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3.0 OBJECTIVES

After reading this unit, you will be able to:

- explain the nature of civil society groups and their relevance to population;
- recognise sustainability issues and to know about the various important movements that exist in India; and
- appreciate how civil society groups and movements have been striving to bring about recognition of their demands and articulations regarding population and sustainability.

3.1 INTRODUCTION

There is a diverse range of groups and movements that we read and hear about expressing themselves vociferously on population and sustainable development. When we get to know about the movements like Chipko or Narmada Bachao Andolan we realise the significance of their struggles to ideas of sustainable development and population issues. In order to develop a comprehensive awareness of the concepts of population and sustainable development, it is important to know about the various civil society bodies and movements that exist on the issue. Environmental concerns, concerns about marginalised groups and their rights especially tribals and women are at the forefront of such struggles.

It was in 1960s that the publication of Rachel Carson’s *Silent Spring* (1962) challenged the very notion of development and fast-paced economic growth by exposing the harmful effects of pesticides on the environment. Frantz Fanon’s
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The Wretched of the Earth (1963), Eric Schumacher’s Small is Beautiful and Susan Griffin’s Women and Nature (1978) became the path-breaking works on this issue. There came about a shift during this period in the writings of environmentalists, ecologists, feminists and economists. Concerns of protecting the environment, people’s rights and women’s rights started shaping their writings. Academicians, writers and researchers from diverse fields started asking similar questions. These questions were at the core of human existence. They were simple and yet they provoked many reactions and controversies. An oft-quoted line of Gandhi contains the essence of these questions. He said, “the earth has enough for everybody’s need not their greed”.

Are there enough resources on the earth for the expansionist economic development that is taking place? Can the earth take the burden of the high patterns of consumption and production? Whose rights should be given priority over whom? Should Individual rights and the market rule supreme or should communities and groups which are dependent and close to nature be given more importance? The answers to these questions were diverse and polarised. While environmentalists, feminists and economists committed to human development agreed on the basic premise of minimalist sustainable development with emphasis on the rights of the marginalised, those committed to economic growth, urbanisation and industrialisation were critical and dismissive of such ideas. Even among those who agreed on the basic norms of human development there were many distinctions based on their method, approach and ideas.

Some academic writings were full of depressing predictions. In 1968 Paul Ehrlich published The Population Bomb in which he forecast that hundreds of millions of people will starve to death by 1970s and 1980s because of overpopulation. In 1972 Meadows, Meadows, Randers and Behrens in their The Limits to Growth (1972) seemed to suggest that humanity would soon exhaust the resource base of the planet. Garett Hardin also wrote a similar extremely influential essay. Doomsday predictions have of course not come true as we know now. The limitations of these theories and their narrow perspectives have been exposed with the passage of time. The linkage especially between overpopulation and resource utilization has been reconsidered in the light of mass production and setting up of multi-national corporations.

However the degradation and depletion of earth’s resources and climate change do alert us to examine the basic principles of development. It is important to look beyond the obvious and examine some of the elements of the theories and ideas which were generated then. It is true that these writings describe a real problem, but whether it is as ubiquitous and as devastating as they imagine is open to dispute.

Here it is important for you to have clarity on the main debates and develop a critical understanding on the issues.

There are two main theories regarding sustainable development. The first theory is broadly known as the theory of maximum sustainable society. It emphasises on development by the maximum usage of the earth’s resources
while keeping in mind elements of environment protection. Use of paper bags, vermi-composting, use of eco-friendly fuels and leveraging the market for these products is what it is all about.

This theory believes that capitalist market can be turned around by motivating both consumers and producers to be supportive of environmental concerns. The theory, also known as eco-capitalism, is based on individual choice and aspirations. It believes that industrialisation and urbanisation should continue as they are necessary for growth. Establishing a code of environmental ethics and using environmental concerns as a point for market competition is the crux of this argument.

The second theory is that of minimum sustainable society which is based on curbing the capitalist market, emphasising on frugal life-styles, creating bio-regions and a commitment to own work and self-reliance. A distinction is made between HE economy and SHE economy. HE economy refers to hyper-expansionist economy and SHE economy refers to sane, humane and ecological economy. The exponents of this theory believe that the elements of a competitive, capitalist market are antagonistic to the principles of sustaining the environment. Therefore they emphasise on a complete transformation of society where there is informal own work being done by people, people working in local contexts, travelling by eco-friendly transportation, growing their own vegetables, etc. It goes along with a decentralised administration and basic markets based on needs of local areas. While this theory is the more appealing one, it is also idealistic and seems difficult to actually put into practice. However the principles of the theory are worthy of consideration especially in the wake of the fast depletion and devastation of the natural resources of the earth due to fast-paced development and establishment of multi-national industries everywhere in the world without consideration of environmental concerns and ethics.

These two theories follow certain arguments derived from two basic notions of environmentalism. The first is that of anthropocentrism. Strong versions of anthropocentrism say that any human preference is to take precedence over any non-human interest. Milder versions vary from considering non-human interests while prioritising human interests to making human beings the basis for considering the value of all other things - human or otherwise. Anthropocentrism influences the ideas of the theorists of maximum sustainable society.

The second notion is that of ecocentrism. Strong versions of ecocentrism say that the protection of nature or the natural environment should be given precedence over human interests. Milder versions gives importance to sentient beings like animals, trees, plants over mountains, rivers, oceans, etc. to one that privileges animals and humans over trees, plants, mountains, etc. Ecocentrism influences the idea of those who believe in the theory of minimum sustainable society.

While viewing the crucial link between population and sustainable development, you need to keep in mind these debates. The sustaining of the earth’s resources as well as the human population which depends upon it cannot be considered separately. A considered view needs to be developed in order to be able to critically contribute to such issues.
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Check Your Progress 1

Note:  a) Use the space below for your answer.
      b) Compare your answers with those given at the end of the unit.

1) Why is it important to understand the nature of civil society groups and movements in order to develop a comprehensive awareness on population and sustainable development?

.................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................

2) What are the problems with the doomsday predictions made in writings of Paul Elhrich and others?

.................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................

3) What are the two main theories of sustainable development? Which do you agree with and why?

.................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................

3.2 CONCEPT AND MEANING OF CIVIL SOCIETY

The idea of civil society is an old one. It has undergone many changes in terms of its meanings. In recent times Neera Chandhoke defines it as “The public sphere where individuals come together for various purposes both for their self-interest and for the reproduction of an entity called society...it is a sphere which is public because it is formally accessible to all, and in principle all are allowed entry into this sphere as the bearer of rights.” In David Held’s words “Civil society is made up of areas of social life...the domestic world, the economic sphere, cultural activities and political interaction...which are organised by private society or voluntary arrangements between individuals and groups outside the direct control of the state.” Edmund Burke called them “little platoons”. They may thus be said to consist of all those institutions that are separate from the state and government and organised by individuals for their private interests.

The development of the idea of civil society in western society has undergone three stages since its advent. The first was the development of the idea in the writings of the English philosopher John Locke in the seventeenth century. The second is in the writings of Adam Smith and others on the commercial society and the third, in the writings of Karl Marx and Gramsci.

The contemporary understanding of civil society is drawn from the liberal understanding of individual rights. Alexis de Tocqueville developed a society-
centred view of civil society, while maintaining a distinction between the civil society and state. He introduced the idea of the associations within the civil society. He distinguished between political society and civil society. He defined political society and state as institutions concerned with the matters of government and power and civil society as the private relationship between the citizens and their non-political associations. He believed that without active participation of people in such civil associations as well as in the relevant political organisations democratic functioning is not possible. He argued that the voluntary associations contribute to the effectiveness and stability of democratic government. Hannah Arendt believes that participation in the associations of civil society helps the individual from selfish pursuit and instils in her the virtue of public spirit and co-operation. Habermas believes civil society is important for the successful implementation of public policy. Partnership between the state and civil society can help to alleviate the gap between policy formulation and implementation.

Civil society thus may be seen to be performing following functions:
1) It limits and controls state power and improves and complements the state by enhancing its democratic legitimacy and effectiveness.
2) It generates a wide range of cross-cutting interests thereby reducing political polarity.
3) It helps to achieve economic and other forms of reforms and promotes democratic culture in society.
4) It develops forms of conflict mediation and resolution.
5) It strengthens community initiative thus reducing burden on the state.

3.2.1 Civil Society and State

Though civil society is distinct from the state, it is linked to state power. The term civil society is of course highly disputed as a category, and certainly has not enjoyed the sustained and focused analytic attention of the market or the state. To make sense of the effects that civil society can have on developmental trajectories first requires a clear theoretical understanding of what civil society is, what its boundaries are, and most importantly, how civil society is differentiated from other domains of social action, most notably the state, market and community.

Following the most recent developments in theory and research on civil society, civil society can be regarded as the full range of voluntary associations and movements that operate outside the market, the state and primary affiliations, and that specifically orient themselves to shaping the public sphere. This would include social movements, independent unions, advocacy groups, and autonomous non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and community-based organizations. From a sociological perspective, actors in civil society rely primarily on “social (as opposed to legal/bureaucratic or market) modes of mediation among people [organizing collective action] through language, norms, shared purposes, and agreements”. (Habermas, 1996) This civic or communicative mode of action is as such distinct from the pursuit of political power, profits or the reproduction of primary ties and identities that characterize social action in the state, market and community. At the heart of any conception
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of civil society is the notion that citizens might be able to interact, deliberate and coordinate with each other based on their capacity to reason. This idea needs to be developed to make the link with democracy and development.

As political theorists from Aristotle to John Elster have argued, civil society provides the normative basis for legitimating democratic rule. There is now a rich and diverse literature that overlaps with normative democratic theory in making the assertion that the mode of action specific to civil society can be distinguished from state. If civil society is considered in terms of how it might contribute to enhancing deliberation in democratic life, then it becomes essential to informing our thinking about development. Deliberation is at the centre of Sen’s argument for reconceptualising development as the pursuit of freedom.

Moving beyond utilitarian conceptions of development, Sen (1999) argues that development is about expanding the capabilities of persons “to lead the kind of lives they value - and have reason to value”. Sen’s argument begins with a refutation of a powerful line of thinking in economics that argues that it is impossible to make ‘social choices’, a view that presumes that preferences are given and leads to emphasizing aggregative logics of decision-making. Sen makes the counter-point that preferences can and should be formed through public deliberation. “Public debates and discussions, permitted by political freedoms and civil rights, can also play a major part in the formation of values. Indeed, even the identification of needs cannot but be influenced by the nature of public participation and dialogue. Not only is the force of public discussion one of the correlates of democracy…but its cultivation can also make democracy itself function better…”

But deliberation can only be effective if all citizens enjoy the basic capabilities required to fully engage in political, social and economic life. Classical and contemporary theories of democracy take for granted the decisional autonomy of individuals as the foundation of democratic life. All citizens are presumed to have the basic rights and the capacity to exercise free will, associate as they chose and vote for what they prefer. This capacity of rights-bearing citizens to associate, deliberate and form preferences in turn produces the norms that underwrite the legitimacy of democratic political authority. But as Somers (1993) has argued, this view conflates the status of citizenship (a bundle of rights) with the practice of citizenship. Given the highly uneven rates of political participation and influence across social categories that persist in advanced democracies (and especially the United States), the notion of citizenship should always be viewed as contested.

This problem is especially acute in the global South. In the context of developing democracies, where inequalities remain high, and access to rights is often circumscribed by social position or compromised by institutional weaknesses (including the legacies of colonial rule), the problem of associational autonomy is so acute that it brings the very notion of citizenship into question. A high degree of consolidated representative democracy found in southern democracies such as Brazil, India and South Africa should as such not be confused with a high degree of effective citizenship. And in the absence of effective citizenship, the problem of subordinate group collective action becomes acute. According to Heller if we recognize this problem, then we have to understand both the potential of civil society—a space in which all citizens can freely associate and participate equally—and the reality of existing civil society.
Under what conditions then does civil society contribute to democracy and to more inclusive forms of development? Given how often the idea of civil society leads to a conflation of the normative with the empirical, a disclaimer is essential here that there is nothing about associational life that is inherently democratizing.

First, in an established constitutional democracy, the basis of legitimacy for all civil society groups is the pursuit of rights. Of course, rights can be selectively or differentially claimed, and can as such reinforce existing inequalities. According to Heller, given that the foundational right is the ‘right to have rights’ (a point made by theorists such as Somers and Arendt, but also brandished by Brazilian social movements), exclusionary claims to rights are hard to defend as legitimate in the public sphere.

Second, according to him, civil society does have a bias towards the subordinate, or better yet against domination. A functioning civil society is one that enjoys and defends associational freedoms. While not all groups are equally positioned to take advantage of such freedoms, the one comparative advantage that subordinate groups do have is the possibility of collective action, a possibility enhanced by a more open civil society. This point is related to the first. The history of civil society struggles that have advanced democratization and social rights can be interpreted as a process of redeeming the unredeemed claims of democratic-constitutional societies, a process that has relied critically on subordinate group collective action. The transformative movements of the 20th century—labour, women, civil and indigenous rights—all had in common demands to expand and deepen rights.

Of course, not all movements have taken the path of expanding civil society. What kind of path movements emerging in the spaces of associational life follow depends on institutional context, economic conditions, and relations to the state and other societal actors. A historical perspective underscores the affinity between social movements and the ideal of political equality that animates democracy. Charles Tilly, the most influential scholar of social movements, argues that while some press particularistic claims, they nonetheless expand possibilities for broader claim-making by excluded groups: “Social movements assert popular sovereignty […] the stress on popular consent fundamentally challenges divine right to kingship, traditional inheritance of rule, warlord control and aristocratic predominance. Even in systems of representative government […] social movements pose a crucial question: do sovereignty and its accumulated wisdom lie in the legislature or in the people it claims to represent?”

It is important Heller stresses that if social movements and civil society have played a critical role in promoting democracy, understanding of their transformative effects should not be limited to questions of political inclusion. The recent revival of interest in civil society came in the aftermath of democratic movements in Eastern Europe. In resisting authoritarianism, these movements naturally emphasized civil and political rights. This lent powerful support to liberal conceptions of civil society that emphasized individual rights and cast civil society in opposition to the state. This liberal conception in turn came to inform ‘democracy promotion’ efforts of Western governments and multilateral institutions that accordingly focused on supporting civic and political rights, as well as economic freedoms of contract and property.

In contrast, civil society-driven democratization in Latin America and South Africa, and a range of transnational social movements that have challenged.
the terms of economic globalization, has brought questions of social and economic justice to the forefront. This is reflected in the most recent academic treatments of civil society, which have explicitly problematised the relationship between civil society and markets, and in doing so, have gone beyond the conventional liberal focus on civil and political rights to bring social rights back in. This distinguishes between what Kaldor has labelled ‘neo-liberal’ conceptions of civil society from what she calls ‘activist’ conceptions. In the neo-liberal vision, civil society is defined as a competitive, voluntary sphere whose primary function is to keep the state in check and even to substitute for the state.

According to Heller, state and civil society thus exist in a zero-sum relationship. Both perspectives presuppose the rule of law and protection of basic individual rights of citizens. There are two senses in which this view explicitly differentiates civil society from the market, and can be linked to demands for social rights. First, if communicative power is the defining resource and mode of action of civil society, it follows that expanding civil society necessarily means preserving it from the intrusions of state power (as in the liberal view) but also from money. Indeed, all civil society organizations, running the full gamut of universities, communications media, advocacy groups and NGOs, work hard to present themselves as independent of state power and money. Civil society actors who seek to have influence can only do so in the public sphere, and their standing there depends on the recognition that they are motivated by a concern for the public interest. Of course, all civil society organizations need resources, which mean money, but their legitimacy rests on articulating and pursuing goals that are not driven by the pursuit of economic. The rise of Hindu nationalism in India (which is by definition antithetical to secular plural democracy) is only the most recent and dramatic example of how associational practices can be breeding grounds for antidemocratic ideologies.

Check Your Progress 2

Note:  a) Use the space below for your answer.
       b) Compare your answers with those given at the end of the unit.

1) How is the state distinct from the civil society?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

2) Critically examine the role and significance of civil society/movements to the democratic functioning of the state?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
The legitimacy of civil society groups and movements is based on their pursuit of rights for people. India has a history of an active engagement of civil society groups and movement with the state. This engagement can be categorised into four types: reformist, confrontationist, cooperative and collaborationist. While some groups and movements may confine themselves to a particular type of engagement, others can be said to be involved in all the four types. According to Gadgil and Guha (1994) the major environmental movements were associated with conflict over forest resources and the others with the issue of water resources. These movements have emerged from the Himalayan region of Uttar Pradesh to the tropical forests of Kerala and from Gujarat to Tripura in response to projects that threaten to dislocate people and to affect their basic human rights to land, water ecological stability. They share certain unifying principles of democratic values and decentralised decision-making processes. They have been able to define a model of development to replace the current resource-intensive one that has created ecological devastation. They have been able to initiate a struggle for safeguarding the interests of the poor and marginalised, among whom are women, tribal groups and peasants.

Among the main environmental movements are Chipko Andolan and Save the Bhagirathi and Stop Tehri project committee in Uttar Pradesh; Save the Narmada (Narmada Bachao Andolan) in Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat; tribal people in Niyamgiri hills of Odisha, the Appiko Movement in the Western Ghats, groups opposing the Kaiga nuclear power plant in Karnataka; the campaign against the Silent Valley project; the Rural Women’s Advancement Society (Gramin Mahila Shramik Unnayam Samiti) formed to reclaim waste land in Bankura district and the opposition to the Gumti Dam in Tripura. There are local movements against deforestation, water-logging, salinisation and desertification in the command areas of dams on the Kosi, Gandak and Tungabhadra rivers and in the canal-irrigated areas of Punjab and Haryana. A movement in the small fishing communities against ecological destruction exists along the coasts of India.

The 1980s saw the debate on environment move from just deforestation to the larger issues of depletion of natural resources. In the wake of reckless deforestation, a unique movement emerged which came to be popularly known as Chipko Movement. Chipko movement in the Garhwal Himalayas, led by Chandni Prasad Bhatt and Sunderlal Bahuguna was a people’s revolt against mindless deforestation. And the method was novel. They did it by hugging trees when woodmen came to axe them. The Silent Valley hydroelectric project was to dam the Kunthipuzha River, in Kerala submerging the entire biosphere reserve and destroying its four-million-year-old rainforests. In 1980, the M.G.K. Menon Committee set up to review the project, came out with a recommendation to scrap it. With 40 per cent of its so-called surplus power being supplied to other parts and many villages of Kerala waiting to be electrified, this grassroots movement became the bedrock of Indian environmental activism.

The Jungle Bachao Andolan, began in Bihar and later spread to states like Jharkhand and Odisha. The tribals of Singhbhum district of Bihar started a protest when the government decided to replace the natural Sal forests with
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highly-priced teak, a move that was termed “a greed game, political populism.” An ecofeminist movement, led by Vandana Shiva, reinstated a farming system centred on engaging women, changing the current system. She founded Navdanya in 1982, an organisation promoting biodiversity conservation and organic farming. The organisation has not only helped create markets for farmers, but also promoted quality food for consumers, connecting the seed to the cooked food. Narmada Bachao Andolan announced the arrival of the India Greens, protesting against destructive development. One of the largest and most successful environmental campaigns, Narmada Bachao Andolan, began in 1985 with a wide developmental agenda, questioning the very rationale of large dam projects in India. This movement, largely led by Medha Patkar, has become the epitome of environmental movements in India.

The recent struggles in Odisha against bauxite mining in tribal areas have added a new chapter in environmental activism in the country. Deep in the jungles of the Niyamgiri Hills in south-western Odisha, the Dongria Kondh tribe have fought a persistent and non-violent struggle against London-based mining company Vedanta that wants to mine their sacred hill, the Niyam Dongar, for 72 million tonnes of bauxite. In April 2013, the Supreme Court granted the tribals the right to decide if the mining would affect their cultural and religious rights. The Odisha government, however, chose only 12 villages that were considered likely to be affected by the mining. Over the last two months, gram sabhas were held at villages in the Rayagada and Kalahandi districts amidst heavy police and paramilitary presence. The Niyamgiri Suraksha Samiti, a local resistance group, stated that over 112 villages would be affected if the mining went ahead and not just twelve as stated by the state government. Relentless rains did not stop the Dongria Kondh and other villagers from walking several kilometres through dense forests to show support and solidarity at all the gram sabhas. In a landslide victory, each and every member of all twelve villages voted unanimously against Vedanta and successfully claimed the entire Niyamgiri hill range as their territorial right.

Check Your Progress 3

Note:  a) Use the space below for your answer.
     b) Compare your answers with those given at the end of the unit.

1) Which are the various civil society groups/ movements associated with Environmental issues in India?

................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................

2) Do you know of other Environmental Movements in India? What are the issues they have raised?

................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................
................................................................................................................
3.4 SIGNIFICANCE AND RELEVANCE

The main aspect of these civil society movements is their integrative social effect on the regions where they are active. They cut across social and cultural cleavages that might have expected to be divisive. They unite people who differ by sex, age, religion, ethnicity, caste, class and region by stressing shared interests in saving the environment. Women have been prominent as leaders and participants. The reason for this is the high status of women in the Himalayan area and among the tribal groups of the Narmada valley and Niyamgiri hills, including unusual freedom of action and movement that accompany their role in the environmental movement. The women are accustomed to responsibility and leadership for community survival. Their work involves them directly and daily with forests and natural resources. They are alert to environmental changes, and they respond readily and knowledgeable to the need to protect the environment. The integrative effects are also felt at the national level by providing a prototype of method and organisation for similar problems elsewhere in India.

According to Gadgil and Guha (1994), environmental movements or groups in India have their origins in conflicts between competing groups - typically peasants and industry – over productive resources. It is a more thorough-going critique both of consumerism and of uncontrolled economic development. Clearly the civil society groups and movements of India bring to the fore the conflict between the agendas of the rich and poor countries which had surfaced briefly at the Rio Conference in June 1992. They raise questions about subsistence and survival which is related to unbridled economic development rather than about population growth. The concerns about population growth are raised by the developed world to fix the blame on the developing and underdeveloped countries. Clearly this argument has been rejected stock and barrel by the Indian civil society groups and movements. Through their engagement and sustained activities they have clearly established the complex nature of environmental degradation here. They have raised major questions about the orientation of economic planning in India, its in-built biases in favour of the commercial – industrial sector, and its neglect of ecological considerations.

Gadgil and Guha (1994) list three alternatives suggested by the civil society groups and movements in order to mitigate these conflicts. The first, which they term as Crusading Gandhian, relies heavily on a moral/religious idiom in its rejection of the modern way of life, a return to pre-colonial (and pre-capitalist) village society, which they uphold as the exemplar of social and ecological harmony. The second, they term as Ecological Marxists, who are hostile to traditions and pay relatively greater emphasis on confrontational movements. In between these two extremes lies a third tendency, which may be termed as Appropriate Technology. It strives for a working synthesis of agriculture and Industry, big and small units, and Western and Eastern (or modern and traditional) technological traditions. There are overlaps and learnings between these three approaches. The three approaches they are also dismissive of arguments which claim that it is population growth which leads to environmental degradation. Irrespective of the vigorous debates between them, they agree the real culprit is unbridled and inessential focus on economic growth and development at the cost of basic human rights of survival and sustenance.
Check Your Progress 4

Note:  
(a) Use the space below for your answer.  
(b) Compare your answers with those given at the end of the unit.

1) Who are the leaders of these Movements/ civil society groups and why?

.................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................

2) Critically examine the suggested alternatives provided by the Environmental Movements?

.................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................

3) What is the unifying factor of the suggested alternative? Do you agree with it and why?

.................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................

3.5 LET US SUM UP

Issues of sustainability, development and population have been engaging the attention of civil society groups and movements. They engage themselves with the question of unbridled expansionist economic development versus sustainable development which gives more importance to civil society which is dependent and close to nature. Theorists have mainly converged themselves around two predominant theories to address this issue. The debate converges itself around the concept of maximum sustainable society which advocates maximum usage of earth’s resources while respecting environmental protection and minimum sustainable society which emphasises on curbing capitalist market and promotes frugal life-style and self reliance by people.

Civil society, which operates outside the spheres of state and market, limits and controls state power and improves and complements the state by enhancing its democratic legitimacy and effectiveness. It helps to achieve economic and other forms of reforms and promotes democratic culture in society. Civil society and movements have projected the views of people in general and of marginalised groups like tribals and women in particular on development and population issues. In India major movements have centred around forest and water issues. They have collectively established that it is not the population growth which has led to environmental degradation, but the real culprit is unbridled and inessential focus on economic growth and development at the cost of basic human rights of survival and sustenance.
3.6 KEY WORDS

Civil Society : Civil society can be regarded as the full range of voluntary associations and movements that operate outside the market, the state and primary affiliations, and that specifically orient themselves to shaping the public sphere. In the process they strengthen democracy.

Fundamental Rights : Fundamental rights is a charter of rights contained in the Constitution of India.

3.7 REFERENCES AND SUGGESTED READINGS


3.8 ANSWERS AND CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Check Your Progress Exercise 1

1) Your answer must include the following points:
   - Narmada Bachao Andolan, Chipko movement, etc.
   - Engagement of civil society movements on various issues like forest and water resources
   - Feminists and ecologists on issues of sustainable development and perils of unbridled development.

2) Your answer must include the following points:
   - The linkage between overpopulation and mass production
   - Setting up of multi-national corporations.

3) Your answer must include the following points:
   - The two theories regarding sustainable development, viz. maximum sustainable society and minimum sustainable society
   - The notions of anthropocentrism and egocentrism.
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Check Your Progress Exercise 2
1) Your answer must include the following points:
   - Views of David Held, Alexis de Tocqueville and Habermas.
2) Your answer must include the following points:
   - Views of Amartya Sen equating development with expanding the capabilities of persons
   - Views of Somers with respect to uneven political participation of citizens;
   - Views of Heller regarding civil society’s bias towards the subordinate and against domination
   - Leanings from recent democratic movements in Eastern Europe.

Check Your Progress Exercise 3
1) Your answer must include the following points:
   - Grouping of civil society groups/movements into major areas of concerns such as forest resources, water resources, coastal ecology, etc.
2) Your answer must include the following points:
   - Movement against Kudankalam Nuclear Power Plant in Tamil Nadu
   - Anna Hazare’s movement against corruption in public life
   - Movements for women’s rights etc. and issues raised by them.

Check Your Progress Exercise 4
1) Your answer must include the following points:
   - Name of the leaders of movements such as Chipko movement, Narmada Bachao Andolan, Silent Valley movement, etc.
   - Leaders of Kerala Sastra Sahitya Parishad’s People’s Science Movement
   - Analysis of the reasons behind these leaders leading these movements.
2) Your answer must include the following points:
   - Views of Crusading Gandhians, Ecological Marxists and Appropriate Technology
   - Your analysis of their suggestions whether they provide a real alternative.
3) Your answer must include the following points:
   - The overlap between Crusading Gandhians, Ecological Marxists and Appropriate Technology and their agreement on the real culprit, i.e., unbridled and inessential focus on economic growth;
   - Your reason for agreeing or disagreeing with them.