate in the Joint Forest Management (JFM) programme because of the legal provisions in the programme. Also highlighted is the fact that the conflicts around natural resources need not always be centred on the resource itself. Underlying issues, at times, might have their origin in the existing socio-economic dynamics.

Seva Mandir, a non-governmental organisation working with tribal communities of Udaipur district, started working with Saharia village in 1979 through its non-formal education programme.² Natural resource based interventions were launched in 1985. The conflict arose when a Forest Protection Committee (FPC), comprising of the people of Kojon Ka Guda, was formed under the JFM programme. The proposal was to enclose a 50ha patch of forestland. Traditionally all three villages were using this patch of forest but the usufruct rights and concessions as per the forest settlement records were with Kojon Ka Guda.

Context

Natural resources

The economy of the villages of Kojon Ka Guda, Padtal and Saharia was dependent on agriculture and livestock. The agricultural landholdings were fragmented and distributed in parcels of half *bigha*³ each. Though the livestock population of the village was high, the productivity of cattle was low due to lack of good quality fodder and inferior cattle breed. The degraded fodder and forest lands were insufficient to sustain the existing livestock. The terrain was hilly with moderate to steep slopes. The degradation of land had led to an acute problem of soil erosion.

The socio-economic context

Most of the people in these villages had common ancestors, and hence within a given village people were related to each other by blood. Historically, they might have come and settled in the area at different points of time but gradually they developed strong social bonds not just because of their proximity to each other but also because of their affiliation to the same caste and sharing of similar social traditions. As a result of social bonds, economic interdependence was also strong.

The people of Kojon Ka Guda were the poorest of the three villages. They frequently worked as labourers in the agricultural fields of the affluent people of Padtal and Saharia. As a result, the latter always treated the former as subjects of mercy. The socio-economic profile of each of the three villages shows:

Padtal: Seven families from this village had permanent jobs in the nearby Jhamarkotra mines. These people earned between Rs5000 to 15000 per month from the mines and also had relatively more productive cattle and agriculture which served as additional sources of income. They were quite powerful and had a strong hold over day-to-day politics in the villages. The remaining population relied on subsistence farming and agricultural labour for survival.

Saharia: In general, the agriculture in this village was better than that of the other villages. For many households the agricultural income was supplemented by family members employed either with the government or other private organisations. Many of the traditional leaders were from this village. However, a section of people in this village were amongst the poorest.

Kojon Ka Guda: In this village the agricultural production was poor and consequently not sufficient to meet the requirements of the community. These people were always on the lookout for some kind of employment nearby. Because of their poor economic status they were too weak to speak up against powerful leaders from the other two villages.

The religious bond

Padtal housed a religious leader called Maharaj who was the caretaker of a *Dhuni* (shrine). Maharaj was a visionary and used his religious status to promote social cohesion amongst these three villages. The villagers in these three villages revered him and frequently took suggestions from him. Thus, Maharaj and the *Dhuni* became a binding force between the three villages.

As Maharaj aged he wanted to appoint his most trusted aid, a young man from Saharia, named Premji, his successor. But he could not do so because his family members and villagers of Padtal vehemently opposed appointing an outsider as caretaker of the *Dhuni*. However, Premji commanded a lot of respect in the area and set up an affiliate *Dhuni* in his own house. As it appears, this did not hurt the relationship between Saharia and Padtal and people from these three villages continued inviting and visiting each other on major social occasions.

Around the same time, Seva Mandir launched its interventions in this area. Premji took the initiative and played a key role in bringing Seva Mandir and the villagers closer. Subsequently, Premji was appointed by Seva Mandir as its para-worker for

these three villages. In the Panchayat elections held in 1994, he was elected the Sarpanch of Lalpura Gram Panchayat, which was a group Panchayat of five villages. The people of all three villages reposed confidence in Premji because of his wisdom and his contact with Seva Mandir. They believed that he would bring the same kind of transparency and justness in the functioning of the Gram Panchayat as he had seen and practised at Seva Mandir.

Development intervention and the role of seva mandir

Since inception Seva Mandir decided to consider the villages of Saharia, Kojon Ka Guda, Devda, Lalpura, Budal and Bhalawaton Ka Guda as a cluster (henceforth referred to as Saharia cluster) because of their vicinity to one another and the social ties between them. People from these five villages would sit together to decide upon the issues of common interest. They were bound together through a traditional institution called *Jati Panchayat*, which governed the social lives of the people within the cluster. Decisions were taken by consensus. This group of villages was lead by a few active people like Premji from Saharia, Khemji from Budal, Bhajjaji and Kaluji from Kojon Ka Guda and Shankar Maharaj from Lalpura.⁴ These leaders, some of whom were also working as para-workers along with the Seva Mandir staff, had developed a comprehensive plan for undertaking the overall development of this region in 1992. The priorities decided in this plan were as follows:

- Development of the agricultural land.
- Development of multiple small lift irrigation schemes.
- Forest regeneration.

Seven wells were selected around the region for installing small lift irrigation schemes. Soil and water conservation works were to be taken up to enhance the water level in all these wells. These developments had the impact of raising community expectations.

In 1991–92 Seva Mandir started taking up soil and water conservation activities in these villages as per this plan. Initially, some structures were constructed on agricultural land. These structures were washed away in the ensuing rains causing damage to the agricultural fields downstream. The cause of the problem was traced to the fact that the upper catchments had not been treated.

Since the upper reaches of land were under the custody of the Forest Department, a Forest Protection Committee (FPC) comprising of the people of Kojon Ka Guda was constituted and registered with the Forest Department in 1992. Although it was well-known that all the three villages were using the forest area in question,

the FPC was constituted only with people from Kojon Ka Guda, as the forest settlement rights to this patch were given only to it. Subsequently, permission was obtained by the FPC to treat the catchment area by constructing loose random rubble check-dams across *nalahs* (streams). For the most part, the soil and water conservation work was completed without any difficulty under the supervision of a monitoring committee comprising of representatives from all three villages.

Pressure builds up

While carrying out this work the issue of encroachment was completely overlooked. A few families from Saharia had encroached upon some patches of forestland which did not exactly fall in the proposed JFM area but were located nearby. The intervention would deny them any opportunity to expand their encroachments into the forest. Besides, the encroached forest areas could also be brought under JFM in future.

While preparations for JFM were on, the people of Saharia and Padtal talked in hushed tones of their exclusion from the FPC and its executive committee. Finally they conveyed their concern to the forestry assistant and the zonal worker of Seva Mandir. Seva Mandir representatives felt that the committee had to be formed only of the people of Kojon Ka Guda in order to meet the official guidelines issued by the Government of Rajasthan. The JFM order clearly stated that FPC could be formed only on the basis of revenue village and be constituted of those people who had been conferred rights in the forest-block Phalet B.⁵ Kojon Ka Guda was a revenue village with Bemla Panchayat and Padtal was a revenue village in Lalpura Panchayat. A joint FPC consisting of members from both the revenue villages was not possible under the existing regulations. There was no question of Saharia being included in the arrangements, as it was a hamlet of Lalpura village at that time. Both Lalpura and Padtal villages had been given user rights in the adjoining forest block, Jhamri B.

The representatives of Seva Mandir suggested to Padtal and Saharia that they could participate in the programme in an informal way and get a share of the benefits, although as per the legal provisions of the programme they would not be on the FPC. They also proposed in the future to constitute FPCs in neighbouring villages to assist in the task of forest protection.

Manifestation of conflict

The FD had granted permission to take up forest development activities in 1994. Work on enclosing 50 ha of forestland under JFM arrangements started in August 1995. It was then that the latent conflict, described above, became manifest. Owing

to the impending threats of violence, the FD intervened and stopped the work on the third day from its commencement. Umpteen numbers of questions were raised by the villagers of Padtal and Saharia who had been left out of the JFM arrangements.

The existing laws of the Department had led to a situation where the people of Kojon Ka Guda, the weakest of the three villages, found themselves confidently facing up to the powerful people from Saharia and Padtal.

A question of identity

The people of Padtal took strong exception to the forest rights being given exclusively to the people of Kojon Ka Guda. They claimed that they belonged to the *Kojya Gotra*, which made them the original inhabitants of Kojon Ka Guda. This was supported by the fact that many of the Padtal farmers owned agricultural land in Kojon Ka Guda.

The FD maintained that the right to the forestland according to its records was with Kojon Ka Guda. It was up to the communities to identify who its real inhabitants were.

This led Padtal to call for a *Jati Panchayat*⁶ to settle the issue. After making the relevant inquiries the *Jati Panchayat* came to the conclusion that the people of Padtal were the original inhabitants of the village now known as Kojon Ka Guda. Only after these people moved further down had the present day inhabitants moved into this area. *Jati Panchayat* also slapped a fine of Rs1200 on the villagers of Kojon Ka Guda. The people of Kojon Ka Guda were not happy with the decision of *Jati Panchayat*. However, they paid the penalties. Having done that, they expressed their unhappiness to the leaders of *Jati Panchayat* and declared that they were snapping ties with all the five villages.

Accentuating factors

A factor that accentuated the conflict was the fact that the Forest Department had taken its stand on the basis of settlement records instead of making a fresh assessment of the ground realities. Under the JFM programme, it is the Department's responsibility to help communities in all kinds of emergency situations. In this case, if the Department had wished, it could have played a very constructive role to resolve the conflict but it remained a passive spectator throughout. Perhaps it did not wish to interfere since Seva Mandir was the implementing agency.

Another factor that could have accentuated the conflict was the appointment of new staff in the area by Seva Mandir. Soon after the overall developmental plan was finalised in 1992, Seva Mandir posted a new block secretary in the area. The new secretary took active initiative in implementing JFM, while the people were

keen on implementing the plan they had conceptualised and developed under the guidance of the previous staff.

During this period, Premji held the twin responsibilities of a health worker as well as that of part-time community worker. He was asked to relinquish one of the two posts in keeping with the norm of one-man-one-post. Premji took it as a machination on the part of the secretary. Subsequently, when Premji was elected Sarpanch of the Lalpura Gram Panchayat in 1994, he was again asked to quit the health worker's job. This was in spite of the fact that, in other areas, para-workers were allowed to retain their positions with Seva Mandir even after being elected to local bodies. Rigidity in following the rules in this case could have affected the relationship with an important local leader and influenced the future course of the conflict.

Conflict resolution initiatives

Initially Seva Mandir maintained its stand that only the people of Kojon Ka Guda had the rights to the forest area where JFM was to be taken up. However, being equally concerned about the welfare of the other two villages, it convened several meetings to bring them together on a common platform. It was during these meetings that it came to know that the people of Padtal and Saharia had agricultural lands within the revenue boundaries of Kojon Ka Guda. This prompted Seva Mandir to conduct extensive surveys to come out with a list of all such families from Saharia and Padtal. It proposed to the villagers that they approach the Forest Department with this list as the basis for constituting a revised forest protection committee. However, the people did not accept this proposal.

Since the conflict originated in the social arena, all political influences were of little consequence in solving the conflict. Efforts made by some political leaders proved futile as the villagers were unwilling to change their positions.

From August 1995 to the present day, field workers of Seva Mandir have continued their visits to these villages. Their sole aim was to bridge the gap created by JFM. They adopted this strategy in spite of obvious pressures to show results in terms of activities and targets. Once the meeting was conducted on a 'Tripata' (the spot where the roads to three villages meet) so that people had a neutral setting to air their views freely. At times the field workers were threatened with dire consequences. Instead of being intimidated or losing heart they would meet the people issuing the threats.

Seva Mandir sought the help of the Forest Department to resolve the conflict but such help was not forthcoming. On several occasions, the Department officials were invited to the meetings held in these villages but they did not show up.

Finally Seva Mandir decided to use a bit of coercion to bring the parties to the negotiating table. It suspended all developmental activities in the three villages and made it clear that work could only be resumed if they decided to bury their differences. This decision helped to bring the three villages together, moreso because they had been undergoing the hardships of three years of recurrent drought.

Getting reorganised

After a consensus was reached between the three villages, a revised FPC was constituted comprising of 120 members from all three villages. Election to the executive committee of the FPC was held in June 2000. The President of the new committee was a consensus candidate from Padtal. He was the son of the legendary Maharaj of the Padtal *Dhuni*. The Vice President of the committee was from Kojon Ka Guda.

A family from Kojon Ka Guda and three families from Padtal continued to oppose the commencement of JFM activities on the same issue of identity. However, the rest of the community (all three villages) decided to proceed with JFM activities. The people were confident of keeping the dissidents isolated. Seva Mandir decided to re-launch various interventions in these villages.

The positive attitude of the people of Kojon Ka Guda helped a lot in bringing about this solution. At one point they were even prepared to give up their claims to the membership of FPC, if only this would help to bring about a peaceful settlement and get the JFM project started.

A revised micro-plan was submitted to the Forest Department. Both the villagers and Seva Mandir were keenly looking forward to getting a go ahead from the Forest Department to undertake forestry development work in the proposed JFM site. The process of reviving the JFM was however affected by bureaucratic delays.

After about six months the DFO visited the villages to attend the meeting. She took a lot of interest in finding out the real problem. As she probed deeper, villagers came out with a five-year-old muster-roll which had on record the name of labours who worked on the site in August 1995. A few people from Kojon Ka Guda demanded that same quantity of work be done by the people of Saharia and Padtal in the form of *Shramdaan* (voluntary labour contribution), as they were to be blamed for blocking the progress of work on the site. The people of Saharia and Padtal agreed to this. After this all the three villages agreed to work together.

Costs of the conflict

For Seva Mandir the conflict represented a major setback to its developmental intervention. In this case Seva Mandir had failed in its objective of strengthening

social harmony between communities. This had an adverse impact on its image of an NGO that could work in close partnership with village committees.

For the village communities the cost was even greater. Before the conflict, Saharia cluster was deemed as one of the best village groups in the entire working area of Seva Mandir. Leaders from this cluster were taken to other villages to orient new village groups to the philosophy and objectives of interventions taken up by Seva Mandir. In the 1994 Panchayat election the three villages stood united and got their man, Premji Maharaj, elected as Sarpanch. Overall, the cluster was progressing at a laudable pace to achieve the larger goals of development. The conflict over the issue of JFM levelled everything off. Since the fateful day in August 1995, when the work on the JFM site had to be stopped, everything came to a sudden and unfortunate halt. People from these three villages stopped speaking to each other and no interactions took place on any of the social ceremonies and occasions like marriages, deaths, etc. There could be no better indicator of the extent to which the JFM conflict had created a wedge in the community.

Policy advocacy

Seva Mandir and other NGOs of Rajasthan engaged into a policy dialogue with the Department of Forests at the highest level. This policy advocacy made it possible to set up FPCs on the basis of a group of hamlets or villages. The guidelines for setting up FPCs were suitably modified.

Analysis and reflections

A stakeholder analysis was carried out in order to understand the dynamics of the conflict and to identify the strategies used by different stakeholder groups in furthering their interests. An assessment was also made of the outcomes (see Annex 2). Six stakeholder groups were identified:

- The people of Kojon Ka Guda village.
- The people of Saharia village.
- The economically prosperous families of Padtal.
- The economically poor families of Padtal.
- The Forest Department.
- Seva Mandir.

The people of Kojon Ka Guda were initially ready to accommodate the people of the other two villages. Among all three villages they were the most in need of potential

employment. Hence, other benefits expected from the forest protection work must have also worked in favour of this stand. However, when they found the responses of other two villages counter productive, they took advantage of the fact that the law was on their side to stake their claim on the JFM project. The people of this village also saw this as an opportunity to improve their social status. Kojon Ka Guda could have found potential allies in the poor families of Padtal. However, they probably felt secure in the fact that they had such strong allies in Seva Mandir and the State Forest Department. Under the circumstances there was no need to share the benefits with others.

Since FD and Seva Mandir were aligned with Kojon Ka Guda on this issue, the leaders of Padtal and Saharia felt that they would need to join forces in order to avert the JFM from going into the hands of Kojon Ka Guda. At stake were not just the benefits from 50 acres of forest development but much more. This would set a precedence, opening the way for their exclusion from other patches of forestland as well. Leaders from Kojon Ka Guda would also gain prominence in spite of their weak economic status. The poor families of Padtal had no say in the matter. They too were in need of employment and other benefits but were not in a position to voice their concerns and interests separately; their fate depended on the decision taken by the leaders who may have convinced them that they could access the forests only if Padtal was also allowed to be part of the FPC.

The leaders of Padtal took the battle into a different arena by invoking the *Jati Panchayat*, where they were confident of victory. Although the *Jati Panchayat* ruled in their favour, this did not change things for them. Hence, Padtal failed to capitalise on this victory and had to continue opposing their exclusion from the FPC.

On its part Seva Mandir found itself in a bind. While it was interested in favouring the weaker sections of the community, most of whom, resided in Kojon Ka Guda, the fact was that establishing an FPC exclusively for this village would break the harmony in the cluster and alienate it from the other two villages. It took the position of backing a Kojon Ka Guda FPC based on existing rules. Hence all its efforts to bring the three villages to negotiate proved futile since the other two villages were not willing to give up their traditional rights nor were they willing to allow the social leadership to tilt in favour of the poor. Subsequently Seva Mandir found itself revising its stand on the single hamlet FPC, which was socially not acceptable by the people of the cluster.

While its strategy at the village level failed to evoke a suitable response from the two villages that were being excluded, Seva Mandir was partially successful in lobbying at the policy level to get the Forest Department to take a more flexible stand with regard to FPC membership. Indeed had the policy advocacy failed for some reason, Seva Mandir would have found it very difficult to work with the entire Saharia cluster.

The Forest Department remained a passive stakeholder for most of the time in the conflict. However, it intervened only to stop the work when it felt that the intervention could lead to violence. Local forest officers did not seem too happy to hand over the forests to the people and seemed less than willing to offer assistance. However, Seva Mandir found the higher levels more receptive and succeeded in getting the rules modified in order to bring an end to the impasse at the village level. The amendments in the rules would pre-empt potential conflicts in several such villages where traditional users of forests would not be willing to give up their access to forests.

Conclusion

This case proved to be a rich learning experience for Seva Mandir. Its staff probably underestimated the serious implications of excluding the other two villages from the FPC. Perhaps the biggest lesson was not to take as sacrosanct any laws and rules made by the government. If the existing laws were against the interests of the local communities it is these that should then be changed first. Without doing so the implementation of the programme could lead to unnecessary discord and loss of goodwill not only between the local communities but also between external agencies and local communities. Post conflict analysis of the impact on various stakeholders is also very important for further monitoring of the situation.

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge the inputs provided by Ms Neelima Khetan and Mr S N Bhishe, CEO and Head, Natural Resources Division at Seva Mandir respectively. We would also like to thank Mr Viren Lobo and Rajiv Kumar of SPWD, Udaipur and Mr Manohar Singh Rathore, Mr Hiralal Patel, Ms Mamta Vardhan, Mr Jawan Singh, Mr Himmat Srimali, all colleagues at Seva Mandir for their help at various stages of the case writing process. Last, but not the least, we thank the people of Kojon Ka Guda, Saharia, Padtal and Lalpura for having shown tremendous tolerance in responding to our never-ending questions.

Postscript

The solution of bringing the three villages together by constituting a common FPC including all adult members of the three villages seems to have worked well. There has been no untoward incident after the conflict was resolved five years ago. The discontentment that arose due to the formation of FPC with members drawn only from one village has been overcome. Presently, the villagers of the three villages sit together and take collective decisions regarding JFM and other activities. Moreover, grass production from the area is shared by them equally. This change has occurred mainly due to the fact that both Seva Mandir, and the Forest Department recognised the traditional rights of the villagers and gave due importance to this aspect while reconstituting the FPC.

Since the resolution of the conflict the FPC has been working quite well. Currently, the forest is in good condition on account of the protection accorded to the area under JFM and as such the future of the FPC seems secure. It has till now developed two patches of forestland under the JFM programme, covering an area of 107 hectares. Fresh saplings of trees have been planted in 57 hectares. The remaining land will also be covered during the current year (2006).

Endnotes

- 1 Development Professional and Block Coordinator at Seva Mandir, Udaipur, respectively.
- 2 Seva Mandir was founded in 1969 by late Dr Mohan Singh Mehta, with the twin objectives of strengthening village institutions and broadening the livelihood base of the tribal communities. Apart from Udaipur district it also works in Rajsamand district. It follows an integrated strategy for rural development covering various aspects of rural life such as natural resource management, women in development, education, health, etc. Seva Mandir has been one of the first to initiate JFM activities in Rajasthan and has contributed significantly to its evolution in the state.
- 3 The size of a Bigha varies from region to region. In Southern Rajasthan, 4.68 Bighas equal 1 ha.
- 4 Padtal was not an active village group then. Since a few families from this village had jobs at mines they were not interested in developmental interventions.
- 5 Forest block is the unit of forest land identified in the working plan for the purpose of planning of silviculture operations like thinning, felling etc.
- 6 Refers to the council of leaders responsible for all social decisions of a particular community in a given geographical area. In this case the Jati Panchayat consisted of elders from five villages. They were given the powers to ascertain the facts and give their judgment on the question of village identity.

Annexure 1
Chronology of events

Year	Event
1970	Seva Mandir started its Education programme in Saharia cluster of villages.
1991	Watershed development work initiated (a committee comprising of representatives from all three villages constituted for monitoring the work).
1992	Forest Protection Committee, Kojon Ka Guda registered with Forest Department.
1993	Resource management plan developed with the people of five villages in a participatory way.
1994	Block staff of Seva Mandir changed because of the routine transfers.
August 1995	Work on enclosing the JFM site initiated but halted after two days.
1996	<i>Jati Panchayat</i> called by Padtal, which ruled in its favour.
1996-1999	Seva Mandir organised meetings to bring all three villages on a common platform; took up policy advocacy at a higher level.
2000	Policy advocacy produced desired effect. Guidelines for FPC suitably modified.
June 2000	FPC reconstituted, including all three villages. Election to the executive committee held.
November 2000	FPC submitted revised micro-plan to the Forest Department.
December 2000	DFO visited the site; approval to restart the work awaited.

Annexure 2
Stakeholder analysis

Criteria	Saharia	Kojon Ka Guda	Padtal (well-to-do people)	Poor families of Padtal	Forest department	Seva Mandir
Resource dependency	Moderate, have other forest areas near their settlement but need to take their cattle to this part of the forest during monsoons when they stay in their fields.	Very high; this is the only forest area near their settlement. Would be benefited most from the restoration of the resource and the increased productivity.	Low; have other forest areas near their settlement. Occasionally collect small timber from this forest, as the vigil of the forest guard is strict in their forest area.	Moderate; collect fuel wood and small timber from this forest occasionally.	Nil- secondary stakeholder	Secondary stakeholder
Economic stakes	Might have had plans to expand their encroachments into the forest area. This would have been made impossible by enclosing the forest area under JFM.	Very high. Forests regeneration would benefit them in terms of better fodder productivity. Work on JFM would bring wages right next to their doorstep, which they desperately needed.	Low; Their jobs at mines paid them well enough.	They would highly appreciate any opportunity to get wages near their village. Were in desperate need of cash for survival.	Lower level officials indulging in rent seeking behaviour may be adversely affected.	Nil
Social stakes	Very high; wanted to retain the leadership as they had initiated the development intervention in this area.	Very high. This could have been a golden opportunity for these people to come up the social ladder.	High; Would never like the people of Kojon Ka Guda to become powerful as Padtal saw them as sort of	These people were in a social dilemma. Because of the stance taken by their leaders they could never come	No social stakes.	For Seva Mandir, success of JFM would have brought success to their efforts of facilitating the access of natural

contd...

			invaders who were getting more and more threatening.	out openly in favour of initiating work on joint forest management.		resources to the communities, which are dependent on it.
Power and influence	Highly powerful. Had traditional as well as emerging leaders among themselves. Very apt at playing politics.	Were not politically aware. The new block secretary lent them the support to stand up against the powerful Saharia leaders.	Very rich. They could have thrown money to bribe FD officials. They were looking forward to settling old scores with the people of KKG.	Least powerful. Nobody approached them at any point of time in the run of events. Neither were they capable of standing up for their interests.	Very powerful as it was the ultimate authority. Lower level officials capable of creating problems so as to retain control over the resource.	Block officials of SM could have played a crucial role in shaping ideas and stances of different parties in the conflict.
Inter-relationships and alliances.	Came closer to Padtal because of their similar stand on this issue. They were also close to some of the SM functionaries but not with the new block staff who were the decision-makers.	Were very close to the new block secretary. He is said to have played a crucial role in motivating KKG people who found themselves standing-up against Saharia and Padtal.	Were close to the people in Saharia. Moreso after this issue came up.	They were the weakest of all the stakeholders. That is why they could not sway away from the stand their village leaders had taken. Otherwise had much in common with the poor of Kojon Ka Guda.	Were almost detached from all other stakeholders. Had formal relationship with Seva Mandir.	As such SM was close to both Saharia and KKG because of their previous engagement in the development interventions. Now, took side of KKG because of legal validity of their claim on the forest area concerned.
Likely impact of JFM	Would be put out of the scene from this big project. Might also lose their leadership. Might also lose their share of fodder and other	Would benefit largely because of the wage income as well as regeneration of forests.	Would lose access to this part of forests. Their social status could be threatened if KKG people were empowered. They	Would be able to avoid migration to nearby towns/cities. Would get wages, which was their immediate need.	Success of JFM would lead to protection of forests. Lower level officials would perceive loss of control over the forests.	Would succeed in its objective of community empowerment. Also the JFM programme would get a boost.

Criteria	Saharia	Kojon Ka Guda	Padtal (well-to-do people)	Poor families of Padtal	Forest department	Seva Mandir
	benefits from this site if they were excluded from the FPC. Those who had encroachments near the proposed JFM site would lose any opportunity to expand it.		had already faced some problems because of KKG people proactively taking-up some property issues.			
Positions taken	Traditionally they had been accessing this forest So they expected to be included in the FPC under JFM.	Initially they were ready to take the other two villages with them. Later changed their stance to put their exclusive claim on the forest.	They claimed to be the original inhabitants of KKG. Hence they claimed a right to access the forests under JFM.	Didn't take any clear stand. Acted according to their village identity.	Took a legal stand: the rights and concessions could only be given to the inhabitants of KKG as per law.	Initial position: Since KKG has got rights and concessions in this forest, they should form the committee. This position changed later when SM realised the legitimate demands of the other two villages.
Interests and expectations	Their interest was to retain access and claim to the forest. Premji, from Saharia wanted to prove that he was indispensable.	Their primary interest was to stand up on their own. Regenerating the forests could have taken them further in that direction.	They wanted to suppress the people of KKG so that they could retain their control over the economic and political domains.	Availability of wages was the prime interest of this group.	Their interest should have been the success of JFM. However, FD officials at lower level took an indifferent stand since Seva Mandir was the implementing agency.	Seva Mandir aimed at empowering the socially backward people of Kojon Ka Guda. The new secretary was eager to bring them up and give leadership roles to Kojon Ka Guda.

contd...

Potential for contributing towards resolution	High; traditionally leadership was in their hands.	They could if they softened their stance.	Low; they only acted as spoilsports. However, the name of <i>Dhuni</i> could have been used to bring all the groups together.	Nil - they were in no position to influence anything.	Very high. They could have taken the matter with higher authorities or found a suitable loophole to include other stakeholders in the FPC.	Moderate; in spite of good rapport with people, felt handicapped because of the JFM policy.
Strategies adopted	Remained adamant on exercising their traditional rights. Also garnered support from the powerful elite of Padtal, so that their claim became difficult to ignore.	With the legal support from the department they stood firm. The main objective was to assert their rights emphatically and show the other two villages that they had the confidence to go alone into JFM.	Remained firmly rooted to their stand. Took the matter to the social arena (<i>Jati Panchayat</i>) to get their claim validated.	They felt powerless, so had no strategy of their own.	Remained a passive spectator; only used its authority in ordering Seva Mandir to halt the work on the site. At the higher level, took the case as an opportunity for refining the policy and making mid-course correction.	Did not force any solution on any of the parties. Made their position known but at the same time adopted the strategy of 'let them decide; we will act only as facilitator'. Withdrew all interventions to make the villages come together. Took up policy advocacy with FD at highest level.
Outcomes	They were successful in getting their share in the management although it is difficult to say whether this could have been possible without the changes that took place at the policy level.	Although lost the position of President to Padtal got a major role in the whole programme. They assumed leadership roles in the post conflict scenario.	Decision of <i>Jati Panchayat</i> came as a big success for them but this did not resolve the conflict. Ultimately their persistent stand to be included compelled SM to reconsider the options and lobby with FD. At the highest level.	Would benefit from the project because of employment generation and access to the forest.	Favourable - since the stalemate had been broken and the policy had been amended.	The solution arrived at is expected to be durable as the interests of all stakeholders has been taken into account.