

# **TRIBAL STUDIES IN INDIA: INTERDISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVES AND APPROACHES**

## **Lecture26**

### **Lecture 26: Resource Rights: Forests**

**Dr. Roluahpuia**

**Associate Professor**

**Department of Humanities and Social Sciences,  
Indian Institute of Technology Roorkee, Uttarakhand**

Good evening, everyone. Welcome back to the NPTEL online course, Tribal Studies in India: Interdisciplinary Perspectives and Approaches. We have already completed quite a lot of lectures for this course, and by now, I hope that all of you have a very good understanding of tribal communities and are also learning a lot of new things about the communities and the complexities and intricacies of studying a community. Now, in the last class, we began with a new field or a new theme, which is the use of resources, and we specifically looked at the question of land.

Today, we will continue with resource rights or resources, and we will focus on forests. Now, many times, since we are talking within the broad theme of resources, you will see that there is a lot of overlapping—land, forest, or, in the next lecture, we will be talking about water. So, in the context of land, we have specifically focused on the nature of land ownership in tribal society, which we have said is predominantly defined by a communal system of ownership. This began to gradually change with the coming of the British, particularly because the colonial state only recognized one form of property ownership: private property. The introduction of new laws and regulations during the colonial rule had a significant impact and consequences on tribal communities.

One of the serious consequences was in terms of dispossession, or sometimes we call it land alienation. Now, for a community entirely dependent on land for livelihood, or for a community whose socio-cultural life is intricately connected to land, it creates a lot of disruption—not only economically but also socially and

culturally. So, when it comes to forests as well, the issue is quite the same in the sense that tribal communities' understanding of the forest is very different, sometimes very distinct. So in Jharkhand, for example, people have a very close relationship with forests. Forests are not only providers in economic terms.

Forests are also a source of beliefs. The socio-cultural beliefs are deeply rooted in the surroundings. Now, in the context of tribal communities like the Khasis in Meghalaya, you will also see that there are certain forests which are treated as sacred. You are not allowed to take anything out of the forest because that is not allowed. Now, across tribal communities in India, you will see that there are variations in terms of the beliefs associated with forests, what forests mean to the communities, but then you will see that the communities do not only look at forests from an economic point of view, which is essentially to extract resources such as...

timber, you know, such as different kinds of fruits, you know, or different kinds of sustainable products, natural products, you know, from forests. The community views forests, you know, as a provider whose socio-cultural beliefs are also deeply rooted or revolve around forests themselves. So today, like land, we will try to look at the kind of legislation, the kind of changes that have happened in the last 100 years or more, and particularly in relation to forests, and how this has altered, affected, or impacted tribal communities. Now, in India today, if you look at tribal communities, it is not that only tribal communities are the ones who are dependent on forests. there are many communities that are dependent on forests.

But then, when it comes to tribal communities, the issue is quite significant because at least 75 percent of the total, you know, tribal population in India is directly or indirectly dependent on forests. They are dependent on forests for fruits, flowers, shelter, medicinal purposes, and monetary income such as firewood and non-timber products. So, when it comes to the ecological history of India, particularly in the context of tribes, Their sustenance, you know, is primarily forest-dependent. Now, for a community like 75 percent of the entire tribal population being forest-dependent, you can see that they are heavily reliant on forest resources for their livelihood and everyday survival.

Now, it is often argued that they have largely been unregulated in exercising relative autonomy over forest products. So, before at least the coming of colonial rule, the tribal communities had a strong relationship with forests and unrestricted access to them. So, in terms of governing the forests, they had relative autonomy. They had relative autonomy when it came to accessing the forests or utilizing forest resources. Ecological and social changes are interdependent, and as such, any ecological change would affect the socio-cultural and economic aspects of tribal communities.

Now, for any tribal community, there is a strong symbiotic relationship between nature and their culture, for instance. I am not saying that there is a harmonious relationship between the community and culture. So, I have said this in my previous lectures as well. But the point is, as I said, taking the examples of tribal communities in, say, Jharkhand or even Meghalaya. Now, any kind of change that happens in the forest particularly has adverse consequences, not only for the economic well-being of the community but also for their socio-economic well-being.

As well as the belief systems. So, forests were often reserved and regulated during different regimes, such as reserved elephant forests during the Mauryan Empire or monopoly over commercial forest produce. Overall, state control over forests was limited and largely restricted. Now, in the pre-colonial period, different empires and kingdoms had their own set of rules and regulations when it came to governing the forests. But then, the manner was not such that they were trying to exert full authority or full sovereignty over control of the forests.

So, there was some semblance of autonomy that communities had and enjoyed when it came to accessing forest resources. There was a notable or radical shift in the interdependence of forests and communities, particularly with the coming of colonial rule. The political dominance and use of technological innovation for extracting resources facilitated the utilization of forest resources and the subsequent loss of rights of forest-dependent communities. Now, by virtue of being in power and politically dominant, the British began to gradually transform forests into state resources and viewed them as a means to extract profit or resources, which in turn facilitated a change in how forest resources were being used. And what it meant for local communities, such as tribal communities, was

that it resulted in the gradual loss of their rights in terms of accessing forest resources.

Now, let us look at the colonial rule. Some of the colonial legislations introduced by the colonial state continue to be enforced even today. And therefore, it is very important to historicize this problem. Now, even in India, if you are interested in understanding the environmental history of India, you cannot but look at how the colonial state tried to regulate and govern forests. Because India had a vast amount of forest resources.

And for the colonial state, you know, it was very important, you know, to tap into and make the most use of it when it comes to forests in India. So the monopoly over large tracts of forests throughout the subcontinent is what created this juncture between the past and colonial history. For instance, around 20% of the land area of India was under the forest department during the colonial period. Now the colonial state began to introduce new laws and regulations, new institutions, and one of them was the forest department. And now in a short span of time at least 20% of the forest land was brought under the forest department.

Now, it essentially means that when these forest lands were brought under the forest department, communities no longer had the right to access these forests, and they belonged to the colonial state. The focus of colonial intervention in the ecological history of India was primarily on resource exploitation or commercialization rather than environmental protection. Now, it is common knowledge that the British primarily came to India to economically exploit the country. So, therefore, it is not surprising that they had no interest in environmental protection when it came to resources like forests. Now, therefore, the primary intention of the colonial state in terms of its actions in relation to forests was basically exploitation and commercialization.

For instance, in the northern part of India, in the Himalayan region, the Himalayan mixed coniferous forests were transformed into coniferous, while the Western Ghats were transformed into thick forests. Now, forests in India were very mixed in terms of the kinds of trees that were grown and the kinds of resources that one could expect. But different kinds of particular trees were being promoted. Such as, you know, in the Western Ghats, the entire forest was gradually being transformed into teak, essentially because there was this

commercialization of forest lands, commercialization of forest resources. Now, from viewing forests, you know, as natural resources.

The transformation that we see during the colonial period was the commercialization of forest resources. The political dominance over the subcontinent allowed the British to introduce different laws and regulations and also have control over large tracts of forest. The forest laws and regulations, one of the important regulations that was introduced was the Indian Forest Act of 1865, which specifically brought forests under state authority and empowered the state to declare any land with trees or bushes as forest. And in 1878, the Indian Forest Act, which was introduced by the colonial state, divided forests into reserve, protected, and village forests; these promulgations during colonial rule were mainly to ensure consistent and rationalized production of teak and timber. Now teak and timbers were essential because during the high period of colonialism, we know that the colonial state was creating a lot of infrastructure that would enable and enhance the accumulation, right.

Now, for example, in India, the construction of railways requires train sleepers. Therefore, to enable that, they have to do something. And that was, you know, indirectly linked to the transformation of forests that we see with the introduction of teak and timbers during the colonial rule. Now, what do these laws and legislations do? These laws and legislations actually snatch away the rights of people over access to forest.

At the same time, what it does is also declare that the colonial state is declaring itself as the sole authority of forest resources in India. This rationalized timber production could only be ensured through the strict regulation of traditionally exercised rights. In the Indian Forest Act of 1878, its family of right holders was allotted a specific quantum of timber and fuel, while the sharing or bartering of forest produce was strictly prohibited. This exclusion from forest management was therefore both physical—denying or restricting access to forests and pastures—and social, allowing right holders only a marginal and inflexible claim on the produce of the forest. So the regulation of forests, which was introduced through these different kinds of laws, particularly the Indian Forest Act was to monitor or even decide how much a family of people who were forest-dependent should be allowed to access and utilize forest resources.

Now, the message essentially was that forests could no longer be accessed openly and easily without the knowledge of the colonial state. And even for people—individuals, families, communities—who were entirely dependent on forests, their access to forest resources was being monitored and regulated. The Indian Forest Act of 1878 created a distinction between agriculture and forests, excluding the agricultural population from forest management. So, therefore, there was this systemic exclusion of people from forest management. So, over a period of time, what we saw was that community claims and rights over forest resources were gradually being denied.

So, therefore, people were no longer allowed to have access to forests. People were no longer made part of any kind of forest management. So, communities relying on the collection of fruits and hunting, particularly in tropical regions, were the ones who faced the direct brunt of colonial forest regulations. Hunting and gathering were declared illegal, and the communities practicing them were denied any kind of monopoly over forest produce. Now, why is this issue of collecting fruits and hunting relevant in the context of tribal society?

Now, you know that many tribal communities are forest dependent. Now, hunting, for instance, is something that is very, very common. It was practiced much before the coming of the British. Now, for many tribal communities, hunting is something which is quite intrinsic to the socio-cultural life of all of the people. Now, with the coming of the British, people were no longer allowed to hunt freely in the forest, and tribal communities were no longer allowed to hunt freely in the forest.

So, therefore, gradually, the people who have actually close relationships with forests, people who have been utilizing forest resources, People who went hunting in the forest are being gradually turned into encroachers when it comes to forest resources. So, this is one of the severe implications that decolonial state and regulations have done when it comes to forest resources in the context of tribal communities. So, to cite an example, the Chenchus, who were hunters and gatherers, lost their rights, and in some places they were placed in large settlements as mobile communities were often seen as a threat to the colonial government. Now, you know that tribal communities are very, very diverse.

Many, many communities have practiced settled cultivation. Many are practicing jhum cultivation, or shifting cultivation. At the same time, many tribal communities are also pastoral communities. Many tribal communities are also nomadic communities in a sense that they continually migrate from one place to another. Now, this form of continual periodic migration, which was being practiced by many tribal communities, was viewed as a threat by the colonial state.

Likewise, in regions where the practice of jhum cultivation was the predominant mode of agriculture owing to the hilly terrains, this practice of jhum cultivation also began to be severely impacted by the colonial forest laws. Now, jhum cultivation for a colonial state, the Britishers began to see this practice of jhum cultivation as destructive to the environment. What tribals are doing is that they are burning down forests and then cultivating the land for four or five years. And then after that, you know, they will move to some other place. So, that is why it is known as shifting cultivation.

Now, these forest laws actually began to curtail, you know, the practice of jhum cultivation by tribal societies. And this curtailment came along with the representation or manufacturing of jhum cultivation as something that is ecologically destructive, economically unviable, and economically unproductive. However, for the tribal communities, jhum cultivation was not only a mode of production, it was also guided by values such as communal labor and adherence to the allotted land as a respect to the tradition. Now, every family, the community will come together. And it was not that people who are more powerful, people who are more influential will get, you know, a vast amount of land.

Sometimes, you know, every community has its own ways of distributing land. Sometimes they will do lotteries. Sometimes they will look at the number of families, the number of members within the family, and then they will take decisions on the basis of that, you know, okay, this family will take this patch of land, this family will take that patch of land. In terms of the distance, they used to decide, you know, collectively. Now, this is a system that is widely practiced.

So, therefore, you know, many times, it is not that every individual or every family is only engaged in cultivation on their own lands. There is something known as communal labor, where there is a lot of interaction happening across families, clans, and kin, you know, to help each other out in terms of weeding, plowing,

and even burning down forests to start the process of cultivation. However, there was this incessant portrayal of jhum cultivation as destructive, and it was discouraged by the colonial state for multiple reasons. One was that the British drew a sharp contrast between plough cultivation and jhum cultivation, where jhum cultivation was discouraged as it was seen as a primitive and unremunerative form of agriculture. Now, as I said, the British began to make these two distinctions between people who practiced settled cultivation.

Settled cultivation, for them, was something more modern and more productive. But jhum cultivation was relegated as primitive, economically unviable, and destructive to the environment because it involved burning down forests, and after a period of time, the communities had to move to a new patch of land. Therefore, the colonial state began to portray the practice of jhum cultivation as something very negative. Areas cultivated under jhum cultivation often were the reserves of the most valued quality of timber species, creating a conflict of interest between the commercial interests of the British in forests and jhum cultivation. But unfortunately, as I said, tribal communities inhabit some of the most resource-rich regions in India, including forests.

Now, these areas where jhum cultivation is practiced by the communities also happen to be areas that have some of the highest-value timber species. For the colonial state, they needed to find a reason why these communities should be prevented from continuing the practice of jhum cultivation because they saw that it was hurting their commercial interests. So, they began to portray the practice of jhum cultivation in an evil manner. They continue to project it as something that is negative, that is environmentally destructive. So, there is this intentional creation or manufacturing of jhum cultivation as ecologically destructive, economically unremunerative.

So, the burning of forest patches was against the commercial interests of the British, and consequently, jhum was held to be the most destructive of all practices for the forest. Now, the colonial state, you know, created this image very intentionally to serve only their commercial interests. Now, even in post-colonial India, many people still debate this issue. And it is not that jhum cultivation is only practiced in India. Many indigenous communities in India continue to practice jhum cultivation.

If you go to Southeast Asia, you will see that jhum cultivation is widely practiced by indigenous communities. Now, everywhere in the world, jhum cultivation is viewed as environmentally destructive. But then, in the context of India, you will see that one can historicize where these ideas emanate, where these ideas began to emerge. It was essentially from the colonial period when the British, due to their economic interests, began to project jhum cultivation as something ecologically destructive. In their attempt to contain the practice of jhum cultivation while keeping in mind their commercial interests, a reserve was established for tribal communities like the Baigas.

The impact of territorial restriction and overall discouragement of jhum was immediately seen in the cultural loss among the Baigas, who in a petition to the British government said, Now, the Baigas, you know, are very important because it was the Baigas—it was Verrier Elwin, actually, who wrote about the Baigas. And the Baigas, actually, were a reflection of Verrier Elwin's love for tribal communities in India. And it is a very fascinating, you know, monograph that Elwin has written on the Baigas. Now, coming back to the shifting cultivation.

The practice of jhum cultivation was still being curtailed. The colonial state was trying to curtail it, and for which they tried; they began to demarcate a specific region or territory as reserved so that communities like the Baigas could continue to practice jhum cultivation. But then, this had very, very severe consequences for the tribal communities. Now, in a letter or a petition that was given to the British government, the Baigas have written that we daily starve, having had no food grain in our possession. The only wealth we possess is our axe.

We have no clothes to cover our bodies with, but we pass cold nights by the fireside. We are now dying for want of food. We cannot go elsewhere as the British government is everywhere. What fault have we done that the government does not take care of us? Prisoners are supplied with ample food in jail; a cultivator of the grass is not deprived of his holding, but the government does not give us our right who have lived here for generations past. So, it is a clear depiction that this deprivation in terms of accessing forests and this curtailment in terms of practicing jhum cultivation have had adverse economic impacts on the lives of the Baigas, who actually were close to starvation.

Now, a community which had produced enough for themselves till the coming of British rule began to witness a severe decline, a deterioration, you know, in their economic life. So, therefore, they are saying that we are starving daily, having no food grain in our possession. So, tribal communities, despite the fact that jhum cultivation may not have resulted in or created a lot of produce at the end of the year, produced enough at least for their own consumption. So, what we see is that these policy changes in terms of access to forests resulted in a severe economic crisis within tribal society. As a result of the loss of cultural and traditional rights over the forest, several tribal groups such as the Saoras of Gangam, Koya and Konda Dora tribes of Andhra Pradesh, and the Gonds and Kolams of Hyderabad rose in resistance.

Now, many tribal communities began to be very unhappy and dissatisfied with the way in which The colonial state was imposing new rules and regulations pertaining to forests. So, therefore, we begin to see a lot of resistance, a lot of struggles during the colonial period where tribal communities actually rose in protest against the new laws and regulations. The repeated protests and resistance by different tribal groups forced the colonial government in several provinces to adopt strategies to control the uprisings. For instance, in the Madras Presidency, forest patches were set aside for tribes to practice jhum cultivation.

So, the economic deprivation resulted in a severe crisis, and it extended to a political crisis as well. so, therefore, the colonial state was forced to rethink its policies in relation to forests, particularly when it came to dealing with tribal communities in many parts of India, such as such as in the Madras Presidency. What we see is that forest patches, some parts of forest areas, were set aside for the community to practice jhum cultivation. Also, to continue pursuing commercial interests, the Taungya method of agri-silviculture was adopted, where jhum cultivation was allowed on the condition of growing timber alongside. However, over time, jhum cultivation largely died down and became unsustainable due to external forces.

So, what we are seeing is that there was this effort to minimize harm, to minimize the impact. But then it was not enough, probably because the impact and consequences, you know, were already too difficult to reverse. So, therefore, what we see is that despite the fact that the colonial state was trying to push a new kind of policy changes following the resistance. But then the fact that jhum

cultivation, the practice of jhum cultivation, has also gradually died down, essentially because lands were no longer available, as these lands were being usurped by the colonial state in the name of protecting forests. Now, what happened in the post-colonial period?

Did the situation change for the better for tribal communities, particularly in relation to forest rights, particularly in terms of their access to forest resources? Or is it that, you know, there is a lot of continuity in terms of the stories when it comes to forest rights? A very important act... One cannot miss when talking about forest rights in the post-colonial period the Scheduled Tribes and Other Traditional Forest Dwellers Act. That is also known as the Recognition of Forest Rights Act, 2006.

So, this act was particularly important, and it received a lot of enthusiasm among tribal communities, as it finally signaled that the government had decided to recognize the rights of tribal communities over forests. Now, the Act actually recognizes the rights of the forest dwellers, such as self-cultivation and habitation, that are recognized and provide ownership and land use rights. So, for the first time, the Forest Rights Act of 2006 actually recognized forest dwellers, such as those practicing self-cultivation and habitation, acknowledging that people are actually living in the forest. People actually rely on forest resources. So, there is this recognition of the rights of people.

It also recognizes community rights, such as grazing, fishing, access to water bodies, habitat rights for PVTGs, that is Particularly Vulnerable Tribal Groups, and traditional seasonal resource access of nomadic and pastoral communities, because primarily they live on. They need grazing lands for their animals. So, therefore, such recognition was also given to communities like nomadic and pastoral communities. Recognition of traditional customary rights and the right to protect, regenerate, conserve, or manage any community forest resource for sustainable use. Now, under this, the Forest Rights Act 2006 mandated the setting up of a Forest Rights Committee to evaluate claims made and verify the details.

Now, through this act, people can actually make claims in terms of having the right to access forests. This kind of claim will enable people to reverse the process of exclusion of communities when it comes to accessing and controlling

forest resources. Moreover, the FRA also protects tribal populations from eviction without rehabilitation and settlement. The act provides security from eviction from forest land until the verification of their rights is complete. Similarly, under Section 3, Clause 1 of the FRA, forest dwellers are protected from eviction or displacement due to development projects without fair compensation.

Now, if you look at the overall nature of the law, if you look at the overall nature of the act, it is very good in the sense that it protects tribal communities from being evicted from forest lands without proper rehabilitation and resettlement. It also protects forest dwellers from eviction or displacement due to development projects without fair compensation. And actually, it allows communities to claim rights. You know, to claim rights, right?

There is this mechanism, actually, which has been created, right, the Forest Rights Committee, which will look into the issues and verify the credibility of such claims. So, now, if you look at this statistics, this is just a statistics. Across India, there are a lot of claims that were made by the community, by individuals, and different kinds of land titles were also distributed. So, it is up to us to really judge whether the Forest Rights Act 2006 has lived up to its expectations or whether it does not really serve the purpose it set out to fulfill. So, as shown in the table, the implementation, more or less, one can say, has been limited, with a significant number of claims being rejected.

S. No.	States	No. of Claims received upto 31.01.2025			No. of Titles Distributed upto 31.01.2025		
		Individual	Community	Total	Individual	Community	Total
		1	2	3	4	5	6
1	Andhra Pradesh	284,870	3,294	288,164	226,434	1,822	228,256
2	Assam	148,965	6,046	155,011	57,325	1,477	58,802
3	Bihar	8,022	NA/Nil	8,022	0	0	0
4	Chhattisgarh	888,028	53,949	941,977	478,563	49,270	527,833
5	Goa	9,758	378	10,136	856	15	871
6	Gujarat	182,869	7,187	190,056	98,289	4,791	103,080
7	Himachal Pradesh	4,880	539	5,419	513	146	659
8	Jharkhand	107,032	3,724	110,756	59,866	2,104	61,970
9	Karnataka	288,549	5,940	294,489	14,981	1,345	16,326
10	Kerala	44,455	991	45,446	29,139	261	29,400
11	Madhya Pradesh	585,326	42,187	627,513	266,901	27,976	294,877
12	Maharashtra	397,897	11,259	409,156	195,667	8,668	204,335
13	Odisha	691,757	28,262	720,019	461,418	8,230	469,648
14	Rajasthan	113,162	5,213	118,375	49,215	2,551	51,766
15	Tamil Nadu	33,119	1,548	34,667	15,442	1,066	16,508
16	Telangana	651,822	3,427	655,249	230,735	721	231,456
17	Tripura	200,557	164	200,721	127,931	101	128,032
18	Uttar Pradesh	92,577	1,162	93,739	18,049	861	18,910
19	Uttarakhand	3,587	3,091	6,678	164	1	165
20	West Bengal	131,962	10,119	142,081	44,444	686	45,130
21	Jammu & Kashmir	33,233	12,857	46,090	420	5,591	6,020
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>4,902,427</b>	<b>201,337</b>	<b>5,103,764</b>	<b>2,380,502</b>	<b>117,683</b>	<b>2,498,185</b>

Source: [https://tribal.nic.in/downloads/FRA/MFR/2025/\(A\)%20MFR%20Jan%202025.pdf#page=3.00](https://tribal.nic.in/downloads/FRA/MFR/2025/(A)%20MFR%20Jan%202025.pdf#page=3.00)



Additionally, there is a greater emphasis on individual claims, while community claims receive comparatively less attention. So, we are sticking more to the individual side. So, the idea of community owning resources, the idea of community ownership of land in a contemporary context, continues to find less

relevance because people no longer abide by this idea of community. Therefore, when it comes to claims to forest titles as well, you see that mostly it was individual claims that were being entertained by the state. The Joint Committee report of 2010 found that the major reasons for denying the claim were the absence of STA community certificates in the claimed land coming under the distributed category.

The Joint Forest Management Program, which was another very important program that tried to bring communities into the management of forests, was launched in 1990 with the primary aim of protecting and regenerating forests. The JFM seeks to form partnerships between forest departments and local users of forests by instituting Forest Protection Committees or Van Suraksha Samitis. Under JFM, villagers should get benefits from forest produce as a reward for assisting in protecting the forest. Now, from 2016 onwards, we begin to see different kinds of changes in terms of laws and regulations pertaining to forests. There are several other efforts, like in the case of joint forest management, where the state tried to integrate the community into the maintenance of forests.

Because for the state alone, protecting forests is sometimes very difficult. Therefore, gradually, efforts were made by the government to bring the community into the management and protection of forests. However, a very important committee, which was established and submitted a report in 2014—now popularly known as the Xaxa Committee—noted that the areas covered under JFM are mostly reluctant to implement FRA. So, this is quite a paradoxical situation in the sense that JFM was actually meant to bring the community into confidence in the maintenance and protection of forests.

But the irony is that the areas covered under JFM are particularly the ones reluctant to implement FRA. Now, we have come to the end of this lecture. so, in this lecture, what we essentially tried to understand was the process by which forests came to be regulated by the colonial state and how this resulted in the economic deprivation of tribal communities. So, changes in forest laws and regulations do not only have economic impacts; they also have significant socio-cultural impacts. As we have discussed in this lecture, for many tribal communities in India, forests are not only economic resources.

Forests hold a lot of socio-cultural value. The belief systems of tribal communities are largely rooted in their natural surroundings. Therefore, any disruption in forest resources also disrupts their socio-cultural life. At the same time, since the colonial period, we have seen that there is this The continual negative portrayal of tribal communities, particularly practices like shifting cultivation, persisted since shifting cultivation requires tribal communities to seek new land periodically—maybe after four, five, or even eight years—and the colonial state projected it as environmentally destructive.

As a result, tribal communities were forced to switch to different occupations, leading to immense pauperization during the colonial period. Now, in the post-colonial period, there were definitely a lot of changes happening in a positive direction. However, many times, they were simply not enough. Many times, the implementation of these new laws and regulations is poor. But at the same time, what we also see is that there are many resistance movements being launched by tribal communities.

At times, there has to be some kind of adjustment to work out – to come up with a workable solution that will benefit the communities. So, in short, the kind of resources, the kind of resource rights that we are discussing, whether it was land in the previous class or forest remains, remains a very central issue in the study and understanding of tribal communities in India. Thank you so much.