

UNDERSTANDING ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENTS

2.1. DEFINING ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENTS

The '*Environmental Movements*' lack a single, comprehensive and precise definition. Therefore, working definition of the '*Environmental Movements*' needs to be developed for the present purpose; and this shall be done after making a survey of some of the prominent and common definitions of the term developed and used by scholars on the theme. Broadly speaking, the environmental movements are generally understood as very diverse social movements characterized by a relatively loose organization of activists involving people in local activity around global environmental and natural issues organized on a transnational basis and promoting a holistic, global and ethical world view emphasizing preservation of nature and restraint on unmindful economic development. However, adapting the concept of the '*Social Movement*' proposed by Diani (1992), the environmental movements may be defined as loose, non-institutionalized network that includes, as well as individuals and groups who have no organizational affiliation, organizations of varying degrees of formality, that is engaged in collective action, and that is motivated by shared identity or, at least, shared environmental concern (Rootes: 1997b). Yet there are other definitions of the environmental movements developed by various scholars in the global context. The environmental movement may be broadly understood as an organized social activity consciously directed towards promoting sustainable use of natural resources, halting environmental degradation or bringing about environmental restoration or regeneration (Gadgil and Guha: 1995: 'Introduction'). The environmental movements represent the dissent about mitigating the environmental destruction and externalities of resource use, rather than confining themselves to resource control and revenue streams (Salih: 1997). They are also quite often the bearers of the ecological critique of the political and economic monopolies. In short, an environmental movement may be conceived as the organized political expression of environmentalism (Johnston *et al.* 2000, Pp.220-222), by environmentalism meaning a social struggle over crucial natural resources and, simultaneously, a struggle over the symbolic power to define environmental responsibilities and how environmental problems should be

understood and solved (Isager: 2000). Bava Noorjahan, however, puts a yet different understanding of the environmental movements, which approximates the definition of Gadgil and Guha cited above. According to Noorjahan (1999); the environmental movements are a people's protest for protecting the natural environment from degradation, decay and destruction by various activities of human beings and for promoting the development of the fragile ecosystem, which is required for human development. It must be noted here that most environmental movements have similar value systems and moral codes and cite common heroes and moral examples in their myths although they often diverge in details such as emphasis, priorities, means of action, and specific goals. These movements invariably interact or are linked with other social movements with similar moral views such as peace movement, human and animal rights movements, anti nuclear weapons movement and so on.

From the definitions cited above, it is revealed that the environmental movements are terms often used for any social or political movement directed towards the preservation, restoration or enhancement of the natural environment. They often share the notion that the perception of one's environment is strongly connected with that of one's self. In this regard, some environmentalists distinguish themselves from conservationists. Thus, quite often than not, an environmental movement is sought to be distinguished from 'Conservation Movement', and/or 'Save our Suburb' movement.

2.2. EVOLUTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENTS

The modern environmental movements developed sometimes in the second half of the 1960s in Europe and North America. Its origin dates back to the 1960s, there, in the wake of Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* (1962), the Torrey Canyon Oil Tanker Disaster (1967), Paul Ehrlich's *The Population Bomb* (1968) and the First Earth Day (of 1970), the concern over human use and abuse of environment proliferated. These may be regarded as the founding blocks of the modern environmental movement.

understood and solved (Isager: 2000). Bava Noorjahan, however, puts a yet different understanding of the environmental movements, which approximates the definition of Gadgil and Guha cited above. According to Noorjahan (1999), the environmental movements are a people's protest for protecting the natural environment from degradation, decay and destruction by various activities of human beings and for promoting the development of the fragile ecosystem, which is required for human development. It must be noted here that most environmental movements have similar value systems and moral codes and cite common heroes and moral examples in their myths although they often diverge in details such as emphasis, priorities, means of action, and specific goals. These movements invariably interact or are linked with other social movements with similar moral views such as peace movement, human and animal rights movements, anti nuclear weapons movement and so on.

From the definitions cited above, it is revealed that the environmental movements are terms often used for any social or political movement directed towards the preservation, restoration or enhancement of the natural environment. They often share the notion that the perception of one's environment is strongly connected with that of one's self. In this regard, some environmentalists distinguish themselves from conservationists. Thus, quite often than not, an environmental movement is sought to be distinguished from 'Conservation Movement', and/or 'Save our Suburb' movement.

2.2. EVOLUTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENTS

The modern environmental movements developed sometimes in the second half of the 1960s in Europe and North America. Its origin dates back to the 1960s, there, in the wake of Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* (1962), the Torrey Canyon Oil Tanker Disaster (1967), Paul Ehrlich's *The Population Bomb* (1968) and the First Earth Day (of 1970), the concern over human use and abuse of environment proliferated. These may be regarded as the founding blocks of the modern environmental movement.

principal social force opposing capitalism influenced the academics (in the likes of Herbert Marcuse) to develop a variety of new approaches to criticism of the bourgeois society. These newly founded critic of bourgeois society and practice attracted many radical young minds that founded several new, radical movements. Environmental movements were thus born as one of these new radical movements, the others being the Civil Rights Movement, the Peace Movement, and many others.

During the early years, the environmental movements were the preserves of relatively small numbers of radical activists such as those associated with the environmental groups- *Friends of the Earth* and *Green Peace* (both founded in 1971). Then on, several environmental movements originated, developed, diversified and proliferated across the global plank that it has become a more mainstream political concern. Today, an environmental movement exists as an extremely large and heterogeneous movement, which can be examined in terms of its different constituent groups, their favoured political tactics, their ideological orientations, and the number and scale of their environmental concern.

The modern environmental movements constitute important political force today, being historically hailed as the most successful movements, both for their enduring presence and its ability to garner broad public support (Buttel: 2000; Dunlap and Mertig: 1992; Frank et al: 2000; Mertig and Dunlap: 2001; Putnam: 2000). The environmental movements (presently used synonymously with the ecology movements) constitute transnational, biophilic, universalized and moral movements. Their basic commitment to fundamental ideology not only transcend the human categories of caste, class, race, religion and nations but the categories of species divisions and the divisions of the organic and inorganic world also (Singh, Rajendra: 2001: P. 268). In conceptual terms, the environmental movement is best understood as an envelope as it encompasses a variety of socially and discursively constructed ideologies and actions, theories and practices.

2.3. STANDPOINTS ON THE GENESIS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENTS

The academic arena pertaining to the understanding of the genesis of the environmental movements is not an uncontested terrain. Several context and theory based arguments dominate the literature on the origin of the environmental movements, owing to the diverse forces and factors that lead to the development of an environmental movement in a given context. The origin of the environmental movements may be better explained following the dichotomous classification of the environmental movements developed by Guha and Martinez Alier (1997) into the materialist and the post-materialist environmental movements. The post materialist movements are quite often situated in the industrialized developed countries of the north and the materialist environmental movements are mainly located in the Third World countries, including India. Let us briefly discuss the origin of northern environmental movements and the third world environmental movements separately.

The literature on the emergence of environmental movements in the North is rather extensive. Particularly in Europe, studies dwell on the structural conditions in the 1970s that generated environmental mobilization. The economic affluence in the postwar North had to some extent resolved the quantitative aspects of distribution. It was the qualitative aspects exemplified in environmental conditions and quality of life that caused concerns for pollution, industrial waste, and urban decay, the '*effluents of affluence*' (Guha and Martinez-Alier: 1997). They became new sites of politics while wilderness areas and clean air became new symbols of healthy society and living (Nash: 1982). Thus, the environmental campaign began, culminating in the escalation of large scale as well as narrow and specifically focused environmental movements in the North. Therefore, the environmental movements came to be conceptualized as a form of post-material politics distinct from the materialist politics of the 'Left-Red' labour and trade union platforms (Dwivedi, R.: 2001: P. 13). Studies in Europe and elsewhere have shown that the core members in the environmental mobilization belong mostly to the middle class living in material conditions that facilitate their relative neglect of material economic and redistributive demands (Offe: 1985; Eder: 1995). The emergence of this post-material politics has led

some scholars to characterize the environmental movements, and for that matter Green Politics in the North as the ultimate luxury of consumer society (Moore: 1989).

As regards the genesis of the environmental movements in the 'Third World', there are two dominant views: the Conventional or the Mainstream Standpoint, and the Livelihoods Standpoint (Wagle, Subodh: 1999). The conventional standpoint equates development with increase in production of goods and services at the national level. In other words, according to this standpoint, the central objective of development is macroeconomic growth. It assumes that the wealth so generated '*trickles down*' to all sections of society. Since this standpoint also assumes that the major source of macroeconomic growth is the phenomenal productivity of the modern, technologically sophisticated industrial sector, for it, therefore, nature remains the chief source of raw materials and energy and also serves as a sink for dumping industrial and urban waste. Because this standpoint owes its origin to the West, its understanding of the ecological and environmental issues is primarily in terms of '*economic externalities*'. On the other hand, the Livelihoods Standpoint may be seen as a Third World critique of the Conventional Standpoint. The livelihoods standpoint carries the fundamental objective of the guarantee of dignified and secured livelihoods to all. Under this standpoint, the set of guidelines for development emerge from the acceptance of social, ecological, and political considerations. The livelihoods standpoint is not anti-growth *per se*, but it attempts to link growth, equity and nature together. It does not either commodify nature, or deify it. It sees surrounding natural resources as permanent and reliable sources for the satisfaction of most livelihood needs.

From the Conventional or the Mainstream Standpoint, the environmental struggles and movements may be seen to have their origin to the *opportunistic instigation* (emphasis mine) for movements and struggles by an organized group of urban environmentalists who are swayed by romantic ideologies, and who end up being instruments at the hands of the International Non-governmental Organisations (INGOs). This understanding believes that these environmentalists who instigate environmental movements and struggles are attracted to

environmental causes which are both fashionable, internationally acceptable, and which are easier to convert into '*struggles*'. This understanding not only characterizes the environmental movements in the South as the brainchildren of Western urban environmentalists, but equally deifies them, too.

Contrarily, from the Livelihood Standpoint, when local people perceive that such an intrusion is going to destroy their current livelihoods without creating alternative livelihood opportunities that could compensate their loss, discontent starts brewing in the community, culminating in the emergence of an environmental movement. Thus the scholarship on the environmental movements in the Third World, and more particularly India, has viewed them as essentially actions by the marginalized poor to protect their environmental means of livelihood and sustenance. It, therefore, implies that the rise of environmental consciousness is attributed to, especially in the context of India, the socio- ecological impact of a narrowly conceived development modal based on short-term commercial criteria of control and exploitation of natural resources, and serving almost exclusively the needs and interest of a rich minority. Hence, the environmental struggles and movements in the third world countries like India have a strong material basis emanating from state hegemony over water, forests and land resources, which serve the subsistence and livelihood needs of the majority of the people. Thus, the environmental movements literature, obviously as a part of the new social movements literature portrays the counter hegemonic formations resisting domination, albeit in different degrees and forms, as well as '*providing same basis for developmental and democratic alternative to the system as it now works*' (Wignaraja: 1993: p.5). These reflect a developmental crisis, manifesting struggles over resources and meanings and a pluralistic paradigm of development and governance and theorized by 'third world'

environmentalism and environmental movements (Shiva: 1991; Bryant: 1992; Friendmann & Rangam: 1993; Gadgil and Guha: 1995; Guha and Martinez Alier: 1997).

2.4. FEATURES OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENTS

Robert Nisbet (1982) has remarked that when the history of the twentieth century is finally written, the single most important social movement of the period will be judged to be environmentalism. This comments bears to the burgeoning of the environmental movements as a major political development dotting almost every nook and corner of the global landscape. The environmental movements globally and in India comprise a diversity of organizations, multifarious issues, varying strategies and is characterized by free floating eclectic brands of multifarious ideological orientations. A survey of some existing literature on the theme reveals the following broad features of environmental movements:

1. Conceptually, the 'environmental movement' is an '*envelop*' term. This is because it encompasses a variety of socially and discursively constructed ideologies and actions, theories and practices (Dwivedi: 2001). Hence, its understanding warrants the unpacking of the envelop and exploring its contents.
2. Environmental movements are not spontaneous developments; the origin, growth and development of environmental movements cannot be attributed to a single factor within a given temporal specific. Like other new social movements, the environmental movements too have complex roots. The formation of environmental movements, therefore, does not owe- to a single issue or a sudden crisis (Bowman: 1997:Pp. 649-667).
3. The environmental movements are not elitist movements in an excluding sense, nor they are mass movements comparable to those seeking economic or political reforms (Morrison and Dunlap: 1986). Its participants cut across social and economic classes.

4. Most of the environmental movements are generally non-class, non-political, non-violent and non-revolutionary democratic mobilizations.
5. The environmental movements are characterized by a diversity of organizations, certain common orientations, varying emphases and strategies and multifarious strands of ideologies because, ideologically, ecologism is still 'thin' with a soft and developing conceptual core (Freeden: 1996, P.551). They are also headed by many leaders or they have many centers of leadership, which is not organized in a hierarchy but bear a '*beterarchic*' character. Hence, the environmental movements are '*polycephalus*' in nature.
6. The environmental movements are characterized by their material, political and ideological expressions. In the Indian context, the material context is provided by the wide ranging shortages of, threats to, and struggles over natural resources. The political expression has been the organization by social action groups of the victims of environmental degradations. The crusading Gandhian, the Marxists, the appropriate technologists (Guha: 1988, Pp. 2578-2581), the ideology of conservation and the perspective of indigenous ecological management (Baviskar: 1995), and eco-feminism (Mies and Shiva: 1993) are the known ideological expressions of the environmental movements in India.
7. The environmental movement are a social force attempting to shape the world's future, although the movements contains several paradoxes and contradictions.
8. Environmental movements mostly oppose the capitalization of nature by the market system and the state control over natural resources (Leff: 1995).
9. Environmental movements are the responses to systemic contradictions. Whether pursuing post- material values (in the North) or material requirements of life (in the South), the environmental movements are

endowed with a generalized radicalism that is directed at the system as a whole.

10. The environmental movements are also characterized by their dynamism and they are transformative in nature.
11. In the domain of theory, the environmental movements have demonstrated the ultimate unity of science. It has drawn the attention of a great diversity of scientific disciplines thereby offering occasion for the development of an interdisciplinary collaboration. No other area of human concern has drawn a parallel diversity of scientific disciplines towards its understanding.
12. The environmental movements are also characterized by its inherent weaknesses and limitations. The environmental movements, and for that matter the literature on it, is handicapped by ambiguity.

These are some of the general, broad features of the environmental movements. However, there are other features, which mark the specific environmental movements. For instances, the style, nature, content and dixon of the environmental movements in the global South differ from their counterpart in the North. Some such select features of the Northern and Southern environmental movements are summarized below:

1. The cause of the environmental movements in the North is '*structural*' in nature. To elucidate, the economic affluence of the postwar North had more or less resolved the quantitative aspects of distribution. It was the qualitative aspects exemplified in environmental conditions and quality of life that caused concerns for pollution, industrial waste and urban decay. They became the new sites of politics while wilderness areas and clean air became new symbols for healthy society and living (Nash: 1982). Environmental mobilizations thus came to be conceptualized as a 'post-material' politics. Thus, environmental movements' origin in the North owe to the '*structural conditions*' in the 1970s.

2. The Northern environmental movements dwell on how the environment should be used. They are symbolic in their expression focusing on '*quality of life*' values and conservation of wilderness and natural areas.
3. The environmental movements in the South have a materialistic form of expression, focusing on the defence of environmental resources, which are needed for survival and livelihood.
4. The environmental movements in the Third World quite often take the form of anti-state agitations. This is because most of the movements owe their origin to the capitalization of nature by the market system, which is quite often mediated by the state.
5. The environmental movements in the South are quite often simultaneously economic (protecting livelihoods) and cultural, resisting displacement from spaces that carry their identity, belief systems and their ways of living (Moore: 1996; Zimmerer: 1996). The tribal movement opposing their displacement in the Narmada Project in India exemplifies this feature.

2.5. IDEOLOGIES, STRATEGIES AND ACTORS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENTS

Like any other social movement, the environmental movements also have some components like ideology and objectives, leadership, actors (other than leaders), strategies and tactics, and organization. These components of the environmental movements are interdependent and mutually influencing. Some important components of the environmental movements have been briefly discussed below:

2.5.1. The Ideologies

Ideological expression and orientation is yet another attribute of an environmental movement. Getting into discourse on the conceptualization of ideology is beyond the scope of the present study. However, it is imperative to

adopt a working definition of the concept of ideology for the present purpose. Thus, for the present purpose, an ideology may be understood as 'a system of ideas which gives legitimacy to an existing or proposed system of relationships, and correspondingly supports an action programme to sustain or subvert the prevailing system' (Gore: 1993:Pp.29-30). Ideology constitutes an important element of a social movement, and hence, of an environmental social movement. Ideologies are action -driven, and hence they provide inspiration as well as legitimacy to a social movement. Further more, ideologies also provide explanations and indicate a value framework of a social movement. Therefore, it implies that ideologies are inherent to social movements in general, and obviously the environmental social movements. There are diverse actors and issues of the environmental movements, and so are its ideologies.

Broadly speaking, the environmental movements may be said to have two distinct sets of ideological orientations. They are, an '*ecocentric*' ideological and the '*technocratic*' ideological wing (O' Riordan: 1981). The former is more radical than the latter, puts the environment first and argues for a fundamental alteration in the existing economic and social uses of nature. By contrast, the 'technocentrism' is anthropocentric and suggests that the environment can be rationally managed within the existing frameworks. However, this ideological classification of environmental movements falls short of universal acceptability. For instance, the environmental movements in India are characterized by free-floating, eclectic brands of ideologies. Guha (1988) suggests five distinct brands of ideological orientations of Indian environmentalism, that is, the Crusading Gandhians, the Ecological Marxists, and the Appropriate Technologists, Scientific Conservationists and Wilderness Enthusiasts. Baviskar (1995) talks of yet two more ideologies of the Indian Environmental Movements-the Ideology of Conservation, and, the ideology of Indigenous Ecological Management. Ecofeminism (Mies and Shiva: 1993) is another addition to the list of the ideologies of Indian environmental movements.

However, what needs to be emphasized at this point is the fact that the ideologies are apparently distinct but quite often than not, they overlap. A particular environmental organization or group may follow more than one

ideologies. In a similar way, a particular ideology may inspire many environmental movements at the same time. The processes of synthesis and negations of the ideologies of the environmental movements in the past have gradually given way to a new ideological form: 'Ecologism' which is still in its nascent stage and hence 'thin'. Mature, 'thick' ecologism of the future with a strong conceptual core as of Liberalism as many scholars hope may claim universality of its application by all environmental groups and organizations and of the green parties across the globe.

2.5.2. Leadership

Leadership occupies an important place in protest movements, and for that matter, in environmental protest movements as well. This is because the leaders are responsible for and instrumental in translating objective causes in to subjective consciousness, articulating the causes of deprivation in whatsoever form of which the common people may have little or no knowledge (Yasin and Dasgupta: 2003). Ghanshyam Shah (2002) points out that the leadership plays a crucial role in articulating ideology and objectives, evolving strategies and programmes and maintaining the spirit of the participants. Although the leadership pattern of the environmental movement varies from one movement to another, yet a general pattern of leadership can be discerned from the analysis of these movements. The general pattern reveals that the leadership of the environmental movement is likely to be more charismatic than bureaucratic like the one provided by Sunderlal Bahuguna in the Chipko movement and by Medha Patkar in the Narmada Bachao Andolan, India. Moreover, the leadership of the environmental movement has come generally from the educated middle class. Hence, it is seen that although environmental movements have a strong local focus, yet the local lower class leadership is conspicuously insignificant as a bulk of these movements are mobilized and led by urban, educated middle-class environmentalists.

2.5.3. The Strategies and Tactics

Beyond ideology and slogans, mobilization also involves a repertory of successful strategies and tactics. By "*strategy*" we mean a long-range plan or policy, while "*tactic*" refers to a specific means or technique for carrying out the plan. Strategies and tactics in movements are generally those which we associate with

any political action in our system: the seeking and forming of alliances, lobbying, picketing, fund-raising, speech-making, pamphleteering, broadcasting in the media, and so on. Sometimes a successful tactic can consist of no more than a skillful reaction to an unplanned *precipitating incident*, which boosts a movement. Frequently, a movement will change tactics or strategies in response to failures and successes. For instance, one of the social movements, The Prohibition Movement first worked only through Protestant Churches and then switched to temperance organizations at the local level. Later on, the movement focused mainly on the state level and the organization of the Prohibition Parties to pressure the state legislatures, but then, around the turn of the present century, it reverted to work at the local level again. However, it finally turned its mobilizations at the state level and galvanized its various state level organizations into a national movement that brought the passage of the 18th Amendment. These changes are the changing strategies and tactics of the movement, which it uses for its own survival. Hence, strategies and tactics of the social movements in general are ever changing to meet the needs of the movement.

The strategies and tactics that the environmental movements use, and normatively should use, are an unresolved theoretical issue among researchers on environmental movements. Thus, the political strategies and tactics of different environmental movements and their actors vary. Many environmental groups and organizations have used physical intervention, for instance, 'tree-hugging' (as in the case of the Chipko Movement in India) as well as graphic media campaigns (like the one of the Green Peace used against the Newfoundland Seal Hunt in the 1980s). Green Parties have used the media too, but also have directly influenced the political debates through their parliamentary debating and voting (especially in Finland, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Belgium, Luxembourg, Netherlands, West Germany, east Germany, France, Italy, Great Britain, Ireland, Austria, Switzerland where the Green Parties are well organized). These apart, there are several other strategies developed and used by the environmental movements, especially of the global South. They include, designing projects for ecorestoration and resource harvesting, national and international lobbying, Satyagraha, etc. (Chipko Movement in India); militant and armed resistance followed by a phase of peaceful protest, (Chico Dam Movement in Philippines); alliance- building

(rubber Tappers Movement in Brazil); violent uprising followed by extensive national and international campaigns (Zapatista Rebellion in Mexico); from Peaceful Demonstration to a Separatist Movement (Ogoni Movement of Nigeria); Plantation works and networking with other environmental groups (Green Belt Movement in Kenya); peaceful protests at the national and local levels, public interest litigations, extensive lobbying and campaigning at the international level etc. These are the various types of strategies and political tactics adopted and used by the environmental movements in general and by the movements in the Third World countries in particular.

2.5.4. The Actors

The environmental movements cover a wide range of issues such as deforestation, water quality, depletion of indigenous resources, human displacement resettlement, threat to public health, toxic contamination and atmospheric pollution. Whatsoever be the nature of these mobilizations, they involve actors and actions. The different categories of actors in environmental struggles and movements have been highlighted. For instance, Escobar (Escobar: 1995) notes around six different categories of the groups that involve in environmental movements, environmental non-governmental organizations (ENGOs), environmental new social movements, green political parties, governments with environmental sensibilities, ecologically sensitized business and '*green consumers*', of which the first three are exclusively environmental. However, it is worth noting here that, both at home and abroad, some groups, which play a significant role in environmental movements, have not been covered in the list above. Several other groups, viz., the local communities, women's organizations, workers and peasants, knowledge class, utopian groups, non-green political parties, engineers, environmentalists, human rights groups, and other support groups also contribute as actors of environmental movements. For instance, the Chipko movement in India comprised ordinary rural Indians (the local community) coming together to protest against corporate exploitation of the environment. Similarly, several support groups took up the cause of the displaced tribals in the Narmada Sagar in India. Fish-workers and farmers also have been involved in environmental movements as actors in the case of the Fisherfolk

Movement in south India and in Baliapal movement respectively. Hence, environmental movements are composed of a diversity of actors.

2.6. UNDERSTANDING ENVIROMENTAL MOVEMENTS: DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES

A few important frameworks or perspectives have been developed and employed to analyze and understand the environmental movements. In other words, the environmental movements are approached from various theoretical perspectives such as from the perspective of Globalization, from the perspective of the state-civil society relationships, from the perspective of Cultural Construction, and also from the perspective of the New Social Movements theory, to mention a few among many. Let us briefly explore some of these theoretical perspectives on environmental movements in the sections that follow:

2.6.1. Perspective of Globalisation

Some scholars have contended that the environmental movements need to be understood as a development within the framework of the Globalisation movement because the environmental movements are deeply embedded in the Globalisation movement. They hold the view that emerging over the last twenty years and reaching mainstream recognition in 1999 after the World Trade Organization (WTO) protests in Seattle (Smith: 2002; Tarrow: 2002), the Globalisation movement is against the hierarchical, undemocratic and unrepresentative structure of global governance (Ayers: 2002; Graeber: 2001; Smith: 2002). Secondly, it is also described as the protest against the weakening of the local governments in favour of a global governing structure (Bourdieu: 2001). Thirdly, the Globalisation movement has been critical of the lack of attention provided for human rights, labour rights, and environmental protection in transnational lending and trade agreements and international business (Keck & Sikkink: 1998; Rothman and Oliver: 2002; Smith: 2002). It, therefore, follows that globalization has come to be something of a umbrella term (or movement), encompassing a broad collection of social movements that engage the global governing system on behalf of various causes or in contention with the system itself. Increasingly therefore, the environmental movements and struggles are falling beneath the globalization umbrella, when seen from the present

perspective. Arguing thus, this perspective highlights the genesis of the environmental movements within the framework of globalization.

This perspective argues that the proliferation of the environmental 'bads' such as air and water pollution etc in the early 1970s could not be addressed exclusively at the local level (Buttel and Taylor: 1992; Smith: 1997; Yearly: 1996; Beck *et al*: 1994; Guidry *et al*: 2000; Mol: 2001; Seidman: 2000). Thus, in the end of the 1960s, environmentalism started to adopt a broader worldview (Frank *et al*: 2000; Smith: 1997), moving towards a more global orientation. It also holds that as a result of the globalizing of the environmental bads and the ability to mobilize in the global arena, a global environmental consciousness took root within the general populace. Hence, from this perspective, the genesis of the environmental movements owe to the globalization of the environmental bads and the development of the global environmental consciousness especially in the aftermath of the Stockholm Conference (1972) as it established the environment as a global problem and submitted the environmental issues into the international discourse. It is also argued that the globalization of the environment was facilitated in the 1970s by the international lending organizations, specifically the World Bank, which began incorporating environmental protection and sustainable development issues into their policies (Keck & Sikkink: 1998; Nayyar: 2002; Rothman & Oliver: 2002). Even the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI) have taken such roles that integrate economic policies with environmental protection (Nayyar: 2002). Owing to the capacity of the globalization movement to effect social change and environmental protection, the globalization movement has attracted a broad collection of the social movements (including the environmental) that view the global governing system as associated with and in the position to change various local and global problems. Thus, over the last thirty years, the environmental movements have remained embedded in the globalization movement. Therefore, as contended by the present perspective, the environmental movements can be better comprehended through an analysis of it as a part of the globalization phenomenon.

2.6.2. The Perspective of Cultural Production

The perspective of cultural production is another theoretical framework used extensively by scholars to analyze the environmental movements (Hou: 2000, Hsiao et al: 1999: p.213; Norgaard: 1994). This perspective argues that cultural production provides an effective means in social mobilization, framing of issues and shaping of political opportunities – three important processes widely considered in the literature on social movements. In studying the environmental movements, Hsiao et al (1999) argues that cultural analysis helps explain why certain ritual acts are successful in mobilizing the environmental movement while others are not. In addition, cultural analysis reveals how discourses and ritualisation impacts the solidarity, identity and consciousness of movement participants, which also helps explain why a movement is successful (Hsiao, et al: 1999). In examining the transformational role of the cultural production in environmental movements, according to the perspective of cultural production, it is useful to invoke Norgaard's (1994) proposition of co evolution in which he describes development as a mutually interactive co evolutionary process between a social system and its environmental system. The co- evolutionary theory emphasizes that the key to sustainable development is not simply a matter of choosing different technology for intervening in the environment, but also the mechanism of perceiving, choosing and using technique that are embedded in culture and social structure. This theoretical perspective is often applied in examining the environmental movements using cultural symbols, etc. as it argues that cultural production in the form of using cultural symbols and construction of identities and the creation of new meanings and values play an important instrumental role in facilitating the movements. Specifically, this perspective provides an important linkage among social mobilization, issue framing and political opportunity structure- the three processes widely considered in social movement literature (McAdam et al: 1996). Here, mobilization structure refers to the formal and informal vehicles through which people mobilize and engage in collective actions. Framing processes refer to the shared meanings and definitions people bring to the situation, that mediate between opportunities and organizations. Finally, the social movements are shaped by broad set of political constraints and opportunities unique to the given context in which they are

embedded. This perspective also contends that cultural production in environmental movement also takes a transformational role by facilitating the internationalization and values at the local level. Through actions involving activists, residents and outsiders, these new values have been constructed and reinforced.

2.6.3. The Sociological Narrative Perspective

The Sociological Narrative Perspective (Gould, Weinberg & Schnailberg: 1993) refers to a method of inquiry that utilizes grounded observations to map the patterns of place at a particular time in order to debunk and reveal social arrangements, which have been hidden by institutional and structural arrangements. This perspective is a self-reflective process that situates rigorously collected and analyzed data within preexisting literatures. It creates alternative versions, which challenge readers to examine his or her belief structures. This debunking relies on the use of socially relevant concepts, which brings back into everyday experience, and make us look for differences between theoretical forms and experiential substance (James: 1907: p.96). In other words, these concepts offer alternative images, explanations and arguments that probe the utility of our dominant symbols and theories. They reveal new versions of why things happen the way they do, and ultimately provide the grounded assessments of the ramifications of current social arrangements and practices.

This perspective is steeped in a conception of science as a self-reflective process that continuously questions its own methods, themes and standards of evaluations. It is the science of '*learning to learn*' (Shapere: 1984) by gathering texts and literatures, but revising the signs and symbols previously used, it offers a new set of signs, symbols and concepts. However, a social narrative to be used as a tool of researching a social phenomenon needs to be relevant, interesting, and consequential at the same time.

2.6.4. The New Social Movement (NSM) Perspective:

The literature on Social Movements is vast and diverse and there are varying interpretations concerning the composition of the social movement. Two theoretical approaches arising from different intellectual traditions have

dominated the recent study on social movements theory. In European Social thought, social movements are considered from the perspective of their transformative power, whereas in American Social Science, social movements are judged by their organizational characteristics (Yearley: 1994, pp151-154). The European Tradition has attempted to show why social movements arise, whereas the American social science, relying on resource mobilization theory has concentrated on the pattern of mobilization of the social movements. The European tradition places the study of social movements within the social setting, linking the rise and demise of the movements to the changing values and structures in capitalist society. Social Movements Theory in this tradition attempts to explain individual participation in social movements. A number of approaches such as the mass society theory, relative deprivation theory, collective behaviour theory have been developed to explain movement participation generated by the structural strains of rapid social change (Jenkins: 1983, p. 528). Resources Mobilization theories developed in the United States in the 1970s added an organizational element to the earlier perspectives. These theories examined the internal dimensions of the social movements. Within this perspective, the formation and development of a social movement depends on the existence of groups or people who manning to mobilize resources in pursuit of a certain cause and who determine the way in which these resources are pooled and directed towards social change. Recently theorists have attempted to combine elements of both these approaches (see for example, Dalton 1994) since neither approach by itself provides a satisfactory explanation. Recent theories on the New Social Movements have combined the two traditions as discussed above. Thus, from this perspective, for a social action to constitute a social movement, a number of requirements are to be met. They include cooperation, collective action, informal networks, shared goals, common identity and desire for social change. The contemporary environmental movements fulfill these requirements and are legitimately regarded as a form of New Social Movements.

In the Indian context, although some scholars (Guha: 1982; R. Kothari: 1986 and 1993; Frank and Fuentes: 1987; Dhanagare and John: 1988; and Omvedt: 1988) have subjected the conceptual issues pertaining to the New Social Movements (NSMs) to theoretical scrutiny, yet it has only amounted to a

relatively little systematic attempt at understanding the nature and form of these movements. Debates and discussions on the new social movements have often been carried on either within the broad Marxist paradigm as in the case of Omvedt, Frank and Fuentes, and Dhanagare and John, or they are mostly conceived in the pacifist, ethno-context of the interactionist phenomenological paradigm reflected in the contributions of Ramachandra Guha and Rajni Kothari.

Omvedt, while analyzing the farmer's movement, introduces the concept of the '*new peasant*' with many features common to many of the new social movements. In this regard, she finds traditional Marxism inadequate for explaining the '*new peasants*' in particular and the new social movements in general. Omvedt viewed the peasant movements' rejection of affiliation to any political party and their alliance with the working class as a rejection shared among all the new social movements including the dalit movement, the women's movements, and the environmental movements. Yet the overarching framework of Omvedt reflects her general Marxist orientation and hence, her conceptualization is marred by both theoretical ambivalence and internal theoretical contradictions as for example at one point she says that the anti-caste movement is an inherently a class based struggle.

Frank and Fuentes developed a conceptualization of the social movements in their *Nine Theses on Social Movements* in which they have adopted a post-Marxist framework of analysis. This is because they hold the view that contemporary social representations are characterized by capitalist economic and hold the imaginary of 'socialism' as the futuristic goal of social transformation. They introduce the concept of immanence and historical inevitability in the study of the social movements. Although they recognize the changeability and dynamic aspects (Theses 2 and 3) and the alliance formation (Thesis 8) especially in case of the environmental social movements, yet the poverty of this framework of social movement analysis lies in the fact that this framework forecloses the possibility of social movements after achieving the goal of socialism.

Dhanagare and John (1988) have also contributed to the conceptualization of the new social movements by way of a critique of Frank and Fuentes whom they charge with an attempt to 'belittle, ridicule and reject' the possibility of radical transformation of capitalism by the exploited classes. Thus, since their analysis too flows from a Marxian framework, they, like Omvedt and Frank and Fuentes, lose their explanatory power to comprehend the new social movements like the environmental movements that cut across the paradigmatic class boundaries.

The interactionist phenomenological paradigm of new social movements of Ramachandra Guha and Rajni Kothari generally makes use of the identity, action, and community defence oriented design of analysis and interpretation, and is characterized by human concerns and the prophecies about the future shape of society. This paradigm is characterized by its dominant liberal humanist ethos and is deeply influenced by the democratic experiences of the contemporary Indian society. Their interpretive conclusions contain elements of democratic crusade, caution and prophecy, and they convey implicational messages about the future shape of the Indian society. However, even this framework fails to make sense of the dynamic and transformative aspects of the environmental protest movements in particular, and therefore falters in its prophecy on the implications of such dynamism and transformations of the movements on democracy and society. This is because the environmental movement itself, unlike other social movements, unfolds its own paradoxes, which renders most theoretical frameworks difficult to capture these dynamic and paradoxical aspects.

Environmental movement is a new social movement that despite sharply criticizing and denouncing the flaws and hazards of a particular social structure makes use of some of the building blocks of the very social structure for its emergence and existence. This paradoxical nature of the environmental movements is best captured by Habermas' theory of Communicative Action. Striving to escape from the blind alley that Weber and the first generation Frankfurt scholars ascribed to the project of modernity, Habermas widens the understanding of the scope of the process of rationalization. He argues that

beyond the strategic-instrumental facet emphasized by the Weberian tradition (Weber: 1978a; 1978b), modern times are also the stage for and the outcome of the rationalization processes put forth by a different logic: modern societies not only set the ground for individuals to be rational in respect to ends, but also be rational when searching for mutual understanding upon everyday situations (Habermas: 1984). It implies that at the hands of Habermas, modern social dynamics turned to be viewed as operating in two main different realms, according to two specific logics: a systemic one and the second one he named as *Lifeworld*. The former realm hosts the process of material production and reproduction of society by means of an autonomous and self-compelling economic subsystem, at the same time that it sets the stage for the administrative and political regulation of modern complex societies. On the other hand, the Lifeworld realm embraces processes of cultural reproduction, social integration, and mobilization which are no longer based on pre-given and taken for granted world views in modernity but rather on a rational pursuit of mutual understanding reflexively oriented. It is here that the Habermasian thesis on the emergence of the environmental movements in contemporary societies makes sense. Habermas places environmental movement in the middle of a set of other new social movements, which spring out of the new character of social conflicts proper to central modern societies. Such conflicts no longer revolve round the issues of wealth distribution, but rather they come out of the conflictive terrain in between the systemic and the Lifeworld realms. Habermas's theoretical framework opened up the new insight in to the understanding of the new social movements in general and the environmental movements in particular. Claus Offe, Andre Gorz, Ulrich Beck and others have richly benefited from the Habermasian perspective on the new social movements. This understanding of the environmental movement as a form of the New Social Movement may be useful in understanding the environmental movements in the present context.

2.7. WHY THE MOVEMENTS MOVE? DYNAMISM AND TRANSFORMATIONS OF ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENTS

The components of the environmental movements as have been discussed above, however, are not *a priori* and *static*. They are rather dynamic and get changed and transformed in the course of the movement. For instance,

sometimes the objectives of the environmental movements emerge on a narrow, particular local issue, which, in course of time, evolve to broad aims for social transformation (see for instance, the case of the Chipko movement in India) and vice versa. Ideologies of the environmental movements also undergo change, providing direction for the evolution of new strategies and programmes. Actors, and for that matter, the leadership which initiates or emerges in the course of the growth of the movement plays a crucial role in articulating ideologies and objectives, and also in determining the nature and type of the movement organization. Competition among movement members in general and leaders in particular for social, economic, political and psychological rewards, the ideological differences amongst the movement participants in general and leadership in particular lead to the development of factions and compel new recruitments to broaden the support base of the movement and give it its dynamism. Most of these divisions occur during the growth phase of the movement, and therefore, lead to the transformation of the nature and content of the movement itself. For example, globally speaking, the movement popularly known as '*environmentalism*' in the 1970s came to be called by the European term '*the Greens*' in the later half of the 1980s. Today, what it remains is usually called the '*Environmental Movement*' or the '*Green Movement*'. Precisely for this reason, the environmental movements can at best be comprehended by way of locating and analyzing the dynamism and transformations of the movements produced by the dialectical interaction of the various components and parameters of the movement over a span of time.

References

- Ayers J. (2002). "From Local to Global: Transnational Political Processes and Contentious Against the Global Economy", in Smith and Johnston (eds.) *Globalisation and Resistance: Transnational Dimensions of Social Movements*, New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Bava, Noorjahan (1999). "Environmental Movements for Sustainable Development", in S. K. Chaube and B. Chakraborty (eds.) *Social Movements in Contemporary India*, Calcutta: K. P. Bagchi.
- Baviskar, A. (1995). *In the Belly of the River: Tribal Conflicts and Development in the Narmada Valley*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2001). "Uniting to Better Dominate", *Items*, Vol. 2 (3-4).
- Bowman, J.S. (1976). "The Environmental Movement: An Assessment of Ecological Politics", *Environmental Affairs*, Vol. 5, No.4.
- Beck, Ulrich, Anthony Giddens and Scott Lash (1994). *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*, Cambridge: The Polity Press.
- Buttel, F. and P. Taylor (1992). "Environmental Sociology and Global Environmental Changes: A Critical Assessment", in Redclift and Benton (eds.) *Social Theory and the Global Environment*, London: Routledge (Chapter 11).
- Carson, Rachel (1962). *Silent Spring*. Greenwich, CT: Fawcett.
- Dalton, R. J. (1994). *The Green Rainbow: Environmental Groups in Western Europe*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dhanagare, D. and J. John (1988). 'Cyclical Movements Towards the "Eternal": Nine Thesis of Social Movements: A Critique', *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 20, No. 21.
- Diani, M. (1992). 'The Concept of Social Movement', *Sociological Review*, Vol. 40, No. 1.
- Dunlap, R and A. Mertig (1992). "The Evolution of the US Environmental Movement from 1970-1990: An Overview", in Dunlap and Mertig (eds.) *American Environmentalism: The US Environmental Movement 1970-1990*, Philadelphia: Taylor and Francis.
- Dwivedi, R. (2001). "Environmental Movements in the Global South: Issues of Livelihood and Beyond", *International Sociology*, Vol.16, No.1. (March), Sage.
- Eder, C. (1995). "Does Social Class Matter in the Study of Social Movement? A Theory of Middle Class Radicalism", in L. Mahcu (ed). *Social Movements and Social Classes: The Future of Collective Action*, New Delhi: Sage.
- Ehrlich, Paul (1968). *The Population Bomb*, New York: Ballantine.

- Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering Development*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Frank, Andre Gunder and Marta Fuentes (1987). "Nine Theses on Social Movement", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 22, No. 35.
- Frank, D., A. Hironaka and E. Schofer (2000). "The Nation State and the National Environment Over the Twentieth Century", *American Sociological Review*, 65 (1), Pp. 96-117.
- Freedon, Michael (1996). *Ideologies and Political Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Friedmann, J. and Haripriya Rangam (eds.) (1993). *In Defence of Livelihood: Comparative Studies in Environmental Action*, West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Gould, Kenneth A, Adam S. Weinberg & Allan Schnailberg (1993). "Legitimizing Impotence: Pyrrhic Victories of the Modern Environmental Movement," in *Qualitative Sociology*, Special Issue: *Social Equity and Environmental Activism: Utopias, Dystopias and Incrementalism*, March.
- Gore, M. S. (1993). *The Social Context of an Ideology: Ambedkar's Political and Social Thought*, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Gadgil, Madhav and Ramachandra Guha (1995). *Ecology and Equity*, New Delhi: Penguin.
- Graeber, D (2001). "The Globalisation Movement: Some Points of Clarification", *Items*, Vol. 2 (3-4).
- Guha, Ramachandra (1982). 'Ecological Crises and Ecological Movements: A Bourgeois Deviation?', (Review Article), *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 17, No. 52.
- Guha, Ramachandra (1988). "Ideological Trends in Indian Environmentalism", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 23, No. 49.
- Guha, R and J. Martinez- Alier (1997). *Varieties of Environmentalism: Essays North and South*, London: Earthscan
- Guidry, J., M. Kennedy and M. Zald (eds.) (2000). *Globalisation and Social Movement: Culture, Power and Transnational Public Space*, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Habermas, Jurgen (1984). *The Theory of Communicative Action*, Volume 1, Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hou, Jeffrey (2000). "Cultural Production of Environmental Activism: Two Cases in Southern Taiwan", *Paper Submitted for the Fifth Annual Conference on the History and Culture of Taiwan*, Los Angeles: University of California, October 12-15.

Hsiao, Hsin- Huang Michael, et al (1999). "Culture and Asian Styles of Environmental Movements", in Yok -Shiu F. Lee and Alvin Y. So (eds.) *Asia's Environmental Movements: Comparative Perspectives*, New York: M. E. Sharpe, Inc.

Isager, Lotte (2000). 'Forest and People in Thai Environmental Discourse,' *Working Paper*, Research Centre on Forest and People in Thailand, January.

James, W. (1907). *Pragmatism: A New Name for Some Old Ways of Thinking*, New York: Longmans Green.

Jenkins, J. C. (1983). "Resource Mobilization Theory and the Study of the Social Movements", *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 9.

Johnston, R. J. et al (eds.) (2000). *The Dictionary of Human Geography* (4th edition), Blackwell, Oxford.

Keck, M. and K. Sikkink (1998). "Environmental Advocacy Networks", in *Activists Beyond Borders*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press (Chapter 4).

Kothari, Rajni (1986). "Masses, Classes and the State", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 21, No. 5.

Kothari, Rajni (1993). "The Yawning Vacuum: A World without Alternative", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 28, No. 22.

Leff, Enrique (1995). *Green Production: Toward an Environmental Rationality*, New York: Guildford Press.

Mertig, A and R. Dunlap (2001). "Environmentalism, New Social Movements, and the New Class: A Cross- National Investigation" in *Rural Sociology*, 66 (1).

Moore, C. (1989). "Foreword", in P. Marsden- Smedly (ed.) *Britain in the Eighties: The Spectator view of the Thatcher Decade*, London: Crafton.

Morrison, D and R. Dunlap (1986). "Environmentalism and Elitism: A Conceptual and Empirical Analysis", *Environmental Management*, Volume 10, No.5.

Mies, Maria and Vandana Shiva (1993). *Ecofeminism*, New Delhi: Kali for Women.

Mol, A. (ed.)(2001). *Globalisation and Environmental Reform: The Ecological Modernization of the Global Economy*, Cambridge: The MIT Press (Chapter 2).

Moore, Donald, S. (1996). "Marxism, Culture and Political Ecolog", in R. Peet and M. Watts (eds.) *Liberation Ecologies: Environment, Development and Social Movements*, London and New York: Routledge.

McAdam, Doug, John D. McCarthy and Mayer N. Zald (1996). "Introduction: Opportunities, Mobilizing Structure, and Framing Processes Toward a Synthetic, Comparative Perspective on Social Movements", in McAdam et al (eds). *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Nash, R. (1982). *Wilderness and the American Mind*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Nayyar, D. (2002). *Governing Globalisation: Issues and Institutions*, New York: United Nations University Press.
- Nisbet, R. (1982). *Prejudices: A Philosophical Dictionary*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Norgaard, Richard B. (1994). *Development Betrayed: The End of Progress and a Co-evolutionary Revisioning of the Future*, New York: Routledge.
- Offe, C. (1985). "New Social Movements: Challenging the Boundaries of Institutional Politics", *Social Research*, Vol. 52, No.4.
- Omvedt, Gail (1988). "New Movements", *Seminar*, Vol. 352.
- O'Riordan, T. (1981). *Environmentalism*, London: Pion.
- Rootes, C. A. (1997b). "Environmental Movements and Green Parties in Western and Eastern Europe", in M. Redclift and G. Woodgate (eds.) *International Handbook of Environmental Sociology*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham and Northampton.
- Rothman, F. and P. Oliver (2002). "From Local to Global: The Anti-Dam Movement in Southern Brazil (1979-1992)", in Smith and Johnston (eds.) *Globalisation and Resistance: Transnational Dimensions of Social Movements*, New York: Rowman and Littlefield (Chapter 7).
- Putnam, Robert (2000): *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Salih, M. (1997). "Politics of Poverty Management and Environment: Displacement by Conservation", *Paper Presented at the Workshop on Politics of Poverty and Environmental Interventions*, Nordic Africa Institute, Institute of Social Studies, The Hague: Netherlands, May.
- Seidman, G. (2000). "Adjusting the Lens: What Do Globalization, Transnationalism and the Anti-Apartheid Movement Mean for Social Movement Theory?", in Guidry, J., M. Kennedy and M. Zald (eds.) *Globalisation and Social Movement: Culture, Power and Transnational Public Space*, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Shah, Ghanshyam (2002). "Introduction", in Ghanshyam Shah (ed.) *Social Movements and the State*, New Delhi: Sage.
- Shapere, D. (1984). *Reason and the Search for Knowledge*, Boston: Reidel.
- Singh, Rajendra (2001). *Social Movements, Old and New: A Post-Modernist Critique*, New Delhi: Sage.

Smith, J. (1997). "Building Political Will after UNCED: EarthAction International", in Smith, Chatfield and Pagnucco (eds.) *Transnational Social Movements and Global Politics*, Syracuse: Syracuse University Press (Chapter 10).

Smith, J. (2002). "From Local to Global: Globalising Resistance: The Battle of Seattle and the Future of Social Movements", in Smith and Johnston (eds.) *Globalisation and Resistance: Transnational Dimensions of Social Movements*, New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

Tarrow, P. (2002). *From Lumping to Splitting: Specifying Globalisation and Resistance: Transnational Dimensions of Social Movements*, New York: Rowman and Littlefield.

Wagle, Subodh (1999). "Environmental Movements in India: A Critique and a Note", *The Journal of Indian School of Political Economy*, Vol.11, No.1 (January-March).

Weber, Max (1978a). *Essays in Sociology*, New York: Oxford University Press

Weber, Max (1978b). *Economy and Society* (In Two Volumes), Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wignaraja, Poona (ed.)(1993). *New Social Movements in the South: Empowering the People*, New Delhi: Vistaar Publications.

Yasin, Mohammad and S. Dasgupta (2003). *Indian Politics: Protests and Movements*, New Delhi: Anmol Publications.

Yearley, S. (1996). *Sociology, Environmentalism, Globalisation: Reinventing the Globe*, Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Zimmerer, K. S. (1996). "Ecology as Cornerstone and Chimera in Human Geography", in Earle, C., K. Mathewson and M. Kenzer (eds.) *Concepts in Human Geography*, Lanham, MD: Rohman and Littlefield.