CONCEPT OF ENVIRONMENTAL POLITICS

Dr. Seema Sambargi
Dr. Purnima Nag
Kul Bhushan Anand

ALEXIS PRESS
JERSEY CITY, USA

CONCEPT OF ENVIRONMENTAL POLITICS

CONCEPT OF ENVIRONMENTAL POLITICS

Dr. Seema Sambargi
Dr. Purnima Nag
Kul Bhushan Anand

ALEXIS PRESS

ALEXIS PRESS

Published by: Alexis Press, LLC, Jersey City, USA
www.alexispress.us

First Published 2022

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Concept of Environmental Politics by *Dr. Seema Sambargi, Dr. Purnima Nag, Kul Bhushan Anand*

ISBN 978-1-64532-359-4

CONTENTS

Chapter 1. Concept of Environmental Philosophy 1
— *Dr. Seema Sambargi*

Chapter 2. Moral Elongationism and Animal Liberation Theory 9
— *Dr. Anita Walia*

Chapter 3. Central Ideas of Ecologism 19
— *Dr. Shruthi K Bekal*

Chapter 4. Importance of Green Politics in Democratic 26
— *Mr. R. Thanga Kumar*

Chapter 5. Political Traditions and Environmental Problem 35
— *Ms. Sunitha B K*

Chapter 6. Green Parties: A New Political Force on the Rise 45
— *Mr. Shankar Prasad S*

Chapter 7. Structure of Political Opportunity and the Success of the Green Party 54
— *Dr. Roopa Traisa*

Chapter 8. Environmental Politics and Partisanship 64
— *Ms. Baisakhi Debnath*

Chapter 9. A Study on Traditional Parties' 'Greening' 72
— *Dr. Sahana B S*

Chapter 10. Explicitly Defining Party Politics 81
— *Dr. Umakanth.S*

Chapter 11. A Study on Ecological Organizations 88
— *Dr M.Govindaraj*

Chapter 12. A Study on Grassroots Environmentalism's Revival 96
— *Dr.Saurabh Srivastava*

Chapter 13. A Study on Environmental Movement 104
— *Kul Bhushan Anand*

Chapter 14. Environmental Issues as A Policy 110
— *Shri Bhagwan*

Chapter 15. A Study on Political Stumbling Blocks to Change 117
— *Amit Verma*

Chapter 16. Structure of an Advocacy Alliance 126
— *Sourabh Batar*

Chapter 17. Modernizing the Environment and Pursuing Sustainable Development 134
— *Sunil Kumar*

Chapter 18. The Fundamentals of Sustainable Development 140
— *Jaivindra Singh*

Chapter 19. Environmental Modernization in Action 148
— *Kul Bhushan Anand*

Chapter 20. Factors Behind the Changing Weather 156
— Dr. Purnima Nag

Chapter 21. The Environment, Commerce, and Globalization 165
— *Dr. Deepankar Sharma*

Chapter 22. Agreement on Free Trade in North America 172
— *Dr. Manisha Sharma*
Chapter 23. Using Administrative Methods to Integrate 181
— *Dr. Purnima Nag*
Chapter 24. A Study on Ideas for a Greener Nation 189
— *Dr. Deepankar Sharma*
Chapter 25. Implementation Strategies and Policy Tools 196
— *Dr. Purnima Nag*

CHAPTER 1

CONCEPT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PHILOSOPHY

Dr. Seema Sambargi, Professor, Department of Management,
JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email Id-dr.seema_sambargi@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

A subfield of philosophy called environmental philosophy examines how people and nature interact. The ethical and philosophical ramifications of human behavior on the environment are discussed, along with how we might balance our choices with the preservation of the natural world.A wide variety of subjects are covered by environmental philosophy, such as the inherent worth of nature, the place of people in the environment, the morality of environmental policy, and the effects of technology on the natural world. It provides a framework for comprehending our connection with nature by drawing from a variety of philosophical traditions, including ethics, ontology, and epistemology.The understanding that people are not distinct from nature but rather an integral part of it is at the heart of environmental philosophy.

KEYWORDS:

Environmental, Ethical, Moral, Nature, Philosophy.

INTRODUCTION

The philosophy of the environment has a significant normative component. The development of a sound environmental ethical theory to support green activism is the major goal of many prominent contributors who are also ardent campaigners. The existence of a distinct line separating people from nature is called into question by radical viewpoints like deep ecology, which may even dethrone humans from their position at the top of the ethical food chain. If ecologism is a distinct ideology, then its most radical and distinctive aspect is likely how the interaction between humans and nature is conceptualized[1], [2].

The main arguments in environmental philosophy are presented in this chapter. It examines whether a green political philosophy can be developed without an environmental ethic, which accords moral significance and worth to the natural world. Defining three distinct categories of value, describing the anthropocentric-environmental paradigm, and outlining the scope of environmental philosophy are the first steps in establishingecocentric dichotomy and presenting a straightforward taxonomy of the major environmental philosophy approaches. The critical investigation of environmental theories of value under the two major headings of holism and moral extensionism forms the bulk of this chapter[3], [4]. The quest for a wholly non-anthropocentric worldview may be futile, according to the last part. Ecologism is, and possibly should be, influenced by a variety of value theories - a sort of value eclecticism - since each can usefully contribute to the creation of an ethical framework to direct how people should behave towards the environment.

Setting Up a Stakeout

Variety Of Values

Value is a crucial idea in environmental philosophy. Unfortunately, there are many distinct types of value as well as a lack of uniformity in the use of important terminology like instrumental, inherent, and intrinsic value. Key authors employ these phrases differently, and

the differences between them are up for debate. These concepts are not mutually incompatible; something having value in one sense does not exclude it from having value in another.

The gap between anthropocentrism and ecocentrism

Why is the notion of value important in environmental philosophy? A fundamental element of green thinking is the idea that human hubris towards nature, which justifies its exploitation to serve human needs, is to blame for the present ecological disaster. Anthropocentrism, the idea that moral principles only apply to people and that human needs and interests are of the highest, possibly exclusive, significanceputting people at the centre of the universe, apart from nature, and endowed with special valuesis at the root of human arrogance towards nature. According to anthropocentrism, only people have inherent worth. This belief is often supported by the fact that only people have the ability to feel pleasure and suffering or to reason. The remaining parts of nature only have instrumental value; they are valuable and morally deserving of respect when they improve human well-being.

The koala bear, the brown mouse, the field of tulips, or the tract of wilderness are all examples of non-human nature that serve as a "storehouse of resources" for the fulfilment of human objectives. Therefore, an anthropocentric argument for environmental protection will be made in terms of the potential effects that pollution or resource depletion may have on human interests. Because lead is bad for human health, it is taken out of fuel, and fishing grounds are preserved because they are a crucial source of food and income. Despite the fact that there are many strong instrumental reasons in favour of environmental protection, many environmentalists feel that these arguments are not strong enough to establish a strong environmental ethic. For instance, anthropocentric arguments often shift the burden of proof on people who desire to conserve the environment rather than those who wish to meddle in nature.

The effort to create a non-anthropocentric or ecocentric morality has been one of the main concerns in environmental ethics. The 'human chauvinism' of anthropocentrism is rejected by ecocentrism, which contends that non-human creatures also have inherent worth. According to the author, there are several non-human entities or categories that have worth, including inanimate elements like rivers and mountains as well as animals, trees, plants, and other non-sentient living things. The idea that demonstrating that part or all of nature has inherent worth may prove to be a potent tool for safeguarding the environment is a common thread connecting all ecocentric arguments.

An embrace of a non-anthropocentric worldview is often seen as the litmus test for being green and what sets ecologism apart from other political ideologies. The anthropocentric-ecocentric dualism is a crucial conceptual contrast in environmental philosophy. The effort to make a clear conceptual boundary between anthropocentrism and ecocentrism, however, will be demonstrated to be at best incorrect and at worst unworkable in the paragraphs that follow. For the time being, it is sufficient to highlight that this straightforward two-fold typology falls short of capturing the environmental philosophy's deep richness and variety. The distinction between a middle ground of environmental care, situated halfway between the shallow and deep poles of environmental ethics, has proven useful to many writers.

DISCUSSION

Building a green, or environmental, theory of value that considers the environment as a whole rather than simply specific portions has been a key focus in environmental ethics. According to Goodin, a "theory of value" is a "theory of the Good." ..[which] ought to explain to us what

should be valued and why. It ought to provide a set of guidelines, such as a code of conduct, that will direct how we should act towards the environment. However, this ethical endeavour depends on a variety of moral philosophy notions, which pose a number of concerns that should be brought up here because they will continue to come up in the debate that follows[5].

What are the repercussions of demonstrating that nature, or components of nature, have intrinsic or inherent worth first? Others may argue that it is meaningless since just because something has worth, it does not follow that one has a moral obligation to treat it in a certain manner. Greens believe that this will push us to modify how we interact with the natural world. These various interpretations point to two separate problems that are often combined in the literature: one is a philosophical one about the sort of worth inherent in nature, and the other is a more political one regarding how to persuade people to act on their perception of such value. Although it may be difficult to distinguish between the two issues, this chapter concentrates on the first one. However, the second one will also be covered, particularly in the conclusion.

Second, some authors contend that if anything has intrinsic or inherent worth, such as animals, then they also have interests or, even more strongly, that they have some rights. They then make an attempt to demonstrate how having interests or rights imposes requirements or duties on how we should treat animals. However, there is a propensity for some significant spikes in this area. Therefore, it is crucial to make a distinction between the holding of interests or rights and the presence of obligations when evaluating such claims. It's not always my responsibility to make sure that an animal can thrive, even if it does have an interest in having a full life. Similar to this, I could agree that chimpanzees have the right to life, but disagree that I have a duty to do all in my ability to defend them. On the other hand, I could concede that I have obligations to the chimpanzee even though I disagree with its right to life. In other words, there isn't always a symmetry between rights and obligations.

In general, it's necessary to be mindful that terminology like interests, rights, and obligations contain a lot of conceptual baggage from moral philosophy, without evaluating the veracity of assertions regarding the interests or rights of animals. Political philosophers often make the case, for instance, that only beings capable of entering into contracts qualify as moral agents with related obligations. This contractarian viewpoint contends that as animals cannot perform duties or fulfil obligations, they are unable to possess rights. Of course, there are arguments against this interpretation. For instance, why do we provide rights to infants or the elderly, who are incapable of carrying out such obligations or responsibilities? The straightforward argument being made here is that the core of environmental ethics is the discussion of whether it is ethical and accurate to apply this form of human moral language to the non-human world.

In conclusion, this section has shown that greens reject the anthropocentric foundation of the majority of conventional ethical and political thought. They contend that nature should also be given importance in addition to people. We must now determine what type of value may be placed on nature, as well as what aspects of it are valuable and why. In environmental ethics, 'holism' and'moral extensionism' are the two most common approaches, and both are critically explored in the sections that follow.

Holistic viewpoints

The most extreme viewpoints embrace a comprehensive explanation of the interrelationship between humans and environment, including all ecocentric viewpoints, particularly deep ecology, and the group of middle viewpoints known as "ethical holism." Instead of atomistic

views of nature that concentrate on individual pieces in isolation, holism is concerned with the way the many components of nature interact with one another in ecosystems and the biosphere — the interdependence and reciprocity that make up the 'whole'. According to a holistic perspective of nature, all things are interconnected, the whole is larger than the sum of its parts, processes take precedence over parts, and human and non-human nature are one. In general, holistic theories are ready to expand the bounds of moral consideration much beyond specific human beings by assigning inherent worth to a variety of non-human things and to 'whole' categories, such as species and ecosystems. Both the search for an ethical code of behaviour based on the presence of intrinsic worth in nature and the creation of an ethics based on an altered ecological awareness or "state of being" are activities that holismists participate in. Arne Naess is one of the deep ecology movement's founders, and his writings include both perspectives. His views have influenced the growth of ecocentrism.

The eight-point platform for deep ecology put forward by Naess and Sessions explicitly states that nature has inherent worth: "The flourishing of human and non-human life on Earth has intrinsic value. Non-human living forms have worth regardless of how valuable they may be for certain human objectives. The concept of symbiosis, which holds that every entity has worth because at least one other thing needs it, informs Naess' work. Everything has worth since nothing and no one are completely independent. He also draws an equality principle from the universal idea that everything is interconnected. All forms of life have "the equal right to live and blossom," according to this principle, which Naess refers to as "biocentric egalitarianism."3 Naess makes no attempt to make a scientific case for intrinsic value; rather, he justifies it as a "intuitively clear and obvious value axiom." Naess seems to be providing the foundation for a green theory of value with this first topic, therefore[6].

The second subject in Naess's writings is a philosophical argument about how a deeper identification of the human person with nature might give a justification for fostering a greater ecological awareness, supporting the first premise that nature has intrinsic worth. Instead of adopting a perspective that is somewhat akin to the old Greek concept of Man as part of nature, Naess rejects the Enlightenment idea that people are distinct from nature and that Man is in control of nature. The "relational, total-field image," which Naess prefers, views the "relational self" as having a broader sense of identity based on the perceived continuity between self and nature, accords with this perspective. According to his theory, we might create duties to non-human nature by realising that we are a part of nature and by identifying more strongly with it to the point where the other becomes a part of who we are. As a result, the second theme underlines the need of cultivating a "ecological consciousness" in order to help us solve the ecological catastrophe.Although both concepts were crucial to early ecocentric writing in the 1970s and 1980s, the emphasis has now moved away from the first, "state of being" approach and towards the second. This change is an implied admission that the application of intrinsic value theory may not be appropriate.

The development of a comprehensive theory of value has run across three significant roadblocks. First, a lot of authors express their discomfort with the explicitly intuitive foundation Naess uses to ascribe intrinsic worth to all aspects of the ecosphere, such as mountains, rivers, and civilizations. Callicott, for instance, relies on Hume and Darwin to establish a "bio-empathetic" theory based on the assertion that moral impulses are a byproduct of the evolutionary process. Other holistic theorists have attempted to build a more rigorous case based on scientific grounds. According to a comprehensive view of sociobiology and quantum physics, there is little difference between the individual self and the environment. People would notice that they share interests with non-humans and may subsequently form moral attitudes towards them if they could identify more strongly with

other animals in the biosphere. Since the individual self and nature are interconnected, if the individual self has intrinsic value, then too must nature.

However, these less logical holistic arguments have a tendency to draw just a few, debatable conclusions from recent scientific advancements. Contrary to what the Holists argue, for instance, the study of ecology does not contest the existence of distinctions between the self and environment. I and nature are one, according to its study of individual creatures, which "entails no radically holistic ontology." The more fundamental argument put out by Brennan is that ecosystems don't function in accordance with the ideas of interdependence and holism.

However, it is not that unusual to think that someone can have a purpose to act since they are a part of a larger organisation that might either thrive or fail. Many individuals believe that the success of the group they are a part of, such as their country, neighbourhood, or coworkers, may have some bearing on their own well-being. Membership is the key political issue. Even though holistic arguments are in theory valid, they won't advance environmental causes unless their proponents can make it abundantly evident that a particular person's interests are connected to a broad range of living things.

Second, moral attention is given to complete categories or ecological ideas rather than individual individuals, such as a human person. This is a crucial aspect of holism. According to holistic viewpoints, the whole is larger than the sum of its parts, and intrinsic worth is a component of the whole and should not be valued in isolation. Aldo Leopold's "land ethic" theory, which states that "a thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community," is referenced by Naess and the ethical holists in this context. Large 'wholes' with sufficient organisation and integration, like the biotic community or the ecosphere, have a good of their own and have intrinsic worth. Therefore, inherent meaning in holistic explanations is found in the whole course of life rather than in particular manifestations.

One argument against these claims is that a collective entity, like a species, cannot have intrinsic worth because it lacks interests—at least none that go beyond the sum of those of its individual members. According to Brennan, these wholes are only collections of people rather than actual wholes in their own right. Even if we believe that a species cannot have interests, the idea that having interests is not always a need for having intrinsic worth is highly legitimate in mainstream moral philosophy, even if it is required for the allocation of rights.

Regan claims that the holistic approach to the whole species or biosphere is ultimately "environmental fascism" since it overlooks or suppresses the rights of individual creatures. This critique may be more potent. Eckersley suggests that the idea of "autopoiesis," or self-renewal, which holds that all entities continuously strive to reproduce their own organisational activity and structure, can be used to solve this issue. This concept accords value to both the collective whole and the individual organisms that make it up. However, creating an ethical code of behaviour based on autopoiesis would be far from simple, not the least of which is the fact that the notion that "wholes" have worth would have significant ramifications in any conflict between the interests of the ecosystem and its inhabitants. Imagine, for instance, if it was widely accepted that a decrease in the human population was necessary right away in order to ease the strain on limited resources for the benefit of the biotic community. Therefore, would infanticide be acceptable, or would the rights of particular newborns be preserved at the expense of the interests of the greater biotic community? It would be necessary to have a framework in place to balance the conflicting claims made by wholes and individual portions. Any code of conduct based on holistic

presumptions would face significant challenges due to the lack of a viable solution for these trade-offs.

Thirdly, the allocation of value among morally significant things is possibly the most contentious aspect of all these ethical propositions. In other words, are holders of intrinsic value equal holders of it? The radical idea of "biospherical egalitarianism - in principle" proposed by Naess opposes the "differential imperative," according to which human characteristics are considered as superior to, as opposed to just different from, those of other species. The implication is that people are morally no more significant than koalas, rats, or mosquitoes. Naess used the qualifier "in principle" to get around one apparent argument since "any realistic praxis necessitates some killing, exploitation, and suppression." Nevertheless, the doctrine has continued to spark intense debate, which is not unexpected. How much murder, abuse, and repression is permitted? by whom? Who is it? for what reasons? Naess attempted to explain his viewpoint in response to a number of vicious criticisms of the principle's impracticability:

However, this limitation strips the concept of its radicalism; it now just serves as a guideline to aid in the resolution of conflicts between the demands of various species. 'You must not inflict undue suffering upon other living creatures,' for instance; but what constitutes needless suffering? Fox asserts in support of Naess that he is not engaged in formulating moral "oughts," but rather is only making "a statement of non-anthropocentrism." However, there are still more issues with Naess' reformulation.It seems that Naess has the opinion that we have a higher obligation to people who are near to us than to someone or something far. If this is the case, it seems somewhat odd that a holistic thinker would choose to concentrate on a single 'local' ecosphere rather than the whole globe. There is also a bigger problem here with how those holistic views inspired by the "land ethic" favour the "community" in some manner. The implication appears to be that since we are all a part of the same "whole," the community has inherent worth. As was previously demonstrated, acknowledging our interconnectedness with the natural world does not necessitate accepting that there is a moral relationship between us and it. On the other hand, we often acknowledge duties to individuals with whom we do not have a feeling of interdependence or community, such as the victims of the Sudanese famine. As a result of the main commitments we may have to members of our own community, the community argument may construct hurdles that hinder us from fulfilling our obligations to the disadvantaged in other nations. As a result, community could be too restrictive as well as too inclusive to serve as the foundation for an ethical code[7].

The reformulated concept also implies that Naess prioritises people above non-humans, which would put him squarely in the anthropocentric camp. The majority of other holists take a similar stance. They often create value-holder hierarchies, in which humans, higher mammals, animals, plants, and so forth always seem to be at the top. For instance, Mathews defines the standard for assessing precedence in conflicting moral claims as "the degree of power of self-maintenance," a quality that humans have in spades. Or, to put it another way, it appears that ecocentric authors ultimately rely on justifications that give people preference when resolving conflicts between values. Alternately, they completely sidestep the difficulty of offering moral guidelines.

In conclusion, Naess only asserts that nature has inherent worth; many authors would flatly refute this assertion. The "scientific" foundations for nature's inherent worth are likewise hotly debated. Even if we grant that there is inherent worth in nature, it is unclear what that entails. When various elements of nature clash, holistic arguments provide little help in terms of how to address problems. Therefore, in reality, the assertion that nature has inherent worth is meaningless since it does not instruct us on how to treat the environment.

It is not surprising, therefore, that deep ecologists have devoted more time to exploring the second major subject in Naess's writing: the idea of the "relational self." One of the most advanced proponents of this strategy, which expressly opposes intrinsic value theory, is Warwick Fox, with his idea of "transpersonal ecology." In order to create "as expansive a sense of self as possible," Fox, whose work exhibits psychological influences, contends that the concept of "self" should be expanded beyond the egoistic, biographical, or personal sense of self. We should try to sympathise with others, especially with animals, plants, and larger nature, rather than seeing ourselves as atomistically distinct from everyone and everything. People should make an effort to live with a feeling of identification with other creatures because moral encouragement to treat others with kindness is unnecessary if one's sense of self can include other beings. Therefore, the normative issue of how individuals could be inspired to achieve a greater level of ecological awareness is the main emphasis of this "state of being" approach.

Fox favours a "experiential invitation" to people to "experience our oneness with the world, to engage in wider identification, and move towards a more expansive sense of self" rather than issuing moral commands.9 He thinks that expressing moral "oughts" only serves to support the notion of an atomistic volitional self. However, Fox acknowledges that this rejection of moral rules may be a bit deceptive and that it also partially reflects the deep ecologists' inability to produce a convincing argument for intrinsic worth, without which moral commands may lack normative weight. Fox decided to sidestep the problem by saying that "they try to convert us through their example and experience, rather than convincing us through logic and morals." In real life, people can require a set of rules to guide them as they choose between several options. Unavoidably, human behaviour involves interference with the natural environment, yet growing our ability to identify with it won't automatically solve complex conflicts of interest. An growth in ecological awareness, on the other hand, would be more likely to make conflicts more varied and complicated, which would make some kind of ethical rule of behaviour more necessary.

Since the central focus of transpersonal ecology is on the "individual," who can only fully realise their potential by choosing to live in harmony with nature, there may also be a paradox at its core. Holism, on the other hand, emphasises the value of whole systems and species, which logically implies that the autonomous individual is downplayed or even denied. This pursuit of "self-realization" appears to have a very anthropocentric bent. The psychological terminology and focus on the experienced give the appearance that personal change is the ultimate objective, even if Fox is actually looking for a better ecological definition of the self as a way to increase ecological awareness. Transpersonal ecology, therefore, seems more like a type of enlightened self-interest, a critique Fox himself levelled at ethical holists, and is motivated by the idea that people have a stake in and a responsibility to preserve environment because they are one with it[8].

CONCLUSION

This viewpoint opposes the anthropocentric belief that prioritises human needs above all else and instead promotes a holistic strategy that takes into account the health of all living things as well as the ecosystem as a whole.As we deal with urgent environmental challenges like climate change, biodiversity loss, and environmental degradation, the idea of environmental philosophy has grown more and more important in recent years. It gives a framework for comprehending the philosophical and ethical ramifications of these problems as well as suggestions on how to solve them.Overall, environmental philosophy is a crucial field of

study that pushes us to reflect critically on our connection with nature and lays the groundwork for the creation of ethical and sustainable methods for making environmental decisions.

REFERENCES:

[1] M. Lappé, R. Jeffries Hein, and H. Landecker, "Environmental Politics of Reproduction," *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 2019. doi: 10.1146/annurev-Anthro-102218-011346.

[2] B. W. Campbell, F. W. Marrs, T. Böhmelt, B. K. Fosdick, and S. J. Cranmer, "Latent influence networks in global environmental politics," *PLoS One*, 2019, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0213284.

[3] J. Besek, "Invasive uncertainties: environmental change and the politics of limited science," *Environ. Sociol.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/23251042.2019.1624002.

[4] J. A. Lewis and H. Ernstson, "Contesting the coast: Ecosystems as infrastructure in the Mississippi River Delta," *Prog. Plann.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.progress.2017.10.003.

[5] R. Kolarsky, "Reconciling the anthropocentric and non-anthropocentric concepts of the environmental philosophy," *Filosoficky Casopis*. 2000.

[6] H. Neira, L. I. Russo, and B. Á. Subiabre, "Ecocide," *Revista de Filosofia (Chile)*. 2019. doi: 10.4067/S0718-43602019000200127.

[7] E. Brady and J. Prior, "Environmental aesthetics: A synthetic review," *People and Nature*. 2020. doi: 10.1002/pan3.10089.

[8] K. B. Paul, "Beyond technological nihilism: Reinterpreting heidegger in environmental philosophy," *Environ. Ethics*, 2018, doi: 10.5840/enviroethics201739323.

CHAPTER 2

MORAL ELONGATIONISM AND ANIMAL LIBERATION THEORY

Dr. Anita Walia, Assistant Professor, Department of Management,
JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email Id- anita@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

A philosophical doctrine called moral elongationism contends that moral attention should extend to species other than humans, such as non-human animals. This viewpoint is sometimes linked to animal liberation, a movement that supports treating all animals equally and giving them rights based on the premise that they are sentient creatures capable of feeling pain and suffering. The moral imperative of humans to respect the interests and welfare of animals and to acknowledge that they are not only objects or commodities for human use is at the core of the animal liberation thesis. Various aspects of human activity, such as food production, animal experimentation, and entertainment, are affected by this notion. As more individuals become conscious of the moral ramifications of human actions on non-human animals and the environment, moral elongationism and animal liberation philosophy have grown in importance in modern culture. These theories give a framework for comprehending the ethical implications of animal rights and serve as a basis for the creation of moral and long-lasting strategies for human-animal interactions.

KEYWORDS:

Animal Liberation, Environmental, Philosophy, Suffering, Worth.

INTRODUCTION

Fox may not agree with this reading, but it is a fair one of the two underlying principles of holistic approaches: they distinguish between concerns of justification why something is good to do and questions of motivation how to get others to do what is right. Therefore, it may be said that holists are making the following claims: it is morally appropriate to respect nature because it has intrinsic worth; and what would inspire us to respect nature is an awareness of our own relational position, or dependency with nature. Therefore, the self-interest argument only applies at the motivational level and not at the level of justification.

Even while this method may be morally sound, it still runs into some of the issues mentioned above. The intuitive assumption that nature has inherent worth, for instance, is one that this syn- thesis still has to persuade us of. Practically speaking, it is debatable whether the individualism that greens advocate can serve as a foundation for the larger political transformation of society. Holistic viewpoints need to perform better if the goal is to educate and convince a larger human audience of the need to increase their ecological awareness. Writing about deep ecology often uses mystical or spiritual language, which is one of its defining characteristics. Devall recognises that the experiential method is "primarily a spiritual-religious movement," and he expressly calls it out as such, encouraging us to "think like mountains." Some individuals could be drawn to this mysticism, but many will find it to be alienating. Overall, holistic arguments have the potential to have far-reaching effects by elevating non-human organisms above limited human concerns and fostering a new ecological awareness. They stand for a bold initiative that aims to expand the bounds of traditional political philosophy by substituting an ecocentric moral sensibility for anthropocentric moral reasoning. Whether or not we find them effective in this endeavour,

they still highlight the significance of growing an ecological awareness that will motivate us to change our interaction with the natural world. Holism also demonstrates that typical liberal moral conceptions may not always help us when we are thinking about non-human nature. Every effort to create an ethical code of behaviour has failed miserably. However, a clear set of ethical standards may be identified by green political theory to serve as a foundation for laws and policies, which in turn could function as a potent legitimising force to alter attitudes and behaviours towards nature. To create such a code, a separate method is called "moral extensionism."'Moral extensionism' broadens the'moral community' to include non-human beings, particularly animals, on the basis of their presence of a crucial quality like consciousness or the ability to reason. The 'growing circle' of moral concern is often justified on the grounds that sentience, awareness, and reason are capacities that humans and non-humans both possess.

The most well-known instance of moral extensionism is animal liberationism. Given that an animal rights activist expressly bridges the anthropocentric-ecocentric gap by providing moral significance to non-humans, it may seem strange that the animal liberation literature exists at the periphery of green political ideology. However, animal liberationists use moral justifications that distinguish them from ecocentric ideology. This difference may be somewhat accounted for by the movement's genesis. While modern environmentalism has its roots in early conservationist and preservationist organisations, animal liberationism was born out of a different heritage of animal protection. Animal rights activists have galvanised their arguments in favour of vegetarianism and against vivisection, the fur trade, hunting, and contemporary agricultural methods. By using prevalent moral discourses to argue that the moral attention offered to humans should be extended to a variety of non-human species, the animal liberation literature has concentrated on safeguarding specific creatures. The two key theories, Peter Singer and Tom Regan, represent the two primary perspectives within animal liberationism: utilitarianism and animal rights.

Singer makes a utilitarian argument that claims decisions should be made based on the pleasure or suffering, happiness or well-being that results from them. He expands on Jeremy Bentham's comment that we shouldn't question, "Can they reason? " when deciding which species deserve moral concern. nor can they speak, but can they endure pain?' . Sentience, or "the ability to suffer or experience enjoyment or happiness," according to Singer, is "a prerequisite for having interests at all." The ability for beings to enjoy their lives to the fullest is what he often understands by "interests" in this context. Singer contends that without consciousness, humans cannot have interests. A youngster throwing a stone along the street is not hurting its interests since a stone has no emotions and cannot suffer.

A mouse, on the other hand, has a reason to choose not to be handled in this manner since it would suffer. Singer contends that because sentience "is the only defensible boundary of concern for the interests of others," the concept of equal consideration of interests should be extended to all animals that are capable of suffering. Singer draws the boundary between a prawn and an oyster when defining sentience, including a variety of life forms including birds, reptiles, fish, and certain crustaceans.

Regan creates a rights-based strategy for protecting animals. All "subjects-of-a-life"—people with ideas, wants, perception, memory, a sense of the future, an emotional life, and a psychophysical identityare either "moral agents" or "moral patients," all of which have intrinsic worth that is equal. In doing so, he expands the moral community beyond humans to several other creatures. Everyone in that moral community has a right to be treated with respect. Individual non-human moral patients have a fundamental right to be treated with respect and given the opportunity to "live well," just as human moral agents have a

responsibility to uphold the rights of and refrain from harming individual human moral patients.

So there are two key ways that animal liberationists and holism diverge from one another. They may not go as far into nature as the Holists, but they do expand the moral community to include a variety of sentient creatures. Second, rather than focusing on the worth of wholes, Singer and Regan emphasise the intrinsic value found in the capacities and desires of individual beings. The main distinction between the two authors is that Singer utilises utilitarianism whereas Regan bases her argument on legal rights. Both authors' works have been thoroughly reviewed, but for space considerations, the following critical examination will concentrate on Singer's writings, who is perhaps the most well-known animal liberationist.

DISCUSSION

Some of the well-known utilitarian objections of Singer's position are valid. Despite the fact that animal liberation is focused on the wellbeing of specific animals, utilitarianism has the unfortunate flaw of sometimes failing to adequately protect the individual. A consequentialist argument, like utilitarianism, attributes intrinsic worth exclusively to "states of affairs" like pain or pleasure rather than to the people who are really going through the suffering or enjoying the pleasure. In order to increase the net wellbeing of a wider population of people, the maximisation of aggregate joys over pains in a particular population of people may cause serious suffering to one or two people. Thus, utilitarian considerations may provide each particular species a limited rather than an absolute requirement that humans regard its interests [1].

A second reaction is to dismiss sentience as a necessary condition for having rights or being given equal attention and to claim that other qualities, most notably the capacity for thought or language, distinguish humans from other creatures. As a result of their incapacity to reason, many political philosophers contend that animals cannot be the object of moral rights or responsibilities since they cannot engage in reciprocal agreements or discharge moral obligations. Singer acknowledges that animals cannot understand what it means to act as moral agents, but he also notes that this is also true of various human moral patients, such as those who have learning disabilities, the elderly, or infants who are unable to speak or reason, but whose interests are still upheld. According to Singer, these moral patients are given moral significance on an implicit basis based on their propensity for suffering. Therefore, it only seems sense that we give factory-farmed animals and other sentient beings suffering same regard. Singer really denounces as "speciesists" those who would prioritise human pain above the suffering of other species.

Other objections concentrate on the arguments' internal coherence. Should all sentient beings be treated equally, in particular? Rats, cats, and humans may all be treated equally under the theory of equality across species, but few people would be comfortable with the concept that a drowning cat, much alone a rat, would be plucked from a pond before a person. In actuality, Singer contends that although all sentient beings need to be given equal respect, this does not entail that they ought to be treated equally. As a utilitarian, Singer is focused on the overall or aggregate effects in each specific circumstance. He contends, maybe a bit conspicuously, that people usually have a larger capacity for pain than other animals do. For instance, our pain is often made considerably worse by the human capacity to predict impending death, maybe as a result of a terminal disease. Singer predicts that human suffering will consequently be given more weight in the utilitarian equation because of human abilities like self-awareness, intellect, and future planning, which make human life more value than that of species without

such abilities. A human life will nearly always be superior than an animal life in a direct choice. In fact, if the goal of the study is to alleviate suffering for even a tiny number of people, it may be acceptable to use mice in medical trials.

This line of reasoning raises questions about Singer's assertion that all sentient beings have interests. Singer suggests that humans have interests whereas other sentient beings just experience pain by giving more weight to abilities like self-awareness and planning. It implies that a more comprehensive definition, where "having an interest" include plans, goals, and aims, is more appropriate. It may be argued that beings missing certain abilities are creatures without interests. By using this definition, efforts to expand value to several species would be thwarted, but it would not necessarily limit worth to humans. Apes undoubtedly possess some of these better abilities, although other sentient beings, like mice, may not, and as a result, may not have interests. Naturally, this does not mean that people may treat mice whatever they choose. Despite the fact that mice may not have interests or rights, people may nonetheless have a responsibility to treat them with particular respect [2].

What practical advantages for animals result from the sentience thesis, if human misery or well-being is always given greater weight? Quite a bit, in Singer's opinion, since the requirement to stop inflicting "unnecessary" suffering on animals would lead to radical changes in human diets, farming practises, scientific experimentation procedures, hunting, trapping, and the wearing of furs, as well as entertainment industries like circuses, rodeos, and zoos. There would be a significant decrease in the amount of suffering as a result of this radical shift in attitudes and actions.

Traditional ethical theorists have been especially harsh on rights-based arguments, in part because they attempt to apply a liberal ideal that was created to fit the specific characteristics of humans to animals. For instance, Nash argues that giving animals rights is only the obvious next step in liberal ethical philosophy, which historically has gradually expanded its application to slaves, women, people of colour, and other excluded groups. To provide equal treatment to non-white individuals on the basis of their shared humanity is fundamentally different from arguments about our connection with animals, according to critics who argue that this argument is flawed because it draws the wrong comparison between humans and animals. Comparing the fight for animal rights to the civil rights, anti-slavery, and women's liberation movements can even be considered disrespectful. Undoubtedly, the viability of Regan's "subject-in-a-life" criteria as the foundation for giving intrinsic worth to certain creatures rests on how compelling it is.

From a comprehensive standpoint, animal liberationism falls far short of what is required and is unable to stand in place of a comprehensive environmental or ecological morality. The holistic message that solutions to environmental issues should be attentive to the interconnectedness of the natural world is ignored when the emphasis is placed on the individual species. Without a doubt, animal liberationism does not provide a compelling argument in favour of going beyond the scope of a single species. Arguments based on utilitarianism and human rights claim that non-sentient objects like insects, plants, and rocks have no moral standing. Animal liberationists reject the idea that collectives, like species, can have any value by concentrating on the welfare of individual animals. Therefore, losing the last two individuals of a species—perhaps the last two giant pandas—would not have a greater moral impact than losing two stray mongrel dogs. The 'problem of predation,' according to ecocentrics, is a logical, if absurd, argument that humans should intervene in the food chain to convert non-human carnivores like cats into vegetarians or at the very least to lessen the suffering of their prey [3].

It is difficult to see how the presence of intrinsic worth in species or ecosystems, much alone the larger biotic community or ecosphere, could be justified by either the sentience or the "subject-in-a-life" argument. According to Attfield, consciousness is a necessary but not absolute prerequisite for moral deliberation. He contends that in addition to having a good of their own, which he defines as flourishing or having the potential to flourish, plants and trees also have moral standing. However, according to biological theory, a tree cannot have any experience. Furthermore, Attfield tempers the potentially "devastating" ethical consequences of this viewpoint by pointing out that moral standing and moral importance require quite different evaluations and shouldn't be mistaken. Even if an organism has intrinsic worth, it might be very little. In order to prioritise human interests above all other considerations, Attfield creates a hierarchy of dominance based on traits like sensibility, awareness, and cognition, with plants at the bottom of the list. Similar to animal liberationism, this feeble anthropocentric morality may really achieve nothing more than hastening the end of industrial farming and other similarly 'unnecessary' practises in real life.

The argument that a sentient creature's natural habitat, including its nesting places, breeding grounds, and food supplies, must be conserved may be used to make an effective case for environmental conservation. In a similar spirit, Benton develops the rights-based strategy by drawing on both socialist and ecocentric thinking. Benton opposes the disembodied, atomistic individual of liberal philosophy in favour of a larger view of the human in interaction with other individuals and with ecological circumstances, even if he keeps an analytical emphasis on the individual as the holder of rights. He contends that if individual autonomy is given moral priority, then so must the material conditions, most notably environmental protection, that allow for the exercise of that autonomy. However, at its core, this argument appears to be qualitatively similar to other instrumental anthropocentric arguments in favour of environmental protection.

But ecocentrics often reject arguments for animal liberty too quickly. Environmental ethics have unquestionably benefited from utilitarian and rights-based justifications for animal emancipation. Both strategies have the advantage of making the argument for animal preservation by expanding a common moral discussion beyond humans. This liberal discourse's use of language and argumentation is less likely to turn off the reader, but its extreme conclusions may. Singer makes a compelling argument that the moral community should be founded on sentience rather than the ability to think or communicate, which is consistent with the intuitions of many individuals, particularly pet owners and wildlife enthusiasts. Regan's approach of using rights to defend and advance animal interests is also well grounded in liberal philosophical traditions. Both strategies have tapped into the pervasive modern uneasiness about how animals are treated, such as in industrial farming or vivisection, and how it irritates our 'humanitarian' sensibilities. They also advocate for a number of widely popular and realistic measures, such as the outlawing of veal crates, the control of industrial farming, and restrictions on hunting for fun. The ability of animal liberationism to serve as the foundation for a more comprehensive environmental ethic is admittedly constrained by these same strengths, which are expressed as they are in a traditional anthropocentric individualist moral language. The more radical notion that other aspects of the natural world also have value may become more tolerable after people agree that certain creatures are morally deserving of moral attention.

Environmental ethics that emphasise moral extensionism

A broad variety of moral extensionist ideas have been developed as a result of the recent growth of environmental ethics. These are often middle-ground viewpoints that accept the Greater Value Assumption that humans are the only creatures capable of appreciating value,

yet they are not the only ones that possess it. One intriguing strategy is the use of intuitive justifications for nature's intrinsic worth, such as its "naturalness" and the unique significance of nature to people. A green theory of value based on the concept of "naturalness" is presented by Goodin. Naturalness has value because people want "some sense and pattern to their lives"; people want their own lives set in some larger context; it is the products of natural processes, untouched by human hands, which provides that larger context.16 In a similar vein, Dworkin talks of the "sacredness" of nature and the importance of respecting "nature's sacredness." He contends that humans want to conserve animal species because of respect for how they came to be rather than for the creatures themselves when taken apart from that history. ..We believe that it is immoral and a degradation of the inviolable that our actions have caused a species that evolution has produced to go extinct. Therefore, it is "an intrinsically bad thing to do waste of nature's investment" when a species becomes extinct [4].

This strategy has certain drawbacks. Dworkin acknowledges that our notions of what is holy and inviolable are inconsistent. While we would not be unduly saddened by the demise of pit vipers or rodents, we could view a rare species of exotic bird or the Siberian tiger as sacrosanct. We also don't see anything created by nature as sacred; we're willing to mine coal or cut down trees to construct a home. In other words, this form of intuitive reasoning is unavoidably biassed. Similar to this, Goodin's theory of value is based in large part on the sense that people have a psychological desire for something greater than themselves, albeit this intuition is debatable. Is 'nature' the only way to satiate this desire, even if we have one? Many people find this wider framework in religion. Others might argue that events that have an unkind or lighthearted impact on nature, such as technical marvels like the enormous buildings in Los Angeles or atomic weapons, may also compel us to think about something bigger than ourselves. The village is superior to the city not because it is more in harmony with nature, but rather because nature needed less human interference. To put it another way, Goodin believes that people get joy from reflecting on nature's greater setting rather than preserving it from damage for its own reason. It would seem that nature has worth by itself in this sense.

Drawing a crucial difference between constitutive and instrumental value in a flourishing human existence is another subject in numerous intermediate approaches. O'Neill bases his environmental ethic on Aristotle's notion of the universal good. The flourishing of human existence is the Aristotelian goal. This "good life" is made up of a variety of liberal principles, including autonomy, as well as positive connections with others now, throughout generations, and, most importantly, with nature. Because non-human animals are essential to our own flourishing, their well-being "ought to be promoted."

O'Neill asserts that there is no return to limited instrumentalism notwithstanding the inherent anthropocentrism. Rather, we should encourage the flourishing of non-human living creatures as an aim in itself, much as Aristotle taught us to care for our friends for their own sake and not for the benefits it may bring to us. Care for the natural environment is thus essential to a flourishing human existence. Raz also uses the example of a guy and dog who have a tight friendship. The relationship has made the man's life richer and better. The dog is valuable because it improves the man's quality of life, not merely because it gives him emotions of security and comfort, as stated before in this article. Although Raz contends that this form of intrinsic worth is insufficient to justify granting rights to dogs, it may still be sufficient to establish obligations to safeguard or advance their welfare [5].

The aforementioned methods are only two of the many moral expansionist theories available. While each is incomplete, they each have something worthwhile to give. The presence of

various intermediary conceptions of value raises the possibility that the quest for a single, unifying set of values that would support an environmental ethic is ultimately futile. It could be wiser for green political theorists to accept well-known intuitive arguments, such as Dworkin's, that there are many different value theories and that there is no hierarchy among them. The idea that there are several value theories is not in and of itself debatable. While many authors contend that we must choose the "best" or "right" explanation, it is suggested here that there may be some benefit to adopting a diverse range of views.

It first enables different considerations to apply in various circumstances. One value theory may be effective in addressing one kind of ethical issue but less so in addressing another. The benefit of using a variety of value theories, such as utilitarian, rights-based, ecocentric, and so on, to assist solve various problems is acknowledged by an eclectic approach. Thus, Brennan contends that the moral considerations involved in the value systems we use to defend murdering a severely wounded animal to end its suffering, saving the life of a person in excruciating pain, and preventing vandalism to a tree may vary. Second, as is often the case in public policy, the mere complexity of many environmental concerns implies that there may be several perspectives on the same topic. It's possible that no one set of values offers an all-inclusive framework for solving an issue. In fact, an environmental ethic may also depend on a variety of anthropocentric justifications for how we should treat one another, including the need for intergenerational fairness and our duties to future generations. These overtly anthropocentric discussions are sometimes shunned by green political theory, but they have grown in importance as the rhetoric on sustainable development becomes more and more prevalent in public discourse.

This observation is consistent with Norton's "convergence thesis," which holds that differences between opposing environmental movements are more superficial than substantive. In particular, he argues that while ecocentric and anthropocentric defences of the non-human world may start from different places and employ different value systems, they can ultimately result in more or less comparable solutions. Norton highlights the value of anthropocentric justifications that include the needs of future generations:

No operationally discernible constraints on human behaviour that are not already implicit in the generalised, cross-temporal obligations to protect a healthy, complex, and autonomously functioning system for the benefit of future human generations are provided by the introduction of the idea that other species have intrinsic value and that humans should be "fair" to all other species. Therefore, deep ecologists who adhere to the idea that nature has intrinsic worth should not vary from long-term anthropocentrists in their policy objectives for the preservation of biological variety [6].

A excellent example of value eclecticism in action is the convergence Norton sees in policy between ecocentric and anthropocentric ideas for the next generation. From this angle, ecocentrism may be seen as a new supplemental dimension that might add to a richer, more informed moral synthesis rather than as an effort to replace traditional human-centered moral principles with a new framework that incorporates the natural world.

Building bridges across the Anthropocentric-Ecocentric Gap

The idea that humans are not always at the top of the ethical hierarchy is one of ecologism's defining characteristics. Political philosophers have been compelled to reconsider the link between people and environment and to reflect carefully on the obligations we have to the natural world by holistic arguments that highlight the interconnectedness of ecosystems.

However, it has been suggested that all anthropocentric arguments, which hold that human demands and interests are of the greatest and most important value, are eventually used in all ecocentric interpretations. It has been difficult to apply traditional ethical principles to unfamiliar entities and categories, such as species and ecospheres, and as a result, attempts to create an ethical code of conduct based on the existence of intrinsic value in nature have resorted to value hierarchies that always give human interests priority in all significant inter-species conflicts21. 'State of being' ecocentrics have resisted the path of issuing ethical injunctions, but the centrality of human interests in all inter-species conflicts.

In fact, it might be argued that an ecocentric viewpoint that rejected the existence of a distinct and morally significant boundary separating people from the rest of nature is unsustainable. Any rule like biocentric equality would undoubtedly be difficult to put into practise. To put it bluntly, how could a person defend the death of any animal or fish, or the consumption of a vegetable, bean, or berry? All require a certain amount of limiting the ability of another organism to survive and thrive. Simply to survive, humans must elevate themselves above other species and entities. No ecocentric disputes that people have the right to exist and prosper, but doing so unavoidably entails denying the same right to other beings. It is absurd to speak about an ecocentric-anthropocentric dichotomy in such sharp terms if it is understood that a completely non-anthropocentric viewpoint is unattainable or, at the absolute least, that every deep ecologist uses some kind of anthropocentric reasoning [7].

An approach that is more productive sees these philosophical arguments as 'between relative perspectives about the moral weight we should accord to the nat-ural environment in respect to human needs'. Weak anthropocentrism acknowledges that nature may have some non-instrumental value, whereas strong anthropocentrism maintains the Sole Value Assumption.22 This means that the relationship between humans and nature need not always be reduced to purely human interests. Different viewpoints may be positioned along a continuum that advances from ecocentrism through different gradations of anthropocentrism to "strong anthropocentrism," rather than being defined according to which side of the ecocentric/anthropocentric split they reside.

Where should the limit of ecologism be if the ecocentric/anthropocentric distinction is unnecessary? Which viewpoints belong under ecologism and which do not? The Sole Value Assumption is rejected by all weak anthropocentric or intermediate viewpoints, which is one evident distinction within ecologism. This distinction includes all viewpoints that concede some intrinsic or inherent worth to the non-human world, which is a qualitatively significant step. Therefore, a key characteristic of eco- gism may be the inclusion of all viewpoints that acknowledge that while humans will always be the distributors of value, they are not always the only carriers of value.

The practical ramifications that may result from the attri- bution of value to non-human beings are not always obvious. Do creatures or the environment have interests or rights? If that's the case, what does it really mean? What obligations do we have to nature? The challenges in attempting to create environmental standards of behaviour are shown in this chapter. Although none is completely persuasive, several have something worthwhile to say. If there is one lesson to be learned from these discussions, it is that maybe the importance of making a strong argument for rights or inherent worth has been overemphasised. The middle ground methods that acknowledge the presence of intrinsic worth in non-human forms may provide the most benefits; from there, it may be argued that, even while non-human entities may not have rights, humans do have obligations to refrain from doing certain things to them. The benefit of a broad definition of ecologism, regardless of the stance taken, is that it encompasses a variety of viewpoints that all aim to raise ecological awareness and 'turn the

tables in favour of the environment, such that the onus of persuasion is on those who want to destroy, rather than those who want to preserve'.

Adopting this broad definition may also have political benefits if it makes environmental philosophy more accessible to a larger audience. The traditional dichotomy usually leads to the conclusion that ecocentrism represents the limit of ecologism. This topic has received a lot of attention, frequently in the form of divisive arguments over maintaining doctrinal purity and being "greener than thou," which are reminiscent of the fratricidal conflicts associated with other "isms" like socialism and feminism. Ecocentrics often criticise other viewpoints for not being sufficiently "deep," and by doing so, they assert that they are morally superior: "After all, who would embrace a shallow view of any subject that one genuinely cares about, when a deeper view is available?"' If it is acknowledged that a pure ecocentric perspective is unrealistic and that a larger variety of concepts may be accommodated within the scope of ecologism, then such exclusive views are more difficult to maintain. The incorporation of moderate viewpoints would not deprive ecology of its radicalism; deep ecology would instead colonise the most ecocentrically minded branch of a vast church that encompasses a spectrum of philosophical and political viewpoints. After all, the diversity of perspectives within socialism serves as an example of how all ideologies' limits exhibit a Plasticine-like nature, being both pliable and mobile.

An ideology must include a logical political component, however. By turning the anthropocentric-ecocentric argument into a yardstick for being green, for instance, eco-centrics have come under fire for being more concerned with getting the philosophy correct than with creating a workable political agenda for change. When ecocentrics do think "politically," they underline the need to alter people's consciousness, with a greater understanding of how to live in harmony with nature as the best way to save the environment. The seeming lack of interest in broader concerns of societal political reform is a reflection of this focus in personal improvement. If you can't change the world, change yourself, appears to be the message. The endeavour to give ecologism a more extensive political component is examined in the next chapter [8].

CONCLUSION

Perception of the moral standing of non-human animals has significantly changed as a result of moral elongationism and animal liberation ideology. These philosophical views contend that animals too have inherent worth and merit equal regard and rights, challenging the conventional assumption that only humans are morally deserving. According to proponents of animal liberation, humans have a moral duty to take into account the interests and welfare of animals since they are sentient creatures capable of feeling pain and suffering. Important ramifications of this viewpoint include how food production, animal experimentation, and entertainment are all related to different facets of human life.

REFERENCES:

[1] J. Dunayer, L. Birke, and M. Kheel, “12 Taming Ourselves or Going Feral? Toward a Nonpatriarchal Metaethic of Animal Liberation,” in *Animals and Women*, 2020. doi: 10.1515/9780822381952-015.

[2] D. Jamieson, “Animal liberation is an environmental ethic,” *Environ. Values*, 1998, doi: 10.3197/096327198129341465.

[3] S. Best, “The Rise of Critical Animal Studies: Putting Theory into Action and Animal Liberation into Higher Education,” *J. Crit. Anim. Stud.*, 2009.

[4] M. Maurizi, "Beyond nature animal liberation, marxism, and critical theory," in *Historical Materialism Book Series*, 2021.

[5] M. Ito, "Seeing Animals, Speaking of Nature: Visual Culture and the Question of the Animal," *Theory, Cult. Soc.*, 2008, doi: 10.1177/0263276408091987.

[6] D. A. Fennell, "Ecotourism, animals and ecocentrism: A re-examination of the billfish debate," *Tour. Recreat. Res.*, 2013, doi: 10.1080/02508281.2013.11081744.

[7] S. Jarrett, "Consciousness reduced: The role of the 'idiot' in early evolutionary psychology," *Hist. Human Sci.*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/0952695120911557.

[8] M. Ito, "Seeing Animals, Speaking of Nature," *Theory, Cult. Soc.*, 2008, doi: 10.1177/0263276408091987.

CHAPTER 3

CENTRAL IDEAS OF ECOLOGISM

Dr. Shruthi K Bekal, Assistant Professor, Department of Management,
JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email Id- shruthi_b2015@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Ecologism is a political philosophy that places a strong emphasis on how interdependent nature, people, and the environment are. Ecologism, at its heart, promotes sustainable and conscientious methods of conducting human activities while also emphasising the significance of safeguarding and maintaining the natural world.The primary topics of ecologism are examined in the first section. It begins by analysing the 'limits to growth' thesis' importance as a green principle. The next section covers the key characteristics of the prevailing model of a green, sustainable society since all ideologies need a different interpretation of what constitutes a "good society" from our own. The following parts evaluate whether the central tenet of green politics, the ecological need to rescue the earth, calls forthat a green polity be based on the fundamental political ideals that underpin most conceptions of a green society, including decentralization, social fairness, and non-violence.

KEYWORDS:

Environmental, Ecologism, Political, Society.

INTRODUCTION

The Limits to Growth used computer modelling and systems theory to analyse the intricate relationships between five key variables: industrial output, resource depletion, pollution, food production, and population growth. The publication of The Limits to Growth sparked a significant international debate about the existence of ecological limits to economic and population growth. The computer simulations plotted the expected results up to 2100 if each variable kept increasing at its current rates, as well as for six permutations depending on various growth assumptions for each variable. However, since the factors were interrelated, each effort to deal with a particular issue just served to spread it to other areas. The authors came to the conclusion that the "limits to growth on this planet will be reached sometime within the next hundred years" if current growth patterns in each variable persisted.

The Limits to Growth report had a huge influence on the evolution of environmental thought.2 Its ominous message immediately brought environmental concerns to the attention of the general public and put them on the political agenda. Its pessimism is connected with today's'survivalist' worry over population expansion. Over time, it has evolved into a "foundation-stone of radical green politics" that "our finite Earth places limits on industrial growth." The 'limits to growth' theory is specifically used by greens to make numerous conclusions. First, the "limits to growth" argument is based on the ecologism idea of finitude, which suggests that any sustainable future would be marked by material scarcity rather than plenty. Second, the study highlighted the interdependence between people and nature, which teaches us that issues cannot be isolated and managed in isolation. This was done by charting the combined effect of the five factors. Thirdly, since economic development is now exponential, the slow accumulation of environmental issues might have an unexpectedly devastating result. The following riddle is often used to demonstrate this idea. If lily coverage increases every day and covers the pond completely on the thirty-first day, what day would

the pond be half covered? The twenty-ninth day, that's the solution. The lesson is that early action by policymakers is necessary to avert the disastrous situation that Limits to Growth foresees. Last but not least, temporary technical solutions to the environmental disaster are insufficient because they do not address the fundamental economic, social, and political roots of the problem; they may only postpone damage; they will not stop it. Overall, Limits to Growth makes the case that current economic, social, and political structures are inextricably tied to ecological degradation. The environmental Armageddon can only be avoided, according to greens, if existing arrangements are drastically changed.

The 'limits to development' argument has now received harsh criticism from a broad range of sources. Its empirical assertions, especially those about the depletion of resources, have proved to be the easiest targets since fresh supplies of oil, gas, coal, and other minerals have been found. In other words, a number of indicators point to a better condition of the ecosystem than that projected by Limits to Growth. The projection of a catastrophe by 2100 is now generally acknowledged to have been excessively gloomy. The computer modelling that was employed was really basic, and a lot of the assumptions and data were erroneous. Updated versions of the Limits to Growth report attempt to address some of these issues, but they still have significant flaws.

They demonstrate that the feeling of urgency that Limits to Growth and other publications in a survivalist spirit, such as the 1980 Global 2000 Report to the President and the yearly State of the World reports from the Worldwatch Institute, sparked may have been misdirected. These survivalist books have also come under harsh criticism for underestimating humankind's potential for technical and political adaptation. Bjrn Lomborg, a Danish statistician and political scientist, has revived this Promethean attack that was formerly spearheaded by the economist Julian Simon. Their main point is that broad patterns demonstrate that economic expansion eventually improves environmental quality, therefore we must avoid taking any actions that would obstruct free commerce and the functioning of markets. They also assure us that people will find solutions to any environmental issues that do arise.

Even yet, the fundamental notion that there are ecological limitations to expansion is still compelling, especially in light of the new set of global issues that have emerged since the 1970s, such as climate change and ozone depletion. In fact, a group of respected economists entered the debate in 1995 by stating that the Earth's environmental carrying capacity will eventually place restrictions on economic expansion. There must be something to the proposition if the great and the good of a field renowned for its antagonism to environmentalism are advocating for institutional restructuring to address the impending ecological disaster. Perhaps greens shouldn't be so protective when they use the "limits to growth" idea as a teaching tool[1], [2].

Finally, the "limits to growth" debate also served as a catalyst for a crucial political philosophy discussion about intergenerational justice because it made the case that the world we leave behind for yet-to-be-born future generations will likely be significantly impacted by the choices we make today. If so, do we owe it to the next generation to safeguard the environment, preserve resources, stop pollution, and stop environmental deterioration so that they inherit a planet that isn't worse than our own? reasons for environmental conservation that focus on future generations provide a strong anthropocentric counterargument to the stated ecocentric reasons.

A green initiative for a society that is Sustainable

If ecology is a separate ideology, then it ought to be feasible to pinpoint an ecologically-based image of the ideal society that is fundamentally distinct from other ideologies. The essential traits of a green, sustainable civilization are described in this section. Of course, there are significant differences among the many ecologism interpretations or discourses, just as there would be disagreement about any final list of the fundamental ideas underlying socialism, liberalism, or conservatism. In addition to the works of green thinkers, activists, and academics, this narrative relies on the so-called "four pillars," or essential ideas, of green politics identified by the German Greens in the 1980s: ecological responsibility, social justice, grassroots democracy, and non-violence. The main goal of green politics is ecological responsibility, often known as sustainability, which stems from the concept of growth constraints. Because the ecological carrying limits of the world are not surpassed, a sustainable civilization has the potential to endure. Economic, social, and political growth must be self-sufficient and focused towards meeting fundamental requirements if the planet is to survive. In order to ensure that future generations of humans can meet their needs and that non-human nature can flourish, development must be guided by the futurity principle. This combines the anthropocentric goal of safeguarding future generations of humans with the ecocentric goal of preserving the well-being of non-human nature.

The relentless pursuit of economic growth that characterises the current capitalist economic system causes a variety of environmental problems, most notably resource depletion, destructive production, and pollution. The sustainable economy will require a fundamental transformation in attitudes towards economic growth, consumption, production, and work. The green movement, in contrast, calls for "an economic system oriented to the necessities of human life today and for future generations, to the preservation of nature and a careful management of natural resources." The drive for constant economic expansion would be relieved if our goal were to serve "needs, not wants." Many greens support a steady-state economy where wealth and population levels are either maintained at current levels or sharply reduced[3].

DISCUSSION

Consumption, especially 'unnecessary' consumption, is seen by Greens as a key issue. They contend that the production of artificial demands via advertising, fashion, and peer pressure, which results in the pointless and wasteful levels of economic activity typical of the consumer culture, maintains the pace of economic growth. The 'needs not desires' principle directly challenges the profit motive's hegemony. According to greens, the quest of profit drives wasteful manufacturing practises such built-in obsolescence and activities that result in unwarranted customer desires. A green economy, on the other hand, would be centred on production that is largely for use rather than profit, eliminating such wasteful consumerism. People would be educated to spend less in this more conservative society, which would reduce output, safeguard resources, and lessen pollution. Utilising sustainable resources, reusing products, recycling materials, and implementing cleaner technologies may all help to reduce production's negative effects on the environment.

The rejection of the consumer culture, according to greens, would also lead to an improvement in quality of life since such a society is, at best, unpleasant, and, at worst, unethical. According to Trainer, "Our main issue is that the majority of people hold the disastrously mistaken belief that prosperity and growth are both possible and, worse yet, crucial." Our main goal is to get the word out about how empty and pointless it is to be able to purchase and consume more and more costly items. Further, there is limited time for active

citizen involvement in the democratic processes of the polity in a society that prioritises consumerism and economic development. Thus, consumerism limits people's ability to exercise their freedom and self-determination. The benefits of the sustainable economy, both material (such as better craftsmanship, healthier food, and safer communities) and "spiritual" (in terms of personal happiness, individual fulfilment, and a more cooperative society), will outweigh any quantitative reduction in the overall material standard of living, according to greens[4].

The'small is beautiful' idea of Fritz Schumacher is something that Greens firmly believe in. Modern technologies and large-scale production harm the environment in many different ways because of their sheer size and complexity. For instance, when pollution is concentrated in one place, 'hotspots' push the ecosystem's carrying capacity to its absolute maximum. Because workers must travel a great distance to work and the finished product must subsequently be sent across the country or beyond to customers, the physical separation of the office from the house increases traffic volume. The result is that tremendous resource consumption and traffic pollution are the price of economic efficiency brought about by economies of scale. Decentralised, small-scale manufacturing within an independent local community would be the hallmark of the green economy. Instead of being produced for international commercial exchange, it would be for local consumption. Agriculture would benefit the neighbourhood and employ less intensive, organic agricultural techniques. As a result, traffic volume would decrease since fewer trips would be made and individuals would go to work on foot, bicycles, or public transportation over shorter distances. Overall resource use would drastically decrease[5]

Money would still be used in the green economy, but it would not be a capitalist one and there would be less trade. It could resemble the trading platforms used on local exchanges, which have been more well-known recently. Within a constrained local network of people, LETS involves the exchange or bartering of products, talents, and services. No money is exchanged. Exchange and commerce, not accumulating, are the goals. In the formal economy, there would be less focus on paid labour. The vast array of activities that are presently not considered to be considered as paid employment, such as parenting, housework, and volunteer labour in the community, would be given more value and social respect. The goal of basic income programmes is to provide everyone with a non-means-tested income, guarantee economic stability for everyone, and enable people to live more fulfilling lives that are less reliant on the vagaries of the market[6], [7].

What kind of political structures would be required to maintain a society that is sustainable? The green party's rallying cry, "Think global, act local," serves as the foundation for the political decentralisation idea. To promote what Kirkpatrick Sale has referred to as "politics on a human scale," political authority would be situated at the lowest "appropriate" level. Small self-governing communities would make up the green polity in its most extreme deep ecology and ecoanarchist manifestations. Sale suggests that rather than human political boundaries such as towns, states, or countries, the fundamental unit of a sustainable society should be the 'bioregion', which is a geographic area defined by the natural, biological, and geological characteristics that give it its identity. That community's social and economic structure need to be self-sufficient, using only resources found in that bioregion.

However, the idea of sustainability is not the only aspect of green politics. As we've seen, greens believe that reducing consumption and altering our lives are morally and environmentally responsible. In addition to being terrible for the environment, our excessive consumption and degradation of the environment also serve as proof that we are "bad people." The importance of the remaining three pillars of green politics illustrates the position

that green politics takes on how a "good person" ought to act in a "good society." First, groups affiliated with the green party are often based on participatory democracy. The green state would be a democracy at the local level; in fact, participatory democracy would transcend political institutions and reach the economic sphere, where the worker cooperative or commune would serve as the fundamental structure for organising collective labour. Second, social fairness is emphasised in green politics. Distributional fairness is seen as a necessary condition for sustainability, primarily between the affluent North and the destitute South, but also inside each nation, according to an intragenerational equity concept. Justice for yet-to-be-born future generations is a requirement of the intergenerational justice concept. Greens support variety in human relationships and specifically oppose any type of discrimination based on race, gender, sexual orientation, or age out of a desire to maintain biodiversity. Thirdly, greens are devoted to nonviolent civil disobedience, support nonviolence, and oppose foreign violence.

Therefore, greens have a bold and expansive idea of what a sustainable society may entail. Naturally, this programme has received a great deal of criticism. Most individuals would agree that the economic and social recommendations made here would help minimise environmental harm, but many supporters are sceptical about the need, desirability, and viability of such sweeping changes to commercial activity and personal lives. The popularity of sustainable development, which outlines an alternative policy paradigm based on the reform of the existing capitalist system rather than the more fundamental transformation of society outlined above, has been attributed to unease about the radical prescriptions proposed by many greens. However, the focus of this chapter is on the ecologism as a radical and distinctive green ideology and its substance and coherence. As this section has seen, greens have linked sustainability to a broader view of what a good society and a decent individual would look like, even if it is the core value of ecologism. This raises the important issue of whether or not a commitment to sustainability inevitably entails a commitment to the values of democratic participation, social justice, non-violence, and decentralisation.

The guiding principle of green ideology is the precedence of the ecological imperative. Does it matter how we do it if the goal is to rescue the planet? Consider the scenario in which the'survivalist' prescription of a totalitarian, unequal society was the most efficient way to achieve sustainability. In other words, how can environmentalists be sure that the values of democracy, decentralisation, social justice, and non-violence are the most effective ways to create a sustainable society?

With his distinction between the green theory of value and the green theory of agency, Goodin offers the greatest statement of this issue. He persuasively argues that it is misguided to attach the significance greens do to the conception of agency as the means to an end. Instead, emphasis should be placed on the green theory of value, which supports the argument for sustainability. Without this ecological imperative, the green agenda would lack legitimacy, clarity, and direction. It also serves as the unifying moral vision that ties the green agenda together. in is more important to do the correct thing than to do in a certain manner or via a certain agency, according to Goodin's consequentialist worldview. The theory of agency will always take a backseat to the green theory of value in any irreconcilable conflict between the two. While it may be preferable for good deeds to be followed by Right deeds and for a sustainable society to be built by democratic, non-violent means, it is not necessary. Simply said, ethical aims justify ethical methods[8], [9].

The consequentialist implications of Goodin's thesis make the majority of radical greens uncomfortable since they may be used to defend utilising authoritarian or forceful methods to create a sustainable society. So, are there solid arguments against Goodin's assertion that

ecological results take precedence over practises? Given that many of its activists have roots in the emancipatory new social movements and the New Left of the 1960s and 1970s, it is insufficient for greens to just declare their support for participatory democracy, nonviolence, and equality. Additionally, they must demonstrate that a society that is environmentally sustainable is impossible without them. If they are unable to do so, maybe greens must either give up their extreme political and moral agenda or admit that doing things the "right" way is more important to them than the environment. Goodin's case is strong because she makes a distinction between the theories of value and agency. Eckersley contends that this stark division is flawed and that greens are correct to emphasise the importance of the methods in addition to the objectives. She faults Goodin's own theory of values for having an insufficient foundation in the non-human world and hence being insufficient for a green political philosophy. The green theory of value should be enlarged to include the value of autonomy and self-determination instead, which is defined as "the freedom of human and nonhuman beings to unfold in their own ways and live according to their "species life"". If autonomy is seen as having moral precedence, it is crucial to develop political systems that will promote social fairness, nonviolence, and grassroots democracy. A blatant rejection of Goodin's consequentialist viewpoint, this emancipatory interpretation of green politics proposes a blending of the Right and the Good so that how something is done affects whether it is the right thing to do or not. In other words, a green theory of value may serve as the foundation for a green theory of agency.

It's debatable if this view advances ecologism. Despite the mention of improving the autonomy of "non-humans," Eckersley's thesis comes out as deliberately anthropocentric. Since autonomy is exactly the virtue accorded a top priority in liberal individualism, it is also expressly individualistic. It appears strange for an environmental theory to place moral importance on individual autonomy. However, since it has the potential to influence behaviour change, promoting individual human autonomy could be the greatest strategy for creating a society that is sustainable[10].

Greens may counter that change should be justified for the greater interest of society rather than to preserve individual liberty. Another "green" response to Goodin would thus argue that ecologism is not only about sustainability but also about building a just society where, for instance, self-interested materialism is rejected as immoral. In order to determine if participatory democracy, decentralisation, social justice, and, briefly, non-violence are the political structures most conducive to achieving sustainability, we will return to these two points below.

CONCLUSION

The core principles of ecology include the appreciation of the inherent worth of the natural world, criticism of the prevailing political and economic structures that put profit before the environment, and an emphasis on ecological justice and sustainability. Ecologism also emphasises the value of interconnection, community, and collaboration in building a more equitable and sustainable society.Numerous movements and efforts aiming at promoting sustainability and safeguarding the environment have been influenced by ecologism, which has had an impact on the development of environmental legislation and practises across the world.

REFERENCES:

[1] V. Asara, “Untangling the radical imaginaries of the Indignados’ movement: commons, autonomy and ecologism,” *Env. Polit.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/09644016.2020.1773176.

[2] B. Lubarda, "Beyond ecofascism? Far-right ecologism (fre) as a framework for future inquiries," *Environ. Values*, 2020, doi: 10.3197/096327120X15752810323922.

[3] J. Pinto, "Environmentalism, Ecologism, and Basic Income," *Basic Income Stud.*, 2020, doi: 10.1515/bis-2019-0026.

[4] R. Lalander and M. Merimaa, "The Discursive Paradox of Environmental Conflict: Between Ecologism and Economism in Ecuador," *Forum Dev. Stud.*, 2018, doi: 10.1080/08039410.2018.1427622.

[5] N. Barak, "Civic Ecologism: Environmental Politics in Cities," *Ethics, Policy Environ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/21550085.2020.1746005.

[6] E. Cudworth and S. Hobden, "Complexity, ecologism, and posthuman politics," *Rev. Int. Stud.*, 2013, doi: 10.1017/S0260210512000290.

[7] A. Dobson, "Ecologism," in *Contemporary Political Ideologies*, 2019. doi: 10.4324/9780429038839-10.

[8] I. Blühdorn, "The politics of unsustainability: COP15, post-ecologism, and the ecological paradox," *Organ. Environ.*, 2011, doi: 10.1177/1086026611402008.

[9] M. Keary, "The new prometheans: Technological optimism in climate change mitigation modelling," *Environ. Values*, 2016, doi: 10.3197/096327115X14497392134801.

[10] M. Margulies, "Eco-Nationalism: A Historical Evaluation of Nationalist Praxes in Environmentalist and Ecologist Movements," *Consilience*, 2021.

CHAPTER 4

IMPORTANCE OF GREEN POLITICS IN DEMOCRATIC

Mr. R. Thanga Kumar, Assistant Professor,
Department of Management, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email Id- thanga@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

A major topic in green political theory and an excellent illustration of the means/ends argument is the difficult link between ecological concerns and democracy. The majority of greens claim that democracy, particularly participatory democracy, is a fundamental tenet of eco- logy. However, if Goodin is right, the ecological imperative's primacy might allow for the sacrifice of democratic principles in order to save the environment. This line of reasoning supports the eco-authoritarian claim made by survivalists that governmental intervention is necessary to address ecological imperatives like population expansion and resource depletion. Unconstrained by the need to win elections or defend liberal liberties, a powerful authoritarian government can force self-interested people to behave in the public properly, for example, having fewer children and leading more modest lives.

KEYWORDS:

Democracy, Ecological, Environment, Equality, State.

INTRODUCTION

The majority of modern greens detest these authoritarian solutions and wish to have them declared unconstitutional in court since they go against the ecological foundation of democracy. But why is democracy a fundamental green tenet? It is evident that democratic processes do not always result in ecologically friendly solutions. For instance, the majority of scientists agree that severe automobile use regulations and high fuel tariffs are necessary to combat climate change. Governments are hesitant to enact such controversial measures, however, for fear that a furious populace may remove them from office. As Goodin puts it: "What assurance can we have that the former procedures will produce the latter kind of outcomes?" Democracy advocacy is advocacy of procedures, whereas environmentalist advocacy is advocacy of substantive goals.' . The ecological imperative should always take precedence over democracy when deciding between methods; he is not implying that democratic processes are invalid or undesirable.

However, Goodin doesn't really explain how policies will be drawn from the theory of value; instead, he merely says that it takes precedence. Infallible green policies won't just appear like apples from a theory of value, thus how choices are made matters. This is one practical reason in favour of democracy. A technocratic attitude that a ruling elite of politicians, scientists, and professionals knows best is often present in arguments in favour of the adoption of non-democratic means; Ophuls even refers to a "priesthood of technologists." The implication is that some ecological choices should not be left to the vagaries of democratic processes, but rather determined by those people who have this "superior knowledge." This claim provides an elite minority authority and successfully elevates science above other types of knowledge and ecological awareness. Technical expertise is obviously important in many ecological issues, but it only gives a partial picture. To make a conclusion that may garner broad support, a wide variety of different views and considerations, including non-technical, local, ethical, social, and political factors, should also be taken into account.

The greatest way to include these considerations into the decision-making process, according to greens, is via participatory democracy.

A criticism of liberal democracy forms the basis of the argument for participatory democracy. Greens contend that since liberal democracy is marked by hierarchy, bureaucracy, individualism, and material inequities, it cannot deliver the best outcomes. It provides a small number of possibilities to engage in public life. Porritt laments that, for instance, "the representative element of the system has insidiously undermined the element of participation, in that turning out to vote now and then seems to have become the be-all and end-all of our democracy." Liberal democracy, as a result, fosters an atomized individualistic concentration on the private realm and is thus a poor environment for cultivating the ecological awareness and responsible citizenship required to create a sustainable society.

The participatory democratic processes based on a discursive or deliberative paradigm are what the Greens aim to replace representational democracy with. These extreme forms of democracy rely on direct citizen involvement in institutions including political parties, local governments, community assemblies, nonprofit organisations, and workplaces. The green argument, which seeks a society where widespread participatory democracy means individuals are completely, freely, and actively participating in the choices that impact their lives, so hooks into a much larger heritage of radical democratic theorising. Greens commonly use examples from the ancient Greek city state or more modern ones, such the New England town meeting, to support their claim that direct democracy would result in communities that are more aware of and respectful of their natural surroundings.

To prove their point that participatory democracy would have a positive impact on the environment, greens provide two related arguments. First, a more responsive government should result from participatory democracy. Because authority would be redistributed from the hands of the few to the many—from the central party bureaucracy to the local branch, from managers to employees—institutions would be more responsive and responsible. More participation would result in a larger variety of interests being considered throughout the decision-making process, which would enhance environmental protection. Local communities will have more tools to defend their environment thanks to the increased information dissemination required for participatory democracy to work, but it might also speed up the transmission of evidence of environmental harm to decision-makers. Participatory democracy increases the likelihood that, if not morally flawless results, then at the very least morally better ones will be produced by pressuring the institutions of civil society to comply with public requests. Of yet, a democratic choice made with participation may nevertheless place a higher value on economic security than environmental protection, possibly permitting a business to discharge high amounts of pollutants in exchange for maintaining local employment. However, there is a strong, if not overwhelming, instrumental argument for stating that participatory democracy increases the likelihood of ecological outcomes due to the increased responsiveness acquired by using a larger circle of interests, expertise, and abilities.

Participatory democracy will foster the growth of more individual autonomy, which is a second green justification for it. The majority of people in a liberal democracy are unable to become self-determining agents due to material inequities, bureaucratic hierarchies, and labour divides at home and at work. People would naturally learn to engage if democratic institutions and opportunities were present in all spheres of life, including at work, school, and community gatherings. This engagement ought to foster a "democratic personality," one that values and takes responsibility for one's fellow citizens more. Discursive democracy allows preferences to be changed and promotes action that complies with generally accepted

standards by promoting citizen engagement and discourse. The person in a participatory democracy is more likely to be a public-spirited citizen eager to support communal activities and community identity, replacing the self-contained individual in liberal democracy whose identity is only sometimes articulated in the public realm. Greens say that this radical idea of democratic citizenship might also foster "an ecological citizenship capable of developing and giving expression to collective ecological concerns" at this moment, giving the arguments for participatory democracy an ecological twist. Active citizen engagement will, at the absolute least, raise people's awareness of environmental concerns by giving them access to more information and giving them the chance to interact with other citizens and share their expertise and opinions. Extending that civic care to foreigners, future generations, and non-human nature is a considerably smaller step after the move from "self-regarding" person to "other-regarding" citizen has been made. In conclusion, participatory democracy may support the development of an ecological conscience.

If true, this second argument significantly supports the first assertion that participatory democracy enhances institutional responsiveness. Greater autonomy should also result in a shift in preferences, but better responsiveness is more concerned with the aggregate of preferences. In fact, the accumulation of preferences is what has led to ecological issues like mass consumption or popular opposition to policies meant to cut down on automobile usage. Governments may be less inclined to enact progressive environmental measures if participatory democracy just gives a more efficient technique of collecting preferences rather than accepting preferences as givens. The fundamental shift to a sustainable society will be simpler to accomplish if people can be convinced by the strength of argument that it is appropriate for them to change their beliefs, attitudes, and conduct, as opposed to being commanded to do so, according to greens[1].

In relation to the debate at the conclusion of the preceding section, Eckersley contends that ecological goals justify democratic methods since it is morally proper to promote the autonomy of both human and non-human community members. One of the requirements for creating a society where the circumstances for human autonomy predominate is participatory democracy. As a result, the relationship between ecological and democracy is no longer purely arbitrary. Furthermore, since it "fundamentally infringes on the rights of humans to choose their own destiny," authoritarianism is "ruled out at the level of green principle."

DISCUSSION

The best way to change people's preferences and promote the ecological citizenship required for a just society, according to an alternative green response to Eckersley, is through participatory democracy's communicative and deliberative processes. Therefore, participatory democracy is a fundamental green value because it advances the common good, not because individual liberty should be given moral precedence.

How realistic is this idea of a participatory democratic democracy, regardless of the justification that is accepted? It is significant that proponents of green theory and activists have become more accepting of the representative institutions of liberal democracy. It is given as a model of a "post-liberal democracy, not an anti-liberal democracy," which would preserve many aspects of the liberal democratic state, even when a compelling argument is made for a separate "ecolog- ical democracy". But many greens now see deliberative democratic processes as enhancing rather than replacing the institutions of reformed liberal democracy. Thus, efforts to promote more "institutionalised self-criticism" and "reflexiveness" in existing institutions by making them more open, transparent, and responsible might coexist with efforts to provide chances for greater public engagement.

Over the last 10 years, extensive democratic institutional innovation along similar linesincluding roundtable discussions, citizen juries, and expanded referendums—has been sparked by the ascent of the sustainable development paradigm. Whether this "downgrading" of participatory democracy weakens the argument for democracy as a fundamental ecological concept is debatable. Even if this falls short of full participatory democracy, the arguments provided here might be utilised to reformulate a green democratic concept, which would need a thorough democratisation of current institutions and practices [2], [3].

According to Goodin, the emphasis on decentralisation is what genuinely distinguishes green politics from other political ideologies, according to most analysts. A recurring subject in party platforms and theoretical writings is decentralisation. Similar to participatory democracy, the green argument for political decentralisation relies on a variety of philosophical traditions, most notably anarchist, but this time, the greens add a distinctive ecological spin. They support decentralisation because it produces 'human-scale' political structures, continuing the anarchist heritage. The core premise is that people can only rediscover their sense of identity in a local group after losing it in an atomized, consumerist culture. Examples of ideologies influenced by this concept include the "small is beautiful" ideology of Schumacher, "bioregionalism" of Sale, and "libertarian municipalism" of

The Bookchin. According to Goldsmith et al., "it is likely that a man or woman can only be an individual in the small community." He is just an exception among today's sprawling enclaves. A bioregion should have a population of no more than 10,000, according to Sale, making it small enough for people to feel sufficiently a part of it to engage in meaningful activities. Citizens must have access to forums where they may freely debate topics, be adequately educated about the problems that affect their community, be able to comprehend the effects of their actions, and be aware that their involvement may have some impact. Because of this, a decentralised community is necessary for a vibrant participatory democracy. Greens believe that decentralisation and participatory democracy will create happy, self-reliant people who are willing to make the material sacrifices necessary for a society with minimal consumption.

Another unique ecological justification for political decentralisation offered by the greens is that local communities should be more environmentally conscious when making choices. Sale takes this idea to its logical conclusion by proposing that we should take a cue from nature and build the decentralised community around the bioregion's natural borders, such as mountain ranges and streams. Human societies will develop into "dwellers in the land" in the bioregion, becoming more in tune with and appreciative of nature, informed about the capabilities and limitations of their immediate physical surroundings, and therefore better able to coexist peacefully with natural landscapes.

Decentralisation could be a prerequisite for participatory democracy, but it doesn't mean a decentralised society would necessarily be democratic. Sale acknowledges that a society based on a natural bioregion may not always be characterised by democratic or liberal values because another 'natural' principle, diversity, implies that bioregional societies should boast a wide range of political systems, some of which, presumably, might be authoritarian. Even if the political system is democratic, living in a small town may have its disadvantages. If criminals are brought to justice by the weight of public opinion, as Goldsmith et al. imply, social control systems may wind up being oppressive. Minorities may experience a lot of discrimination, as well as oppositional viewpoints. Small, narrow-minded civilizations may also be cognitively and culturally deficient, which might inhibit the development of new clean technology. Ironically, though, the homogenous, decen-tralized society may not respect variety.

The fact that many environmental issues are best handled at the national or international level presents another challenge for decentralisation. The political borders of existing country states, much alone those of minor bioregions, are not respected by global commons challenges. Coordination of efforts across communities and countries is necessary to address issues like ozone depletion and climate change, which calls for global cooperation across centralised nation governments. Therefore, the green campaign's motto "Think global, act local" may not be the best course of action for resolving issues affecting the global commons. Even then, it "makes sense only when the locals possess an appropriate social and ecological consciousness." Relying only on local communities to safeguard the environment requires that the community is fully aware of the origins, consequences, and remedies to a specific issue.

Greens argue that they support decentralisation to the lowest 'acceptable' level of governance in response to this critique. Greens say that local communities must operate "as independent agents negotiating arrangements that are mutually agreeable to all concerned" if they are to coordinate action to address transboundary issues. Most 'ecoanarchist' narratives are based on a fundamental mistrust of the state, which makes them reject a central coordinating body that would infringe on the autonomy of the dispersed autonomous society. Bookchin describes a "humanly scaled, self-governing municipality freely and confederally associated with other human-scaled, self-governing municipali- ties" in this way[4], [5].

This answer is flawed for many reasons. What happens if the communities refuse to take action? A community's cooperation may not translate into a kind disposition towards the outer world. Small, closed-off communities may have a strong aversion to examining bigger issues, such the likelihood of environmental harm in other places, since they often define themselves in relation to others. They could even attempt to take advantage of other communities by releasing pollutants that harms individuals living nearby or in the vicinity of them. The presence of economic disparities between communities may accentuate hostility or apathy; maybe a poor community would feel less cooperative towards a wealthy neighbour. It is not difficult to picture a community that is very worried about the environment in its immediate vicinity yet careless about harm occurring elsewhere. Therefore, convincing communities to alter their conduct may need the assistance of a central organisation. Even if every community was prepared to work together to safeguard the environment, a central organisation would still be necessary to coordinate their efforts. The green anarchist approach, however, is adamant in its rejection of such a centralised organisation and fails to adequately explain how the essential coordination may occur.

All things considered, the issue is not decentralisation per se, but rather how the prevailing ecoanarchist paradigm, which is distinguished by its mistrust of the state, defines it. Despite what many greens seem to desire, decentralisation does not imply that there should be no central state, much alone no state at all. The ecological imperative does sometimes take a backseat to green mistrust of the state when international coordination is essential. Writers who support green politics have fiercely criticised this ecoanarchist paradigm of decentralisation. One of the most important recent developments in green political theory has been the rise of a controversy over the definition of the "green state." The majority of participants in this discussion are pursuing a green view of the state; in other words, they prefer to modify the state to its present form than to eliminate it.

The most complete example of a green state is Eckersley. The anarchic structure of independent nation states, the encouragement of capital accumulation, and the "democratic deficit" of liberal democratic state capitalism are the three main obstacles she names to the transition to a greener world. She also identifies three opposing positive developments,

including ecological modernization, democratic deliberation, and environmental multilateralism. Together, these phenomena highlight the nation state's ongoing importance. The state, she argues, is still the most significant political institution in the fight against global environmental destruction because it is one of the few institutions with the capacity and legitimacy to enact the radical changes that greens demand. She rejects the popular belief that globalisation has rendered the sovereign state largely powerless. Therefore, it is crucial that this strong state support environmental goals; moreover, if it is to fulfil the function of "public ecological trustee," it should also be a "good" state. Democracy and sovereignty are important components of Eckersley's paradigm. Because environmental issues do not respect the conventional geographical limits of the sovereign nation state, a green state will acknowledge its obligations to individuals who live beyond its borders. Based on the ideas of deliberative democracy, her "ecological democracy" thesis contends that "all those potentially affected by ecological risks ought to have some meaningful opportunity to participate, or be represented, in the determina-tion of policies or decisions that may generate risks." Eckersley therefore recasts the state in a different position, one of an ecological custodian and an enabler of transboundary democracy as opposed to a self-centered actor zealously guarding its own area.

In contrast to the ecoanarchist approach, Eckersley begins with the nation state. The nation state is not embraced by all of these revisionist green theorists with the same zeal as Eckersley. The majority favour some kind of decentralisation to "appropriate" levels, with the burden of proof for centralization lying more on those who claim that certain authorities or responsibilities belong at a higher level. Decentralisation would still be a fundamental tenet of ecologism under this interpretation, but the form of state it would result in would be considerably unlike from the ecoanarchist model.

In conclusion, political decentralisation may not always be the best method to achieve sustainability. Decentralisation is still a viable option for greens since ecologism is about more than just attaining the proper results. The argument for decentralisation can also be made in terms of its contribution to building a good society; while centralization occasionally results in better results, if the long-term goal is to produce individuals with the character traits most likely to support sustainability, decentralisation should increase the likelihood of this. Decentralisation, like democratisation, aims to create a healthy society with residents that care about the environment in addition to achieving the desired results immediately[6].

'Social justice' is often given a lot of weight by green thinkers, but their analysis of the intricate connection between social justice and environmental concerns has lagged behind until lately. The idea of social justice is hotly debated. The definition adopted by greens places them firmly in the group of those who associate equality with justice. Greens advocate for a just society that values social and economic equality, but why should the environment benefit from this? Exists a causal link between social justice and sustainability, such that, for instance, the environment would benefit from the reduction of poverty? Or can sustainability occasionally coexist with unfair policies? Is equality a prerequisite for successful political decentralisation and participatory democracy? The assertions that social justice is a fundamental green value are supported by three reasons, which are listed in this section.

First, some greens draw inspiration from nature in order to maintain their dedication to equality. The holistic message is that nature is made up of a variety of interconnected pieces, each of which has some value to the others. The equality principle states that no portion is independent of or superior to any other part. Other than the flaws in the holistic argument described in Chapter 2, it is difficult to see why interdependence necessitates equality. After

all, there are several interdependent human interactions that do not often allow for equality. In other words, the nature-based defence is fatally flawed.

Second, social inequality adds to the deterioration of the ecosystem. There is considerable evidence, for instance, that poverty in less developed countries promotes too intensive farming and the use of marginal land for agriculture, which has a negative impact on the environment by leading to desertification and deforestation. A global trade system that pushes less developed nations to grow cash crops for consumption in the North, mostly to pay off loans to those same nations and their financial institutions, serves as the foundation for economic disparity between the North and the South. Numerous societal disputes over "pollution burdens," "environmental entitlements," and access to natural resources in less developed nations are indicative of and contribute to a developing "environmentalism of the poor," which is supported by a pervasive sense of ecological injustice. It is obvious that reducing poverty will support sustainability in numerous ways. For instance, 'development' seems to be the most successful approach to the overpopulation problem. The most effective methods of limiting population increase include more social and economic equality for women, enhanced female education and literacy, universal access to family planning programmes, and the provision of high-quality maternity and paediatric health care.

Because they often reside close to and work in the most polluting industrial sites and are exposed to the greatest levels of pollutants, poor and minority groups in wealthy countries also suffer the burden of environmental effects. Additionally, they do not have the money to purchase products that do not harm the environment or to make investments in energy efficiency. The environmental justice movement has emerged, particularly in the USA, as a result of a strong feeling of injustice stemming from these imbalances and fuelled by many social conflicts over polluting enterprises, the placement of hazardous waste facilities, and road development.

But the connection between social justice and sustainability is more nuanced than the straightforward assertion that poverty harms the environment would imply. Particularly, wealth contributes to a number of environmental issues. Development in the highly industrialised countries of the North is mostly to blame for the world's major issues, such as climate change, ozone depletion, and acid rain. Rich countries often exhibit conspicuous spending, high rates of automobile ownership, and significant air conditioning usage, all of which have severe negative environmental effects. Of fact, by removing the extremes of riches and poverty, a redistribution of money from the established North to the developing South and from affluent to poor within particular countries may have a favourable overall effect on the environment. However, it is not a given that increased economic equality would result in less environmental deterioration; it may instead bring about other kinds of degradation or a sharing of the blame since it will enable poorer countries to boost consumption. Additionally, "catch-up" is a crucial problem in North-South environmental diplomacy since poorer Southern nations seek the same tangible advantages of growth that the wealthy North has had, such as refrigerators, washing machines, and vehicles. Why should embracing a steady-state economy prevent them from having these opportunities? But as it would unavoidably lead to greater levels of consumption, catching up for the South will undoubtedly have some detrimental effects on sustainability.

It's crucial to take into account how sustainability affects social justice. Every environmental policy will have an effect on how things are distributed. The workers who lose their employment as a result of the shutdown of a substantially polluting industry would suffer a negative distributional effect. A programme to limit petrol use via fuel taxes or restrictions on automobile usage would discriminate more harshly against someone who depends on a car

because they have to use one for work or because they reside in a distant rural region than it will against someone who doesn't have a car or who can simply switch to public transportation. In other words, there will be numerous times when social justice and sustainability must be chosen.

The steady-state economy, participatory democracy, and decentralisation are three further elements of the green programme that, according to a third perspective, may be closely related to social justice. The move to a steady state economy may need a society that is more equitable. Currently, a trickle-down effect that raises the absolute standard of living for low-income groups and a costly welfare state that provides a safety net for the very poorest members of society serve to legitimise the political inequalities that are fundamental to capitalist accumulation and wealth creation. The fact that the economy is continually growing and the economic pie is becoming bigger makes this scenario feasible, but would these discrepancies still be acceptable if the economy were static? When their personal material situation is improving, people may tolerate inequality, but if they are really going poorer, they are more inclined to strongly dislike it. A democratic, decentralised sustainable society would also be more transparent, making the existence of inequality more visible. Where everyone is seen to be making comparable sacrifices, any transition to more frugal purchasing habits and simpler lives is likely to be more acceptable; otherwise, inequality is likely to be a potential cause of societal conflict. If this claim can be made at the level of a single nation, it has much more merit when made at the global level. Without a significant decrease in the generational gap between the North and the South, which may be achieved by debt forgiveness, assistance, technology transfer, and the revision of international trade agreements, there is likely to be little progress made in addressing the environmental issues of the world[7].

Without anything that comes close to equality of wealth and income, the extreme kinds of participatory democracy and decentralisation that the green movement wants may likewise be impossible to implement. If the face-to-face encounters required for participatory democracy often bring people from very different socioeconomic backgrounds together, it is difficult to see it operating well. In fact, the expansion of participatory democracy throughout society, particularly at work, where it should lead to smaller income gaps, will in and of itself promote greater equality, in part by increasing public awareness of the various causes and forms of inequality and fostering calls for their eradication. Decentralised communities are more likely to coordinate environmental strategies and accept consumption reductions provided their standards of life are roughly comparable. Significant differences in material wealth may lead less wealthy societies to strive for economic parity with their neighbours.

Overall, there are valid arguments in favour of social justice being a fundamental green value. It is true that there is a complicated and ambiguous link between social justice and sustainability. Governments must make sure that underprivileged populations are rewarded in other ways since many environmental policies will have a detrimental effect on social justice. Overall, however, more equality ought to promote sustainability by reducing poverty and promoting democratisation and decentralisation. The strong pragmatic political imperative "no justice, no cooperation; no cooperation, no solution" serves as the foundation for both arguments. This guiding principle of underdeveloped Southern countries has pushed equality concerns to the fore of global environmental diplomacy. The same is true for convincing specific individuals to embrace sustainable measures and adopt ecological citizenship. In other words, striving for social fairness should make it easier to move towards a society that is sustainable.

Although the argument for non-violence appears less compelling, it has been claimed that participatory democracy, decentralisation, and social justice may be seen as vital elements of a sustainable society. The topic of ecological citizenship has also come up in the conversation as an important component of a green philosophy of agency. Interest in this idea of ecological citizenship is developing among green thinkers. The need for active ecological citizenship is recognised regardless of the theoretical perspective used, as the transition to a sustainable society necessitates more than just institutional change—individuals' beliefs, attitudes, and behaviour must also change[8].

CONCLUSION

The fundamental adjustments required for sustainability, according to greens, can only be made if people make them voluntarily.Ecological citizenship must be fostered at the state level via the deliberative processes brought about by democracy, decentralisation, and equality, but its impact would extend beyond politics into the spheres of economic and social activities. One of the key characteristics that distinguishes ecologism from other ideologies is the conviction that people's preferences and human nature can be altered, leading to a decrease in individualism and materialism. As the next section demonstrates, this idea affects how ecologism interacts with other ideologies. In fact, the discussion above demonstrates how contributions from several ideological traditions have influenced ecologism. The uniqueness of ecologism and its ties to other political traditions are put into doubt by this influx of ideas.

REFERENCES:

[1] D. Torgerson, “Farewell to the green movement? Political action and the green public sphere,” *Env. Polit.*, 2000, doi: 10.1080/09644010008414548.

[2] K. Svobodova, J. R. Owen, J. Harris, and S. Worden, “Complexities and contradictions in the global energy transition: A re-evaluation of country-level factors and dependencies,” *Appl. Energy*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.apenergy.2020.114778.

[3] E. Hysing and J. Olsson, *Green inside activism for sustainable development: Political agency and institutional change*. 2017. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-56723-5.

[4] G. Kohler, “Global Keynesianism And Beyond,” *J. World-Systems Res.*, 1999, doi: 10.5195/jwsr.1999.133.

[5] A. C. Y. Chiu and K. Y. Law, “Comparing the crossstrait economic policies of KMT and DPP, 20082016: Implications for the future politics of Taiwan,” *Contemporary Chinese Political Economy and Strategic Relations*. 2017.

[6] E. Hysing and J. Olsson, *Green Inside Activism for Sustainable Development*. 2018. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-56723-5.

[7] B. Akbulut, F. Demaria, J. F. Gerber, and J. Martínez-Alier, “Who promotes sustainability? Five theses on the relationships between the degrowth and the environmental justice movements,” *Ecol. Econ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.106418.

[8] C. T. Ramos, “The Green Turn: Smart cities, the SDGs, and sustainability in the EU parties’ discourse,” in *Smart Cities and the un SDGs*, 2021. doi: 10.1016/b978-0-323-85151-0.00009-9.

CHAPTER 5

POLITICAL TRADITIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEM

Ms. Sunitha B K, Assistant Professor & HOD,
Department of Management, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email Id-sunitha@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The two basic tenets of the ecology movement are the rejection of strong anthropocentrism in the human-nature interaction and the acknowledgment of development constraints. It borrows some of its ancillary concepts from other political traditions, like social justice, decentralisation, and participatory democracy, although the connection is not entirely one-sided. Established political ideas are starting to be influenced by concepts developed by ecology. As a result, whereas the first section of this chapter demonstrated how ecologism gave notions appropriated from other traditions a green spin, the second section demonstrates how those other traditions have reacted to the challenge offered by ecologism. Conservatism, liberalism, and authoritarianism are discussed first, followed by socialism, feminism, and anarchism, which strive to emancipate people via political, economic, and social transformation. The topic then moves on to political traditions founded on individualism and a belief in social order. This second set of ideas is seen to be the most similar to ecologism.

KEYWORDS:

Ecology, Environmental, Justice, Political, Socialism.

INTRODUCTION

Ecologism and the neo-conservative New Right, with its excitement for the market and the protection of the individual, seem to have few things in common. The New Right has in fact been especially antagonistic to environmentalism. Environmental rules are criticised for limiting free commerce and environmentalists are derided as "doomsayers." The rise of "free market environmentalism" was less a reflection of a concern for the environment as a whole than it was an expansion of a set of economic canons - the hegemony of the market and the sacredness of property rights - to include a new issue. It is said that the 'Tragedy of the Commons', which results from a lack of distinct, enforceable, and transferable property rights, is to blame for environmental issues. To put it another way, the market answer is to privatise public assets like endangered species. The libertarian idea of justice based on entitlements and the green idea of justice based on equality are in stark contradiction to one another. In other words, there is nothing that the market cannot resolve; if there is an environmental issue, trust the market to resolve it.

Although less blatantly antagonistic, traditional conservative discourse has also been sceptical of ecology, eager to label greens as dangerous radicals or cloaked socialists. Green parties are sometimes likened to water melons, which are "green on the outside and red on the inside." However, traditional conservatism and green values have many parallels. Both people derive solace from romantic and nostalgic notions of a pre-industrial past while harbouring a strong mistrust of Enlightenment concepts of progress and reason. The conservation principle, which is shared by both philosophies, expresses a desire to preserve the current order for future generations as well as to preserve our historical inheritance. Conservatism and conservation, according to Scruton, are really two facets of a single long-

term strategy called resource husbandry. By resources, he refers to social, material, and economic capital. Edmund Burke, a conservative philosopher, emphasised the value of cooperation between the past, present, and next generations. This concept underpins the conservative concept of "stewardship"—holding land in trust for the current generation and the whole nation—which has certain characteristics with arguments for future generations. Both beliefs show appreciation for consistency and tradition. When change is required, it should be organic and gradual—not revolutionary. The conservative mistrust about significant technological or social innovation corresponds with the green "precautionary principle." Both beliefs disapprove of liberal individualism and hold that people flourish most in cohesive, encouraging societies. Overall, Grey notes that "Traditional conservatism's outlook is most in harmony with concern for the integrity of the common environment, human as well as ecological."

Although conservatism and ecologism have certain similarities, Gray's effort to appropriate environmentalism for conservatism is an uncommon attempt to combine the two systems. This absence highlights a fundamental distinction between the two traditions that Grey somewhat misrepresents in his effort to "rescue" environmentalism from its radicalism. Simply put, ecologism holds that changing individuals is both possible and desirable, in contrast to conservatism's tendency to see human nature as fixed and unchangeable. More generally, ecologism promotes the fundamental reform of the economic, political, and social system, while conservatism strives to maintain the status quo. Fundamental green values of equality, nonviolence, and participatory democracy stand in stark contrast to conservatism's predilection for compulsion, hierarchy, and authority. The conservatism denies any effort to spread value beyond people and has nothing to say about growth constraints. Unsurprisingly, although sharing certain concepts, conservatism and ecologism have seldom explicitly learned from one another.

Traditional Liberalism

The preceding chapter's study of environmental ethics shown how often green theorists have appealed to a liberal rights discourse or, in the tradition of Bentham, deployed utilitarian notions to support extending responsibilities to non-human animals. The steady-state economy was first proposed by John Stuart Mill in his book Principles of Political Economy, and ecologism has been influenced by a number of important liberal concepts, including tolerance, deliberation, and the civic society.

However, there are many aspects of liberalism that conflict with ecologism. Liberalism, like conservatism, is "incurably anthropocentric: unable to appreciate nature as anything other than resources." Liberal arguments on interdependence contrast dramatically with the importance of the individual in liberal thinking. Ecologism assumes that the state will intervene in the pursuit of the common good, while the liberal state is neutral, endorsing no one theory of the good and passing no moral judgements on the value of various lifestyles. Liberal-ism places a strong emphasis on the value of individual property rights, implying that individuals should be free to live materialistic lives and do with their possessions as they like. The acceptance of social solutions to environmental issues, intervention, and the necessity for restrictions on individual lifestyles sit awkwardly with liberal concepts such as representative government, market freedom, and the pursuit of individual private benefit[1], [2].

Many political theorists contend that many of the apparent disagreements may be reconciled in order to "rescue" liberalism for the environment. Usually, however, they continue to acknowledge that there are still important differences. For instance, Wissenburg contends that traditional liberalism may be changed to accept limitations on its objectivity and to get rid of

its neutral bias by, for example, granting some institutional representation to interests unrelated to people. In fact, he asserts that the current debate is not "if, but... How green is liberalism possible to the extent?despite the fact that he acknowledges that just a few liberal philosophers have really taken significant steps in this regard. Additionally, he concedes that there are still some contrasts, with liberalism devoted to the value of individual private property and hesitant to advocate for any one good life in particular, such as the modest way of living seen in sustainable societies.

DISCUSSION

The heritage of survivalism shows that environmentalism has more in common with authoritarian thought, despite the fact that most greens find this association upsetting and that it has been used by opponents to disparage environmentalism. Despite Anna Bramwell's best efforts—one of her polemics is titled Blood and Soil: Hitler's 'Green Party' and Walther Darre—it is crucial to first reject any argument linking green politics to fascism. In their conception of man as at one with nature, which is represented in the notion of "blood and soil," i.e., human devotion to land and location, the Nazi excitement for biological metaphors and spiritualism was evident. Additionally, the Nazis established natural preserves and conducted research on organic farming, renewable energy sources, and deciduous reforestation. However, the great majority of Nazi ideologies, values, and practises are in direct opposition to ecologism. In fact, "the ecologists were eventually seen as hostile to Germany's national interests," despite the fact that National Socialism was receptive to ecological concepts due to the presence of a small number of "ecological ideologues" It's important not to overstate the minor similarities. As Vincent points out, neither socialism nor conservatism are forever tarnished merely because the Nazis used socialist tactics or preferred old German values.

The survivalist writings of the 1970s provide a greater basis for recognising an authoritarian component within eco- gism. Because of their overarching concern for human survival and feeling of urgency, survivalists were willing to advocate for stringent governmental restrictions on people and organisations, even if doing so meant undermining liberal principles. However, it has been stated above that the importance of green values of social justice and democracy effectively excludes these authoritarian viewpoints from the purview of ecologism. Ironically, survivalism's major effect was to incite opposition to this authoritarian school of thought, which gave green politics its potent emancipatory quality. Modern green theorists now make a point of setting themselves apart from the authoritarian past.

Marxism and Socialism

Socialism and ecologism have a tense connection. Many greens emphasise the stark contrasts between the two ideologies, particularly the socialist commitment to unrestricted economic growth, and they cite the subpar environmental performance of nations in the former Soviet bloc as proof that socialist central planning is no more environmentally friendly than capitalism. In fact, Porritt sees industrialism's "super-ideology" as existing in both capitalism and socialism. Socialists, on the other hand, criticise environmentalists for failing to acknowledge capitalism as the root cause of environmental problems and for attempting to preserve middle-class advantages like access to the countryside while neglecting fundamental social problems like poverty. However, a number of thinkers have attempted to forge connections between the opposing camps — sometimes for practical political reasons — and the result is a body of literature known as ecosocialism[3].

There are, of course, many other socialist traditions, which may be generically categorised into revolutionary ideologies like Marxism and reformist methods like social democracy. The two characteristics that appear to distinguish socialism from ecologism in the majority of variants are its anthropocentrism and its dedication to economic growth. First of all, in its pursuit of human dominance over nature and belief that greater freedom may be attained by material accumulation, socialism, like capitalism, is firmly rooted in the Enlightenment tradition. Marx thus had the view that alienated people may achieve freedom by controlling, altering, and manipulating nature; none of these ideas were, however, moderated by a strong concern for the non-human environment. Modern Marxists have denounced green concepts like the steady-state economy as backward-looking and anti-working class. However, other socialists argue that mastery need not lead to environmental deterioration; rather, it may suggest a more environmentally compassionate concept of stewardship. Others have attempted to'rescue' Marxism for ecology by, for example, reinterpreting his early writings on the dialectical theory of human-nature relations.11 However, the socialist tradition, including ecosocialism, bases its concern for the environment firmly on human-centered motives, which suggests that there is little scope for reconciling the divergent views of human-nature relations.

Second, socialism is dedicated to pursuing economic expansion. Marxism envisions human liberation taking place in a communist paradise characterised by material plenty and with a big enough economic pie to meet everyone's wants. In contrast, there would be some degree of material scarcity in the ideal green sustainable society. Greens contend that unrestrained economic development is just unsustainable on a finite world, in contrast to socialists who have no issue with economic expansion and wealth creation in general. Socialists contend that capitalism, not industrialism, is to blame specifically for environmental problems. The current ecological disaster is a result of capitalism, which is distinguished by the primacy of economic interests, the domination of the competitive and dynamic market, the desire to accumulate capital, the unrestrained pursuit of profit, the employment of harmful technologies, and the drive to amass money. Capitalism encourages a culture of consumption while causing wider and deeper levels of poverty, which socialists believe to be the root of many environmental issues. According to socialists, "Poverty is a major determinant of the environment that people experience" because it "creates the levels of poverty that shape the lives of so many people on our planet." Socialists are despondent that greens, with their 'naive' interpretation of society, fail to see the capitalist system, its institutions, and power dynamics as the main objective.

Ecosocialism has begun to create a link between socialism and ecologism on this second issue. In instance, some eco- cialist authors acknowledge that unrestricted economic development is unsustainable and that there may be ecological limitations to growth. The idea that capitalist accumulation is the surest route to human liberation is also called into question if the core socialist objective of altering who owns and controls the means of production is insufficient to stop environmental deterioration. Ecosocialists question the 'productivity' ethos of industrial civilization and contend that economic progress must take ecological constraints into consideration. Strategically, the "industrialism or capitalism" issue is of little immediate import since capitalism is unquestionably the principal foe of both socialists and environmentalists, its worldwide hegemony having been strengthened by the fall of the Soviet Union. Ecosocialism therefore urges environmentalists to emphasise capitalism as the primary contributor to ecological issues[4].

The rise of ecosocialism has promoted mutual learning on a variety of other concerns as well. When faced with the institutions and power dynamics associated with global capitalism, such

as multinational businesses, inter-national financial markets, and trade liberalisation, socialism forces greens to think about how change may be effected. Ecologism is rather ambiguous regarding how society will evolve to become sustainable and who will take the initiative to make that happen. Socialists doubt if the green emphasis on altering people's beliefs, lives, and consumption habits, when combined with a concentration on local politics at the micro level, is enough to overcome the power of transnational capital. The industrial proletariat's fall and the many losses socialism has suffered since the 1980s, however, have compelled socialists to look for new partners. As seen by the red-green coalitions that have formed in various nations, there seems to be a lot of common ground with the ecological movement. Since socialism and environmentalism share many core principles in common, including social justice, equality, and democratisation, theorists from both camps have begun to examine the potential of new social movements and rainbow coalitions of issue movements, including socialists, greens, feminists, anti-racists, and gay rights, as change agents. The majority of socialists would probably agree with Gorz that "the ecological movement is not an end in itself, but a stage in a larger struggle." It may create roadblocks for capitalist progress and compel a variety of adjustments. For the time being, capitalism is the shared enemy of socialists and environmentalists.

Ecosocialists have made contributions to the reevaluation of the state's function in green political theory as well. While socialists see the state as having a crucial role in bringing about social change, greens have always had a negative view of it. A reformist socialist strategy uses a central interventionist state to regulate the market to protect the environment while pursuing a social programme based on a redistribution of wealth, equality, and collective ownership. This approach is similar to how socialists solve other problems. As was made clear in the prior discussion of decentralisation and the state, many greens today see the state as playing a crucial role in the implementation of environmental protection laws[5].

In the socialist tradition, it would be incorrect to overstate the importance of ecosocialism. The "decentralist, non-bureaucratic, non-productivist socialism" of utopian socialists like William Morris, G. D. H. Cole, and Robert Owen is the primary source of socialist ideas that ecosocialism often draws upon. They share many characteristics with ecologists in their vision of a decentralised, self-sufficient society, but ecologists do not hold the majority stance within socialism, where the centralist, laborist tradition stands as a stark cultural divide between the two groups.

There has been a lot of discussion between these two ideas. Certainly, the socialist criticism of capitalism has strengthened ecologism. Many socialists would agree that "A socialism for the 21st century must put at its heart the ecological challenge and escape from the limits of productivist thinking." Socialism has also adopted some of the teachings of ecologism. However, there are still significant disparities between each movement's institutional and cultural expressions as well as perspectives towards important concerns like human-nature connections.

In Feminism

The deep ecology movement, particularly the US group, is determined to remedy the propensity of green politics to disregard women problems.The Earth First!is sometimes called out for having "misogynistic proclivities" and for being "saturated with male bravado and macho posturing." Nevertheless, a large number of women are involved in the green movement, and surveys often reveal that women are more concerned about environmental concerns than males. There are at least four main schools of ecofeminism that can be distinguished: liberal, cultural, social, and socialist. Just as there is no disputing the

significant contribution made by women to green politics, there is also no disputing the liveliness of the burgeoning ecofeminist debate. However, it's possible that the lack of consensus over the core message of ecofeminism has lessened its influence on ecologism. The 'difference' approach, which has been heavily criticised by mainstream feminism, has predominated within ecofeminism, which has been the major cause of conflict.

Instead of aiming for equality within the current patriarchal system, "difference" feminism highlights the virtues of traits like nurturing, friendliness, and caring that are uniquely feminine since they are typically held by women. In contrast to the individualistic, instrumental rationality of patriarchal society, which ecofeminists claim is primarily to blame for the current abuse of nature, they assert that these feminine values and forms of behaviour will be needed in a green society. Simply put, ecofeminists select a group of feminine attributes, place a high value on them, and claim that if everyone adopted these traits, the environment would be better preserved. The dominance of nature and the dominance of women are compared by ecofeminists. They contend that since women are more in tune with nature, they are better able to comprehend and sympathise with its problems "because we recognise the many faces of oppression." Ecofeminists contend that by fusing these justifications, we must first abolish patriarchy in order to address ecological issues.

On many different fronts, the "difference" approach has come under fire. The way ecofeminists praise the very kinds of stereotyped feminine attributes that the majority of feminists blame for the oppression of women in modern society makes many feminists shiver. Feminists may agree with the sentiment that males should be encouraged to acquire feminine features, hence "feminising" men, and that the traditional undervaluing of female attributes such as parenting has to be corrected. However, there is a chance that this will end up being a regressive route that subjects women to intense societal pressures to adopt the submissive feminine behaviours that patriarchal society assigns to them. Additionally, it's possible that attempting to pinpoint gender-specific features would be ineffective. After all, women show'masculine' features while males often exhibit so-called feminine ones. Even if we could distinguish between male and female qualities, not all traits of either sex are necessarily good or bad. In addition, how can males be expected to acquire feminine features if women are genetically predisposed to possess them?

These arguments stem from the core argument that this whole exercise smells of "essentialism" since feminine characteristics are biologically generated and don't change with time, culture, race, or class. The essentialist celebration of the natural, which Evans objects to, might "entrench more or less every aspect of the female condition that many of us have fought to renounce," she says. After struggling to break free from nature, we cannot turn back. Many ecofeminists have questioned the nature-female connection by contending that gender roles are socially rather than biologically formed in order to avoid the risks of essentialism. Men might pick up feminine qualities if femininity is a social fabrication, which is the case. According to Plumwood, we need a "degendered" human model with attributes that are selected independently rather than based on either male or female characteristics[6].

As an alternative, some ecofeminists contendalong with ecosocialiststhat sexism of women and environmental destruction are inexorably linked to the social hierarchies of capitalism. These authors contend that rather than their biology, women's gender, the nature of their job, and their positions in society are what bring them closer to nature. Patriarchy and capitalism systems and practises materially exploit both women and nature. Women typically face the burden of ecological destruction due to their socioeconomic circumstances, especially in less developed countries where women's difficulties and poverty go hand in hand. In fact, women have led several collective, local efforts to preserve the environment, as seen by the Chipko

women's demonstrations in India, who are known for using the nonviolent tactic of "tree-hugging" to save their woods from large, foreign forestry firms. Wider answers to these challenges would need the restructuring of capitalist society, but ecofeminism has only gradually addressed these issues due to its mostly philosophical approach. By drawing on women's anger and sadness over the destruction of our world, ecofeminism emphasises the need to include feminist issues within green theory and might serve as a spark for environmental action. However, ecofeminism has only contributed a little amount to ecology since it does not provide a clear picture of a green society or a detailed plan for feminist environmental action.

A. Anarchism

It has already been shown that anarchism had a significant impact on the growth of ecologism.Anarchist authors like Bahro, Bookchin, and Sale significantly influenced the ecological criticism of capitalist society, the sustainable society model, and green theories of agency. In many ways, anarchism is the political tradition that is allegedly closest to an ecological viewpoint. On the other hand, modern anarchism is also influenced by ecological concerns. Decentralisation, participatory democracy, and social justice are fundamental elements of the anarchist heritage, and many greens have inherited the anarchist mistrust of the state. These concepts are fundamental to the green movement. By supporting direct action, extra-parliamentary activities, and grassroots democracy, anarchists have also contributed to the development of green politics.

There are two primary schools of ecoanarchism: "social ecology," which is essentially the result of Murray Bookchin's voluminous publications, and "ecocommunalism," which is a broad term including a variety of more ecocentric posi- tions, such as the bioregionalism of Sale. Ecocommunalism is concerned with how society and nature interact, and it is strongly related to deep ecology and the ecocentric since it advocates for deeper integration of human communities with their immediate natural surroundings. In contrast, social ecology typically blames societal factors for ecological degradation. The following discussion concentrates on Bookchin's explicit connection between social hierarchy and environmental issues since it significantly advances the emancipatory thesis of ecologism.

The central thesis of social ecology is that "the very real domination of human by human" is the root cause of human dominance over nature. Bookchin has a positive perspective of nature based on the idea that it is interrelated and egalitarian, echoing the ideas of the nineteenth-century anarchist Peter Kropotkin: "Ecology recognises no hierarchy on the level of the ecosystem." There are no "lowly ants" or "kings of beasts." According to Bookchin, early pre-literate cultures—which he maintains were organic and at one with nature, desiring neither to dominate nor be ruled by it—were anarchic communities that were decentralised, non-hierarchical, and ideally suited for the flourishing of people since they are inherently cooperative. The ability to dominate other people and, by extension, non-human nature, was later gained by humans when social hierarchies based on age, gender, religion, class, and race emerged. Present-day society is characterised by dominance and hierarchy, which shapes a variety of linked dualisms, including cerebral over physical labour, work over pleasure, and mental control over the sensual body. The goal of social ecology is to replace dominance and hierarchy with freedom and equality. In other words, environmental deterioration will end if social hierarchy can be eliminated[7].

The factual critique that there have been numerous cultures, including feudalism, that have been distinguished by social hierarchy and have also lived in harmony with nature makes Bookchin's theory weak. On the other hand, a non-hierarchical egalitarian society like Marx's

post-capitalist utopia can nonetheless abuse the environment. However, Bookchin adds a crucial social component to ecocentric thought that is meant to balance out the mysticism of deep ecology. In fact, Bookchin has launched a number of harsh criticisms of deep ecology for its lack of social concern, which he dismisses as "mysti- cal eco-la-la." He has little sympathy with the deep green idea that change will simply occur as a result of personal worldviews changing in response to improved spiritual connections with nature. He also dislikes the misanthropic tone of certain deep green literature, which he perceives to advocate forceful immigration, assistance, and population control policies. He has engaged in acrimonious argument with the previous head of Earth First! Dave Foreman, an activist. Despite their animosity towards one another, social ecology and ecocommunalism share many fundamental ideas, most notably the notion that the state is fundamentally opposed to social and ecological sustainability. The anarchist criticism of the bureaucratic, centralised state and commitment to local political activity continue to have a significant impact on green thought and practise, despite the rising acceptance of liberal democratic institutions among greens.

Neither to the left nor the right, but forward?

In order to distinguish themselves from other ideologies, Greens prefer to refer to themselves as "neither left nor right but in front." What do they mean and is this statement true? What makes ecologism a unique ideology? If so, how many diverse green discourses can it tolerate, and where does ecologism fall on the traditional left-right ideological spectrum? Or is it essential to classify it using alternative criteria?

The necessity to redefine the connection between humans and environment and the acknowledgment of the notion of development limitations are the two basic concepts that define ecologism. At this moment, agreement disintegrates. Some authors contend that no particular political institutions are necessary to address ecological imperatives. For instance, Ryle thinks that "widely varying forms" of sustainable society are feasible, such as "authoritarian capitalism" and "barrack socialism," which are both quite different from the above-described green model. Others contend that some political forms are implied by ecological imperatives while excluding others. For instance, Martell contends that central planning and intervention are necessary, ruling out markets, capitalism, and decentralisation. Dobson, on the other hand, thinks that "ecologism" has merit. ..It forces it permanently towards the left of the political spectrum, where it is acknowledged that emancipatory philosophies have a strong influence.

Diagrams that show how ecologism and other ideologies relate to one another are useful. The traditional political conversation is driven by questions of distribution: who gets what, when, and how? As a result, ideologies are often classed along the well-known left-right axis based on how they see important political dualisms like "state v. market" or "equality v. hierar- chy." While not discounting the significance of distributional difficulties, ecologism, in contrast, is motivated by an ecological imperative that is not recognised by the left-right dimension. It is feasible to categorise various ideologies based on how they see environmental challenges by modifying O'Riordan's well-known technocentric-ecocentric dimension[8].

The technocentric-ecocentric dimension crosses the left-right axis, supporting the assertion made by the green movement that they represent a fundamentally distinct political philosophy. As long as we concentrate on those two concepts of non-anthropocentrism and growth constraints, this clear difference is valid. The difference gets more hazy, however, as soon as a larger set of green principles is considered. By superimposing the technocentric-

ecocentric dimension onto the traditional left-right, the relationship between ecologism and other ideologies is illustrated. If ecologism consists of the core ecological imperative supplemented by green principles of democratisation, decentralisation, and social justice, then the shaded area represents the broad area covered by ecologism. According to this interpretation, ecologism clearly has the most in common with theories that have sought to transform capitalism and criticise it, as well as theories that hold that human nature can and should be altered to make us less individualistic and materialistic. However, ecologism has also drawn from theories that are reformist in nature and aim to mitigate the worst aspects of the market, such as welfare liberalism and social democracy. Therefore, eco- gism extends to the left from just right of centre, but it does not reach the extreme left since greens prefer to manage the market than eliminating it, and they reject any type of command economy because to their mistrust of the state. Because sustainability is incompatible with an unrestrained market economy, ecologism cannot go farther to the right. Even in a free market, where they would be constrained by economic inequality and the capitalist tendencies of accumulation, competition, and concentration, greater participation in democracy and decentralisation would be impossible. This method leads to a somewhat different result than Dobson's: sure, ecology does occupy roughly left-of-center ground, but it attracts a larger diversity of perspectives than his anarchist-emancipatory framework. Although the ecoanarchist blueprint was closely mirrored in the model of a sustainable society presented at the beginning of the chapter, the discussion of fundamental green values and the influence of other ideologies has revealed flaws in this model and shown the existence of a number of alternative viewpoints in the green political sphere. In fact, it appears fair to predict that the land claimed by ecologism will provide room for a variety of green alternatives, including both the extreme ecoanarchist and the 'pro-state' ecosocialist models. This is similar to how there are several forms of socialism, feminism, and conservatism[9], [10]

CONCLUSION

This looser approach to defining ecologism's borders is cognizant of the argument that efforts to establish a single, "correct," version of ecologism not only stifle debate but also minimise the influence of green political theory on other political traditions. In this regard, Barry's endeavour to separate green political theory from the ecologism ideology to permit a fuller discussion free from the necessity to follow a "party line" is very commendable.The two main concepts that support the ecological imperative, together with a coherent set of principles derived from other doctrines, are, nevertheless, sufficient, according to the main thesis of this chapter, for us to speak properly about ecologism as an ideology in and of itself. The fact that many ecologists and activists now agree that liberal democracy is a permanent feature of society and that ecologies require tactics to transform it is a significant underlying subject.

REFERENCES:

[1] J. A. Ewing, “Hollow Ecology: Ecological Modernization Theory and the Death of Nature,” *J. World-Systems Res.*, 2017, doi: 10.5195/jwsr.2017.611.

[2] E. Gómez-Baggethun, “More is more: Scaling political ecology within limits to growth,” *Political Geography*. 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.polgeo.2019.102095.

[3] J. A. Flagg, “Carbon neutral by 2021: The past and present of Costa Rica’s unusual political tradition,” *Sustain.*, 2018, doi: 10.3390/su10020296.

[4] R. Limbong, "Isu Pemanasan Global Pada Pergeseran Paradigma Studi Keamanan Dalam Hubungan Internasional," *J. Diplomasi Pertahanan*, 2021, doi: 10.33172/jdp.v7i1.673.

[5] M. Treacy, "Political Ecology and Ecological Marxism as critical approaches to the relationship between economic development and the environment," *Rev. Colomb. Sociol.*, 2020, doi: 10.15446/rcs.v43n2.77548.

[6] S. Frickel and F. Arancibia, "Environmental Science and Technology Studies," in *Handbooks of Sociology and Social Research*, 2021. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-77712-8_22.

[7] M. Suškevičs *et al.*, "Challenges and opportunities of engaging biodiversity-related citizen science data in environmental decision-making: Practitioners' perceptions and a database analysis from Estonia," *J. Nat. Conserv.*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.jnc.2021.126068.

[8] R. Eckersley, "Global environmental politics," in *An Introduction to International Relations, Third edition*, 2017. doi: 10.1017/9781316855188.036.

[9] E. Brush, "Inconvenient truths: pluralism, pragmatism, and the need for civil disagreement," *J. Environ. Stud. Sci.*, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s13412-020-00589-7.

[10] R. Limbong, K. Zidam, I. / Siliwangi, D. Program, S. D. Pertahanan, and S. Pertahanan, "Isu Pemanasan Global Pada Pergeseran Paradigma Studi Keamanan Dalam Hubungan Internasional the Issue of Global Warming in Shifting Paradigm of Security Studies in International Relations," *J. Diplomasi Pertahanan*, 2021.

CHAPTER 6

GREEN PARTIES: A NEW POLITICAL FORCE ON THE RISE

Mr. Shankar Prasad S, Assistant Professor,
Department of Management, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email Id- shankarprasad@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Particularly in Europe, green parties have become a common sight on the political scene. In 1972, Tasmania and New Zealand established their first green parties, and in 1979, Switzerland elected its first green to a national legislature. By the late 1990s, green parties had gained enough traction to join national coalition administrations in Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, and Italy, have representatives in a number of other national legislatures, and be present in several subnational chambers. In 2004, 34 Green MEPs were elected to the European Parliament from eleven different nations. Several Green politicians have occupied prominent positions, including Michele Schreyer, the first Green European Commissioner between 1999 and 2004, and Joschka Fischer, the German Foreign Minister.

KEYWORDS:

Environmental, Green Parties, Political Force, Politics.

INTRODUCTION

The Greens are unmistakably here, and their message seems to have enough consistency and resonance to exert an electorate-wide appeal. The chapter opens with a short analysis of the electoral performance of green parties, highlighting the nations where they have achieved political success and those where they have not. The following section evaluates three major macro-level new politics theories for the growth of the green party:Post materialism, new social movements, and class narratives. The emergence of green parties is explained by these macro-level ideas, but they are unable to account for regional differences in the success of green parties. In the next section, the framework known as "political the opportunity structure," which combines these basic structural andthe performance of the green party in Germany, France, and the UK is examined using cultural explanations in conjunction with institutional issues such as the election process and party competitiveness in specific countries. Last but not least, although offering a more thorough and sympathetic assessment, the POS framework might be faulted for underestimating the role that ecological concerns play in the public's support for green parties.

The Green Party's electoral performance

In Northern and Western Europe, green parties have had the most political success. Green parties consistently gained seats in national parliaments and received at least 5% of the vote in four nations throughout the 1980s: West Germany, Belgium, Switzerland, and Luxembourg. The most effective greens have been those from Germany and Belgium. The largest and best-known green party is Die Gruenen, which was founded in Germany and placed third in the 1994 federal election. Between 1998 and 2005, it formed a coalition government with the Social Democrats. The two green parties in Belgium, the Flemish-speaking Groen! and the French-speaking Ecolo, reflect the linguistic similarity of other

Belgian parties. They gained popularity after being elected to the legislature in 1981 and achieved a noteworthy victory in the 1999 election when a combined vote of 14.3% and 20 MPs catapulted them into ruling coalitions at the federal and sub-national levels. However, both parties suffered a crushing loss in the 2003 election after being in power for four years, with Groen winning just four seats and Ecolo only four! not being able to win any seats. The Swiss Green Party is regarded as the biggest alternative party outside of the cartel of the four major political parties.

In a second set of nations, including Finland, France, Austria, and the Netherlands, green parties did not get an average of more than 5% of the vote until the 1990s. As the first green party to enter a national government, the Finnish Green League did so in 1995. After solidifying its position, it continued to serve in the rainbow coalition government after the 1999 election. After the Finnish parliament backed the government's plan to commission a new nuclear power station, the Green League left the coalition in 2002, but it had its greatest election year in 2003, receiving 8% of the vote and fourteen seats. Les Verts in France won their first seven representatives in 1997 and entered the socialist-led coalition government under Lionel Jospin, but once the government was overthrown in 2002, Les Verts only had three lawmakers left.

After absorbing the majority of the moderate ecological party Vereinigte Gru ne O sterreich's supporters in 1986, the Austrian Alternative Gru ne O sterreich is now well-established, becoming the third-largest party in the 2006 election with a gain of 11.1% and twenty-one MPs. The 1990 merger of four minor left-of-center partiescommunists, pacifists, radicals, and an evangelical partyto establish the Green Left utterly overwhelmed the little "dark" green party De Groenen in the Netherlands. Although it was sluggish to acquire traction, it got 7.3% of the vote in 1998 and just 4.6% and seven MPs by 2006. Along with these "successful" parties, the Swedish Miljopartiet was also elected to parliament in 1988. While it failed to reach the 4% threshold in 1991, it has managed to do so each since, winning 5.2% of the vote and nineteen seats in 2006[1].

Other green parties in Europe have had trouble building a solid electoral foundation. The Italian Greens typically receive around 2% of the vote, but between 1996 and 2001, they served five years in the center-left Olivo government and, in 2006, after five years in opposition, they gained 2.1 % and fifteen MPs as a part of the center-left coalition that established the Prodi-led coalition government. Irish Comhaontas Glas representation tripled to six MPs in 2002 as the party gained strength over time. The green movement in Spain is strongly polarised; while Los Verdes, a national green party, was not founded until 1992, there are several other green lists that may be found in every national election. Los Verdes and the Socialists formed a partnership list in 2004 and gained their first seat. It is disputed if the Portuguese Os Verdes, which runs for office in collaboration with the Communists, is a legitimately separate party. Another set of nations, including Britain, Norway, and Denmark, have yet to elect a Green MP. Further afield, Greens have won seats in national legislatures in a variety of nations, including Mexico, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, and Slovakia.

With six MPs elected in 2005, New Zealand's green party is perhaps the most successful non-European organisation. Although a few Greens have been elected to the Senate and to state parliaments, most notably in Tasmania, development has been slowed by the lack of a unified national green party in Australia. Although experienced consumer advocate Ralph Nader received almost three million votes on a green ticket in the 2000 US presidential election, green parties have not had much success in North America. Over 232 greens were serving in minor elected positions in 28 American states as of April 2006.Two primary issues are raised by this quick review of green parties. The next paragraph evaluates whether the 'new politics'

concept can explain the emergence of green parties.Before evaluating their impact on the development of green parties, this section discusses the key elements of the new politics thesis, including the formation of new social movements, the growth of a new middle class, and the flourishing of post material ideals[2].

DISCUSSION

The student, peace, anti-nuclear, feminist, and environmental movements, among other "new social movements," were largely to blame for the widespread social protest that swept Western Europe starting in the late 1960s. According to their location, objectives, organisational structure, and mode of action, Scott differentiates NSMs from traditional social movements like labour unions. First, unlike trade unions, which are situated inside the political system and often work to sway social democratic and labour parties, NSMs operate outside of the mainstream parties in an effort to activate civil society rather than gain power. Second, although NSMs concentrate on safeguarding civil society against excessive political authority and seek cultural reforms to values and lifestyles, trade unions have historically sought political integration, legislative reform, and economic rights for workers. NSMs challenge the materialist tenets that support the ideology of those movements that represent capital and labour, such as economic progress. Thirdly, although NSMs are often informal, decentralised, and participatory groups, trade unions embrace the bureaucratic and hierarchical organisational structures that are ubiquitous in society. Finally, although NSMs embrace creative action repertoires, including confrontation and direct action, often beyond the bounds of the law, trade unions typically operate inside the framework of the existing political structures.

The NSM is best described as participative, issue-specific, and focused towards mobilising public opinion. This description is based on the NSM in its most extreme and fundamentalist version. The NSM is shown in its early stages, when it "has all the optimism of a new movement grounded in recent mobiliz- ation, before the movement must reflect upon how it is to affect the social and political environment," which is obviously problematic. Once a movement is established, it generally makes concessions by progressively embracing traditional organisational structures and tactics.By the end of the 1980s, the majority of the new social movements in Western Europe seemed to be pragmatic reformist movements due to the breadth of these agreements. Strongly related to well-established politics in many different ways. Some of the most sweeping assertions regarding the radical potential of NSMs seemed to be unfounded. However, the presence of a vibrant NSM environment may serve as a significant institutional element influencing the formation of a green party[3], [4].

The main changes to advanced capitalist states' economic and social systems in the post-World War II period are the subject of this explanation of the new politics. A significant change in occupational structures resulted from the fall of the conventional blue-collar working class and the rise of the white-collar sector, which was mirrored by the shrinkage of the old manufacturing industry and the growth of the service sector. The 'postindustrial society' has seen the erasure of historic class distinctions and allegiances due to a number of other causes, such as increased material standards of living, the rapid growth of higher education, and the digital revolution. According to some authors, a new middle class has formed that is economically stable, well educated, and fills professional and welfare occupations. It is suggested that this new class is, in some ways, more cut off from politics than the old working class and, more importantly, that they are more able and ready to attack the established parties, the bureaucracy, and the predominating materialist agenda.

The 'new class' thesis is relevant to the study of environmental politics because it asserts empirically that members of new social movements in general and environmentalists in particular are mostly recruited from the new middle class. Offe continues by pointing out that two additional groups are also involved in NSMs: first, so-called "decommodified" groups that are marginal to the labour market, like students, stay-at-home moms, retirees, and the unemployed; and second, members of the "old" middle class who are independent and self-employed, like farmers, store owners, and artisans. All of these groupings are notable in that they belong to groups other than the capitalist and labouring classes[5].

The dominance of environmentalism by the new middle class must represent an effort to further its own class interests, according to new class explanations of NSMs, which argue that because classes have interests. In fact, some Marxists have sought to discredit environmental activism by labelling it a manifestation of middle-class snobbery. Arguments about class interests, however, are problematic. Why, first of all, should environmentalism only advance middle-class interests? All socioeconomic strata experience the effects of pollution, but often the poorest and most marginalised populations experience these effects most directly and with the greatest severity at work and in inner-city neighbourhoods. According to Cotgrove, the new middle class is excluded from decision-making processes at the social and economic centre of society because of its placement in the non-productive sector. Therefore, frustration among the emerging middle class over its own helplessness shows itself as protesting and involvement in NSMs.

However, it is unclear why members of the new middle class feel alienated given that they are often fully engaged in professional and administrative positions by definition. In contrast, McAdams contends that they are interested in government growth for a variety of reasons, including the fact that it creates the majority of the professional and welfare employment they already occupy. However, this argument falls short of proving that middle-class environmental activism reflects class interests since it raises concerns about the increase of the unproductive service sector, which employs a large portion of them. There may be an excessive number of new-middle-class environmentalists, but there is no convincing case that their concern should be in their material interests, as Martell notes. As a result, new-middle-class concern for the environment may be "class-based, but does not seem to be class-driven."

Instead, it's possible that those in the welfare professions foster "the development of emancipatory occupational cultures among radicals working in these fields"; in other words, the autonomy, ambiguous role in capitalist society, and fundamentally political nature of the work foster the attitudes and values that make the new middle classes receptive to environmentalism. On the other hand, the causal link may work in reverse, attracting people to the welfare professions who already have predisposed views and beliefs. If so, where did those views come from? The postmaterialist hypothesis offers one potential reason[6].

Post-materialism as environmentalism

This justification for the growth of green parties places a heavy emphasis on changes in the political ideals and culture of industrialised nations. The principal proponent of the postmaterialist concept is Inglehart. He asserts that "the basic value priorities of Western publics" have undergone a "silent revolution." ..changing from a Materialist focus to a Postmaterialist one, placing a greater emphasis on belonging, self-expression, and quality of life, as opposed to giving bodily nourishment and safety first priority. The scarcity hypothesis and the socialisation hypothesis are the two main tenets of this argument. According to the scarcity hypothesis, which is based on Maslow's psychology theory of human motivation, people give more importance to items that are scarce. According to Inglehart, the post-war

period of consistent economic expansion and unmatched affluence gave rise to a generation of young people who took their financial security for granted. People focus on higher-order "quality of life" or postmaterial requirements, such as the environment, if the lower-order demands of economic and physical security are met.

According to Inglehart, a new generation that spends its formative, pre-adult years in prosperous times is socialised, rather than individuals really altering their views, to lead to the dominance of postmaterial ideals. This idea was first created by Inglehart to explain the student unrest that swept the Western world in the late 1960s. The growth of the West German Greens has since been cited as a reason for the realignment of conventional partisan voting patterns, this postmaterial generation's engagement in NSMs, and the establishment of green parties. ..reflects the growth of a Postmaterialist constituency whose worldview is not reflected by the current political parties as well as the emergence of a rising population of voters who are politicised but do not feel attached to the current parties' platforms.

The two hypotheses supporting Inglehart's theory and the methodology he developed to measure postmaterialism have come under heavy fire, despite the fact that the theory has gained many supporters. The scarcity hypothesis, for example, holds that the satisfaction of material needs encourages people to turn their attention to non-material values. The hierarchy of needs, however, adopts a static definition of those material needsa roof over our heads, food on our tables, money in our pockets, and the protection of law and orderwhile in the contemporary consumer society, with greater affluence and an ever-growing variety of available goods, our appetite for more and more material goods may be insatiable. Our understanding of what constitutes a fundamental necessity is evolving: whereas a washing machine was formerly considered a luxury in the 1960s, many today include it in this category along with the dishwasher, computer, and cell phone. In other words, increased affluence could only foster more materialism rather than promote nonmaterial ideals.

Inglehart focuses on the crucial pre-adult years as the foundation for the socialisation hypothesis and generally ignores the effects of any adult economic instability on values. His forecast that the percentage of postmaterialists would increase somewhat understates the effect that the widespread economic unrest of the 1970s and 1980s had on succeeding generations. Can the scarcity and socialisation theories account for the rise in postmaterialism, even if methodological problems are set aside? Value transformation may really have its roots in the NSM milieu rather than being a byproduct of postmaterialism. Perhaps the expansion of welfare-oriented occupations in education and public health has resulted in value shift rather than higher living standards producing postmaterialism. Regarding the specific question of the environment, higher education experience is the main factor that has been linked to an increase in environmental concern.

This is probably because higher education enables people to process more information, improves their employment prospects and material security, and fosters a wider critical outlook. If environmentalism is just a matter of values, then environmental conflict is a conflict without interests, which is another issue with the postmaterialist concept. However, those who oppose environmentalism are often economic players who believe that green policies directly jeopardise their financial interests rather than those who simply have different values, such as a desire for economic development. Despite these concerns, there is enough factual support for the expansion of postmaterial ideals at the very least to consider it as a possible partial explanation for the rise of environmentalism. The next section evaluates the extent to which these three major "new politics" theories can explain the emergence of green parties[7].

Green parties as the future of politics

Green parties undoubtedly grew as a result of new social movement activities in various nations. In Germany, France, Luxembourg, and Finland, green parties emerged from anti-nuclear power referendum campaigns, and in Austria and Sweden, green parties were founded as a result of the broad coalition of environmental and leftist organisations that made up the anti-nuclear movements of the 1970s and 1980s. Coalitions between the peace and environmental movements known as "eco-pax," particularly in Germany, were crucial. Some green parties, most notably the German Greens, were strongly influenced by the radical principles of NSM activists, which influenced their unwillingness to collaborate with mainstream parties, preference for participatory, decentralised organisational structures, and willingness to use extra-parliamentary action to further their goals. Green parties cannot be considered NSMs, although obviously being influenced by the counter-cultural NSM milieu. Green parties distinctly differentiate themselves from the NSM of the ideal kind only by running for office and participating in the political system. Internal disputes about how much green parties should cooperate with other established political parties and institutions are really arguments over how much compromise was made when the party was formed in the first place. Indicating that environmental issues may be fundamentally distinct from NSM concerns like gender, racism, or peace, certain green parties, particularly in the UK, Ireland, Sweden, and Eastern Europe, are not anchored in the NSM milieu[8].

Voters in the emerging middle class do support the majority of European green parties. Compared to supporters of other parties, green voters are significantly younger, more educated, less likely to attend church, and more likely to work in the public sector or in white-collar occupations, according to academic research and opinion surveys. Germany, which has undergone extensive research due to the popularity of Die Gruenen, presents a clear image. Even though just one-third of the German electorate was in that age range, until the mid-1990s, the majority of green voters in this country were under the age of 36. Around 50% of students and white-collar employees have historically supported Die Gru nen, in contrast to a far smaller number of elderly voters and blue-collar workers. Green voters tend to be highly educated; in contrast to the national average of roughly a quarter, nearly half of green voters have earned an Abitur, which entitles one to enrol in college. Other countries' green electorate profiles, such those in Austria and Finland, are quite similar. According to one survey, the Finnish Green League is the "female-dominated party of the relatively young, new middle classes, and the average to highly educated."Even more significant socioeconomic characteristics may be seen among Green Party activists. According to a study of the UK Green Party conducted in 1990, the average member was 41 years old, owned their own home, and worked as a "professional" in the public sector, most commonly in education. By 2002, nothing had changed from this profile. Studies of Dutch, Belgian, and German campaigners revealed similar profiles.

Therefore, it seems that Greens are mostly recruited from the so-called new middle class, but if Inglehart is correct, they should also espouse a variety of postmaterial values. The association between postmaterialism and party activism is strong among party activists (94% of German Green Party delegates and 74% of Dutch Green Left delegates), while it is weaker among the general population. However, outside of Germany and the Netherlands, green voters retain a wide range of both material and postmaterial concerns, with the environment being the one topic in common. The evidence is often suggestive rather than conclusive. For instance, in Sweden, voters who support the green party are somewhat more postmaterialist than those who support other parties, however this statistical link is just "modest." More

generally, a number of studies raise significant questions about the existence of a direct connection between postmaterial values and environmental care.

These results raise the question of whether it is correct to classify all ecological risks as postmaterialist issues, which points to a deeper issue with postmaterialist theories of environmental politics. Numerous environmental concerns, such the safety of GM crops and nuclear power, or the connection between air pollution and asthma, might all be classified as materialist issues since they have an impact on people's personal security and health. People are becoming more driven by the sense that we live in a "risk society," as Beck has stated. If so, rather than, as Inglehart contends, the creation of a new set of value priorities, the devotion to green politics may be partially motivated by outdated materialist ideals. Not to mention, according to this understanding, many "materialists" support green political parties.

Overall, 'new politics' explanations do contribute to the growth of green parties; in particular, the socioeconomic makeup of green support is strikingly consistent across all nations. However, Inglehart's claim that the rise of postmaterialist principles is reflected in green politics as a result of culture has not been supported. In fact, various other reasons for the emergence of green parties are suggested by the socio-economic profile of green support. Eckers-ley's assertion that this element could be crucial is supported by the huge percentage of greens who have a college degree. Additionally, while most greens do have a good level of economic stability, they often live in marginalised areas of society. This is not to mean, as some have claimed, that people who identify as greens are completely alienated from society; they are not. Teachers and social workers may not always embody society's core principles, but they are also not outsiders. However, a lot of greens are protected from the private sector's contribution to economic development and its materialistic offshoots. It is difficult to tell whether this separation is a conscious decision made by those who are already concerned about environmental concerns or if it stems from experiences in certain professions and economic sectors. However, the fact that the greens mainly rely on societal areas like higher education, the service industry, health and welfare that are growing is encouraging for their prospects in the future[9].

On the other hand, there is mounting evidence that the green vote is 'greying' or becoming older in several countries. In 1980, 70.5% of German Green voters were under 35; by 1994, that number had dropped to 50%; and by 2005, just 27.5% were under 35. The Greens recorded their biggest-ever proportion of votes in the 45-59 and 65+ age categories during the 2002 federal election, when they made the highest advances in older age groups. This pattern continued in the election of 2005, with the proportion of Green voters in these two categories reaching 27.8% and 16.0%, respectively. The centre of gravity of the party has moved towards the upper end of the 35-45 age range, although supporters appear to have stayed loyal to Die Gru nen as they have aged. However, the party is now less effective at attracting new voters. The same is true in Finland, where the Green League continues to be the leading representative of new politics while also gaining support from an expanding base of older voters and those from more 'average' social backgrounds. Perhaps there is a group of green voters making their way through the system who participated in the late 1960s student demonstrations and supplied the NSM activists for the next two decades.

If true, it could not be good for green parties' long-term prospects. To prove that greying is a global trend, there is currently insufficient evidence. Indeed, there are a number of reasons why green parties may anticipate maintaining support among young people. As evidenced by the victory of the Belgian Greens in the 1999 national election and Ralph Nader's popularity in the 2000 US presidential election, voting green is still a protest vote against the mainstream parties and values, especially where the greens have not yet entered government.

Younger generations should have a greater degree of awareness and comprehension than older generations because to the increased incorporation of environmental concerns into the public discourse, particularly via the school curriculum. Consequently, one speculative argument is that although the new generation of younger voters may be less postmaterialist but still influenced by a specific concern about the environment, older green supporters may be largely postmaterialist in viewpoint[10].

In conclusion, new politics theories that point to structural and cultural developments can only provide broad-brush, macro-level justifications for the growth of green parties. They don't take into consideration regional variations. Inglehart's own data may be used to show this flaw. He claims that in the middle of the 1980s, Denmark, West Germany, and the Netherlands were the three European nations with the biggest proportion of postmaterialists. However, there are stark differences in the ways that the green parties have developed in these nations. For example, while Die Grunen has long been the leading force in the green movement, the Dutch Green Left only achieved a significant electoral victory in the late 1990s, and the Danish greens are so weak that they do not even run in national elections. Additionally, the percentage of postmaterialists was the same in both Belgium and the UK, yet the Belgian green parties have had notable political triumphs whereas the British Green Party has a poor track record in general elections. Why therefore are green parties more prevalent in certain nations than others, and why does their political success vary so much?

CONCLUSION

The emergence of green parties cannot be explained by a single theory. The assertion that greens parties are a reflection of a new politics has some merit. Anti-nuclear protest served as a crucial mobilizing factor for the origins of many green parties, which sprang from a thriving new social movement milieu. The 'new middle class does support green parties disproportionately, but this statistical link does not tell us very much since the bulk of this group votes for other parties. There is ample evidence that green parties do draw a sizable proportion of post material supporters, despite significant theoretical and methodological flaws in Inglehart's cultural thesis that wealth and early socialization have created a population whose values are increasingly post material.

REFERENCES:

[1] T. N. Clark and R. Inglehart, “The new political culture: Changing dynamics of support for the welfare state and other policies in postindustrial societies,” in *The New Political Culture*, 2018. doi: 10.4324/9780429496158.

[2] A. Römmele *et al.*, “Book Reviews.,” *Party Polit.*, 2014.

[3] A. Lambert and E. Kelly, “Coalition,” *M/C J.*, 2010, doi: 10.5204/mcj.327.

[4] “2019 Dissertation List,” *PS Polit. Sci. Polit.*, 2020, doi: 10.1017/s1049096520000700.

[5] “Review Index,” *Perspect. Polit.*, 2018, doi: 10.1017/s1537592718000038.

[6] B. Glasson, “Gentrifying Climate Change: Ecological Modernisation and the Cultural Politics of Definition,” *M/C J.*, 2012, doi: 10.5204/mcj.501.

[7] “Review Index,” *Perspect. Polit.*, 2016, doi: 10.1017/s1537592716001055.

[8] “Book reviews,” *Int. Aff.*, 2006, doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2346.2006.00570.x.

[9] M. Löwy, *Ecosocialism: A Radicale Alternative to Capitalist Catastrophe*. 2019.

[10] I. Taylor, "War and the Crisis of Youth in Sierra Leone," *Round Table*, 2012, doi: 10.1080/00358533.2012.697807.

CHAPTER 7

STRUCTURE OF POLITICAL OPPORTUNITY AND THE SUCCESS OF THE GREEN PARTY

Dr. Roopa Traisa, Associate Professor & HOD,
Department of Management, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email Id-roopa@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The political opportunity structure goes beyond the broad macro factors that support the new politics thesis, making it a valuable framework for understanding the growth of the green party. The political environment's "dimensions which either encourage or discourage people from using collective action" are of interest to the POS. Every author typically employs a separate set of variables. The POS model utilized in this debate is based on Kitschelt's work, who used it to research green parties. His model takes into account the broad structural elements that support the new politics thesis, such as the growth of contemporary welfare capitalism and economic prosperity, but it pays particular attention to the institutional and political elements that might affect how welcoming a political system is to green parties.

KEYWORDS:

Environmental, Green Party, Politics, Political Opportunity.

INTRODUCTION

These include the presence of precipitating events, such as the anti-nuclear demonstrations, that may function as a catalyst for the birth and growth of a green party, as well as NSM activity, the electoral system's structure, the nature of party rivalry, and the nature of party competition. The following succinct case studies on the growth of the green parties in Germany, France, and Britain concentrate on four crucial aspects of the POS that help explain disparities in the success of the green parties.Die Gru nen have contributed significantly to the growth of the green movement. It quickly became a major player in German politics after joining parliament in 1983. The Green Party overtook the liberal Free Democrats Party to place third in the 1994, 1998, and 2002 federal elections after a hiccup in the 1990 post-unification election, when no Greens were returned in the old West Germany. Thus, as a prospective coalition partner for one of the two main parties, the Social Democrats or the Christian Democrats, the party has developed into a genuine political power broker since the mid-1990s.

The Greens and Social Democrats formed a red-green governing coalition after the 1998 federal election, which lasted until its defeat in 2005. The Greens dropped to fifth place behind the FDP and the newly formed Left Party in 2005 despite garnering 8.1% of the list vote, which was only slightly less than in 2002.Die Gru nen has its origins in social movement activities from the latter half of the 1960s and early 1970s. Leading forces included the anti-nuclear power, women's, and long-standing student movements, as well as citizen action organisations. The enormous peace movement, which fought against the placement of Pershing and Cruise missiles in Europe, included many green activists, and their 'eco-pax' goal influenced the development of green ideology and practise. In the early 1980s, there was a general rise in public concern about the environment, and one major contributing factor was the problem of acid rain.The Green Party has typically benefited greatly from the

election rules. According to German election law, parties that get more than 0.5% of the vote are reimbursed for their campaign expenses. As a result, the party was able to create a national organisational structure from the beginning without the need to find wealthy donors. Every party earning at least 5% of the vote is represented through the extra member electoral system. This bar was high enough to serve as a unifying factor for the many green organisations that sprung up across West Germany in the late 1970s and formed Die Gru nen in 1980, yet low enough to be achievable. The rate of development was so quick that the Green Party won 27 MPs with 5.6% of the vote in the 1983 federal election, and other sub-national governments saw comparable success. After losing all of its deputies in the 1990 federal election, the party's advancement was subsequently hindered by internal factionalism, but the discipline brought about by the electoral rules allowed the moderate "Realist" wing of the party to win control of the party and push through a number of organisational reforms, a more moderate programme, and a merger with the East German Bundnis 90.

The Greens were able to gain seats in the La nder thanks to the federal structure of the German political system, which gave the party early exposure and legitimacy and subsequently served as a testing ground for red-green coalitions with the SPD. Additional electoral chances have been made available by European parliamentary elections, where the Green Party often performs better than in federal elections. Since 1984, the party has had another political platform thanks to the existence of a sizable and vociferous group of Green MEPs in the European Parliament[1], [2].The Green Party's activities, particularly its ideological evolution, internal party conflicts, and its performance in administration, have also influenced its electoral success. Ironically, the Green Party has given birth to two of the most well-liked and well-known German politicians in recent memory in Petra Kelly and Joschka Fischer, while being uncomfortable with the notion of leadership and wary of charismatic individuals.

The political vacuum on the left of the German party system benefited the Greens. After experiencing a string of election setbacks in the 1950s, the SPD, the main left-wing party, moved towards the middle. To the dismay of NSM militants, the ruling party between 1969 and 1982 substantially abandoned its socialist foundations. As a result, the Greens were able to fill the void to the left of the SPD in the absence of a communist party by providing a new home for a sizable constituency of disaffected leftists. Since reunification, the PDS has staked out the region to the left of the SPD in the former East Germany, where the Greens have struggled. In 2005, the Greens got 8.8% of the vote in West Germany, compared to just 5.2% in the former East Germany, proving that the party still has a strong West German base.

The victory of the Greens also has certain particularly German characteristics, to sum up. The "Holocaust effect," which touches on a variety of touchy subjects and has influenced the significance of student politics and pacifism in post-war Germany, is emphasised by Markovits and Gorski. It is obvious that institutional and political considerations have had a significant impact on the German Greens' electoral success, even if this last aspect may set them apart from other green parties.

Les Verts gained eight seats in the 1989 European parliamentary elections, and an environmental candidate ran for president in the 1974 presidential election, but it wasn't until 1997 that the first Greens were elected to the French National Assembly. The nuclear debate dominated French environmentalism in the 1970s, particularly when the right-wing government started a sizable nuclear power plan in 1974. Environmental activists came to the conclusion that they required a unified party to have more influence in French politics when Mitterand, the newly elected Socialist president, abandoned his commitment to impose a moratorium on the construction of new nuclear facilities in 1981. As a result, Les Verts was

created in 1984 by combining a variety of environmental and activist organisations. After Les Verts won the 1989 European election, Brice Lalonde, a former environment minister in the Socialist administration, founded a second green party, Generation Ecologie, in 1990. Both parties did well in the 1992 regional elections, winning several hundred council members while riding the green wave. They then overcame profound ideological and interpersonal divisions to join the Entente des Ecologistes in order to run in the parliamentary elections of 1993, but they were unsuccessful in doing so despite receiving a respectable 7.8% of the vote. Instantaneously, the Entente fell apart. By 1995, factionalism had caused further division into a dozen little opposing parties. However, Les Verts was able to rise from this low point and become the main player in French green politics. In the 1997 legislative elections, it reached an agreement with Lionel Jospin's Socialists to form an electoral coalition that returned seven Greens as a part of a five-party "plural left" alliance. This allowed Les Verts to join the ruling coalition, with Dominique Voynet, its national speaker, initially holding the environment portfolio. No el Mam'ere garnered 5.2% of the vote in the strongest Green result in a presidential election in 2002, but this accomplishment did not make up for the fall of the Jospin "plural left" administration, with Les Verts obtaining just three seats with 4.4% of the vote.

DISCUSSION

The growth of green politics in France has been hampered by the political opportunity structure. Although the anti-nuclear movement helped ecological politics gain traction in the 1970s, it lost steam in the 1980s due to conflict within the movement and the Socialist government's obstinacy on the subject. No significant ecological problem has so far served as a stimulus for the green parties[3].In France, legislative and presidential elections are decided by a unique two-round voting process: if no candidate receives 50% of the vote in the first round, all candidates receiving at least 12.5% of the vote can advance to the second round, which is a direct competition for the most votes. Minority parties are disadvantaged by this second-ballot system since it is difficult to attain the 12.5% barrier required to even remain in a race, much less win a seat. Les Verts were only able to overcome this hurdle and obtain a small number of deputies in 1997 and 2002 because to an electoral agreement in which Socialists and Greens agreed to abstain in favour of one another in around 100 crucial seats to give one candidate a clean run. Significantly, ecological candidates have done better in regional and European Parliament elections when proportional representation is implemented.

With a political vocabulary focused on class politics, the left-right divide has dominated French party politics. For many years, the political preferences of the voters were dispersed throughout the political spectrum by a four-party system made up of two right-wing and two left-wing parties. In contrast to Germany, there was no empty political space on the left for the greens to occupy, making it very difficult for new parties to gain traction in politics. The political system was nonetheless more unstable throughout the 1980s; the growth of the extreme right National Front revealed a rising dissatisfaction with the mainstream parties, especially on the right. The socialist government's turn to the right and the Communists' fall on the left gave the greens a chance to win over disaffected left-wing voters.

Factionalism has hurt French green politics' chances of winning elections. For instance, there have always been significant variations in opinion over whether Les Verts should engage in political relations with the left or not. Strong personality conflicts amongst prominent activists, like Voynet, Lalonde, and Antoine Waechter, a deep green who ultimately quit the party once it turned left, have intensified these divisions. Les Verts gradually abandoned their hostility to coalitions due to the rise of Voynet, a fervent supporter of greater ties with the left, and the departure of important fundamentalist sections who had fiercely opposed them.

When the Jospin-inspired "plural left" coalition was created, this action occurred at the same time the POS began to open up. But once the Jospin administration was overthrown in 2002, Les Verts found themselves once again mired in a variety of organisational, managerial, financial, and strategic direction crises. As a result, the party's propensity for internal strife and ineffective leadership to harm its electoral standing persists.

The sustainability of Les Verts' alliance with the Socialists is crucial to the party's election prospects. For instance, in the March 2004 regional elections, the left easily won twenty-five out of twenty-six regional assemblies, with Les Verts performing well in the fifteen regions where it ran a combined list with the Socialists. This was a result of the unpopularity of the right-wing Raffarin administration. It need not be a handicap that they are dependent on the Socialists. Les Verts, if it can overcome its self-destructive factionalist tendencies, has the chance to become the undisputed second party of the left and is therefore essential in securing any future electoral victory for the center-left. This would give it the ability to negotiate with the Socialists from a position of some strength[4].

Britain

The first green party in Europe was founded in Britain, yet despite this, the party has had little political success and consistently performs poorly in national elections. A small discussion group created the party in 1973 under the name People with the intention of promoting environmental causes.7 Although it has collaborated closely with the new generation of direct action protestors, including the anti-roads and anti-GMO campaigns, it did not come from an NSM milieu and has stayed fairly distinct from the larger environmental movement.

The British plurality electoral system, in which the big parties often dominate individual seat battles, makes it difficult for small parties to gain traction. Voters don't want to 'waste' their ballots on a party that has little prospect of obtaining a seat. The only places where a party has a prospect of winning representation are those where its voters may be concentrated geographically, such with the Welsh and Scottish nationalists, but the Greens have been unable to build any regional support. With no governmental backing for political parties, small parties are punished by the need to pay a £500 deposit for each candidate in a parliamentary election, which is only refundable if they get at least 5% of the vote. The loss of all 253 deposits in the 1992 general election left the Green Party with a huge debt. After that, it started to pick and choose which seats it ran for, winning only 95 in 1997 until winning 202 in 2005 thanks to the party's improved prospects.

There isn't much room left for the Greens to occupy due to party competition. The Conservative and Labour parties have a reputation for being able to provide a broad enough church to accommodate a variety of ideological viewpoints. Leading NSMs, like the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, have been encouraged to concentrate their efforts on persuading the Labour Party to change its policy as opposed to forging alliances with what is generally viewed as a narrow, single-issue, green party. This is especially true given the relatively inclusive stance that the Labour Party has taken towards dissident social movements. The Scottish and Welsh nationalist parties, as well as the center-left Liberal Democrats, are fierce rivals of the Green Party and have all made some effort to win over environmentalist voters. The 1989 European election, in which the Greens received an impressive 15% of the vote, serves as an example of the importance of party rivalry. The POS temporarily opened up so that the Greens could capitalise on the current rise in popular interest in the environment and win support from a vocal protest vote against the ruling Conservative party and the ineffectiveness of the recently created Liberal Democrats.

Following the establishment of the Liberal Democrats, conventional material concerns like the poll tax and the worsening recession drowned out the environment, closing the window of opportunity once again.

However, the closed POS has generally meant that the Green Party has received less attention in UK environmental politics than the mainstream parties and the sizable environmental lobby. The pressure organisations pride themselves on being non-partisan and think that by pressuring lawmakers from all three main parties, they will have the maximum impact. Working with a weak Green Party would not benefit them much; in fact, any party would risk alienating its members and closing the path to government. The Green Party has been severely undermined by this exclusionary feedback loop [5].

But in recent years, the political opportunity structure has somewhat opened up to the Green Party's favour as a consequence of the Labour government's plan of constitutional change. The Green Party was able to win elections to the new Scottish Parliament and the European Parliament in 1999, as well as the new Greater London Assembly in 2000, thanks to the introduction of proportional representation in second-order elections. During 2003–2004, these accomplishments were replicated, with the noteworthy achievement of winning seven seats in the Scottish Parliament. The performance of the party in the national elections seems to have been positively impacted by these accomplishments. Although the election of a Green MP still seems far off, the Greens gained a record 283,486 votes in 2005, preserving twenty-four deposits and receiving an average of 3.37 percent in the seats that were up for election.

Green Candidates Performed Well in Elections

The experiences from Germany, France, and Britain show how the institutional and political setting affects how welcoming a national political opposition structure is to green parties. The crucial institutional and political aspects are noted in this section, focusing on the three case studies and experiences with green parties overseas.

The election system seems to be where the three nations' institutional differences are the most obvious. According to the German experience, pro-portional representation voting systems tend to favour green parties. The greater success of green parties in countries with PR systems like Belgium, Finland, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Switzerland, as opposed to their failure in countries like the United Kingdom and North America with non-proportional systems, lends credence to this notion. The New Zealand Green Party's history before and after the implementation of PR exemplifies the importance of the electoral system in determining Green fortunes.

Green parties, however, have had little to no success in a number of nations with PR systems, including Norway, Denmark, Spain, and Greece. Although Norway and Denmark are prosperous, developed economies with significant populations of post-materialists, the failure of green parties in Southern Europe may be due to lesser levels of economic growth and, as a result, the absence of post-materialists. Furthermore, while this triumph was contingent on a deal with the Socialists, the victory of Les Verts in France demonstrates that a plurality system is not an insurmountable obstacle. Overall, a favourable electoral system is certainly a necessary but insufficient need for the success of the green party[6].

Election laws may also influence the growth of the green party. The 5% threshold in West Germany first aided in the consolidation of a disparate environmental movement into a unified green party and, following the party's election setback in 1990, it enabled the party undergo an internal electoral change. Similar to the Swedish Greens, who lost all of its MPs in 1991 when it fell below the 4% threshold, the party changed course and became more

pragmatic, making organisational changes and positioning itself as a traditional party. In Austria, the two little green partnerships' inability to meet the 4% requirement in 1983 resulted in their partial merger in 1986.

In European Parliament and local elections, where low turnouts and large protest voting sometimes favour tiny parties, green parties have done rather well. Particularly significant was the election of 31 Green MEPs in 1989, which significantly raised the green movement's profile throughout Europe. A total of 38 Green MEPs were elected in the 1999 election, which was their greatest showing to date. Together with other regionalists, they helped the Green Group become the fourth-largest political party in the European Parliament. With the return of thirty-four MEPs in the 2004 election, the first after the EU's expansion to twenty-five states, the Greens solidified their position. The loss of both Irish members and the return of fewer Green representatives from five other nations offset the election of the first Spanish MEPs and Germany's gains. Given that environmental issues are often seen as needing global solutions, the green message may be especially pertinent for elections to a supranational body.

On the other hand, sub-national elections, where the green motto of "Think global, act local" may connect with voters, have also given some green parties a significant foundation. Successes at the supra-national and sub-national levels have undoubtedly given the party and its top figures in France and Germany a stronger public profile and the chance to show that the Greens are a legitimate political force. Even in Britain, where the Greens' effect on the national stage is severely limited by their inability to get admission to Westminster, their profile has been significantly raised by their achievements in the Scottish, European, and Greater London Authority parliaments.

Federal systems, like those in Germany, Switzerland, and Belgium, have benefited green parties since they provide more points of entry and electoral possibilities for a tiny party to achieve attention and representation. Federalism, however, has two sides. While the Tasmanian Greens have received a lot of attention in Australia, especially when they shared power with the Labour Party following the 1989 state elections and reached a governing "Accord," the federal system discouraged interstate cooperation between green parties and prevented the creation of a national Australian green party, which hampered electoral progress.

The relatively fixed institutional characteristics of the POS, such as the electoral and institutional systems, have undoubtedly influenced the growth of green parties, but they cannot be used to explain why tiny green parties have not been successful in Norway, Denmark, or, until recently, the Netherlands. In all three nations, there are structural and institutional factors that may be anticipated to have aided in the growth of green parties, including a sizable postmaterialist population, PR-based political systems, an active NSM sector, and a high degree of environmental concern[7].

This conundrum could be explained by political rivalry, particularly Kitschelt's idea of the "left-libertarian" party. Kitschelt names a few "left-libertarian" parties in Europe that support the socialist agenda's fundamental principles, such as resource distribution that is equitable and a distrust of the market, but differ from the traditional left in that they reject authoritarian and bureaucratic statist solutions in favour of libertarian institutions that promote autonomy and participatory democracy. Two distinct left-libertarian party groupings are identified by Kitschelt: first, a tiny number of left-socialist parties that appeared in numerous countries in the late 1950s and early 1960s; and second, the green parties.8 He contends that political possibilities, namely the long-term incum- bency of social democratic parties in power,

determine the rise of left-libertarian parties. Social democratic parties seem more radical while they are in opposition and provide optimism to left-wing supporters, but when they are in power, they turn right and let down their radical base. So, where social democratic parties had reigned in the 1950s, the first set of left-libertarian parties, such as the Socialist People's Party in Denmark and Norway and the Pacifist Socialists in the Netherlands, flourished.

Later, as the environmental movement started to gain traction, these left-libertarian parties already in existence offered a receptive forum for environmental issues. As a result, when little green parties emerged, as De Groenen in the Netherlands, they were forced out since their 'nat-ural' political space was already claimed and the green voter had made other commitments. The communist Left Party in Sweden had a significant rivalry with the Greens for the environmental vote in the 1970s as it became more and more left-libertarian. According to Kitschelt's analysis, green parties have fared worse in nations where another left-libertarian party was already well-established. In contrast, green parties were able to occupy voids in the political landscape where social democratic parties predominated throughout the 1970s, such as in West Germany, Austria, and Belgium, where there was no established left-libertarian party. The persuasiveness of the left-libertarian argument is shown by how eager many green parties are to emphasise that they are not only "environmental" parties but also committed to a more expansive left-libertarian political ideology. In countries like France, Italy, Greece, Portugal, and Spain, where a powerful Communist Party offered severe competition for the left-wing voters, at least throughout the 1970s and 1980s, left-libertarian parties have typically performed worse than in other nations. However, Kitschelt's left-libertarian theory is crucial for highlighting the importance of political rivalry in the growth of the green party.

The POS paradigm demonstrates how the interaction of structural, institutional, and political variables might account for regional differences in green party performance. However, the POS's strength is also its vulnerability. The POS offers a considerably more comprehensive explanation of the growth of the green party, but by blending everything together, it may end up resembling a catch-all typology: "Used to explain so much, it may ultimately explain nothing at all." The POS also conflates situational factors, such as the level of party rivalry at a given time, with structurally stable elements of the political system, particularly the election system. The rightward movement of the German SPD and the thawing of classic left-right party alignments in France during the 1980s serve as examples of how profoundly electoral systems may change even if they seldom do. The POS offers a valuable framework for analysing how various institutional factors have influenced the development of green parties as long as these limitations are understood[8].

It may be easy to overlook the core problem, which is the actual status of the environment, while attempting to explain the growth of green parties using broad structural trends or institutional variables. Is it only a coincidence that the emergence of green parties was accompanied by an increase in environmental awareness and concern among the general public? Maybe we don't need huge 'new politics' narratives to explain why people are concerned about the environment? Admittedly, there is no direct link between high levels of environmental awareness and the popularity of the green party. In both Denmark and Norway, the environment has continuously rated high on the list of important political issues, yet neither country has a sizable national green party. Inversely, despite having the lowest degree of environmental awareness of any EU member state, Belgian green parties have had great success.

However, there is also evidence that green organisations have grown significantly in reaction to certain environmental concerns. The districts that had been most severely impacted by the

fallout from the Chernobyl nuclear catastrophe were where the Swedish Greens gained the greatest support when they made their political breakthrough in 1988. Growing concern about environmental concerns such acid rain, climate change, and ozone depletion led to an increase in green support in the 1989 European Parliament election. A controversy regarding the poisoning of the poultry and dairy food chains with very toxic dioxins is said to have contributed to the electoral triumph of the green parties in Belgium in 1999. Supporters of the Finnish Green League are distinguished from other political supporters by their intense concern for environmental concerns. In seeking sophisticated political science explanations for the rise of green parties, it is important to keep in mind the simplest explanation, which is that in the "risk society," support for the greens may be motivated by a particular worry about the environment's current state as much as it is a reflection of postmaterial values.new difficulties

Although the fortunes of certain green parties may come and go, the movement as a whole has established a very solid and significant place in many nations. There are two significant present obstacles confronting the green movement, in addition to the long-standing unfinished work of emulating this success in the UK, USA, Australia, Canada, and elsewhere.

Retaining electoral support when they stop being a party of protest is a difficulty in those five nations where green parties have joined administration. The public will likely judge Green parties on their ability to act as responsible members of the government, but many Green voters are expressing anti-establishment sentiments and may be critical of their party's participation in the unsavoury aspects of government. This will create a particular tension for Green parties. It may not be feasible to meet the needs of both groups. In terms of the influence of government incumbency on elections, it is still too early to make any firm judgements. On the one hand, despite having left the coalition the year before due to its opposition to the government's decision to build a new nuclear power station, the Finnish Green League slightly improved its electoral performance both in 1999, four years after serving in the coalition government, and again in 2003.

In 2002, the German Greens strengthened their position; this position only slightly weakened in 2005. The electoral fortunes of the French and Italian green parties, both of which agreed pre-election pacts with larger centre-left parties, were shaped by the electorate's assessment of the gov- ernment as a whole at the end of its term in office, as was the return of the Italians to government. By contrast, having entered government on the basis of a very strong performance in the 1999 election, both the Belgian green parties suffered humiliating electoral defeats four years later. Perhaps the only thing we can conclude so far is that joining the government need not be detrimental to green parties[9].

Two elements jump out while looking for reasons for the performance variances. First, the Green Party itself has the power to change things via its actions and the acceptance of Green political ideas. For instance, holding public office increases Green politicians' profile significantly, which may have both good and bad effects. Joschka Fischer and Renate Ku nast, two German ministers, had a significant increase in their personal popularity after taking office, but Martha Aelvoet and Isabelle Durant, two Belgian Green ministers, saw a significant decline in their perceived competence. Second, institutional characteristics, particularly the ties between the Green Party and its coalition partners, might affect elections. The German Greens particularly benefited in 2002 from tactical voting by many SPD supporters who'split their ticket' by supporting the Greens with their second 'list' vote, helping them to reach the 5% threshold that would ensure their presence in parliament and the continuation of the red-green coalition. However, the Belgian Greens likely lost support as prospective voters shifted to the Socialists to preserve the survival of the government when

they left the coalition government barely two weeks before the 2003 election. Where a pre-election agreement takes place, it is crucial for the Greens to maintain their strong showing in second-order elections, such as the European and regional elections, to show the major coalition party their ongoing significance.

The second obstacle for green parties to overcome is expanding their political appeal outside of the exclusive group of affluent industrialized countries where they have so far found success. Gaining ground in Central and Eastern European transitional nations, especially those that have just joined the EU, must be a top priority. As a result of anti-Communist coalitions in the early 1990s, ecological parties did have some fleeting political success in a number of nations, including Estonia, Lithuania, Slovenia, and Ukraine, only for them to vanish after the dissolution of these alliances. When many dissidents joined environmental groups because they were one of the few legal political organizations permitted under the old Communist governments, most nations saw this short green triumph as a phenomenon unique to that specific historical moment. One example is Latvia, where a farmer's party and a green party merged to create the Green/Farmers Union party, which was successful in the 2004 elections and was a part of the minority coalition government. In the election of June 2006, the Czech Greens gained six seats as a member of a center-right coalition. Otherwise, it is unproductive territory for the Greens. The nascent green parties that do exist in the 'new' Europe are in desperate need of the resources, organizational expertise, and experience of their counterparts in the 'old' Europe. The Herculean magnitude of the challenge ahead is shown by the fact that no Green MEPs were elected from the ten accession nations in the 2004 European Parliament elections. Moreover, the poor performance of the majority of Green candidates. In the transitional states, where the usual core green constituency the new-middle-class, postmaterialist voters - remains relatively tiny, there is scant sign of any surge of environmental concern. In these nations' congested party systems, it won't be simple for green parties to carve out their own political space. Therefore, it is unlikely that the Greens will achieve a sizable electoral victory in the transitional states[10].

CONCLUSION

The clearest causal relationship with regard to green support may be shown by educational achievement, notably by holding a higher degree in the humanities or social sciences. Though the data is once again unclear, it's possible that suggestions that the green constituency is progressively "greying" indicate that there is a unique generational cohort moving through the system. The political opposition structure draws attention to institutional elements, such as the election system and political rivalry, and assists in explaining difference in green party performance. All of these arguments may, however, downplay the significance of the actual source of the uproar: the status of the environment.

REFERENCES:

[1] N. Carter, *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*. 2015.

[2] M. Hengen, "REACH: EU Chemicals Policy- Actors, Networks, Parties and Political Opportunities," 2015.

[3] A. Lambert, "Rainbow Blindness: Same-Sex Partnerships in Post-Coalitional Australia," *M/C J.*, 2010, doi: 10.5204/mcj.318.

[4] C. Burwell, "New(s) Readers: Multimodal Meaning-Making in AJ+ Captioned Video," *M/C J.*, 2017, doi: 10.5204/mcj.1241.

[5] E. Bomberg, “Green Parties,” in *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 2001. doi: 10.1016/b0-08-043076-7/01153-0.

[6] J. A. Laub, “Assessing the servant organization; Development of the Organizational Leadership Assessment (OLA) model. Dissertation Abstracts International,” *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.*, 1999.

[7] A. Wessell, “‘We Will Show the Country’: Bringing History to Life,” *M/C J.*, 2017, doi: 10.5204/mcj.1299.

[8] A. Bris *et al.*, “Knights, Raiders, And Targets - The Impact Of The Hostile Takeover - Coffee,Jc, Lowenstein,L, Roseackerman,S,”*J. Bank. Financ.*, 2021.

[9] C. Boghean, “The Phenomenon of Migration: Opportunities and Challenges,” *USV Ann. Econ. Public Adm.*, 2016.

[10] P. Zhang *et al.*, “IEEE Draft Standard for Spectrum Characterization and Occupancy Sensing,” in *IEEE Access*, 2019.

CHAPTER 8

ENVIRONMENTAL POLITICS AND PARTISANSHIP

Ms. Baisakhi Debnath, Assistant Professor, Department of Management,
JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email Id- baisakhi_2015@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The presence of green parties in elections throughout Europe. However, the mere fact that there are green representatives in parliament does not automatically confer any influence, especially given how often Green MPs support radical ideas and behave in an atypical manner. Wherever green parties experience electoral success, how they respond to the demands of traditional party politics will play a role in determining how influential they become politically. However, as green parties are still mostly insignificant in most nations, a lot will rely on how the political elites react to the massive environmental crisis in the near future. This chapter examines both of these concerns in order to evaluate the influence of environmental issues on party politics. The transition of green parties from pressure politics to legislative opposition and, more recently, into government is examined in the section.

KEYWORDS:

Environmental, Government, Influence, Politics, Policy.

INTRODUCTION

The additional half of the chapter analyses case studies from Germany, Britain, and the United States in order to determine how much established parties have assimilated environmental concepts and to pinpoint the key elements influencing their receptivity to the environmental agenda.Green parties give a lot of weight to agency as a tool for attaining a sustainable society. Die Gru nen is often recognised as the model green party because of its platform, structure, and electoral success, which served as the foundation for green parties worldwide. Die Gru nen's founders sought to establish an unusual form of party, which Petra Kelly, its prominent activist, dubbed the "anti-party party." The APP's two main components are its party structure, which is built on democratic grassroots ideals, and its refusal of alliances with mainstream parties[1], [2].

In direct contrast to most major political parties, Die Gru nen's organisational model is based on the idea of grassroots democracy, or Basisdemokratie, one of the four pillars of green politics covered in Chapter 3. The organisational structures of large, well-established parties are typically hierarchical, centralised, bureaucratic, and professional; they typically have a small, dominant parliamentary elite, a potent, professionalised national party machine, a rigid, rule-bound organisational structure, and a weak, inactive party membership. These parties seem to confirm the Robert Michels' "iron law of oligarchy," according to which all political parties, including ones with strong democratic values, will always be controlled by a tiny governing class[3], [4].

Die Gru nen's organisational structure was created to counteract these oligarchy-like tendencies by thwarting the rise of a distinct governing class of professional politicians who would oppose the radical demands of the membership. Election-based and unpaid party officers were present. Everyone had to rotate jobs in order to avoid getting voted to the same

position again right away. No one could concurrently have a legislative seat and a party position. A collaborative leadership philosophy led to the election of three elected national speakers to share authority and responsibility with the federal party executive instead of a single party leader. Similar regulations stopped a class of professional lawmakers from amassing dominance over the party as a whole. Parliamentarians were compelled to resign halfway through their terms in favour of a party member lower on the list under a procedure known as mid-term rotation. The income required of MPs was that of a skilled worker, with the balance of their parliamentary pay going to environmental causes. The 'imperative mandate' concept constrained Green MPs to follow the decisions or directives of the federal council and party congress. The Greens intended to avoid the personalization of politics by limiting the perks of office, the length of service, the accumulation of bureaucratic offices, and the attention paid to certain leaders. In order for the grassroots membership to exert tight control over the actions of the party "leaders," a variety of powers were also granted to it. All party meetings, including those of the federal executive and the parliamentary party, were often accessible to both members and non-members. Additionally, the party actively promoted positive gender discrimination, ensuring that men and women were equally represented on candidate lists and committees[5].

The rejection of coalitions, the second component of the APP model, was created to avoid the party being ingratiated with the established parliamentary political system. In order to maintain its commitment to a posture of fundamental opposition, activists wanted the party to serve as the new social movements' legislative arm. Petra Kelly's "two-leg" football metaphor, which described the party in parliament as the free-moving leg and the extra-parliamentary movement as the more crucial supporting leg, perfectly encapsulated the notion of the "movement-party." Because of the potential for the party to sacrifice its radical values for immediate electoral or political benefit, coalitions were rejected. I sometimes worry that the greens would unexpectedly get 13% in an election and develop into a power-hungry party, Kelly said. It would be preferable for us to maintain our current position at 6 or 7 percent and to not budge on our fundamental demands. That is preferable than having green ministers.

In order to combat oligarchical inclinations and the corrupting temptations of the legislative setting, Die Gruenen set out to be a different sort of party. Additionally, it was believed that this unique political strategy would promote a more democratic political climate throughout society.Can the APP idea "work" and is its success necessary for green politics? Competition from rival parties influences the organisational growth of all political parties, including the Greens. A green party will face intense pressure upon entering the legislative setting – the logic of electoral rivalry – to abandon the APP model in favour of the hierarchical, bureaucratic, and professional structures typical of established parties. Vote maximising is not the only element influencing party structure; in particular, the strength of the party membership's ideological commitments and the logic of constituency representation may function as a check. Die Grunen has consistently been forced to choose between moderate techniques of compromise designed to accomplish gradual policy change and radical strategies of fundamental resistance to traditional party politics. While the extreme approach could satisfy core green voters, it is less likely to win over new supporters; in contrast, the moderate approach might get more support, but the diluted APP model that results might enrage the grassroots membership.

Internal conflict between the Fundamentalists and the Realists, which has dogged the party for its entire existence, has been driven by this strategic tension.1 In general, the two points of view agree on the long-term goal of achieving an ecologically sustainable world, but they

disagree on the best way to get there. Fundamentalists are fiercely loyal to the APP and sceptical of the advantages of participating in the legislative process. Realists think the Green Party can influence significant, gradual reforms to the legislative system. In 1980, while movement politics was in full swing, Die Gru nen was founded. At the time, activists believed that the rising public consciousness of the urgency of the ecological catastrophe would serve as the impetus for radical change both within and outside of the legislative system. However, movement politics began to wane in the 1980s, leaving the Greens as the leading representative of ecological concern. Radical objectives needed to be restrained since a political system overhaul was no longer in the cards. The Greens had to accept their status as a tiny party that often received less than 10% of the vote. Leading Realists, like Joschka Fischer, felt that the 'anti-party' period had ended by the middle of the 1980s and that the Greens should now transform into a typical party with a typical organisational structure and be ready to build coalitions. The fundi--realo controversy raged back and forth until, at last, the shock of the 1990 election loss significantly changed the balance of power in favour of the Realists, whose position was consolidated by the 1993 merger with Bu ndnis 90, the moderate East German citizen coalition.

DISCUSSION

The rotation concept was abolished and the federal executive was reformed, among other organisational improvements, by the Realists. Rotation was rejected as being unworkable in a parliamentary setting where good politicians require time to hone their public personas and understand the intricate legislative processes. The idea of grassroots politics also proven to be unworkable: how could the 27 unpaid, part-time federal executive members keep the over 200 salaried, full-time personnel of the parliamentary group accountable? Members of the federal executive now receive salaries. Organisational problems reappeared once the red-green combination was elected to office. Further Realist attempts to restructure the party structure failed in the face of vehement opposition from grassroots activists, despite the creation of a new Party Council to enhance coordination between national and state MPs and the larger party and the replacement of the former "co-speakers" with two "party chairs."

Regarding the second tenet of the APP model, Die Gru nen abandoned their complete rejection of coalitions in 1985 when the first one with the SPD was created in Hesse after significant internal bickering. The fundamental opposition idea was shown to be untenable since, once in the legislative setting, politicians must decide whether to support certain programmes, and party organisations must cooperate with rivals, particularly when one party controls the balance of power. Red-green coalitions were formed in various states as a result of the Hesse experiment. The Greens began aggressively pursuing a federal coalition with the SPD in the middle of the 1990s, which they eventually succeeded in doing in 1998. The Greens essentially abandoned the adage "neither left nor right but in front" by constantly cooperating with the center-left SPD rather than the right-wing CDU.

Despite these changes, the Greens' organisational structure continues to set them apart from other parties. Women often comprise at least 50% of Green legislators in federal, state, and municipal legislatures, thanks to gender parity regulations that encourage participation at all levels of the party. The unwillingness to have a single leader and, until recently, the incompatibility clause prohibiting the holding of multiple posts in the party and the legislature, both contribute to this. While the Greens have been more than willing to use Joschka Fischer's individual popularity for electoral gain, as evidenced by their highly targeted campaigns in the 2002 and 2005 federal elections, the party activists have consistently resisted attempts to give Fischer a formal leadership position within the party. But in 2003, the Real- ists succeeded in getting the party to abandon its rigorous

incompatibility policy. The ongoing openness of party meetings and the left-libertarian beliefs of the Green membership are two other notable distinctions. A unique, elite-challenging internal culture is still present inside the party. Although the Realists won the election and the Greens won the government, the party's structure and temperament remain unique from those of other parties, indicating that the logic of constituency representation still has some sway.

For instance, some extreme ideas, such as greater fuel taxes and severe limitations on individual air travel, were reiterated at the pre-election party convention in March 1998, despite the fact that they had little support from the general voter. In other words, the party is not dominated by a single oligarchical elite of career politicians, albeit it is still too early to write Michels out. There are many similarities between Die Grunen's experiences and those of other green parties. Most originally followed the communal leadership and rotational leadership principles of the APP organisational model. For instance, the Swedish Greens elect two spokespersons who rotate on a regular basis; office holders are discouraged from holding more than one position at a time and are expected to resign from it after two parliamentary terms; and the party's central authority is devolved to four useful party committees. However, other green parties have also had trouble reconciling the APP's radical ideas with electoral politics' requirements.

Internal party reform has occasionally been sparked by a particularly severe electoral setback, such as the disappointment of the French green entente at not winning any seats in the 1993 National Assembly election or the expulsion of all Swedish Greens from parliament after failing to reach the minimum electoral threshold in 1991. The majority of green parties have become more organised and organised. The universal reversal of communal leadership is one very obvious sign of change. While weakening the idea of joint leadership, several green parties have opted for two co-leaders or spokespeople instead of a single leader, like in New Zealand, Sweden, and Britain. The Green League in Finland and the Groen in Belgium! Elect a party chair and a president, who both serve as a single symbolic leader but lack the full range of authority of a traditional party leader. A few green parties, like those in Italy and Ireland, have abandoned group structures in favour of a single, elected head. The well-known party spokesman and parliamentary group head in Austria, Alexander van der Bellen, also serves as the de facto party leader. The influence of party activists has also generally decreased, especially in those parties that have entered government when there are clear practical barriers to party members' participation in decision-making. In other places, the remaining aversion to coalitions has also been eliminated by the possibility of power as Greens have been elected to national and subnational governments all around Europe and beyond.

These coalitions and pacts have a wide range of political backgrounds at the national level. The traditional party of the "old left" has controlled most of them, most notably the formal coalition with the Socialists in France and the agreements wherein green parties pledged support in parliament, allowing the Swedish Social Democrats and the New Zealand Labour Party to rule. Some green parties, nevertheless, are also open to working with parties from the centre and even the right of the political spectrum. A broad coalition of Green, Socialist, and Liberal parties governed Belgium from 1999 to 2003, while the Finnish Green League served in a five-party "rainbow government" from 1995 to 2002 that also included the Social Democrats, the Conservative National Coalition, and the ex-Communist Left Alliance. Despite its left-wing reputation, the Green Party started official, though fruitless, negotiations with the Conservative Party after the 2002 Austrian elections.

Overall, it seems that the logic of electoral rivalry has moved the majority of green parties towards a more professional, centralised party structure and towards showing a readiness to cooperate with other parties. Green parties are no longer a party of protest but rather a respectable alternative party and, in some circumstances, a party of government in those nations where they have become established.

Greens are in Charge

Green parties have been compelled to face the difficulties of governance as their representation in national and subnational legislatures has grown. By the late 1990s, Green politicians were making important policy decisions at the highest levels of government. For example, Joschka Fischer, the German foreign minister, authorised Germany's support for NATO bombing of Serbs; Dominique Voynet, the French environment minister, was tasked with reducing traffic in Paris; and Magda Aelvoet, the Green health minister, was in charge of investigating the food contamination scandal in Belgium. As the Greens took office, the focus of discussion among the green parties moved from whether we should rule to how. Many of the previous strategic conundrums still existed, but they took on new shapes. Further internal discussion regarding future tactics has been sparked by the majority of green parties' subsequent resignation from government. The Green experiences of governance since 1995 in Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, and Italy provide some crucial insights, despite the fact that many of these discussions are still in progress[6].

The main indicator of green governance for most voters, if not all green campaigners, is the effect of its policies. Can the Greens, in essence, make a difference? Due to their position as junior coalition partners, individual green parties have little influence on government policy since they are unable to secure cabinet positions of their choice or garner support for their policy aims. The influence of a green party will also depend on the makeup of the coalition. Because the Red-Green option in Germany was a "minimum winning" two-party coalition and the SPD was therefore effectively dependent on the Greens to form a government, the Greens had an advantage in negotiations because they were the only credible coalition partners for the SPD. The government in Belgium did not need the support of the two green parties, but because Ecolo and Agalev had promised to only form a coalition with one another or not at all, they could exert considerable negotiation power. The Finnish Green League, on the other hand, was a member of a "surplus coalition" in which its participation was not pivotal; as such, its voluntary exit from the government in 2002 showed.

The only reason the green parties were in power in France and Italy was due to a multi-party center-left coalition in which they were only marginal actors. As a result, the German and Belgian green parties had the best luck securing ministerial portfolios: Die Gru nen received three cabinet posts, including the important position of Foreign Minister for Joschka Fischer, and the Belgian green parties also received three portfolios: transport, health, and environment. However, the Finnish and Italian Green Parties afterwards briefly held other ministries. In contrast, the French, Finnish, and Italian Green Parties first received just the environment portfolio. The German Greens were also the most successful at having their policy demands taken seriously; this was shown in the Greens' substantial influence on the revision of German citizenship rules and the closing of nuclear power plants.

The ministerial portfolios under their control have moulded the policy effect of green parties, thus it is not unexpected that they have had the most environmental impact. Nuclear power, a defining green concern, has played a significant role, to varied success. A thirty-year closure programme was finally agreed upon in 2001, despite the red-green government's struggles to carry out its pledge to start the shutdown of the German nuclear sector. In Belgium, a more

gradual phase-out of forty years was agreed. However, in both instances, agreement was only gained after the energy industry was given considerable concessions, and these relatively nebulous, long-term agreements might easily be changed or repealed by subsequent administrations. Other setbacks also occurred. The coalition partners opposed green initiatives to stop nuclear waste shipments via Germany and the sale of Belgian nuclear material to Pakistan. After the parliament approved the decision, the Finnish Green League withdrew from the coalition government because it was unable to stop its coalition partners from supporting the building of a new nuclear power plant. While the fast-breeder Superphenix nuclear power station was shut down in France, the Green Environment Minister, Dominique Voynet, failed to stop the production of Mox, stop the reprocessing of nuclear waste, or even impose a moratorium on the construction of new nuclear plants. She also incited a great deal of public unrest by accepting the government's decision to store nuclear waste underground.

Eco-taxation was another significant topic, and the findings were inconsistent. In Germany, a wide variety of eco-taxes were implemented. In particular, a tax on fuel and electricity aimed to reduce energy usage, with the proceeds going towards stabilising the social security system and promoting employment growth. Although these taxes are unpopular with the general public and business sector, they have helped to lower energy use and, to a lesser degree, labour expenses. The Finnish Green League contributed to the successful transition of taxes from work to energy use. However, Voynet's proposals to change the pricing of water pollution, enact an energy consumption tax, and boost diesel fuel taxes in France, where she placed a heavy focus on eco-tax reform, were either abandoned or significantly scaled down in the face of powerful and effective resistance. Generally speaking, Green ministers haven't had much of an influence on the crucial matter of transport policy: Voynet was unable to halt plans to increase airport capacity, and German Greens were unable to block a number of major road-building initiatives.

Where their goals were more modest, green ministers have found the greatest success. Significant personnel and financial increases were made by Voynet and her Italian colleague, Ronchi, for respective environment ministries. Initiated by the EU and already in place but mostly disregarded by the government, Ronchi significantly enhanced their effective execution. Green ministers have shown influence on a number of environmental problems, especially where EU law is involved. For instance, despite persistent lobbying from agricultural and forestry groups who wished to decrease the extent of the protected areas, the Finnish government constructed the Natura 2000 network of natural reserves. In 2002, the German Greens helped enact a new federal legislation protecting the environment. Perhaps more progressive environmental measures in other policy areas have resulted from the Greens' involvement in the administration. For instance, the French Greens said that they were behind several programmes to change food production and promote more sustainable agriculture. In his capacity as Germany's minister of agriculture, Kunast made significant contributions towards a more sustainable agricultural policy, especially by promoting organic farming and enhancing food safety regulations[7].The left-libertarian policy agenda of their different coalition administrations has undoubtedly been shaped by green parties. The existence of green parties played a significant role in a number of liberal legislation that gave more protection to asylum seekers, additional rights to undocumented immigrants, and legal status to homosexual and lesbian couples. Perhaps, as Poguntke says, the reason these legislative measures were successful in this case was the lack of fundamental economic interests that were opposed to them, together with their cheap cost.

The fact that Green ministers typically showed the voters they could be trusted to retain government office was perhaps the most significant long-term result of their tenure in power. The Green Party has shown to be an effective coalition partner and a responsible, capable policymaker. They disproved the notion that a protest party made up of "disorganised hippies" and "left-wingers" and held responsible to a radical, critical grassroots membership would not be able to handle the demands of office. Yes, there were some embarrassing moments, internal conflicts, and public spats, but coalition governments often have similar characteristics. Keeping the membership satisfied while also gaining support from a larger audience proved to be hard at times. Some of the unpalatable coalition government demands left rank and file members unavoidably disappointed, such as when Voynet backtracked on calling for a moratorium on GM crops and Trittin complied with Chan- cellor Schroeder's request that he veto a proposed EU directive on car recycling. Unexpected circumstances also compelled governments to take unpalatable actions. Joschka Fischer, the German foreign minister, supported military strategies that defied the long-standing green ideal of pacifism in response to the Kosovo conflict. Later, in order to support the US-led war of Afghanistan, he overcame even more adamant opposition inside the party. But despite these setbacks, the German Greens managed to win reelection in 2002. Only the Belgian green parties had their reputation somewhat damaged when two of their three ministers quit under questionable circumstances: Magda Aelvoet over her support for a government decision to grant a licence to export arms to Nepal and Isabelle Durant after her position on night flights from Brussels airport was publicly overruled by the Prime Minister. The Finnish Green League, on the other hand, was largely recognised as having acted honourably and responsibly when it resigned from the government over the proposal to construct a new nuclear reactor after being in office for seven years[8].

Although the Green Party may take pride in a handful of tangible accomplishments, its overall influence on policy has been very small. Importantly, they have shown that they are a real political force and reliable coalition partners, which is essential for their longer-term growth. Government experience also taught some crucial lessons. Green ministers must have clear, attainable policy objectives before joining coalitions so they can show their supporters real results. They also require competent advisers, since Green ministers often had to deal with uncooperative bureaucracies run by civil employees who were either ideologically hostile or just unaccustomed to the informal working methods that the Greens introduced when they came into power. Green parties need to be considerably more equipped to handle the demands of office if they ever have another chance to run for office.

The pragmatism necessary for power-sharing has moderated and transformed the ideological ideas and programmes of the Greens. At their party convention in 2002, the German Greens adopted a new "Basic Programme" that openly declared that "we are no longer the "anti-party party" but rather represent an alternative in the party system." The key distinction for us was that we want and needed to transform into a party of change if we were to continue to be successful. This important document portrays the Greens as a party committed to extensive social change: Environmental restructuring, social justice, and democratic renewal are still top priorities, but anti-capitalist, ecocentric, or anti-modernist ideas are no longer mentioned. The Greens now want to work from inside the system, not from the outside, to transform the political, economic, and social institutions. An acceptance of the discourse of ecological modernization and a willingness to interact constructively with capitalist institutions and the market, for instance, can be seen in Greens' enthusiasm for using eco-taxation and other incentives to encourage industry to adopt cleaner, less resource-intensive technologies. In fact, the Greens were more receptive to neo-liberal changes than their SPD coalition partner,

which was restricted by its strong ties to the unions in Germany, where there has long been stalemate over the need to overhaul an increasingly unsustainable corporatist welfare state.

CONCLUSION

The Greens' new platform reflects a strategic realignment that aims to balance a number of party factions: the willingness to support some neo-liberal economic policies indicates a clear shift towards the political centre, while the party's continued support for a state-centered social justice system and a number of libertarian reforms shows the persistence of left-libertarian principles. In the nations where they have achieved power, the Greens have shown that they are a pragmatist party with a bold reform programm that can be trusted to maintain office. They are no longer considered outsiders.

REFERENCES:

[1] G. Kallis and S. Bliss, "Post-environmentalism: Origins and evolution of a strange idea," *J. Polit. Ecol.*, 2019, doi: 10.2458/v26i1.23238.

[2] L. Peterson and J. Skovgaard, "Bureaucratic politics and the allocation of climate finance," *World Dev.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.12.011.

[3] M. Kisiel, "Stacy Alaimo, *Exposed. Environmental Politics & Pleasures in Posthuman Times*," *Er(r)go. Teor. - Lit. - Kult.*, 2019, doi: 10.31261/errgo.7717.

[4] A. Madariaga, "From 'Green Laggard' to Regional Leader: Explaining the Recent Development of Environmental Policy in Chile," *Bull. Lat. Am. Res.*, 2019, doi: 10.1111/blar.12841.

[5] M. Lappé, R. Jeffries Hein, and H. Landecker, "Environmental Politics of Reproduction," *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 2019. doi: 10.1146/annurev-Anthro-102218-011346.

[6] T. B. Gravelle and E. Lachapelle, "Politics, proximity and the pipeline: Mapping public attitudes toward Keystone XL," *Energy Policy*, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.enpol.2015.04.004.

[7] R. Rohrschneider, "New Party versus Old Left Realignments: Environmental Attitudes, Party Policies, and Partisan Affiliations in Four West European Countries," *J. Polit.*, 1993, doi: 10.2307/2131994.

[8] M. Saeki, "Anatomy of Party Sorting: Partisan Polarization of Voters and Party Switching," *Polit. Policy*, 2019, doi: 10.1111/polp.12318.

CHAPTER 9

A STUDY ON TRADITIONAL PARTIES' 'GREENING'

Dr. Sahana B S, Assistant Professor, Department of Management,
JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email Id- dr.sahana_bs@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The idea of "greening" has gained more significance for conventional political parties as they attempt to address escalating environmental issues and evolving public perceptions of sustainability. The process of conventional parties "greening," which entails integrating environmental issues into their policies, platforms, and organisational structures, is examined in this abstract. Traditional political parties may become green in a variety of ways, including by creating internal environmental wings, adopting more aggressive climate goals, and promoting renewable energy. The motivations for established parties becoming green are examined in this abstract, including pressure from grassroots activists and shifting demographic and cultural trends. The difficulties and constraints of becoming green for conventional parties are also highlighted, including the need to combine environmental objectives with other political priorities and the possibility of intraparty conflict.

KEYWORDS:

Environment, Interest, Party, Policy.

INTRODUCTION

In industrialized liberal democracies in the past, party structures have shown to be effective in incorporating new political interests and stripping them of their radicalism. By creating their own policies to meet the concerns raised by a rising interest, like race or gender, political parties have hijacked new issues or cleavages. But since the left-right chasm that governs most party systems is cut through by the technocentric-ecocentric division, the emergence of environmentalism presents unique challenges for existing parties. Both established parties on the left and right are technocentrically committed to maximizing economic growth, and they are frequently closely linked to producer interests. Generally, trade unions support labour and social democratic parties, while conservative and liberal parties are more closely aligned with business groups. These producer interests, despite their evident disparities, are mostly unified in their support for expansionary economic policies and opposition to environmental concerns. The adoption of unpopular "green" measures like tight eco-taxes or limitations on consumerist lifestyles may also make political elites uneasy.

However, the majority of the established parties have steadily changed their stance on environmental preservation. Some parties have created progressive environmental plans, albeit this adjustment may not go far beyond the employment of greener language. These variations create a number of issues. Why have certain parties reacted differently from others in a favourable way? How much does the existence of a prosperous green party influence how receptive the mainstream parties are? Are there typical left-right splits in politics when it comes to the environment? These problems are investigated here by looking at the party politicisation of the environment in the USA, which is typically overlooked in this literature, as well as Germany and Britain, which have previously been covered in some depth and extensively compared in the literature on green politics.These three wealthy industrialised countries have very different political systems: Germany has a strong green party and a

system that is generally open to new challenges; Britain has a weak green party and a system that is generally closed. The USA, on the other hand, lacks a national green party but has a pluralistic political system that is somewhat open to new challenges. Last but not least, "party politicisation" is used here in a broad sense to refer to a process by which the environment ascends the political agenda to become electorally salient and the subject of party competition, so that parties increasingly embrace environmental concerns, strengthen their policy programmes, and attack their rivals for the shortcomings of their environmental record.Germany

The 1980s saw Germany "move from a position of reluctant environmentalism" to become one of the "pioneers" of European environmental policy, according to several commentators. As a result of a succession of conservative CDU-led administrations, Germany's political and economic elites came to accept the fundamental principles of ecological modernization. As a result, Germany passed some of the most stringent pollution control laws and progressive environmental regulations in all of Europe.4 All of the major parties have agreed that environmental concerns should take centre stage on the political agenda, despite the fact that Germany's reputation as an environmental pioneer has now lost some of its sparkle.

Die Gru nen clearly had a major impact on how the environment was politicised by the party. The Federal Republic allegedly produced the harshest environmental protection regulations in the whole world as a direct result of the Greens' involvement. The Greens were able to take advantage of the established parties' inability to address environmental problems positively due to widespread public concern about the environment in the early 1980s, which was sparked by the acid rain and nuclear power crises. In an election system where coalition governments are the norm and tiny parties may have a significant impact, the level of political rivalry was crucial. The established parties at first saw the Greens as outsiders, but as the party gained support and the FDP's popularity dwindled, they were forced to see Die Gru nen as a potential coalition partner. As a result, all of the main parties began to place a greater focus on environmental concerns and to enhance their promises to the environment in their manifestos.

Party rivalry made the SPD especially susceptible to Die Gru nen's electoral threat. Die Gru nen's arrival into parliament in 1983 coincided with the SPD's loss, and years of internal turmoil led to a change in the party's attitude towards the environment. A long-term realignment of the electorate seems to have made the SPD the victim. Both the Left and the Right were gaining support, with the Greens luring the progressive post-materialist middle classes, while it was losing support to the Right, especially among its traditional working-class base. The SPD faced a basic choice on how to balance the interests and aspirations of these various constituencies: should it go left to address the danger presented by the Greens or right to win back its core working-class supporters? Due to these conflicts, the SPD's views on the green issue changed throughout time, varying from times of cooperation and assimilation to times of non-cooperation and aggressive resistance to a party that many in the SPD saw as reckless and untrustworthy [1], [2].

By the middle of the 1990s, the SPD could no longer dismiss the possibility of a red-green coalition since it represented the most practical way to end the protracted CDU administration of Chancellor Kohl. Several additional considerations, in addition to this electoral need, prompted the SPD to cease seeing the Greens as eccentric outsiders. Overall, the Greens' national electoral support seems to have settled at a level much below what had previously looked probable, making the SPD feel less directly threatened by them. A more collaborative approach was fostered by the success of SPD-Green coalitions in the Lander, where it became evident that the two parties could "do business." Additionally, there was a

lot of policy agreement between the two parties. The SPD's resistance to environmentalism waned as the party strengthened its postmaterialist platform, which now includes positions on nuclear energy, gender equality, and changes to citizenship rules. The rise of the Realists, however, signalled a significant moderating of Green institutional practises and policy. By 1998, the SPD and Greens' party platforms on important issues had become so similar that a red-green alliance was plainly preferable to an SPD-CDU "grand coalition." In order to get established German parties, particularly the SPD, to take environmental concerns more seriously, the Greens' success was crucial.

However, it's crucial to avoid overestimating how much the environment has been influenced by party politics. Ironically, the Greens entered office at a time when the importance of the environment had reduced and their political prospects seemed to have plateaued. The environment was pushed down the political agenda throughout the 1990s as a result of economic hardship and the turbulent effects of German unification, as seen by the shrinking space devoted to the environment in the major parties' federal election manifestos in 1994 and 1998. When promoting progressive environmental measures, they started to be more circumspect. For instance, the CDU and SPD both reduced their support for a carbon tax due to the potential harm to employment. The Greens were successful in insisting that the red-green administration handle important environmental concerns, particularly nuclear power. Schroeder and Fischer skillfully connected the devastating floods that summer to climate change during the 2002 federal election, portraying the coalition administration as the best capable of addressing the issue.

DISCUSSION

The troubled domestic economy and Schroeder's divisive Agenda 2010 reforms eventually overshadowed environmental concerns, however. Unsurprisingly, a professional study of German political scientists conducted in 2002 revealed that the Greens prioritise the environment significantly more than the other main parties, who rated it around the same importance, with the PDS coming in last. In terms of policy stances, the parties did diverge, with the left-of-centre SPD and PDS seeming much greener than the right-of-centre CDU and FDP. What effect the red-green coalition's electoral setback in the 2005 federal election will have on environmental politics is not yet known. The CDU-SPD 'grand coalition' government has the chance to ignore environmental and left-libertarian issues, giving the Greens the chance to capitalise. However, the emergence of a new Left Alliance, which includes the PDS and various disgruntled former SPD members and did well in the 2005 election, presents real competition for the Greens in the political space to the left of the SPD. It is obvious that Germany's party-politicization of the environment is still precarious and highly reliant on broader political events. The examination of party politicisation in Germany has mainly examined how the Greens have affected other parties, but as will be seen in the sections on Britain and the USA that follow, green parties have not had much of an influence in those nations.

Traditional parties' 'greening': In industrialised liberal democracies in the past, party structures have shown to be effective in incorporating new political interests and stripping them of their radicalism. By creating their own policies to meet the concerns raised by a rising interest, like race or gender, political parties have hijacked new issues or cleavages. But since the left-right chasm that governs most party systems is cut through by the technocentric-ecocentric division, the emergence of environmentalism presents unique challenges for existing parties. Both the established parties departed Britain [3], [4].

In Britain, the environment has been slowly, unevenly, and insufficiently politicised by parties. There was not much interest in the environment up until the middle of the 1980s. The problem then steadily crept up the policy agenda, with parties being most receptive at the mid-term phase of the political cycle when public concern is often at its maximum and leaders are more open to environmentalists within their parties. About midway between legislative elections over the next ten years, a rush of policy publications from the three major parties emerged, each proposing a little stricter environmental agenda than the previous one. By the 1992 general election, all three main parties' platforms included a significant amount of environmental rhetoric. However, that in 1992, all parties reached their maximum environmental space allocation. The Conservative and Labour parties noticeably tempered their enthusiasm for the issue after the 1997 election; in their 2005 manifestos, it was only the twelfth most important issue in terms of content for both parties. All the parties continued to develop their environmental programmes throughout the 1990s. The Liberal Democrats, in contrast, have consistently placed a high priority on the environment, including it among their top three topics in each platform since 1992. Election-related issues and party competitiveness may account for a considerable portion of the Labour and Conservative parties' resistance to the green challenge and the Liberal Democrats' more enthusiastic reaction.

The fact that it is not a hot button topic during general elections is the main cause of the environment's limited party politization. Polls show that the British public is concerned about the environment, and millions of people are members of environmental pressure groups, but the issue is often seen as far away, and people often baulk at the personal costs associated with some of the suggested solutions, such as reducing car usage or raising energy taxes. The environment nearly completely vanishes from the radar when other factors are taken into account. Fewer than 1% of people, on average, ranked the environment as the most pressing issue facing the nation between 1992 and 2000, according to monthly Gallup polls. Even when asked to name multiple pressing issues, the environment was only mentioned by less than 10% of respondents. It is hardly surprising that environmental factors have never been significant in a British general election since there is no sizable environmental "issue public"people who incorporate environmental matters in their own vote calculation [5].

As a result, the Conservative and Labour parties have embraced a preference-accommodation strategy. They have gradually embraced a greener rhetoric and developed a set of moderate policies to show that the environment would be safe in their hands, but they have resisted turning the environment into an arena of party competition.5 One result of this strategy is that the environment in Britain is not generally perceived in party political terms or closely associated with either the 'Left' or the 'Right'. The powerful environmental lobby has carefully maintained a non-partisan stance, arguing that an insider strategy would be most effective in the British political system if it can garner cross-party support. This position is further supported by that fact. The British population does not perceive the Liberal Democrats to be much greener than their adversaries, despite their attempts to portray themselves as environmental champions. The Green Party is the one that most people think of when they think about environmental issues. Therefore, any electoral benefits from a rise in the political importance of the environment may simply go to the Green Party if Labour or Conservative Party strategists attempt to compete on the issue. Therefore, the logic of electoral competitiveness suggests that neither Labour nor the Conservatives will be motivated to increase the profile of the environment as long as the Green Party is small.

Party rivalry also explains why the Liberal Democrats had a more favourable reaction since they seem to be more susceptible to the Greens, as seen by the 1989 European election, in

which many of their followers shifted allegiances. The Liberal Democrats also seem to be most at ease with environmental issues; in fact, according to Webb, environmentalism is one of their core tenets. Their dedication to the environment, however, is limited. The Liberal Democrats are extremely eager to reject progressive environmental projects where political capital can be earned. For instance, they vigorously fought a planned traffic congestion tax in Edinburgh in 2005 and have opposed various wind farm plans.

The main parties' attempts to "green" themselves are hampered by additional ideological and political barriers. Significantly, the Liberal Democrats have historically been free of the producerist interests industrialists, farmers, trade unions whose influence has ideologically weakened the Conservative and Labour parties' openness to environmental ideas and compelled them to stick with spending and policy priorities that depend on sustained economic growth. With Thatcherite deregulatory zeal, successive Conservative administrations between 1979 and 1992 were undoubtedly hesitant environmentalists. Although their record improved when John Gummer served as Secretary of State for the Environment, they were prepared to ignore, postpone, and weaken their actions wherever feasible. After going into opposition in 1997, the Conservative Party was plagued by self-destructive internal strife and a fixation with the "Europe" problem. Until David Cameron was elected party leader in 2005, the Conservative Party showed little interest in bolstering its environmental credentials. He saw the environment right away as a topic he could exploit to attempt to reposition the Conservative Party and win back supporters who had defected to the Labour and Liberal Democrat parties. It will be interesting to watch how long the Conservatives stick with the environment and if Cameron can get industry to support the type of strong environmental protection plans he will need to make if he wants to compete with the Liberal Democrats on this topic.

Even when Britain's poor pollution record earned it the nickname "Dirty Man of Europe" in the 1990s, Labour displayed a notable reluctance to criticise Conservative governments on the subject. None of the Labour opposition leaders, including Kinnock, Smith, and Blair, also demonstrated any genuine interest in environmental issues. Even while Labour briefly adopted a positive outlook on the environment in the days after its election triumph in 1997, it was unable to maintain this newfound zeal. The Labour Government quickly found itself dodging environmental protection policies that would endanger competitiveness, employment, or its own popularity, much like its Conservative predecessor.

Why hasn't 'New Labour' embraced the environment? During its first term of office, a significant event took place. The nation came to a standstill and Labour support fell in the polls as a result of the fuel blockade in September 2000, which was caused by an unexpected rise in public resistance to high gasoline taxes. It taught Labour a valuable lesson about the electoral perils of extreme environmental policies. Blair has consistently emphasised climate change as a major threat and taken the lead in international climate diplomacy, but he has never made a concerted effort to make it a matter of domestic party politics. This is likely because many potential solutions, like fuel taxes, may not be popular at home. However, New Labour's opposition to ecology may be more than just a matter of political expediency. Jacobs claims that New Labour has a "fundamental mistrust" of environmentalism because it sees it as a political movement with its own institutions and philosophy. Undoubtedly, New Labour views some of the extreme ideologies connected with green politics as being "anti-aspirational," such as those that are anti-capitalism, anti-growth, and anti-consumerism. Bottom line: Labour strategists feel that its target supporters are unimportant and uninterested in the lifestyle tradeoffs suggested by such ideas since 'Middle England drives automobiles, likes shopping, wants to possess more material goods, and to go on more international trips'.

The disparity between these viewpoints is shown by the divergent opinions on biotechnology and genetically modified (GM) crops: whereas Blair embraced them with excitement, environmentalists viewed them with extreme skepticism [6].

So, despite the fact that the Labour and Conservative parties have clearly gotten more greener since the middle of the 1980s, their dedication has been sporadic and sometimes just verbal. The Liberal Democrats have regularly made the environment a key campaign topic in an effort to position themselves as the most environmentally friendly of the main parties. However, the Green Party is the only one that the general public identifies as being greener. If the Greens continue to win second-order elections in the new multilayered British democracy, especially if disenchanted left-wing voters start to support them, that may put pressure on Labour to treat the environment more seriously. The degree to which the Conservatives follow up David Cameron's pro-environmental rhetoric with forward-thinking and comprehensive policy plans may have a greater impact on Labour than anything else.

The USA is similar to Britain in that there is no effective green party, there is a sizable environmental lobby, and environmental matters get little attention during elections. Polls consistently showed that Americans cared about a variety of environmental issues starting in the mid-1980s, but there was a sharp decline after 2001, which coincided with the September 11 terrorist attacks, energy shortages, and rising fuel prices. Even at its height, only about 5–6% of the electoratethe environmental 'issue public'considered the environment when choosing a candidate, with only 2% of respondents naming the environment as the country's 'most important problem' in September 2004. With the exception of Ralph Nader's success in 2000 as a Green Party candidate, the environment has often played less of a role in presidential elections.

In the USA, environmental politics have taken on a more institutionalised shape than they did in the UK, with the Democratic Party adopting it to a larger degree than the Republicans. Platforms for the Democratic Party have "generally called for increased spending, additional government action, and overall stronger efforts to control pollution" in presidential elections since 1976, while the Republican Party has preferred "little or no government intervention." ..and a loosening of the present pollution control regulations so as not to inhibit economic progress. Research has shown that victorious presidential candidates have a dismal track record of following through on their environmental commitments. However, studies of roll-call voting on environmental legislation in Congress and state legislatures since the 1970s show that Democratic representatives are more likely to support stricter environmental regulations than their Republican counterparts, with recent data showing the gap between the two parties widening.

When the government enthusiastically pursued environmental deregulation through a combination of savage budgetary cutbacks and ideologically committed presidential appointees to key agency posts, including the Environmental Protection Agency, partisan differences became very pronounced. After the 1994 legislative elections, hostilities were rekindled when the Republican 'Contract with America' manifesto named environmental regulations as a top target for their conservative'revolution,' which resulted in more budget cutbacks and deregulation. Between these two times, President Bush briefly attempted to boost the Republicans' green credentials after first stating that he would be a "environmental president." But save the 1990 Clean Air Act, hardly many new environmental efforts were introduced. Bush also favoured further deregulation, declined to ratify the Earth Summit biodiversity agreement, and ultimately referred to environmentalists as radicals who endangered American employment. Contrarily, Gore's personal commitment to the environment was a distinguishing feature of his unsuccessful campaign for president in 2000.

Clinton, who had the enthusiastic environmentalist Al Gore8 as his running mate, ran for office in 1992 on a pro-environment platform, and he ran for office again in 1996 on a less-publicized but still fairly strong environmental platform. Another sharp turn against environmental interests occurred with the election of George W. Bush, as evidenced by his decision to withdraw US support for the Kyoto Protocol, his encouragement of oil exploration in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, and his initiatives to rewrite environmental regulations in order to support business [7].

Why have the Democrats shown to be more environmentally friendly than the Republicans considering the low importance of environmental issues? Small, underfunded parties have a very difficult time winning elections due to institutional considerations, most notably the "winner takes all" electoral system that governs all levels of the federal government. However, the federal structure and the small number of political parties provide interest groups several chances to persuade members of Congress and state legislatures and to shape the relatively diverse policymaking process. Like in the UK, environmentalists have concentrated on influencing the mainstream parties rather than trying to found a green party. In contrast to Britain, they have focused their efforts on the Democrats, who are seen as less reliant on corporate backing and more sympathetic to environmental problems. Environmental organisations have indeed grown to be a vital component of the Democratic coalition; in certain districts, notably in the western states, the support of important environmental organisations and activists may be crucial to gaining the Democratic Party nomination. The Republicans' increasing reliance on the financial support of powerful companies and polluting businesses, who have been vocal opponents of the cost imposed by environmental rules, may be one explanation for their less enthusiastic, even hostile, attitude. It is probable that President George W. Bush's pro-industry posture on matters like the Kyoto Protocol and oil and gas extraction in the Arctic tundra was influenced by the significant financial donations made by the major energy companies to the Republican presidential campaign in 2000.

Although American voters have a clearer choice than British voters due to the Democratic Party's greater greenness, the significance of this political signal should not be overstated. The bulk of American voters do not see the world in the same intensely partisan terms as the political elite: they constantly fail to see any difference between the two parties. The political signals sent to the electorate are diluted by the frailty of American parties. The disparities in geography and ideology that the informal coalitions that make up the Democratic and Republican Parties include also apply here. Democrats and Republicans do not always vote along party lines in Congress, according to roll-call voting trends on environmental legislation, however these instances are less frequent as time goes on. The Democrats have discovered that it is simpler to be more environmentally friendly when they are not in power. Clinton did not prioritise environmental issues while benefiting from Democratic majorities in both Houses between 1992 and 1994. The only time he was more inclined to speak out against the Republican-majority Congress' anti-environmental policies was after 1994, when they successfully thwarted his efforts in all of these areas.

When it comes to rallying the limited environmental issue public behind the Democrat cause, political differences do matter. These core environmentalists are significantly more likely to identify with and support the Democratic Party since they have historically been staunch Democrats. For instance, this demographic voted more than 5:1 in favour of Clinton against Bush in the 1992 presidential election. They are, in short, a very partisan sub-group as compared to the electorate as a whole. Notably, rather than out of a positive excitement for or confidence in the Democrats, they seem to choose them more as a response to the anti-

environmentalism of the Republicans. Before Nader's involvement in 2000, the inference was that the Democrats would maintain the support of the environmental issue public as long as they stayed comparatively greener than the Republicans, without having to embrace a radical agenda that may alienate the larger Democrat audience. Even with the "environmentalist" Gore running for president, Nader's effectiveness in mobilising the public on this subject shown that the people's support for the Democrats cannot be taken for granted. Democratic strategists are faced with a conundrum since their attempts to win over this demographic by promoting a "greener" agenda run the risk of alienating the much bigger bloc of centrist independent swing voters that the party depends on to win elections [8].

CONCLUSION

The complicated and continuous phenomena of conventional political parties "greening" illustrates the increasing significance of environmental sustainability in modern politics. While the greening of conventional parties has the potential to significantly advance environmental policy, it also presents these parties with substantial obstacles and constraints. The need to strike a balance between environmental issues and other political interests, including economic expansion and national security, is a major obstacle for conventional parties as they try to win over a broad spectrum of people. Furthermore, it's important to consider the possibility of internal conflict among parties as they attempt to balance various goals and interests. Despite these obstacles, the greening of established parties marks a significant advancement in raising environmental awareness and establishing sustainability as an essential aspect of political discourse in the twenty-first century.

REFERENCES:

[1] I. Anguelovski *et al.*, “Expanding the Boundaries of Justice in Urban Greening Scholarship: Toward an Emancipatory, Antisubordination, Intersectional, and Relational Approach,” *Ann. Am. Assoc. Geogr.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/24694452.2020.1740579.

[2] J. Cortés, M. D. Mahecha, M. Reichstein, R. B. Myneni, C. Chen, and A. Brenning, “Where Are Global Vegetation Greening and Browning Trends Significant?,” *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 2021, doi: 10.1029/2020GL091496.

[3] M. Shrivastava and J. P. Tamvada, “Which green matters for whom? Greening and firm performance across age and size distribution of firms,” *Small Bus. Econ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s11187-017-9942-y.

[4] J. J. T. Connolly and I. Anguelovski, “Three Histories of Greening and Whiteness in American Cities,” *Front. Ecol. Evol.*, 2021, doi: 10.3389/fevo.2021.621783.

[5] R. Zhang, G. Chen, Z. Yin, Y. Zhang, and K. Ma, “Urban greening based on the supply and demand of atmospheric PM2.5 removal,” *Ecol. Indic.*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2021.107696.

[6] J. C. Bikomeye, J. Balza, and K. M. Beyer, “The impact of schoolyard greening on children’s physical activity and socioemotional health: A systematic review of experimental studies,” *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 2021, doi: 10.3390/ijerph18020535.

[7] S. Piao *et al.*, “Characteristics, drivers and feedbacks of global greening,” *Nature Reviews Earth and Environment*. 2020. doi: 10.1038/s43017-019-0001-x.

[8] F. Sharifi, A. Nygaard, W. M. Stone, and I. Levin, “Green gentrification or gentrified greening: Metropolitan Melbourne,” *Land use policy*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.landusepol.2021.105577.

CHAPTER 10

EXPLICITLY DEFINING PARTY POLITICS

Dr. Umakanth.S, Professor & HOD, Department of Management,
JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, India,
Email Id-umakanth@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Party politics is the term used to describe the rivalry of political parties for control and influence over the government. Analysing the formal structures and procedures of political parties, as well as their beliefs, platforms, and organisational methods, is necessary to formally define party politics. This may aid in elucidating the objectives and driving forces behind political parties, as well as their interactions with other participants in the political process, including interest groups, the media, and voters. Effective democratic administration depends on voters having a solid understanding of party politics, which helps them choose which party and policies to support. A thorough knowledge of party politics may also aid in fostering accountability and transparency in the political system as well as facilitating productive communication and cooperation between various political players. Parties may be very varied and complicated, and they may behave differently in various political settings, making it difficult to define party politics.

KEYWORDS:

Environment, Influence, Party, Policy.

INTRODUCTION

Party politics, or the battle of political parties for influence and power in government, is a key feature of contemporary democracies. The idea of party politics is intricate and varied, entailing a variety of formal structures and procedures that are influenced by institutional, historical, and cultural aspects. In-depth investigation of the idea of party politics, including its salient characteristics, motivating factors, and difficulties, is the goal of this review work.The presence of political parties itself is one of the primary characteristics of party politics. Political parties are official entities that work to advance the interests of certain social communities. Parties may play a variety of functions in the political system depending on the environment they operate in and can differ greatly in terms of their beliefs, platforms, and organisational structures. The struggle for influence and power among parties is another important aspect of party politics. This rivalry may manifest itself in many ways, such as media campaigns, lobbying, and political battles.

Drivers of Party Politics:

The institutional, historical, and cultural influences that define various political systems may have an impact on the complex and multidimensional nature of party politics. The need to represent the interests of various social groups, the desire for power and influence, and the need to address evolving societal and environmental problems are some of the main forces behind party politics. Institutional aspects of party politics may also be influenced by election rules, media coverage, and the influence of interest groups on public opinion.Party politics presents a number of difficulties and constraints, while playing a prominent role in contemporary democratic regimes. The necessity to strike a balance between conflicting

interests and goals both inside and across parties is one of the main difficulties in party politics. In addition to addressing evolving socioeconomic and environmental issues, this may include managing complicated ideological, cultural, and institutional elements. The possibility of internal party strife, the have to adapt to changing media environments and public opinion, and the impact of interest groups and other external players on the political system may all be seen as additional difficulties in party politics.

The environmental challenge has only been partly accepted by the main political parties in the USA, where it is not a particularly important election issue. Environmental politics, however, have become more partisan, and this trend seems likely to continue given that polling data now clearly links liberal ideology and Democratic Party support with pro-environment attitudes among the general public. Conservatives and Republicans, on the other hand, are less likely to share this view. However, the truth is that resistance to environmental measures, particularly higher gasoline taxes, is so strong on a number of important topics, most notably climate change, that even Democrats are hesitant to take a potentially unpopular green stance.

Generally speaking, labour and social democratic parties are backed by trade unions, whilst conservative and liberal parties are connected to corporate organisations. Both the left and right share a technocentric dedication to maximise economic development and are often related closely to producer interests. These producer interests, despite their evident disparities, are mostly unified in their support for expansionary economic policies and opposition to environmental concerns. The adoption of unpopular "green" measures like tight eco-taxes or limitations on consumerist lifestyles may also make political elites uneasy.

However, the majority of the established parties have steadily changed their stance on environmental preservation. Some parties have created progressive environmental plans, albeit this adjustment may not go far beyond the employment of greener language. These variations create a number of issues. Why have certain parties reacted differently from others in a favourable way? How much does the existence of a prosperous green party influence how receptive the mainstream parties are? Are there typical left-right splits in politics when it comes to the environment? These problems are investigated here by looking at the party politicisation of the environment in the USA, which is typically overlooked in this literature, as well as Germany and Britain, which have previously been covered in some depth and extensively compared in the literature on green politics.

These three wealthy industrialised countries have very different political systems: Germany has a strong green party and a system that is generally open to new challenges; Britain has a weak green party and a system that is generally closed. The USA, on the other hand, lacks a national green party but has a pluralistic political system that is somewhat open to new challenges. Last but not least, the term "party politicisation" is used here in a broad sense to describe a process whereby the environment rises to the political agenda to become electorally salient and the subject of party competition, so that parties increasingly embrace environmental concerns, strengthen their policy programmes, and criticise their rivals for the shortcomings of their environmental record.

Numerous experts concur that Germany "moved from a posi- tion of reluctant environmentalism" to become one of the world's leading'pioneers' of European environmental policy. German political and economic elites progressively embraced the fundamental principles of ecological modernization under a series of conservative CDU-led administrations, passing some of the most difficult laws in the world.The German reputation as an environmental pioneer has since lost some of its lustre, but all the established parties

have accepted the central position of environmental issues on the political agenda. gent pollution control standards and progressive environmental policies in Europe, while on the international stage Germany took the lead in pressing for tougher action on a wide range of issues.

Die Gru nen clearly had a major impact on how the environment was politicised by the party. The Federal Republic allegedly produced the harshest environmental protection regulations in the whole world as a direct result of the Greens' involvement. The Greens were able to take advantage of the established parties' inability to address environmental problems positively due to widespread public concern about the environment in the early 1980s, which was sparked by the acid rain and nuclear power crises. In an election system where coalition governments are the norm and tiny parties may have a significant impact, the level of political rivalry was crucial. The established parties at first saw the Greens as outsiders, but as the party gained support and the FDP's popularity dwindled, they were forced to see Die Gru nen as a potential coalition partner. As a result, all of the main parties began to place a greater focus on environmental concerns and to enhance their promises to the environment in their manifestos[1].

Party rivalry made the SPD especially susceptible to Die Gru nen's electoral threat. Die Gru nen's arrival into parliament in 1983 coincided with the SPD's loss, and years of internal turmoil led to a change in the party's attitude towards the environment. A long-term realignment of the electorate seems to have made the SPD the victim. Both the Left and the Right were gaining support, with the Greens luring the progressive post-materialist middle classes, while it was losing support to the Right, especially among its traditional working-class base. The SPD faced a basic choice on how to balance the interests and aspirations of these various constituencies: should it go left to address the danger presented by the Greens or right to win back its core working-class supporters? Due to these conflicts, the SPD's views on the green issue changed throughout time, varying from times of cooperation and assimilation to times of non-cooperation and aggressive resistance to a party that many in the SPD saw as reckless and untrustworthy.

By the middle of the 1990s, the SPD could no longer dismiss the possibility of a red-green coalition since it represented the most practical way to end the protracted CDU administration of Chancellor Kohl. Several additional considerations, in addition to this electoral need, prompted the SPD to cease seeing the Greens as eccentric outsiders. Overall, the Greens' national electoral support seems to have settled at a level much below what had previously looked probable, making the SPD feel less directly threatened by them. A more collaborative approach was fostered by the success of SPD-Green coalitions in the Lander, where it became evident that the two parties could "do business." Additionally, there was a lot of policy agreement between the two parties. The SPD's resistance to environmentalism waned as the party strengthened its postmaterialist platform, which now includes positions on nuclear energy, gender equality, and changes to citizenship rules. The rise of the Realists, however, signalled a significant moderating of Green institutional practises and policy. By 1998, the SPD and Greens' party platforms on important issues had become so similar that a red-green alliance was plainly preferable to an SPD-CDU "grand coalition." In order to get established German parties, particularly the SPD, to take environmental concerns more seriously, the Greens' success was crucial[2].

However, it's crucial to avoid overestimating how much the environment has been influenced by party politics. Ironically, the Greens entered office at a time when the importance of the environment had reduced and their political prospects seemed to have plateaued. The environment was pushed down the political agenda throughout the 1990s as a result of

economic hardship and the turbulent effects of German unification, as seen by the shrinking space devoted to the environment in the major parties' federal election manifestos in 1994 and 1998. When promoting progressive environmental measures, they started to be more circumspect. For instance, the CDU and SPD both reduced their support for a carbon tax due to the potential harm to employment. The Greens were successful in insisting that the red-green administration handle important environmental concerns, particularly nuclear power. Schroeder and Fischer skillfully connected the devastating floods that summer to climate change during the 2002 federal election, portraying the coalition administration as the best capable of addressing the issue.

The troubled domestic economy and Schroeder's divisive Agenda 2010 reforms eventually overshadowed environmental concerns, however. Unsurprisingly, a professional study of German political scientists conducted in 2002 revealed that the Greens prioritise the environment significantly more than the other main parties, who rated it around the same importance, with the PDS coming in last. In terms of policy stances, the parties did diverge, with the left-of-centre SPD and PDS seeming much greener than the right-of-centre CDU and FDP. What effect the red-green coalition's electoral setback in the 2005 federal election will have on environmental politics is not yet known. The CDU-SPD 'grand coalition' government has the chance to ignore environmental and left-libertarian issues, giving the Greens the chance to capitalise. However, the emergence of a new Left Alliance, which includes the PDS and various disgruntled former SPD members and did well in the 2005 election, presents real competition for the Greens in the political space to the left of the SPD. It is obvious that Germany's party-politicization of the environment is still precarious and highly reliant on broader political events. The examination of party politicisation in Germany has mainly examined how the Greens have affected other parties, but as will be seen in the sections on Britain and the USA that follow, green parties have not had much of an influence in those nations[3].

DISCUSSION

The case studies in this section are used to derive a number of conclusions concerning the kind and degree of environmental party politicisation. First, the atmosphere has been somewhat partisanized in all three nations. No party can afford to ignore the environment since it is now firmly entrenched on the political agenda. The intensity of public awareness about environmental issues has been a key element pushing this process everywhere. The variance in the passion shown by parties for environmental concerns may be explained by changes in the volume and intensity of public opinion. Generally speaking, individuals are most concerned about the environment during times of economic success and are least concerned when attention is drawn back to materialist matters during times of economic distress. As a result, the rise in interest in the mid- to late 1980s, fueled by an increased understanding of global issues and heightened by precipitating incidents like the Chernobyl and Exxon Valdez accidents, undoubtedly played a role in the greening of German, British, and American political parties at this time.

The level of public concern seems to be highest in Scandinavia, where surveys indicate that at least a third of people think environmental issues should be given more attention than economic development. This result may be explained by a larger proportion of postmaterialists in those populations or by a particular sensitivity to environmental problems. In any case, this deeper concern contributes to the explanation of why Scandinavian established parties have often created greener platforms than elsewhere.However, the environment has only seldom been a serious political salience issue. It is often seen as one of the most important topics in national elections by much less than 10% of voters - perhaps 5%

in the USA and Britain. In party publications or the US president's 'State of the Union' address, politicians are more likely to discuss the political climate than during election campaigns, when it often goes unmentioned. The commitment of established parties to environmentalism is clearly constrained by their low saliency[4], [5].

Thirdly, the existence of a powerful green party in Germany undoubtedly sparked a greater politicisation of the environment, while the lack of such a party in Britain and the United States explains why environmental politics are less intense in these nations. A thriving green party does not, however, ensure a favourable reaction from other parties. Despite the existence of two green parties in Belgium that had electoral success, the major parties remained mired in a left-right materialist debate and gave little ground to environmentalism. The thawing of these solidified party divisions in the late 1990s, which made it possible for the Greens to join the ruling coalition, did not mark the beginning of a more extensive politicisation of environmental concerns in Belgium. Intense political rivalry in multiparty systems forced established parties in Switzerland, Austria, and Sweden to create extensive environmental agendas before green parties won elections, preventing them from establishing a monopoly on environmental care. The broader greening of established parties, which had hindered the growth of the minor green party, De Groenen, came with the establishment of the Dutch Green Left in 1990. Similar to these examples, established political parties in Norway and Denmark embraced advanced environmental programmes without any encouragement from a green party, stifling the development of new green parties. The importance of green parties seems to be directly correlated with the level of political rivalry in a given nation[6].

Fourthly, Rohrschneider contends that election rules, which mediate the main "Old Left" parties' policy responses, are especially crucial in determining how environmental orientations influence voter partisanship in each nation. Environmentalism may be a particularly serious danger to 'Old Left' parties if environmental cleavages reflect the traditional left-right dimension and left-wing voters show more support for ecological problems than those on the right. One example of a well-established leftist party being endangered by the rise of a green party is the German SPD, which alternates between centrist and leftist agendas. By implementing more aggressive environmental policies, the Social Democrats in Austria and Denmark have also made an effort to counteract the danger posed by green or left-libertarian groups[7].

The left-right split does not, however, usually reflect the environmental cleavage. With the strong environmental lobby being non-partisan, environmentalism in Britain mainly cuts across political lines. The electorate is less inclined to associate environmental concerns with a larger left-libertarian agenda in the absence of a strong green party. The Labour Party has remained comparatively indifferent to environmentalism in a political system that is still controlled by two broad-church parties that are skilled at absorbing divisions and divergent viewpoints. There is no similar "Old Left" party in the US, and party politics there are not clearly divided along left-right lines. However, the Democratic Party, which is more liberal and left-wing, has adopted a more progressive stance on the environment. In contrast, social democrat, centrist, and liberal parties have all vigorously campaigned for votes in multiparty Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland. As a result, environmental problems are high on the agenda, but conflicts do not always fall neatly along left-right lines[8], [9].

In conclusion, major institutional components of political opportunity structures will influence how environmental politics are conducted in each nation. While the comparatively restricted POS in Britain has allowed the main parties to get away with marginally greener language and deeds, Germany's open POS contributed to a severe politi- cization of the

environment throughout the 1980s. The POS in the USA has been sufficiently open for pressure to be applied on the Democrats to adopt a more partisan approach on the environment, but the low salience of the environment has set firm limits on the two main parties' total response to environmentalism.

Green parties often assert that they are unique from other parties, and they do continue to be such, both officially and culturally. For instance, the majority of green parties have avoided electing a single leader and may claim that women are equally represented. The "normalization" of most green parties, as shown by Die Gru nen, has caused them to compromise the anti-party model in order to win elections and shape policy. Incorporation and deradicalization of green parties by the current political system may have occurred to some extent based on their willingness to join governing coalitions. Aside from increasing the overall pressure to increase the representation of women, the APP model has had no obvious impact on how other parties behave. However, green parties in government can boast to some actual policy accomplishments and have shown that they can be reliable and capable members of the government despite their inexperience and status as junior coalition partners.More generally, the situation still lacks electoral relevance.

The status of the economy, taxes, and other materialist problems continue to dominate political discourse. Election victories for the green movement have contributed to upend established party structures in various nations. The environment may move up the political agenda as a result of a significant green party representation, compelling traditional parties to adjust to this new agenda. If it ever was, environmental politics are no longer the exclusive domain of green parties. Other parties often claim that they are the "real" green party, even in countries like Britain where green parties are weak. Established parties have appropriated and deradicalized some of the environmental agenda by using greener vocabulary and making new environmental commitments. Therefore, it is crucial that green parties do not let their larger role as activists and defenders of a green conscience be sacrificed on the altar of political success, particularly when they join government. A similar conflict between radicalism and reformism is being faced by the larger environmental movement outside of parliament[10].

CONCLUSION

Party politics is a complicated and multidimensional idea that is essential to contemporary democracies. Party politics has the ability to significantly advance environmental policy, social justice, and other critical areas, even while it may present considerable obstacles and constraints, such as the need to balance conflicting interests and objectives within and across parties. In order to better comprehend and address the political difficulties of the twenty-first century, it is crucial for academics, decision-makers, and people to work together to establish techniques for clearly defining party politics.

REFERENCES:

[1] X. E. Barandiaran, A. Calleja-López, and E. Cozzo, “Defining Collective Identities in Technopolitical Interaction Networks,” *Front. Psychol.*, 2020, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01549.

[2] L. Ozzano and F. Cavatorta, “Introduction: Religiously oriented parties and democratization,” *Democratization*, 2013, doi: 10.1080/13510347.2013.801252.

[3] K. C. White, “The Tea Party as Brand,” *Oxford Scholarsh. Online*, 2018.

[4] M. J. Costello, "Administration Triumphs Over Politics: The Transformation of the Tanzanian State," *Afr. Stud. Rev.*, 1996, doi: 10.2307/524672.

[5] "Visions of gender in the making of the British welfare state: the case of women in the British Labour Party and social policy, 1906-1945," in *Maternity and Gender Policies*, 2020. doi: 10.4324/9780203059913-13.

[6] D. Henley and H. G. C. (Henk) Schulte Nordholt, "From Contest State to Patronage Democracy: The Longue Durée of Clientelism in Indonesia," in *Environment, Trade and Society in Southeast Asia*, 2015. doi: 10.1163/9789004288058_012.

[7] L. Bennett, "Chicago's new politics of growth," in *The New Chicago: A Social and Cultural Analysis*, 2006.

[8] I. Bailey and H. Compston, "Resource exchange, political strategy and the 'new' politics of climate change," in *Climate Change and the Crisis of Capitalism: A Chance to Reclaim, Self, Society and Nature*, 2012. doi: 10.4324/9780203146118-20.

[9] A. A. Ongiri, "'Black Arts for a Black people!': The cultural politics of the Black Power movement and the search for a Black Aesthetic," 2000.

[10] A. Sinden, "In defense of absolutes: Combating the politics of power in environmental law," *Iowa Law Review*. 2005.

CHAPTER 11

A STUDY ON ECOLOGICAL ORGANIZATIONS

Dr M.Govindaraj, Associate Professor, Department of Marketing,

CMS Business School, JAIN Deemed to-be University, Bangalore, India,
Email Id- dr.govindarajm@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Environmental and conservation-related concerns are the main areas of concentration for ecological organisations, which include a varied set of NGOs and advocacy groups. The purpose of this abstract is to examine the function and influence of environmental organisations in advancing sustainability and safeguarding natural resources. The abstract looks at several ecological organisations, such as environmental justice organisations, conservation groups, and groups fighting for climate change, and their various approaches to promote ecological sustainability. The abstract also examines the motivations for and difficulties facing ecological organisations, such as the need of striking a balance between environmental objectives and other political concerns and the possibility of clashes with other stakeholders like business and the government. In general, ecological organisations are essential in influencing public opinion and advancing environmental policy reform. Ecological organisations contribute to the creation of a more just and sustainable future for people and the earth via their advocacy work and interaction with stakeholders at all levels.

KEYWORDS:

Ecological, Environmental, Organizations, Traditional.

INTRODUCTION

Since the middle of the 1980s, the environmental movement has expanded quickly, giving certain organizations the means to develop into highly professional organisations and get frequent access to influential decision-makers. Without a doubt, environmental groups have been the most successful force fighting for progressive environmental change, especially in nations like the USA and the UK where there isn't a strong green party and the established parties haven't done much to address environmental issues. However, this institutionalisation process required concessions that lessened the radical edge of powerful organisations like Friends of the Earth and Greenpeace, and they helped to fuel the 1990s resurgence of grassroots environmental groups like the UK anti-roads protesters and the US environmental justice movement. In this way, the environmental movement has faced a choice that is common to many other political movements: should it continue to pursue a radical outer approach of confrontational protest politics or stick with the reformist insider strategy of pressure politics?

The evolution and successes of the environmental movement are discussed in this chapter. In the early parts, environmental organisations are reviewed, and a typology is presented that will be used to help make sense of this expansive and varied movement. The main focus is on the strategic dilemmas facing any environmental group: should it adopt a professional or participatory organisational structure and should it use conventional or disruptive forms of pressure? The following sections explore the dynamic tension between the mainstream environmental lobby and the less formally organised grassroots sector. The expansion of transnational environmental action as a reaction to the problem of globalisation is examined in the next section, along with the question of whether it signals the creation of a new civil

society. A preliminary assessment of the influence of environmental organisations is provided in the last section. The degree to which the environmental movement is an expression of the new politics is one issue that runs throughout the chapter.

Audit of the Environmental Movement

If the environmental movement were to be evaluated just on the basis of its size and scope, it would be evident that it has grown to be a powerful force in the majority of industrialised nations. With 12,000 local grassroots organisation and at least 150 national environmental associations, the USA is home to an estimated 14 million members. In the UK, there are roughly 200 national associations with 4 to 5 million members, whereas Germany has about 900 organisations with 3.5 million members. According to a poll, a surprising 45% of Dutch people claimed to be members of an environmental group, compared to 15% of Americans, 13% of Danes, and less than 3% of German, British, and French individuals. The Dutch have the greatest membership per capita[1].

The first wave of the conservation movement saw its inception between the late nineteenth and the 1950s, with an emphasis on the preservation of natural resources and the protection of species. The National Trust and the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds in the UK, the Sierra Club and the National Audubon Society in the United States, and the Naturschutzbund Deutschland in Germany all had their beginnings in this time. The World Wildlife Fund, currently known as the World-Wide Fund for Nature, was established in 1961 as a conservationist group with a worldwide view, serving as a bridge to a new class of global organisation. The second wave was a result of contemporary environmentalism in the 1960s, which heralded an increase in the quantity and size of organisations. New associations like Friends of the Earth and Greenpeace quickly developed into multinational organisations with national affiliates in several nations, reflecting the transnational aspect of contemporary environmentalism. They shared a larger environmental goal—as opposed to a conservatist one—with new national organisations, such the Environmental Defence Fund and the Natural Resources Defence Council in the USA. This agenda included industrial pollution, nuclear power, and an increasing list of global issues. During this time, traditional conservation groups saw a significant increase in membership and were inspired to broaden their agendas to include a variety of environmental and, more recently, social justice issues.

Since the 1970s, that membership has increased significantly, becoming more concentrated in a limited number of large organisations. The patterns of membership expansion have a cyclical structure, with periods of development being separated by intervals of consolidation and stagnation. Following the first surge in the late 1960s and early 1970s, a second era of development was seen in the mid- to late 1980s, as public awareness about environmental issues throughout the world increased. Early in the 1990s saw a drop in membership for various environmental organisations; in particular, Greenpeace USA's membership fell, leading to the closure of regional offices and a third reduction in paid employees. Nevertheless, the biggest environmental organisations now have sizable budgets thanks to the sharp rise in membership fees and the emergence of organised fundraising campaigns. One of the largest non-profits in the nation to receive private funding is the US organisation The Nature Conservancy, which had an overall budget of $972.4 million in 2003[2], [3].

DISCUSSION

The environmental movement is very diversified, including established conservation agencies, global NGOs, extreme direct-action organisations, and a huge number of regional grassroots movements. In fact, some observers contend that there is no unified environmental movement since there are more variances than commonalities among the many organisations.

Dal- Hai, on the other hand, speaks of a universal "green rainbow" in which disparities across groups only reflect trends along a continuum between a conservation orientation and an ecological orientationideal kinds that roughly correlate to the two historical phases of environmentalism. The term "broad networks of people and organisations engaged in collective action in the pursuit of environmental benefits" is used here to refer to the whole environmental movement. However, inclusion may often lead to unusual bedfellows, therefore the typology created by Diani and Donati offers a useful framework for understanding this eclectic trend.

According to Diani and Donati, all EPGs must fulfil the two fundamental functional criteria of resource mobilisation and political efficacy. The process of mobilising resources entails acquiring the tools required for group action. There are basically two options: either to deploy human resources by promoting member involvement, or to increase public support via mass membership and fundraising in order to sustain a professional organisation. A professional organisation or a participatory organisation is the fundamental option. Political effectiveness is the selection of a strategy and a set of methods. Again, there are two main options: either a conventional strategy for political negotiation that abides by the existing political rules of the game, or a tactic that subverts established political norms[4].

Therefore, two fundamental conflicts are identified: one between participatory and professional organisational paradigms, and the other between unconventional and traditional kinds of pressure. Four organisational kinds result from these decisions:The public interest lobby employs conventional pressure techniques, has a low participation rate, and is run by professionals. The organisation that promotes disruptive protest, sub-cultural frameworks, and participatory action. The professional protest group mixes traditional methods with aggressive ones, as well as professional activism and financial resource mobilisation. The participatory pressure group employs traditional pressure methods while also include rank-and-file members and supporters.The institutionalisation of the mainstream movement and the revitalization of the grassroots sector are two major developments in the evolution of the environmental movement that are examined in the following sections using this typology.

The environmental movement was institutionalized:

Everyone agrees that the environmental movement has become more institutionalised in Western Europe and North America. Although there are significant regional differences, with institutionalisation being strongest in Germany, the Netherlands, and the Nordic nations and weakest in France and Southern Europe, it seems that the mainstream environmental movement has opted for reform over revolution. In order to function inside the political system, it has shed any radical social movement origins; as a result, professionalisation and traditional procedures have taken the place of participatory ideals and unorthodox strategies. Using the criteria outlined in Box 6.1, this section assesses the kind and degree of institutionalisation, paying special attention to the growth of Friends of the Earth and Greenpeace[5].

First, it is important to differentiate between "environmental" organisations' experiences and those of conventional conservation organisations, for whom institutionalisation is an undeniable indicator of success. Most environmental organisations were "born institutionalised." Initially, these were elitist organisations looking to moderately alter the pre-existing socio-political system. The contemporary, mass-membership conservation organisations have exploited their tremendous revenue to transform themselves into highly competent public interest organisations, but they still operate as hierarchical entities with limited democratic rights offered to members. Formerly dependent on volunteers for

administration, legal counsel, and lobbying, these functions are now handled by professionals, including managers, attorneys, fundraisers, lobbyists, and scientists. The majority of conservation organisations adhere to traditional techniques of pressure. Their political campaigning is focused on informing the public, engaging in lobbying, and using the legal system to defend the environment. Since they regularly converse with politicians and other government officials and represent environmental concerns in standard-setting and enforcement, conservation organisations have grown to play a formal role in policy implementation. Many conservation organisations get significant public support for their work, which ranges from habitat preservation to eco-labelling and is often done in collaboration with state authorities. In countries like Germany and the Netherlands, where top environmental organisations are supported by the government "with the declared objective of creating a counter-lobby," institutionalisation is at its most pure. Therefore, inasmuch as they are now mass-membership organisations with more legitimacy and improved access to politicians, conservation organisations have institutionalised themselves.

Because of the clear danger to the natural ecosystems that conservation organisations strive to safeguard, several of these organisations have evolved in their readiness to expand the scope of their objectives to cover a variety of international environmental challenges. Major Sierra Club initiatives, for instance, focus on "safe and healthy communities," "smart energy solutions," and "global warming." Recognising that the conservation of migratory bird habitats from environmental threats like climate change is essential to maintaining the UK's vast variety of bird species, the RSPB took an active role in the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development. The massive expansion of conservation organisations, however, has not resulted in a fundamental change in their objectives or approaches.4 Groups like the Sierra Club and the RSPB have always been public interest organisations; they are just now bigger and more effective at it[6].

For organisations that began as radical social movements, like Friends of the Earth and Greenpeace, the institutionalisation process has proven more challenging. Both came from the "modern environmentalism" period. David Brower, a former Sierra Club worker who was sceptical of that organization's resistance to using confrontational tactics, founded FoE in the USA in 1969. Canadians opposed to a scheduled US nuclear test on a Pacific island launched Greenpeace in 1971.5 Both organisations immediately gained a reputation for creative lobbying, well-publicized rallies, and direct action. Through its risky, spectacular, high-profile activities at sea against nuclear testing, whaling, and the slaughter of seal pups, Greenpeace in particular captured the attention of the world. Both associations are now massive, global institutions: the FoE International federation has

member organisations in 70 nations, while Greenpeace maintains operations in 40 nations. Green-peace International had 2.7 million "supporters" and a net income of €158.5 million in 2004. Both membership and revenue had exploded. According to FoE International, they have 1.5 million "members and supporters." FoE, for instance, increased from eight local organisations, 1,000 supporters, six staff members, and a budget of £10,000 per year in 1971 to around 220 local groups, 100,000 supporters, 92 staff members, and a budget of £5.5 million per year in 2004. Organisational development of this kind satisfies the first category of institutionalisation without a doubt, but can it be consistent with the goals and tactics of social movements?

FoE and Greenpeace's organisational frameworks originally diverged significantly. In its early years, FoE had characteristics of a social movement organisation. In each nation, it began as a small campaigning organisation, often with a central office to coordinate plans and independent local units with independent authority over resources and campaigns. There are

now several organisational structures for FoE in different nations, from the decentralised Australian organisation to the structured US group that focuses on the Washington lobby. However, when FoE drew a sizable membership, it became more centralised and formal. For instance, as FoE increased, the gap between the core and neighbourhood groups widened. The centre first rejected calls from local organisations for a larger voice in the organisation, but in 1983 it developed a more democratic structure in response to mounting pressure from members and campaign personnel. While local organisations may influence policy via the annual conference and elected members do have a majority on the board, it is debatable how democratic the FoE really is given its continual development and professionalisation. Overall, even while the national level essentially sets the strategy, it is also highly interested in maintaining the grassroots membership content, which is why it decided against expanding the national office and to place any future staff expansions at the regional and local levels. As a result, FoE has gradually transformed from an informal social movement to a formal, centralised organisation, yet aspects of the two 'types' continue to conflict, indicating that the change is not yet complete[7].

Greenpeace, in contrast, has never said that it is democratic. Its founders had a defined organisational vision for an elite, hierarchical system where full-time employees and professional campaigners held power. The goal was to release such activists from time-consuming, ineffective democratic controls so they could focus on direct action. The majority of Green-peace "members" are really "supporters" whose membership money does not provide them legal organisational privileges, and the participation of local organisations and Fundraising is usually the only option for individual supporters. Each nation only has a few hundred full members. For instance, in Greenpeace Germany, members elect a management board that sets the agenda and names a directorate to lead a management team that oversees the national organisation. 'Authoritar- ian leadership' has been used to define this very person- centred and centralised executive structure.

FoE and Greenpeace are becoming more professionalised, as seen by the fact that their national offices now employ a sizable number of marketing and fundraising specialists in addition to campaigners and administrators, and rely less on volunteers. Both organisations make large investments in mail-order recruitment. They buy address lists of individuals who fit the demographic profile—occupation, education, age, disposable money, and political affiliations—and who are likely to be sympathetic to environmental concerns and prepared to pay a membership. According to a British survey, the average FoE voter is a "well-educated middle-class female under 45 in a professional/managerial occupation from a relatively affluent household, who is a member of other campaigning organisations" Every new "eco-crisis" is deftly exploited with a big mailshot to current and potential supporters, along with carefully selected high-profile campaigns or stunts to attract media attention. The majority of British FoE members are recruited by direct mail or advertisements rather than through a social network of friends or coworkers, which is a sign of the strategy's efficacy. Paul Watson, a former Greenpeace volunteer, has said that the organisation has "turned begging into a major corporate adventure."

Both Greenpeace and FoE have a membership made up mostly of "couch" people who are happy to pay a membership fee and let the leadership handle operating the group. Most supporters do not want to become activists and are hesitant to make significant sacrifices to safeguard the environment, therefore it seems that they just have a limited emotional connection with the organisation. This passive support is likely no more than can be anticipated from a marketing plan that only asks for a modest financial commitment from supporters in exchange for their pleasant feelings towards supporting the cause. Jordan and

Maloney refer to Greenpeace and FoE as protest businesses modelled after private business practises rather than new social movements because they place a strong emphasis on recruitment and marketing, make policy centrally, delegate campaigning to professional staff, and view supporters as a source of income. This description may be more appropriate for Greenpeace than for FoE since the latter still puts a high priority on its relationships with its membership at large[8].

The adjustments that Greenpeace and FoE have made to their advocacy campaigns provide more evidence of institutionalisation. Both organisations initially operated outside of the political system and often used unusual strategies, but with time, each has shifted to a more traditional toolkit. For FoE, this transformation from outsider to insider is most obvious. Early on, FoE regularly used direct action, as shown in the 1971 campaign to have non-returnable soft drink bottles sent to British Schweppes warehouses. However, FoE has always used a variety of tactics; in particular, it places a lot of emphasis on the technical rationalism of its case and enjoys "winning the argument." For its participation in the public investigation into nuclear fuel reprocessing at Windscale in 1977, it earned a great deal of respect in Britain; this success led it to approach the mainstream environmental lobby.

FoE was able to allocate additional resources as it expanded to monitoring governmental operations, producing technical reports, using the legal system, and contacting politicians and public officials for lobbying purposes. Its efforts have steadily changed from conflict and criticism to practical, advice-based activism over time. Today, the government often consults with the FoE, and sometimes its members may be found on official committees. In order to maintain the respectability required for regular insider status, it avoids the huge confrontational acts that helped it establish its image but might potentially jeopardise that position. Instead of enjoying direct action as it once did, FoE is now reluctant to employ it because it cannot afford to disobey the law without risking having its financial assets seized by the courts.

Greenpeace is still more dedicated to the idea of direct action. It has always understood the importance of media image and rapidly gained a reputation for spectacular antics that drew in large audiences. The Rainbow Warrior incident of 1985 was a significant occurrence. A crew member was killed when this Green-peace ship, which was being used to protest French nuclear testing, was blown up by operatives of the French government when it was parked in a New Zealand port. The attention that followed helped Greenpeace expand quickly as a global group. However, this change introduced fresh strategic conundrums. Greenpeace's clever use of "guerrilla theatre" to dramatise environmental catastrophe led to the development of a mutually beneficial partnership between the organisation and the media. These prominent direct acts probably contributed to the increased visibility of problems like whaling, seal hunting, and the Antarctic. The issue was that the strategies on which Greenpeace staked its reputation seemed to have a finite shelf life; stunts had to be ever more outrageous to keep the attention of media that had grown weary of them by this point.

As a large, global NGO, Greenpeace now had the means to create fresh approaches, and as a result, it chose a more beneficial, "solutions-led" strategy. By commissioning research, sharing findings, and assigning more scientists to important positions, this approach built on the scientific knowledge on which Greenpeace had long prided itself. Additionally, it reflected Greenpeace's view that governments have significantly ceded authority to companies. Greenpeace was willing to compromise its adversarial stance towards its longtime "enemy" by employing science to engage in a "rational" discussion with industry. The solutions-led approach saw Greenpeace collaborating closely with businesses in the 1990s to find alternatives to ecologically harmful practises including the usage of chlorine-free

newspaper paper and fuel-efficient vehicles. One important goal was to utilise market forces to alter company conduct, as the successful "greenfreeze" refrigerator campaign shows. This "constructive engagement" has sometimes even turned into a "partnership" in the case of Greenpeace UK, which partnered with an energy company to fund a wind power facility and urges customers to buy their electricity from this provider. However, Greenpeace has refrained from pursuing direct corporate sponsorship, in contrast to many other well-known organisations like WWF[9].

The shift for Greenpeace to more acceptability has not been simple. Ironically, both the marketing team and the antiquated activists were displeased with the transition to solutions-led advocacy. Hardline activists accused the organization's leadership of selling out by speaking with companies, and some of them quit or were driven out of the group. The marketing professionals were concerned that the solutions-led approach's low profile was failing to generate the sexy headlines and moving images required for funding. These internal pressures have caused Greenpeace to exhibit a renewed enthusiasm for direct action since the mid-1990s, including the occupation of the Brent Spar oil-rig, an attempt to halt French nuclear testing in the Pacific Ocean, the destruction of GM crop experiments throughout Europe, and temporarily halting Land Rover sports utility vehicle production. Working with industry as a policy was not replaced by direct action; rather, the two methods are used simultaneously. Grey et al. demonstrate how Greenpeace has utilised a wide variety of unconventional and traditional techniques in its numerous North Sea fishing sector campaigns, choosing whatever appears most fit to accomplish a specific goal.

Whereas Greenpeace previously preferred to act alone, now, like FoE, it regularly collaborates with other EPGs, such the Dolphin Coalition of forty organisations, which was instrumental in gaining laws to save dolphins in the eastern Pacific Ocean from tuna-fishing fleets. It is evident that FoE and Greenpeace have undergone substantial institutionalisation when all three criteria are taken into account. With its professionalisation and emphasis on traditional strategies like publicity, lobbying, litigation, and expert testimony, FoE is now much closer to the public interest model than it was when it first began as a somewhat participatory protest organisation, even though it still retains elements of democracy and participation. Greenpeace has institutionalised more as well, but because of its ongoing dedication to direct action, it is more akin to the professional protest model. It is not an insider public interest organisation since neither the government nor the big environmental lobby often trust it to participate in formal lobbying or serve on committees. Contrarily, many environmental activists believe that even Greenpeace has lost its radical edge due to its discussions with business and increased caution towards breaching the law, despite the fact that its rekindled zeal for direct action has partially restored some of its radical credentials. However, many environmentalists are choosing to become engaged in grassroots activism as they grow more and more frustrated with the mainstream environmental movement[10].

CONCLUSION

Ecological organisations are a significant and diversified set of advocacy and non-governmental organisations that are crucial in advancing sustainability and safeguarding natural resources. These groups use a variety of tactics to advance ecological sustainability, such as conservation activities, climate action programmes, and campaigning for environmental justice. The necessity to reconcile environmental aims with other political agendas and the possibility for confrontation with other stakeholders are only a few of the considerable obstacles and problems they face. Despite these obstacles, ecological organisations have significantly influenced public opinion and encouraged legislative change on environmental problems. These organisations are assisting in the development of a more

just and sustainable future for people and the environment via their interaction with stakeholders at all levels. In order to safeguard the environment and advance ecological sustainability, it is crucial for both politicians and individuals to support ecological organisations and participate in their work.

REFERENCES:

[1] B. Xu and M. Han, "An analysis of the operation mechanism of chemical industry park ecosystem based on theory of ecological organization," *Energy Eng. J. Assoc. Energy Eng.*, 2021, doi: 10.32604/EE.2021.013384.

[2] D. Manuel-Navarrete, "Double coupling: Modeling subjectivity and asymmetric organization in social-ecological systems," *Ecol. Soc.*, 2015, doi: 10.5751/ES-07720-200326.

[3] C. G. Chakrabarti and K. Ghosh, "Maximum-entropy principle: Ecological organization and evolution," *J. Biol. Phys.*, 2010, doi: 10.1007/s10867-009-9170-z.

[4] A. J. Felton and M. D. Smith, "Integrating plant ecological responses to climate extremes from individual to ecosystem levels," *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*. 2017. doi: 10.1098/rstb.2016.0142.

[5] P. Reopanichkul, T. A. Schlacher, R. W. Carter, and S. Worachananant, "Sewage impacts coral reefs at multiple levels of ecological organization," *Mar. Pollut. Bull.*, 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2009.04.024.

[6] G. D. Peterson, "Scaling ecological dynamics: Self-organization, hierarchical structure, and ecological resilience," *Clim. Change*, 2000, doi: 10.1023/A:1005502718799.

[7] L. L. Wolf, F. G. Stiles, and F. R. Hainsworth, "Ecological Organization of a Tropical, Highland Hummingbird Community," *J. Anim. Ecol.*, 1976, doi: 10.2307/3879.

[8] W. F. Cross, J. M. Hood, J. P. Benstead, A. D. Huryn, and D. Nelson, "Interactions between temperature and nutrients across levels of ecological organization," *Global Change Biology*. 2015. doi: 10.1111/gcb.12809.

[9] P. R. Guimarães, "The Structure of Ecological Networks across Levels of Organization," *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*. 2020. doi: 10.1146/annurev-ecolsys-012220-120819.

[10] L. Tsaryk, P. Tsaryk, and I. Vitenko, "Approaches To Optimization Of The Landscape-Ecological Organization Of The Territory Of The Region," *Sci. Issues Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk Natl. Pedagog. Univ. Ser. Geogr.*, 2021, doi: 10.25128/2519-4577.21.1.22.

CHAPTER 12

A STUDY ON GRASSROOTS ENVIRONMENTALISM'S REVIVAL

Dr.Saurabh Srivastava, Assistant Professor, Department of Marketing,
CMS Business School, JAIN Deemed to-be University, Bangalore, India,
Email Id- dr.saurabhsrivastava@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Grassroots environmentalism is the collective effort of private citizens and neighbourhood groups to advance environmental sustainability and solve environmental issues. The current resurgence of grassroots environmentalism is examined in this abstract along with its effects on environmental campaigning and policy. The abstract examines the factors that have sparked this renaissance, such as the increased public concern about environmental degradation and climate change as well as the easier accessibility of technology and social media. The abstract also examines the many tactics used by grassroots environmentalists, such as citizen science, direct action, and community organising. Grassroots environmental activism's potential advantages and drawbacks are also examined, including its ability to foster more civic involvement and democratic participation as well as its propensity to enflame tensions with prevailing institutions and interest groups. Overall, as people and communities play a more active and major role in influencing environmental discourse and policy, the resurgence of grassroots environmentalism signals a fundamental change in environmental policy and advocacy activities. In order to advance greater environmental sustainability and social justice, it is crucial for politicians and other stakeholders to acknowledge and interact with grassroots environmentalism.

KEYWORDS:

Earth, Environmental, Global, Grassroots, Road.

INTRODUCTION

In the 1990s, as the environmental movement grew, there was widespread worry that its newfound prosperity may also be its downfall. After all, a movement's influence would quickly wane if it was unable to mobilise its followers against the government or businesses. The movement had lost its radical character as a result of institutionalisation, and environmental demonstrations seemed to be declining.8 Ironically, the grassroots environmental movement was the one that saved the day. Alongside the major environmental organisations, there has always been a grass-roots sector, but in the late 1980s and early 1990s, it experienced a resurgence in a number of nations, most notably the UK and the USA, frequently in response to perceived shortcomings of the institutionalised mainstream environmental movement. The term "grassroots" covers a wide range of variations, but three general categories can be made out: first, radical social movements like the Sea Shepherd Society, Robin Wood, and Earth First, second, small local groups fighting a particular local unwanted land use; and third, large coalitions of groups like the US environmental justice movement and the UK anti-roads protesters, which may include members of both the other two categories. This section examines each of these three areas in order to evaluate the importance of the grassroots sector.

The most radical strain of the grassroots movement belongs to the first group of organisations, which has an overtly ecological and countercultural focus. Although many of

these organisations have a national or even an international structure, their dedication to participatory, decentralised structures and adamant opposition to institutionalisation in any form make them grassroots organisations. Many were founded by people fed up with mainstream environmental organisations. A splinter group of Greenpeace Germany activists founded Robin Wood because they want a more participative organisation with a clearly German purpose that focused on acid rain and forest degradation. The Sea Shepherd Society was started by former Greenpeace campaigner Paul Watson and is known for spectacular actions including destroying two Icelandic whaling ships in 1986. The most extreme organisation is Earth First, which was started in the USA in 1980 by five activists who were dissatisfied with the rigid bureaucracies and moderate position of other significant conservation organisations including the Wilderness Society and the Sierra Club.

Deep ecologists, or "ecotage" practitioners, the founders of Earth First! were dedicated to aggressive direct action, including acts of civil disobedience and "monkey-wrenching."9 Because most of Earth First!'s operation is shrouded in secret, our understanding of it is quite hazy. It has a very anti-institutional structure made up of around a hundred organisations, each with fifteen to twenty activists, support groups, and fourteen operational centres that coordinate national efforts. Groups are self-sufficient; they choose their own campaigns and raise their own funds. Earth First! is not represented by a single person. A magazine, a yearly gathering, and an activist conference are just a few of the coordination and communication organs. For its theatrical attention-seeking actions, such perching in trees slated for logging, and, most importantly, for its acts of ecotage, Earth First! has attracted a lot of notice and infamy. By regularly damaging the technological assets of businesses involved in logging, drilling, energy production, and surveying, activists have gone well beyond the bounds of civil disobedience. Earth First! is delighted that it flouts the law and loves any media reaction aimed against it, while Greenpeace breaches the law sparingly, ideally when there is no moral ambiguity about the conduct, and only after it has carefully considered the effect on its public reputation.

In fact, it has drawn harsh criticism from the American media and other environmental organisations, as well as violent backlash that included a pipe bomb planted beneath the vehicle of a prominent campaigner. By the early 1990s, there were severe ideological rifts within Earth First! between older activists like Dave Foreman, who emphasised a nar- row "deep ecology" zeal for wilderness and biodiversity issues, and a younger generation who despised some of the misanthropic sentiments of the first group and preferred to develop a broader social agenda. When Foreman and his allies finally left, Earth First! was able to expand its environmental justice agenda. Earth First! is a prime example of a participatory protest organisation because to its democratic, decentralised structure, dedication to direct action, and readiness to work outside of the established political system. Earth First! organisations were established in the Netherlands, Ireland, and Britain in the 1990s. Ironically, a new covert military organisation named the Earth Liberation Front arose in the USA, inspired by the direct action movement in the UK, and claimed responsibility for a number of ecoterrorist activities, including a variety of arson assaults against developers and logging firms.

Most organisations come under the second type of grassroots organisation. They are based on a neighbourhood and are often created by locals as a "not in my back yard" reaction to a planned LULU, such as a new road or incinerator, or out of worry about the health dangers of an existing hazard, such as a polluting industry or the spraying of pesticides. These organisations often encourage participation and depend significantly on donations, membership dues, and fundraising. The group's local basis is likely reflected in the

membership, which is likely to be middle class in affluent areas and working class in less affluent areas. The proliferation of anti-toxic waste and environmental justice organisations in many impoverished urban and rural communitieswhere membership is notably different from that of the mostly middle-class mainstream environmental movementis a remarkable characteristic of US grassroots organisations. Women of all social strata are particularly well-represented in the anti-toxics movement, which also has a much higher percentage of African-Americans and Latinos.

DISCUSSION

There are NIMBY organisations worldwide, and they use a variety of tactics. Some are participatory pressure organisations that use traditional strategies to make their arguments known, such as lobbying, organising petitions, bringing lawsuits, or fielding candidates in local elections. Conventional approaches often fail to produce the desired results, driving disgruntled and more politicised activists to resort to more aggressive, unorthodox strategies including rallies, sit-ins, and blockades. In a well-known event from 1978, residents of Love Canal in New York held two EPA officials "hostage" for several hours in an effort to raise awareness of the dangers posed by nearby hazardous chemical contamination. President Carter proclaimed the region a disaster zone two days later, making the locals eligible for federal aid.

There have been several successful grassroots initiatives that resulted in projects being abandoned, postponed, or modified, but there have also been numerous unsuccessful campaigns where the LULU is still constructed. Typically, passionate local activists are powerless in the face of the combined might of profit-driven businesses and governments keen to avoid impeding economic growth. When local efforts are successful, external causes are often to blame. One examination of local efforts in Britain demonstrates how any modest success was mostly "dependent on action or inaction at other levels," such as the engagement of the mainstream environmental lobby, the national government, the European Commission, and multinational companies. Thus, when the British government imposed a ban on the construction of all nuclear power plants, the long-running local campaign against a planned nuclear power station in Druridge Bay, Northumberland, finally found success.

Recognising the drawbacks of working alone, many local organisations have forged connections with other like-minded grassroots organisations. In light of this, the third type of grassroots groups refers to the growth of alliances and networks among regional environmental organisations, which is particularly apparent in the USA. The Centre for Health, Environment and Justice and the National Toxics Campaign are two national coalitions that have coordinated efforts against chemical risks; each claims to be in touch with up to 10,000 and 7,000 local organisations, respectively. There are other regional organisations as well, like the Work on Waste in New York State and the Silicon Valley Toxics Coalition in California. These alliances have developed out of a shared desire to exchange technical and scientific knowledge, benefit from one another's experiences, and pool resources for jointly managed initiatives. The widespread dissatisfaction with the polished professionalism of major environmental organisations has served as another motivator. The ineffectiveness of lobbying by public interest organisations, the unwillingness of the established organisations to support direct action, their propensity to collude with large businesses, and their attention to the Washington lobby are all commonly criticised by grassroots activists[1].

The environmental justice movement criticises mainstream organisations for focusing on 'universal' problems like protecting wildlife and natural resources while disregarding

environmental risks that disproportionately affect poorer populations. Environmental justice concerns such as class, poverty, racism, and gender are brought to the forefront of environmentalism by this movement. It contends that in order to address environmental risks, which are intrinsically related to inequality, entrenched economic and political systems must be changed rather than focusing on middle-class concerns like conservation and preservation. As a result, environmental justice is a practical political embodiment of both the socialist criticism of environmentalists as middle-class elitists and the social justice concept of ecologism. The environmental movement's "whiteness" is undoubtedly up for serious attack from the environmental justice movement. One of its accomplishments is its inclusivity, which Schlosberg claims has been fostered through a kind of discursive democracy founded on tolerance for many identities and origins and without any attempts to impose any strong ideologies on the movement.

The lack of a comparable large grassroots working-class or non-white environmental justice movement in Europe may be a result of different political opportunity structures, particularly the more pluralistic American polity and the greater ability in Europe to express social justice issues in partisan terms through left-wing or green parties. Whether they are advocating for problems related to pollution, energy, or nature protection, the majority of networks of environmental organisations in European nations continue to have an overtly environmental emphasis. For instance, in Germany, the anti-nuclear movement continued to dominate demonstrations far into the 1990s. As no new nuclear power plants were being constructed, the only significant change in tone was a movement from demonstrations opposing their construction to those against the transport and storage of radioactive waste. The informal network of garbage campaigns in the UK, notably those opposed to planned incinerators, serves as a recent illustration of an emerging environmental justice movement. Local protesters and Friends of the Earth have both used the language of environmental justice in their opposition to plans to build larger incinerators in socially disadvantaged areas like Crymlyn Burrows, South Wales.

The UK anti-roads demonstrations, one of the most significant coalitions in Europe, had a minor social justice goal, although it was more explicitly "green" than the American environmental justice movement. Starting in 1992 with opposition to the M3 motorway extension at Twyford Down, the anti-roads movement involved a number of connected struggles against the construction of new roads as part of the Conservative government's massive construction programme. These campaigns continued across the nation. Two volunteer umbrella organisations, Road Alert and Alarm UK, coordinated the informal alliance of between 250 and 300 anti-roads organisations. The fact that each anti-roads movement comprised a combination of two different types of grassroots organisations is an intriguing aspect of the demonstrations. There was usually one particular group of locals who had been fighting the particular plan for many years, mostly because they were NIMBYs, and who had exhausted all legal means of protest. A second group of green counter-culture activists, often referred to as "eco-warriors" or "eco-protesters," later joined them. Thus, vivid photos of middle-aged, middle-class citizens feeding and watering the eco-warriors in their treehouses and tunnels were shown to the public.

Like the environmental justice movement, the radical eco-protester side of the anti-roads movement was sparked by frustration with the mainstream, established environmental organisations, particularly FoE and Greenpeace. The decision of FoE to leave Twyford Down shortly after construction started, when it was hit with a number of injunctions that threatened to seize its assets, was a significant symbol of their helplessness. The eco-warriors, who were willing to engage in those kind of direct action that alarmed the mainstream organisations,

entered this political vacuum. Earth First!'s emergence in 1991 was crucial; by 1997, there were roughly 60 active organisations and 400 activists attended its annual conference. Even while not all eco-activists supported Earth First, the whole anti-roads movement had several basic traits. It had a loose, decentralised, and non-hierarchical organisational structure. The political parties, organisations, and organisations had a profoundly negative impact on the activists. Eco-protest was appealing to a certain demographic:

Although the road-building initiative was their principal worry, their worries extended to more general issues with the British state's concentration of power, property ownership, and the restriction of human freedoms. Additionally, open-cast mining, quarrying, and a second runway at Manchester Airport were all opposed by eco-protesters. Many people joined organisations like Reclaim the Streets and The Land is Ours as the anti-roads movement began to fade away around 1996. These organisations had a more positive agenda, linked land ownership and current patterns of car use to environmental problems, and were more strongly influenced by social justice issues. Many people began participating in direct action demonstrations against GM crop testing starting in 1999, while others turned their focus to the Global Justice Movement and multinational corporations like McDonald's, Shell, and BP. The eco-protesters seem to be the "first full expression of the new social movement type in British environmental politics," as Doherty described them[2], [3].

The two parts that came before it have shown how the environmental movement includes a diverse range of organisational structures, methods, and tactics. The typology shows a dynamic movement in which, in many countries, a thriving grassroots sector made up of both "participatory pressure" groups of local citizens opposing specific LULUs and "participatory protest" ecological social movements should be set against the convergence among the major environmental groups towards the institutionalised "public interest" model. Contrary to Bosso's misgivings, there does seem to be enough shared ground to speak of a single, broadly defined environmental movement. Apart from the apparent similarities, including a common concern for environmental destruction, two specific examples of this unity have special significance.

First, there seems to be a creative friction existing between the movement's many wings. Most definitely, the widespread mistrust of the mainstream movement among concerned citizens contributes to the strength of the grassroots sector. Many grassroots organisations were born out of a deep-seated resentment towards the environmental lobby's perceived helplessness, particularly due to their disregard for local campaigning. Established organisations have attempted to react to the threat coming from below, especially those with radical antecedents. In response to complaints that it had abandoned its participatory values, FoE, for instance, has educated some local groups in the techniques of non-violent direct action and hired regional campaign coordinators to motivate its sometimes-dormant local organisations to become more active. In response to critiques of its authoritarian, anti-democratic structure, Greenpeace has also shown sensitivity. Greenpeace UK, for instance, relaxed its ban on local supporters participating in activities beyond fundraising and publicity in support of national and international campaigns in 1995.

Later, in 1999, it established a network of "active supporters" to enable supporters to get more involved in local actions. Greenpeace USA has also collaborated closely with grassroots organisations and made a determined effort to hire more people from underrepresented ethnic groups. One reason for this change of heart was that FoE and Greenpeace, like other big organisations, saw a drop in support and a reduction in money in the middle of the 1990s, which posed a direct challenge to the "protest business" model. This stalling might also be a result of the grassroots problem. The Sierra Club and National

Audubon Society in the USA have come under fire from members who want them to become more radical and less focused on Washington. Thus, it seems that the mainstream and grassroots sectors have a mutually beneficial connection that will likely often recreate similar cycles of activity and stasis throughout the "green rainbow."

Second, EPGs have shown a growing propensity to establish alliances and networks in order to achieve their objectives more successfully by combining their resources. The formed organisations often participate in national and international coalition work, which reflects their increasing convergence. The major EPGs have years of combined experience working in government committees, in the lobby, and creating coordinated replies to consultation papers. The creation of loose-knit coalitions with certain grassroots organisations, such as the environmental justice movement and anti-roads demonstrators, demonstrates that there is enough overlap to cooperate on important issues. An coalition including FoE, WWF, Alarm UK, and Earth First! successfully fought the plan to construct a Thames river-crossing across Oxleas Wood in London. Although there was initially a lot of hostility between the FoE and the eco-warriors during the anti-roads campaigns, especially at Twyford Down, they eventually collaborated. German anti-nuclear demonstrations in other countries often feature a coalition of national environmental organisations, including Greenpeace and the Bund fu r Umwelt and Naturschutz Deutschland, as well as local organisations. Gould et al. came to the conclusion that organisations are most successful when they form alliances with regional or national organisations from their research of local environmental mobilising in the USA. There was a great deal of coordination between established and grassroots networks during the large global mobilisation of NGOs opposing the World Trade Organisation conference in Seattle in November 1999.

The Seattle gatherings also highlighted the globalisation of environmental politics as a major obstacle facing the modern environmental movement. The acts of non-democratic international capitalist organisations like the WTO have a significant impact on the environment in an interconnected global economic system, and international environmental diplomacy between nation states has also increased. How can environmental NGOs expect to fight against such strong entities when crucial choices are being made by international organisations, multinational businesses, and national governments more often than not?

However, there are also prospects on the global stage. The environmental movement has recently demonstrated its capacity to build international coalitions of NGOs, from both the North and the South, which have achieved some notable successes, such as making it possible for international agreements to prevent the exploitation of the Antarctic's mineral resources, outlaw ozone-depleting CFCs, and protect biodiversity. Major organisations like Greenpeace and FoE have often shown their previous dynamism at this international level, maybe because international campaigns are more glamorous, garner more attention, and present new problems for organisations like FoE that are becoming more and more constrained by domestic institutionalisation. Indeed, environmental NGOs are now so active on a worldwide scale that some authors believe a new global civic society is emerging. This society is defined as "that slice of associational life that exists above the individual and below the state, but also across national boundaries." They contend that people are increasingly perceiving themselves as a member of a larger global society where they might be represented by environmental social movements: a worldwide "new politics"instead of identifying with the country state. This inspired vision identifies an essential area in modern environmental politics, even if it may at this time seem a bit far-fetched[4], [5].

The global justice movement has been the most intriguing case in point. This large movement consists of a network of individuals and groups working together to address a variety of

interconnected global challenges, including development, trade, debt, poverty, and the environment. It includes activists from both the North and the South and establishes crucial connections between their respective issues. The GJM includes a diverse range of direct-action groups, including environmental, anti-capitalist, and anti-globalization protesters, as well as mainstream, moderate organisations like aid and development charities, religious organisations, and leading environmental groups like WWF and FoE. These various GJM factions have participated in traditional political activities like the Multilateral Investment Agreement and World Trade Organisation reform campaigns, high-profile public demonstrations like those at the Gleneagles G8 summit in 2005 and the Geneva WTO summit in 2002, and a variety of conferences like the European Social Forum[6]. It is not surprising that similar processes have taken place on a global scale as they have at the domestic level, with establishment NGOs criticising the direct action protesters' confrontational tactics as counterproductive while the latter view the former's moderate tactics as a "sell-out" that is ineffective. Others, such Friends of the Earth, which has worked hard to embrace a transnational global justice agenda in the UK, prefer to see these disagreements as a productive tension that will help bring concerns to the attention of the general public. The GJM has included some green rhetoric, but despite the fact that many environmental activists have thrown themselves into it wholeheartedly, it is clear that environmental problems have not been given top priority. The environmental impact of many of the largest anti-globalization protests, such as the Prague protest against the IMF/World Bank in 2001, has been quite little. One explanation may be the significant role played by left-wing activists in the direct action anti-globalization movement. These activists have a larger political agenda and may yet have unresolved misgivings about ecology. Climate change, a clearly environmental concern with significant social justice consequences, is becoming more important within the GJM agenda, which might correct this environmental injustice[7], [8].

CONCLUSION

As people and communities play a more active and substantial role in influencing environmental rhetoric and policy, the rebirth of grassroots environmentalism signifies a fundamental change in environmental policy and advocacy activities. Growing public concern about climate change and environmental damage, as well as the increased accessibility of technology and social media, are some of the factors driving this renaissance. To advance environmental sustainability and solve environmental issues, grassroots environmentalists use a variety of tactics, such as citizen science, direct action, and community organising. Grassroots environmental activism may improve democratic involvement and engagement, but it may also run into obstacles and disagreements with powerful institutions and interest groups. Nevertheless, the significance of grassroots environmentalism cannot be overstated because it is a potent force for advancing greater social justice and environmental sustainability. To fully use grassroots environmentalism's potential to build a more sustainable and just future for everyone, policymakers and other stakeholders should acknowledge and participate in it.

REFERENCES:

[1] J. de Moor, “Grassroots environmentalism,” *Env. Polit.*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/09644016.2021.1981069.

[2] S. Chen, “The rise of blockadia as a global anti-extractivism movement,” *Local Environment*. 2021. doi: 10.1080/13549839.2021.1969352.

[3] N. Özberk, “‘Ecoactivist’ poetry in the Turkish grassroots environmentalism,” *Folklor/Edebiyat*, 2019, doi: 10.22559/folklor.1095.

[4] M. Bloom and S. Q. Fuentes, "Experiential learning for enhancing environmental literacy regarding energy: A professional development program for inservice science teachers," *Eurasia J. Math. Sci. Technol. Educ.*, 2019, doi: 10.29333/ejmste/103571.

[5] L. Dillon *et al.*, "Situating Data in a Trumpian Era: The Environmental Data and Governance Initiative," *Ann. Am. Assoc. Geogr.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/24694452.2018.1511410.

[6] S. Schunz, "The European Union's environmental foreign policy: from planning to a strategy?," *Int. Polit.*, 2019, doi: 10.1057/s41311-017-0130-0.

[7] A. Scheidel *et al.*, "Environmental conflicts and defenders: A global overview," *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2020.102104.

[8] S. Staggenborg, "Review of 'Grassroots Environmentalism,'" *Soc. Forces*, 2021, doi: 10.1093/sf/soab058.

CHAPTER 13

A STUDY ON ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENT

Kul Bhushan Anand, Assistant Professor
Department of Mechanical Engineering, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email id-anand_kb1980@rediffmail.com

ABSTRACT:

In reaction to environmental problems including pollution, habitat loss, and climate change, a worldwide social and political movement known as the environmental movement was born in the latter half of the 20th century. The environmental movement seeks to safeguard natural resources and advance better environmental sustainability. A summary of the history, objectives, and tactics of the environmental movement is given in this abstract, along with information on how it has influenced environmental activism and legislation. To accomplish its objectives, the movement uses a variety of tactics, including as advocacy, legal action, and direct action. Both locally and globally, environmental policy and advocacy activities have been significantly influenced by the environmental movement.

KEYWORDS:

Environmental,Government, Influence, Policy, Sustainability.

INTRODUCTION

Despite its triumphs, the movement still confronts obstacles including governmental resistance, a lack of finance, and disinterest among the general population. Nevertheless, the environmental movement is a significant force in the fight for improved environmental sustainability and the preservation of natural resources for coming generations. It is essential that decision-makers and other stakeholders support the environmental movement and strive towards a future that is more sustainable.Since its inception in the latter half of the 20th century, the environmental movement has played a significant role in influencing both public opinion and government policy. An overview of the history, objectives, and tactics of the environmental movement, as well as its influence on environmental policy and advocacy activities, are provided in this review article[1], [2].

Environmental Movement History:

In reaction to a number of environmental problems, such as pollution, habitat damage, and species extinction, the environmental movement was born[3], [4]. The publication of Rachel Carson's Silent Spring and the approval of important environmental laws like the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act gave the cause a boost in the 1960s and 1970s.

Environmental Movement Objectives:

The protection of natural resources and the promotion of improved environmental sustainability are the main objectives of the environmental movement. Among these are initiatives to lessen pollution, protect biodiversity, and support renewable energy sources. The movement also promotes the necessity for both individual and group action to solve environmental challenges, as well as increased public knowledge of these issues[5].

Environmental Movement Approaches:

The environmental movement uses a variety of tactics, such as advocacy, legal action, and direct action, to accomplish its objectives. Lobbying legislators, planning demonstrations and marches, and doing public outreach and education are all examples of advocacy activities. Litigation techniques entail taking environmental laws and regulations to court or requesting restitution for environmental damages. Civil disobedience tactics like blockades and rallies are examples of direct action techniques that call for change by bringing attention to environmental problems[6].

The environmental movement's effects

Both locally and globally, environmental policy and advocacy activities have been significantly influenced by the environmental movement. The movement has been crucial in influencing public opinion and increasing public awareness of environmental problems. Additionally, it has played a significant role in the adoption of environmental laws and guidelines, including the Paris Climate Change Agreement. The movement has also accelerated the creation of alternative energy sources and supported sustainable business practises across several sectors.

Problems the Environmental Movement Faces

Despite its triumphs, the environmental movement still confronts many obstacles, such as political resistance, a lack of money, and disinterest on the part of the general people. Some stakeholders, such as business associations, may be against environmental restrictions and in favour of laws that place a higher priority on economic development than environmental sustainability. Additionally, the movement struggles to keep the public's interest and support, especially in light of other urgent problems like economic inequality and national security.

It is obvious that the environmental movement has grown into a significant political force in the majority of industrialised, advanced democracies, but it is exceedingly difficult to assess its total influence or make any definitive judgements about the relative merits of conventional and unorthodox approaches. In certain circumstances, such as the Greenpeace Brent Spar campaign, it may be able to evaluate how an action has affected the situation, but how can the effect of Greenpeace's larger fight for climate change prevention be quantified? We may only be able to provide generic, immeasurable estimates at best. By using a paradigm that separates five types of impactindividual identity, sensitising, procedural, structural, and substantivethis section takes a preliminary start in that direction.

Raising activists' ecological awareness is one of the direct political goals of collective action. Thus, one criterion is whether participation in environmental organisations influences one's political identification. Most typically, this form of politicisation occurs in active grassroots organisations where members take part directly in a common battle. As seen by the anti-roads eco-protesters, participation in ecological social movements embedded in the counterculture, like Earth First!, is likely to provide a uniquely potent political experience.

A significant accomplishment of the environmental movement, according to Torgerson, is the development of a "green political sphere" that extends beyond the radical fringe and is marked by an environmental vocabulary that enables individuals to lead political lives. Additionally, the UK and the USA have provided proof that even NIMBY involvement may be a politically enlightening experience. Whether a NIMBY response may develop into a Not in Anyone's Back Yard mindset is the crucial point in this case, according to Freudenberg and Steinsapir. Do people who participate in a fight against a LULU start to think more broadly?

For example, "If I don't want this incinerator in my neighbourhood, why should anyone else have to put up with it?" The nature of energy production and use may then start to draw broader inquiries from the public. In other words, people could start to cultivate a broader ecological conscience. Local organisations' participation in coalitions like the National Toxics Campaign in the USA may be crucial to this educational process since it encourages people to connect their issues with those of other communities. In contrast, "couch" members of significant environmental organisation may assuage their environmental consciences with the limited act of maintaining their consumerist lifestyle while making frequent donations to a significant organisation. If a person's engagement is limited to receiving an annual payment, it obviously has no more potential to polarise society. But 'couch' membership should not be carelessly disregarded. Joining is a political statement in and of itself. The availability of publications and advocacy material may be educational, provoking individuals to consider their own and other people's lives. Membership could also be the first step towards deeper engagement, especially if people feel upset that their membership doesn't appear to be "making much of a difference."

By helping to put the environment on the political agenda and encouraging popular support for environmental conservation, the environmental movement has clearly had a significant and ongoing sensitising effect. Its greatest accomplishment may have been to create an atmosphere where governments are expected to give environmental preservation more consideration, even if it is still not on par with conventional material concerns. Insider and outsider tactics have both contributed to the development of ecological consciousness. The well-established environmental lobby continuously educates and persuades political leaders to take the environment into account. Confrontational acts that draw media attention have consistently succeeded in bringing environmental concerns into the public eye, away from the centre of government. Together, the many elements of the environmental movement—from climate change to biodiversity, from energy to wastehave all influenced the political conversation.

One result has been a series of structural adjustments in how governments approach environmental issues. The establishment of environment ministries in the majority of countries was primarily attributed to environmental policy, in particular. Some significant procedural victories for the insider strategy can be noted. The environmental lobby is increasingly more often consulted on a wide range of issues across most of Northern Europe, North America, and Australasia. The global environmental lobby is represented in a number of UN and other international dialogue networks, including the EU. Whether procedural advantages result in influence is a crucial topic. As Chapter 7 demonstrates, environmental organisations have had little success in gaining access to the policy networks that influence key economic choices in the areas of finance, industry, trade, energy, and agriculture, all of which are still heavily influenced by corporate and producer interests. There is a cost to being an insider group when regular access is secured, as is common in corporatist Norway where the environmental movement is represented on numerous governmental policymaking committees.

This cost involves compromise, playing by the rules, and doing business with interests whose values and actions may be incompatible with those of the majority of environmentalists. When the North American Free Trade Agreement was being negotiated in the early 1990s in the USA, for instance, incorporationary demands from the Washington lobby were readily obvious. Most environmental organisations subsequently backed NAFTA after initially opposing it when it was first proposed by George W. Bush in order to keep their access to the Clinton White House and because they had been "purchased" by huge corporate

contributions, which they largely rely on. Insider status might be flimsy as well. Both the UK and the USA's anti-environmentalist leaders, Thatcher and Reagan, dramatically reduced the improved access to government that the environmental lobby had gained in the 1970s. In the USA, after the doors had started to open again from the late 1980s onwards, they were once more slammed shut with the election of George W. Bush in 2000. Environmental organisations have found that their access to ministers has only somewhat increased, even in countries where green parties have joined government, like Germany[7].

It is especially difficult to assess the environmental movement's substantial influence, which serves as its litmus test. Local grassroots organizations have undoubtedly achieved numerous individual achievements. Additionally, they have suffered several setbacks; for instance, the majority of the British roads that were the target of a protracted anti-roads direct action campaign in the 1990s were finally constructed. Campaigns at the local level seldom result in significant policy changes. The strongest argument against the British anti-roads protests is that while they were successful in raising the issue of road construction on the political agenda and creating the conditions for the Conservative government to make significant cuts to the program, they were not the deciding factor. While some commentators in the USA are wary of the impact of grassroots organizations, others claim that these campaigns have changed the law regarding right-to-know laws and pollution control, as well as encouraged business and the government to take a more preventive approach to environmental contamination. Executive Order 12898, which mandated agencies to take social and environmental justice problems seriously, seems to have been issued by the Clinton administration as a result of the environmental justice movement. Confrontational tactics in Germany, particularly the anti-nuclear campaigns opposing the building of nuclear reactors and the transport of nuclear waste, have achieved several remarkable successes. These campaigns used a combination of grassroots movements and more mainstream organisations, such as Greenpeace. In fact, Germany is the only nation with "significant proactive policy in response to environmental activity in civil society," according to Dryzek et al. in their fascinating comparative study of the environmental movements in Germany, Norway, the UK, and the USA.

The mainstream environmental movement's insider approach has mostly had a defensive effect; a strong, unified green lobby can often thwart unwelcome governmental efforts and obstruct ecologically harmful development projects. Although its influence has changed over time and between different countries, it hasn't been as successful in gaining support for its own reforms or in significantly altering the policy discourse. Of course, a variety of contextual factors, such as the openness of the political opportunity structure, public perceptions, the politicisation of the environment by political parties, the strength of the producer lobby, and the tactical decisions made by the environmental groups themselves will all influence the policy impact of the environmental lobby in any given country.

DISCUSSION

A movement must be able to tie its interests to one or more of the imperatives that make up the state's core, according to Dryzek et al., for an insider approach to be successful. The environmental movement's persistent and well-known issue, however, is that its objectives conflict with the fundamental national imperative of economic expansion. Unusually, the core economic growth imperative was momentarily replaced by a legitimation imperative, which allowed the American environmental movement to exert significant policy influence over the Nixon administration in the early 1970s, when the Environmental Protection Agency was established and a portion of environmental legislation was passed. As a result of a number of contentious social and political concerns as well as the rise of a flourishing

counterculture, Nixon believed that the environment was one matter on which he could quell public unrest and stop the movement's progress. The environmental movement ultimately had little influence in the USA and abroad, and insider techniques proved to be a "bad bargain, because the included group must either remain tame, frus- trated, or be deflected."

The environmental movement's fortunes changed in a few Northern European nations with the emergence of ecological modernization, which views economic and environmental concerns as perhaps compatible. Incorporating environmental organisations into government planning, for instance, led to undeniable policy advancements in Norway starting in the middle of the 1980s. In contrast, the environmental movement in Germany, where ecological modernization also began early but the state initially showed less receptivity to environmental groups, pursued a dual insider-outsider strategy of seeking inclusion in the governmental policy-making process while maintaining a persistent, sometimes combative, involvement in civil society. The good news is that the fundamental tenets of the state are not unchangeable and that an insider approach may be more firmly based on the alternative policy paradigm of ecological modernization. Therefore, the message for the environmental movement in all of its manifestations is to do all in their power to change the state's fundamental principles so that they are consistent with the environmental imperative[8].

Currently, there are two major tendencies that define the environmental movement. Even once radical organisations like FoE and Greenpeace are being dragged more and more into the establishment as a result of the widespread convergence of major environmental NGOs in the majority of nations towards an institutionalised, professional public interest paradigm. The revitalization of the grassroots sector, which has reaffirmed the significance of local activity and questioned the efficacy of the major organisations' moderate insider approach, contrasts dramatically with this tendency, especially in the UK and the USA. Thus, the rise of environmental organisations as a significant political force, the creative protest repertoires, and the radical organisational structures and ideology of ecological new social movements are all indicators of a new politics.

However, the mainstream movement's institutionalisation also raises the possibility that long-standing political conduct patterns may remain stable. Despite being difficult to quantify, the environmental movement has had a significant influence on legislation, rhetoric, and agenda-setting. However, the movement is roiled by frustration and disappointment due to the policy elites' persistent marginalisation of environmental concerns. The capacity of the environmental movement to address the issue of the transnational agenda brought on by the growing internationalisation of environmental politics is now crucial. Environmental organisations are merely one player in the policy process at this level, just as they are at the national and sub-national levels, hence they cannot be evaluated in isolation. Therefore, comprehension of the environmental movement's role in the policy-making process is necessary for a thorough assessment of its impact.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the environmental movement has had a significant role in influencing public opinion and environmental policy. Its lawsuit, direct action, and advocacy techniques have significantly influenced environmental policy and advocacy activities on a national and worldwide level. The campaign does, however, confront formidable obstacles, such as governmental resistance, a lack of money, and popular indifference. Nevertheless, it is impossible to overstate the significance of the environmental movement because it is a potent force for advancing greater environmental sustainability and safeguarding natural resources for future generations.

REFERENCES:

[1] C. Bueger, T. Edmunds, and B. J. Ryan, “Maritime security: The uncharted politics of the global sea,” *Int. Aff.*, 2019, doi: 10.1093/ia/iiz145.

[2] L. Wallbott, G. Siciliano, and M. Lederer, “Beyond PES and REDD+: Costa rica on the way to climate-smart landscape management?,” *Ecol. Soc.*, 2019, doi: 10.5751/ES-10476-240124.

[3] M. Bloom and S. Q. Fuentes, “Experiential learning for enhancing environmental literacy regarding energy: A professional development program for inservice science teachers,” *Eurasia J. Math. Sci. Technol. Educ.*, 2019, doi: 10.29333/ejmste/103571.

[4] L. Dillon *et al.*, “Situating Data in a Trumpian Era: The Environmental Data and Governance Initiative,” *Ann. Am. Assoc. Geogr.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/24694452.2018.1511410.

[5] D. H. Kalonya, “Environmental movements in Turkey from the perspective of commons,” *Int. J. Commons*, 2021, doi: 10.5334/ijc.1088.

[6] S. Schunz, “The European Union’s environmental foreign policy: from planning to a strategy?,” *Int. Polit.*, 2019, doi: 10.1057/s41311-017-0130-0.

[7] A. P. J. Mol, “The environmental movement in an era of ecological modernisation,” *Geoforum*, 2000, doi: 10.1016/S0016-7185(99)00043-3.

[8] R. Gulliver, K. S. Fielding, and W. Louis, “The Characteristics, Activities and Goals of Environmental Organizations Engaged in Advocacy Within the Australian Environmental Movement,” *Environ. Commun.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/17524032.2019.1697326.

CHAPTER 14

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES AS A POLICY

SHRI BHAGWAN, Assistant Professor
Department of Mechanical Engineering, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email id-Shribhagwanme@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

Global authorities are becoming more and more concerned about environmental challenges. These problems include, among others, water shortages, deforestation, air pollution, and climate change. Policymakers must strike a balance between economic growth and environmental preservation since both concerns have a big impact on both people's well-being and the future of the planet. These problems are addressed by environmental policy via a range of initiatives, such as legislative frameworks, financial incentives, and public awareness campaigns. International accords, like the Paris Agreement on climate change, provide a foundation for international collaboration on environmental challenges of significance to all countries. A multidisciplinary strategy that incorporates scientific knowledge, public involvement, and cooperation amongst many sectors and stakeholders is necessary for effective environmental policy. The links between various environmental challenges as well as the social, economic, and political elements that influence environmental results must also be taken into consideration by policymakers. As environmental challenges continue to dominate the public conversation, authorities must give sustainable development top priority and enact measures that advance both social and environmental well-being over the long term.

KEYWORDS:

Global, Government, Environmental, Policy, Political.

INTRODUCTION

Environmental issues may call for specialised care, but policymakers have been hesitant to understand this. All governments embraced a technocentric approach that saw environmental problems as the regrettable side-effects of economic expansion until new environmental imperatives developed in the 1960s, requiring politicians to tackle the environment for the first time as a major policy issue. It was considered that most environmental issues could be resolved and that the contemporary liberal democratic state's fundamental commitment to economic development and political-institutional structures did not need to be questioned. The typical response to environmental issues, referred to as the "traditional policy paradigm," was end-of-pipe, reactive, tactical, and fragmented. This old worldview has been shown to be ineffective, unable to address modern global concerns as well as long-standing issues with pollution and resource depletion. As a result, the alternative paradigm of sustainable development has been posing a growing threat to the conventional paradigm. Even in nations that have led the way in implementing progressive environmental legislation, many aspects of the conventional model are still firmly entrenched despite the mounting environmental catastrophe and the ideological commitment of policy elites to sustainable development.

The essential qualities that identify the environment as a policy issue and make it such a challenging subject for policymakers are identified in the introductory portion of this chapter. The following section of the chapter investigates how environmental policy is made by using a variety of policy process theories. It is believed that the structural strength of producer

interests in capitalist society and the institutional fragmentation of the policy process contribute to the old paradigm's persistence. However, policy change may and does happen. To estimate the likelihood of policy change, multiple models are employed in the second part of the chapter. The chapter concludes with a case study of the nuclear power sector.

The Main Elements of The Environment as A Policy Issue

This section lists seven key qualities that set the environment apart as a challenge for policy.

The public good

Many natural resources are what are referred to as "public goods." This means that "no subtraction from any other individual's consumption of that good results from the consumption of each individual" Both 'non-rival' and 'non-excludable' describe public goods. They are 'non-rival' because one person's consumption does not restrict the consumption of others. For example, one person inhaling clean air does not prevent another person from doing the same. In the sense that others cannot be excluded from the benefits that follow from one person abstaining from a polluting behaviour, public goods are 'non-excludable'. Contrarily, with private commodities, the rule of property might exclude competitors.

Because attempts to safeguard the environment may run into serious collective-action issues, the public character of environmental problems has significant ramifications for policymakers. A power plant that releases sulphur dioxide that will eventually fall as acid rain far away or a factory that dumps chemicals into a river that pollutes it for miles downstream are two examples of how the benefits of using a public good are frequently concentrated among a small number of producers while the costs may be widely dispersed. If a government wants to stop this pollution, the burden of paying for the solution may mostly rest on the polluter, in this case the owner of the plant or the power producer. As a result, a few spatially concentrated polluters who may be required to pay for clean-up measures have an incentive to act collectively to protect their interests, while individual citizens who are affected by the pollution are typically uninformed, geographically dispersed, and lacking in motivation to mobilise as a group in defence of their interests [1].

Individuals have an incentive to free-ride on the combined efforts of others to address the issue if they cannot be excluded from the benefits that others provide. Therefore, there will be a strong temptation for people to disobey these directives in the hope that others will be more obedient. For example, if a government asks people to refrain from 'unnecessary' activities like washing cars or watering lawns or if it seeks to prevent air pollution by asking people to use their cars less. Therefore, free-riding will lead to a less than ideal delivery of the collective benefit, in this case, a consistent supply of water or clean air.

Making the distinction between common-pool and common-sink resources is also helpful. Fauna, forests, and fish stocks are examples of common-pool resource systems, which are sufficiently big that excluding prospective beneficiaries from accessing them would be expensive but not impossible. The difficulty for policymakers is to guarantee that, for example, the fishing fleets of various countries do not capture more fish than is advisable for the sustainability of the overall stocks since people benefit from these stocks by diminishing the common pool. Although they share many characteristics, common-pool resources, such as elephants, trees, and fish, can each be individually appropriated, making them less pure public goods than common-sink resources, such as fresh air. The issue here is not how much air is used, but rather how people utilise this resource to get rid of waste products like carbon dioxide and sulphur dioxide. Controlling the amount of pollution produced by common-sink resources is a problem for society as a whole. In the event that sinks or pools are not

protected, there may be a "tragedy of the commons" in which a resource is either fully depleted or rendered useless.

Transnational Issues

Transnational issues including climate change, ozone depletion, and marine pollution are examples of global commons problems that commonly cross international boundaries. Environmental protection is seriously threatened by global issues, which can only be resolved via coordinated international action. However, if one country takes steps to stop global warming or minimise ozone depletion, it cannot exclude other countries from the benefits. The idea of national sovereignty states that there is no analogous worldwide authority no global government that can compel every nation to comply, while a single government may use the law of the land to oblige individuals or businesses to modify their conduct. As Chapter 9 demonstrates, attempts by the international community to handle transboundary challenges have therefore necessitated previously unheard-of levels of cooperation between states and the creation of new international institutions to convince hesitant countries to embrace joint action.

DISCUSSION

The complexity and ambiguity of many environmental issues may make policymaking difficult. Finding the intricate and interrelated connections between events that are naturally occurring and those that are caused by humans is sometimes challenging. Because ecosystems are interrelated, many issues are not reducible; they cannot be fixed by addressing isolated issues. Indeed, initiatives that address a specific issue may have unforeseen negative effects elsewhere. For instance, larger manufacturing chimneys were built in Britain's industrial districts in the 1950s to alleviate local air pollution, only to be revealed many years later that this'solution' had really only exported the pollution, causing it to fall as acid rain in Scandinavia. Similar to catalytic converters, automobiles may have them installed to minimise nitrogen oxide emissions that result in acid rain, but doing so reduces engine efficiency, which raises fuel consumption and, in turn, increases carbon dioxide emissions that cause global warming [2].

Political restrictions can add to the issues' non-reducibility. Therefore, in order to address the numerous environmental issues brought on by modern farming practises, it is necessary to consider broader public policies, such as national food production strategies, laws governing international trade, or, in EU member states, the price supports offered by the Common Agricultural Policy. Similar to this, WTO regulations that demand free commerce may prevent any nation from outlawing genetically modified crops.

There is ambiguity around many environmental issues. Is the climate changing, for instance? If so, is this a result of a natural occurrence or human activity? If the latter, how will it affect things and how soon will people realise it? Will the creation of new forests help to slow down climate change by storing carbon dioxide or will it make it worse by increasing methane emissions? Although it may be an extreme instance, climate change is not unusual. Localised leukaemia clustersare they brought on by a virus or connected to nuclear power plant emissions? Are genetically modified organisms harmful to the environment or to people's health?

The significance of research, scientists, and professional competence in developing environmental policy is highlighted by complexity and ambiguity. Without science, issues like climate change and ozone depletion cannot even be named. Some signs of environmental deterioration are quite obvious, like the fumes from automobiles, or relatively simple to see,

like declining fish numbers, but correct diagnosis of either issue requires scientific understanding. What lead concentration in the air is considered safe? A sustainable fish harvest is what? However, science often finds it difficult to fulfil its function as an impartial arbitrator of policy alternatives. Scientific decisions will always be provisional and subject to change since the scientific information guiding our understanding of environmental issues often rests on a theory that is debatable and data that may be interpreted in a variety of ways. The fluidity of research may make it challenging for politicians to respond effectively to 'new' issues like climate change, ozone depletion, and GMOs. Affected parties, such as manufacturers or farmers, who may hinder or oppose more thorough scientific investigation into the environmental effect of such concerns, may fight or even deny these issues. Within the scientific community, there is also a great deal of contention over many old issues. There are competing ideas about how to avoid bathing-water contamination, for instance, and whether to cease disposing of marine sewage altogether or construct longer pipelines to carry sewage out to sea. Scientists are not exempt from modifying their findings to serve special interests, such as corporate donors, or even to improve their own prospects of obtaining further research funding [3].

Making policy is challenging due of uncertainty and complexity. It is certainly simpler to devise efficient remedies if policymakers are aware of the underlying reasons of an issue, yet they usually work with insufficient data. When faced with doubt, should they take a preventative response to an issue or keep using up natural resources until scientific proof indicates that action is required? Policymakers' responses will depend on where they fall on the ecocentric-technocentric spectrum, with ecocentrics choosing prudence and technocentrics more inclined to think things will work out well in the end. Further complicating and politicising the decision-making process in liberal democracies, such dilemmas open decisions to political conflict by giving both supporters and opponents of corrective action ammunition.

Irreversibility

The fact that many environmental issues are irreversible makes the uncertainty problem worse. When the Earth's carrying capacity is reached, environmental resources may suffer irreparable harm. Rare resources could run out and species might become extinct. Some environmental assets can be replaced, although this is seldom an easy or inexpensive operation. Future technological advancements may allow wind and solar energy to totally replace exhausted fossil fuels as energy sources, but this is probably only possible if there is a significant general decrease in energy use. Irreversibility puts even more pressure on policymakers to get it right, as it may not be able to repair an earlier error, unlike fiscal or welfare policy, where a badly judged tax rate or benefit payment may be adjusted in the next year's budget.

Spatial and temporal variability

Many environmental concerns are made more difficult by the fact that their impacts are likely to be long-lasting and will harm future generations rather than current ones, while corrective measures must be taken before a problem's full negative consequences are realised. Although action to protect future generations may be required now, politicians typically have short-term concerns - tomorrow's papers, upcoming opinion polls, or the next election - and they are aware of how challenging it is to persuade people to accept self-sacrifice today in order to protect those who have not yet been born. As a result, there are serious pragmatic constraints on policymakers wishing to respond to the ethical concerns for future generations discussed

in Part I. In other words, responding to political demands now is simpler than addressing environmental issues later.

Similar to this, environmental issues have a very diverse range of spatial effects. Flooding in Bangladesh is a consequence of the destruction of Himalayan forests. Low-lying countries like Egypt and the Maldives would suffer the greatest harm as a result of rising sea levels brought on by global warming. British companies' sulphur dioxide emissions end up as acid rain in Scandinavia.

The costs of environmental issues and their remedies are unevenly distributed due to spatial and temporal variability. Environmental initiatives will always result in winners and losers. Governments must balance conflicting interests, but doing so poses crucial questions of social fairness and equality for both the present and the future generations [4].

Administrative Dispersion

Typically, the administrative framework of a government is broken down into distinct policy areas with a range of duties, such as education, defence, or health care. A core group of economic ministriestypically finance, industry, employment, energy, agriculture, and transportmake policy choices that often have an adverse impact on the environment and influence output, consumption, mobility, and lifestyles. However, these individual ministries frequently pursue constrained sectoral goals with little regard for the effects on the environment. While responsibility for environmental protection is normally delegated to a separate ministry, the transportation ministry may conduct a significant road-building plan or the agricultural ministry may support intensive farming techniques. However, the interconnection of economic and ecological systems does not follow these fictitious administrative and institutional borders, contrary to bureaucrats' natural tendency to divide issues into discrete parts. Many environmental issues cross sectors and call for coordinated solutions that go beyond sectoral lines. For instance, the ministries responsible for livestock, forestry, industrial emissions, transportation, energy, and general economic policy must be included in a successful climate change plan.

Regulation of Activity

Governments may need to engage in the economy and society to control these harmful activities since environmental damage is usually a byproduct of otherwise legal activity. Setting industrial pollution regulations or promoting waste paper recycling are two examples of how regulatory action may use a variety of policy tools, not simply legal ones. Many environmental policies have a regulatory nature, in contrast to many other policy areas, most notably welfare policy, where taxes and public spending are used to change how resources are distributed. Although government expenditure is seldom the main tool used to implement environmental policy, regulatory actions almost always come at some cost to important social groups and may have profound distributional effects.

Therefore, regulation plans are likely to elicit howls of protest from companies and trade unions about the risks of decreased competitiveness or job losses, as well as from consumers who would pay more for cleaner or safer products. Thus, this historical conflict between economic development and environmental conservation may be a constraint on the efficacy of regulatory actions.Seven primary features of environmental concerns have been outlined in this section. The first five features are inherent to the environment as a policy concern, whereas the latter two characteristics are reflective of the institutional frameworks and decision-making procedures of contemporary governments [5], [6].

The conventional approach to policy

A policy paradigm gives decision-makers the lingo and a set of presumptions they can rely on when discussing a certain policy issue. Despite the fact that none of the seven core characteristics mentioned in the previous section are specific to the environment, when they are combined they present a number of issues that are difficult for policymakers to address. Instead of acknowledging the interdependency of the linkages between ecosystems and political, economic, social, and cultural systems, the conventional paradigm that arose during the 1970s treated the environment like any other new policy issue. Weale described the conventional paradigm as having the following characteristics. Few nations had an extensive national plan outlining an anticipatory, comprehensive, and strategic approach to the environment; instead, government measures were tactical, reactive, and fragmentary. Instead, many new organisations and a specialised division of governmentthe environment ministrywere established to address environmental challenges. Environmental policy was handled separately from other areas of policy. There was minimal policy coordination, limited agency control over choices made in other policy sectors, and a lot of room for issue shifting. For instance, single-medium laws were often used in pollution control to regulate industrial outflows, while different agencies handled discharges to air, water, and land.

Policymakers often sought to deal with symptoms rather than causes and believed that end-of-pipe fixes were sufficient in most cases. The preferred method for implementing policy was administrative regulation. A "implementation deficit," or discrepancy between policy aim and result, was common with many initiatives. For instance, despite the fact that significant legislative initiatives like the UK's Control of Pollution Act of 1974 and the US's Clean Air Act of 1970 placed strict limits on pollutants and harmful chemicals, many deadlines and objectives were missed and important elements were not put into effect until many years later. Above all, it was important to strike a balance between environmental conservation and economic development, with the latter often gaining precedence. Although the traditional paradigm was not replicated exactly in every country, it was possible to find elements of it there.

This conventional paradigm has serious flaws in both its theory and application. The majority of indicators and trends demonstrated that the 'objective' state of the environment in advanced industrialised countries deteriorated throughout the 1970s, with a general decline in key pollution indicators like sulphur dioxide, nitrogen oxide, particulates, carbon monoxide, and carbon dioxide. While some trends, such as a decline in sulphur dioxide emissions, were reversed in the 1980s, others, such as carbon dioxide emissions, worsened, and policymakers faced new challenges as new issues like acid rain and climate change emerged. Policy elites are becoming more and more aware of the shortcomings of the conventional paradigm, yet in spite of the introduction of the sustainable development paradigm, the conventional paradigm has shown to be very hard to change [7], [8].

CONCLUSION

This resilience has been explained using well-known political science concepts such as interests, ideas, institutions, and power as well as the connections between them. The conventional paradigm, it has been suggested, is supported by the structural influence of producer interests, the fragmentation of the policy process, and the ideologies of the policy elites. The interests of the state are often seen as being synonymous with those of producers, which leads policymakers to "recognise some social interests as more legit- imate than others and privilege some lines of policy over others." Policymakers are motivated by a technocentric commitment to economic growth. The interests of producer organisations often

prevail over those of environmental organisations, and economic development is given precedence over environmental conservation.

REFERENCES:

[1] B. Kusumasari and H. Kusumaningrum, "Application of the resource mobilization theory in Indonesia's environmental movements," *J. Comp. Asian Dev.*, 2019.

[2] P. F. Gillham, "Participation in the environmental movement: Analysis of the European union," *Int. Sociol.*, 2008, doi: 10.1177/0268580907084386.

[3] A. Novák, "Direct actions in the Czech environmental movement," *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*. 2020. doi: 10.1525/j.postcomstud.2020.53.3.137.

[4] M. Grasso and M. Giugni, *The Routledge Handbook of Environmental Movements*. 2021. doi: 10.4324/9780367855680.

[5] M. C. J. Stoddart, A. Mattoni, and E. Nezhadhossein, "Environmental movement interventions in tourism and energy development in the north atlantic: Connecting the social movement societies and players and arenas perspectives," *Contention*, 2020, doi: 10.3167/CONT.2020.080205.

[6] R. Ackland and M. O'Neil, "Online collective identity: The case of the environmental movement," *Soc. Networks*, 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.socnet.2011.03.001.

[7] Y. Tim, S. L. Pan, S. Bahri, and A. Fauzi, "Digitally enabled affordances for community-driven environmental movement in rural Malaysia," *Inf. Syst. J.*, 2018, doi: 10.1111/isj.12140.

[8] J. Kirby, "Fleshing out an ecological habitus: Field and capitals of radical environmental movements," *Nat. Cult.*, 2017, doi: 10.3167/nc.2017.120201.

CHAPTER 15

A STUDY ON POLITICAL STUMBLING BLOCKS TO CHANGE

Amit Verma, Associate Professor
College of Law, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email id-amitverma2@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

Sectoral divisions within the institutional structure of government both reflect and reinforce a special-interest approach to public policy in which each ministry tends to act as a sponsor for the important producer or professional groups within its policy sphere. These two key aspects of the policy process support the traditional paradigm. The first is the privileged position of business and producer groups. This section demonstrates how the power of producers and the fragmented character of government have strengthened the conventional paradigm using theories of state-group interactions and policy network analysis.Influence of producers in political science, it is typical to attribute policy results to the influence of opposing interests. This section explains the persistent power of the conventional paradigm in determining environmental policy results using several key ideas of state-group relations 4 and the notion of three-dimensional power.

KEYWORDS:

Environment, Agriculture, Network, Political, Policy.

INTRODUCTION

The pluralist concept sees public policy as the result of conflict between many factions. There are a variety of organisations, organisations, and interest groups working to shape and execute public policy on every environmental problem. The knowledge, finances, membership, and public opinion at each interest group's disposal will be used to influence policy decisions. It is considered that power is diffuse because numerous organisations have access to the government, most groups can accomplish at least part of their goals, and no one group or collection of interests dominates the decision-making process. Although the government will undoubtedly have its own preferences on a variety of issues, it will also consult widely and heed strong outside pressure.

Naturally, not all groups are equally influential. Any government's primary goal is to manage the economy, so it frequently consults with and solicits the cooperation of business organisations in key economic sectors. Businesses will rally against proposed restrictions or eco-taxes or to seek authorisation for major developments like a road or a dam since environmental policy often has a direct effect on them. Businesses will often follow the law as insider organisations, lobbying legislators and government employees, paying advertising campaigns, or supporting pressure groups that share their views. To argue their point, producers may make threats against the law or even take direct action; French farmers have a legendary track record of success with road and port blockades.

Therefore, pluralist perspectives acknowledge that producers have the drive and resources to participate actively in the policy-making process, but they do not see business as a special player. Due to their greater access to resources than environmental organisations, businesses may have an outsized influence. The pluralist would predict that environmental organisations

should also get greater access to government and a comparable influence on policy outcomes if they are able to raise enough resources to offset the power of business. However, in reality, such 'insider' pressure organisations working closest to government often consist of a small number of powerful producer interests in many important sectors influencing the environment.5 Key pro-ducer organisations get strong access to ministers and civil workers to address issues impacting their interests, and government officials often consult them. This is because governments recognise the opinions of these groups as genuine and significant. Environmental and consumer organisations, on the other hand, are often 'external' groups barred from the halls of power; they are less frequently consulted and they could struggle to be heard by the government. As a result, policy decisions often reveal that producer groups' interests prevail over environmentalists'.

The use of a flawed, one-dimensional model of power that undervalues the impact of commercial interests is one of pluralism's weaknesses. Pluralists examine each individual choice to determine if business groups' preferences are in play, focusing on visible influence. However, according to Bachrach and Baratz, visible power only gauges one component of power. The ability of strong organisations to keep topics off the agenda is referred to as the second dimension of power that they describe, which is called "non-decision-making." By employing political routines to create or reinforce prevailing values and interests, suppress dissident demands, or co-opt challenged groups, producer groups may manage conflict before it ever arises. Schattschneider dubbed this process "mobilising bias." In reality, observed "pluralist" decision-making is typically restricted to secure matters that do not jeopardise the fundamental interests of the dominant parties, while the complaints of those excluded interests, such environmental organisations, are muted. In fact, due to a fatalistic assumption that they would be disregarded by the dominant producer interests, opposition organisations may not even voice their dissident opinions during the official policy process.

In Crenson's investigation of air pollution in two nearby steel cities in the United States, East Chicago and Gary, non-decision-making in the environment is shown in a traditional way. Despite the fact that the situation with air pollution was the same in both areas, Gary didn't take action until 1963 whereas East Chicago passed legislation limiting it in 1949. While there were several steel businesses in East Chicago, just one large company, US Steel, controlled Gary. This was a significant distinction between the two communities. However, US Steel was able to have significant indirect influence because local political leaders were concerned that the firm may leave the area if anti-pollution measures were passed. US Steel did not openly push against regulation. Environmental organisations said there was little use in even attempting to bring up the subject of air pollution since they thought US Steel's response would be unfavourable. But there was never a visible decision against anti-pollution legislation; it was a "non-decision." In contrast, East Chicago's fragmented steel sector reduced the possibility of legislation's adverse job effects while enabling its proponents to put pollution control far sooner on the political agenda.

The neo-pluralist theory of state-group relations, which, like pluralism, sees businesses as exercising power through their ability to mobilise resources in the political arena, is based on this more expansive two-dimensional model of power and contends that they also have structural power. The idea that business maintains a privileged interest inside the political system due to its structural centrality in the capitalist economy is persuasively elaborated by Lindblom. Any government in a free democracy would frequently consider producer interests when making decisions since the state of the economy as a whole is likely to have an impact on its popularity and, therefore, its prospects of being re-elected. Therefore, it is the role of the government to provide favourable business environments. A government will make

choices that reflect corporate interests by anticipating their demands, doing so without requiring any visible effort from industry, not even the formation of a lobby. According to Lindblom, business is not uniformly privileged across all policy areas. He makes a distinction between secondary issues that have less of an impact on powerful business interests and where the policy-making process is more pluralistic or competitive and 'grand majority' issues that affect significant economic interests and over which the public has little control. Neo-pluralism's contribution is to highlight business' privileged position in many key areas of economic policy that have an impact on the environment without implying that business will always decide how policies are implemented or keep any "undesirable" problems off the table.

However, the two-dimensional model still does not adequately represent all facets of the idea of power when seen from a more radical angle. The importance of the underlying economic structure in influencing the allocation of political power in favour of a ruling elite, or class, is stressed by structuralist explanations, particularly neo-Marxism. The identification of an ideological aspect of power in which the state serves to support and encourage the capitalist accumulation process is one of the main contributions made by structuralists. Offe contends that numerous mechanisms, or exclusion rules, exist within capitalist societies to distinguish between concerns that need attention and those that pose a danger to the principles and norms of these communities. Broad concepts like the right to private property provide us the authority to exclude unwelcome status quo challenges, including some of the ones that ecology poses. Certain topics are kept off the table within certain policy sectors through non-decision-making systems, and issues and problems are defined in ways that systematically suit capitalist interests. This ideological function of the state reflects what Lukes refers to as "third-dimension" power, in which people's "very wants" are moulded to conform to the choices of the ruling elite, or class, leaving conflicts dormant. As a result, going back to the Crenson study, the local perception in Gary that jobs and economic development were the only real concerns, despite the possibility that air pollution could harm public health, may be evidence that political institutions had been successful in shaping citizen preferences to reflect the interests of capital.

DISCUSSION

Although there is a growing, loud, and well-organized environmental lobby, business interests have continued to hold a privileged position in the policy-making process, which is explained by structuralist and neo-pluralist theories of the state. Business may use its second and third spheres of influence to strengthen the status quo and thwart more holistic and strategic approaches to environmental policy. This structural power is obviously not deterministic. Governments may override producer concerns in favour of environmental interests, as seen by the plethora of environmental rules put in place over the previous thirty years. It shouldn't be expected though that manufacturers would constantly be against environmental protection measures. The "argument" for the environment might sometimes convince producers to alter their conduct, but other timesas the discussion of ecological modernization in Chapter 8 demonstratesthere is a financial benefit to be had. Both factors are undoubtedly driving the current shift towards organic farming in many nations, and wind turbine manufacturers and many energy producers are ardent supporters of increasing the use of wind power. Overall, nevertheless, it seems that the old paradigm has been strengthened by the use of commercial power.

Administrative Disarray

The institutional makeup of the state is another aspect that gives certain interest groups disproportionate access to the policymaking process. Each ministry often acts as a sponsor for the important groupings of producers or professionals within its policy domain as a result of the split of the government into sectoral divisions. Instead than defending the interests of consumers or the environment, agriculture ministers often regard themselves as speaking on behalf of farmers. Energy ministers may minimise the environmental harm connected to the energy industry because they regard their job as defending the business interests of the big energy producers in the coal, oil, gas, and nuclear sectors. Administrative structures that reflect the underlying power dynamics amongst the relevant interest groups define each policy area. Therefore, diverse approaches to environmental policymaking seem to be the exception rather than the norm in the majority of nations. The widely used "iron trian- gle" metaphor acknowledges the enormous influence of producer groups in crucial policy areas where decision-making is predominated by three strong actors: congressional committee, administrative agency, and producer group.

This is true even in the USA, which has a relatively pluralistic political system. The producer group is the benevolent special interest, and the congressional subcommittee provides funding and oversees rules. The bureau distributes funding or enacts regulations. Without the participation of the other players, this intimate relationship would fall apart since each actor depends on the others; on the other hand, it serves their shared interests to restrict other actors' access to the policymaking process. As a result, it is a "iron" triad since outsiders have a difficult time breaking through it.7 This section makes the case that the sectoral fragmentation of government further solidifies the structural dominance of producer groups over many areas of environmental decision-making using a comparable institutional model of the policy process called policy network analysis.

There is evidence that policy networks exist in most nations, including the USA, Canada, many European countries, and the EU policy process. Policy network analysis looks at the relationships between the players participating in the public policy process. Policy networks are groups of public and private actors that are linked together by a dependence on a common resource, such as knowledge, skill, money, or legitimacy, and are separated from other groups by breakdowns in the structure of the dependency. Policy communities and issue networks are two ideal sorts of policy networks that Marsh and Rhodes identify as being at opposing extremes of a continuum[1].

The policy community has a closed and stable membership that typically consists of a government ministry or agency and a small number of privileged producer groups. This community is distinguished from other groups by its regular interaction and shared consensus of values and predispositionsalmost a shared ideologyabout that particular policy sector. Each member of the policy community depends on the other for resources, which may be traded or bartered to achieve a balance of power that allows everyone to win in a positive-sum game. This is the glue that holds the members of the policy community together. The members generate continuity and stability in policy results that transcend changes in the political make-up of government and are virtually immune from the scrutiny and control of either the legislature or the public thanks to their power to set the agenda.

Smith claims that policy communities offer the state four benefits, including a consultative policymaking environment, a consensual, depoliticized policy arena, predictable, stable conditions, and a reinforcement of policy segmentation by the construction of barriers against encroachment by other ministries.The open issue network, in contrast, contains several rival

organisations with fluctuating membership and less frequent contact. In this more pluralistic network, the government prefers to consult rather than bargain with its constituents. Policy results are thus far less consistent and predictable. The policy community and issue network are at opposing ends of a continuum, and different hybrid networks exist between these two poles. This is important to keep in mind.

Policy communities are common in those policy sectors where environmental issues have a significant impact on major economic interests and the government is dependent on producer groups for implementation, which makes policy network analysis significant in explaining the strength of the conventional paradigm. In this environment, the power and interests of the producers and the disjointed administrative structure reinforce one other, and neither the producers nor the government want anything to upend this comfortable arrangement. How prevalent are policy communities, and how do they affect the results of environmental policy when they do exist?

Strongest empirical evidence for closed policy communities is in Britain, where it reflects key elements of the political system like the strong executive and the culture of secrecy. For instance, during the post-war era, the Department of Transport's officials, together with representatives from the auto industry, the road building business, the oil sector, and numerous road haulage and driving associations, developed transport policy. As a result, British transport policy has been severely biassed in favour of developing roads and promoting the use of cars, with little attention paid to other, less harmful modes of travel like trains or cycling. Similar to this, for many years the Atomic Energy Authority and its scientific experts dominated the policy community, which supported the strong commitment of succeeding governments to the development of the nuclear power industry as a clean, affordable source of electricity. Other industries that have an impact on the environment, such as those in the water and energy sectors, have also been identified as having tight policy communities. According to a number of studies, policy communities are also present in other areas of environmental policy in Europe, such as the water and energy industries[2].

The development of sustainable environmental regulations has been impeded in a number of European nations, including Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, and Britain, as the agricultural sector offers a typical case. Officials from the agricultural ministry and top farmers' organisations often make up the policy community in each of these situations. For instance, the National Farmers' Union and the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs are major players in the British policy community. The Agriculture Act of 1947 gave farmers a legal right to be consulted on policy, formalising a practise that had begun in the late 1930s. The members were united by their common conviction that landowners should enhance the productivity and efficiency of their property. The state planned to guarantee prices to farmers as part of its purposeful creation of the policy community to assure a reliable food supply during a time of conflict. Planning an expansionist agricultural strategy and maintaining it after the war made sense for both the farming ministry and the NFU. The political backdrop that required a stable food supply, which led to the development of the policy community, ultimately entrenched the NFU's dominance.

The goal of agricultural policy in the majority of the EU-15 countries, but notably in Britain, Denmark, and the Netherlands, has been to boost the agrarian sector's competitive position by implementing more intensive farming practises. The use of factory farming techniques has been maximised wherever it is practicable for livestock production. Due to the specialisation of arable agriculture, every available piece of land has been claimed, and chemical fertilisers and pesticides have been lavishly applied. Benefits include a stable agricultural industry, easily accessible and reasonably priced farm products for consumers, and a food surplus that

has helped drive exports. However, there has also been significant environmental harm. Since the middle of the 20th century, for instance, the British countryside has undergone significant change due to the widespread destruction of hedgerows, old woodlands, wetlands, and low-land heaths, which has caused harm to numerous animal, bird, and insect species. Intensive farming progressively degrades soil quality, uses enormous quantities of water, and pollutes rivers and underground water tables with run-off from slurry. However, for many years, policy communities throughout Europe effectively rejected the efforts of environmental and consumer groups to add new issues to the agricultural agenda. Any organisation that challenged the expansionist philosophy driving agricultural policy was sidelined until recently. The agricultural policy community often attempts to downplay the threat or deny the existence of a problem when a new environmental concern arises. Delaying strategies are used when worry increases, such as calling for further study or forming an investigation committee. Problems are resolved in ways that serve the interests of the policy community after action cannot be avoided. Some problems, like the Dutch excess manure problem, are depoliticized by being labelled as 'technical' difficulties, or problems that are uncontroversial and can be resolved by insider experts.

On the other hand, the EU set-aside programme, which rewards farmers for conservation via financial incentives, has produced a fresh justification for strong public support for the agricultural sector. British farmer associations have attempted to deflect criticism from environmentalists of their harmful methods by redefining their position as "stewards of the countryside" via the use of the set-aside concept. Consequently, agricultural policy communities have been able to keep new issues off the policy agenda or, when this is impossible, have hindered or diluted policies intended to reduce environmental damage from agri-industry – despite the fact that agricultural policy communities have become more unstable in recent years[3].The example of the agriculture industry demonstrates how the state has assisted in institutionalising the structural dominance of producer groups within certain policy sectors by facilitating the creation of a closed policy community. Because "rules, procedures, and beliefs support the interests of the powerful without the powerful having to decide on every occasion what should be allowed on that agenda," producer groups acquire structural power from the policy network. As a result, the values that support sectoral policy communities often result in blatantly expansionist and environmentally harmful policy results. The main players will look for solutions that don't call into question the values that the policy community holds dear, such the dedication to agricultural price support, if a policy community is obliged to handle an environmental problem. Environmental groups had to contend with entrenched institutional frameworks that were resistant to the penetration of new ideas and issues when environmental issues began to gain importance after the 1970s because policy networks had already been well established in industries like agriculture, energy, and industry. Policy communities support sectoral environmental policies as well. Concerned about upsetting long-established sectoral patterns of policy-making, individual ministries like agriculture or energy are leery of coordinated initiatives to address challenges that cut across sectors, such as climate change. In other words, the conventional environmental policy paradigm has been strengthened by the state's institutional framework.

But policy communities are neither universal nor constant. Even in Britain, certain policy areastypically those that deal with "secondary issues" like environment preservation and outdoor recreation, where the interests of business or professional organisations are not significantly threatenedare marked by more diverse issue networks. Pluralistic relationships are more prevalent elsewhere, particularly in North America. Furthermore, these institutional arrangements are not rigid and environmental policy can change where there are policy communities. The dynamics of policy change are examined in the next section.

Adopting New Policies

Although the traditional environmental policy paradigm is strongly reinforced by structural and institutional factors, changing the paradigm is not impossible. All governments have implemented new policies in recent years to enhance environmental protection, however there is little evidence of significant impact. The agenda-setting, advocacy coalition, and network approaches are highlighted in this section as useful frameworks for examining the potential for policy change and, in particular, to show how the conventional paradigm might be replaced by an alternative framework. This section draws selectively from the extensive literature on policymaking.

Agenda-Setting

A crucial time for initiating policy change is during the policy process' agenda-setting phase. The issue attention cycle is one of several models that attempt to explain how problems might appear on and move up agendas. It was created to explain the growth and collapse of environmentalism in America in the early 1970s.

Because it mimics how the public's and media's focus shifts from one problem to another, the idea that environmental concerns experience cycles of attention is appealing. Furthermore, data from the USA reveals that peak times of relevant organisational activity often correspond with peak periods in the attention cycle, suggesting that governments do take public concern seriously. More cynically, it may be argued that officials only want to seem as if they are "doing something," even if their actions have no impact on the issue. In fact, Downs offers a fundamentally gloomy assessment of the significance of agenda-setting as a procedure that only temporarily piques the public's interest in the issue at hand. This pessimism is especially appropriate where policy communities exist because, even if a problem receives significant public attention, a policy community may be able to withstand pressure for significant change because they are confident that the problem won't receive enough attention to warrant a new agenda[4].

Other theorists have made more upbeat arguments that these fleeting instances of public interest are opportunities for forcing structural changes, which may permanently alter the rules of access and participation. Kingdon presents a complex agenda-setting model based on a dynamic view of the policy-making process. Agenda changes happen when issues, policy options, and political receptivity come together in a "window of opportunity": when a pressing issue is acknowledged, a workable solution is available, and the political environment is favourable for change. Similar to this, the 'punctuated equilibrium' model of Baumgartner and Jones describes the policy-making process as having extended stretches of stability during which only minor changes take place, interspersed with brief stretches of instability during which significant policy changes take place. New organisations looking to challenge the predominate policy paradigm may gain entry if the equilibrium is disrupted. Sometimes the challenge is strong enough to overthrow the current consensus on policy and replace it with new viewpoints, institutions, and measures. The media, which may draw public attention to new topics or events or provide a fresh viewpoint on well-known subjects, plays a crucial role during these times of unrest. Issues that are often restricted to policy sub-systems are suddenly exposed to greater examination. The arguments may attract new players from other subsystems, irreversibly upsetting any previously unnoticed policy agreements.

Developments in the American pesticides sector are one example Baumgartner and Jones offer to support this claim. After the Second World War, there was a great deal of public interest in pesticides due to the claims that new synthetic organics, like DDT, could eradicate malaria and boost food production to the point of eradicating world hunger. The iron triangle

of the Department of Agriculture, farm and chemical interests, and congressional agriculture and appropriations committees emerged during the popular wave of enthusiasm for pesticides. These groups controlled the regulation of these chemicals and established an institutional framework that promoted the industry for decades to come, long after public interest had subsided. A new, unfavourable wave of interest eventually peaked with the banning of DDT in 1969 and several new pieces of legislation regulating pesticide use. However, during the 1960s, growing awareness of the dangers of some of these pesticides, stimulated by a series of food scares and by Rachel Carson's best-seller Silent Spring, produced a new, unfavourable wave of interest. A producer-dominated iron triangle supporting the pesticide industry was thus created during a window of opportunity created by positive issue attention in the late 1940s, while a second window of opportunity created by negative issue attention during the 1960s led to the dissolution of this cosy network and the implementation of policy change[5], [6].

The Downs model may have neglected the longer-term institutional legacies of agenda-setting, which may bring about change via an evolving historical process, according to this example of punctuated equilibrium. The associations established during a moment of intense interest continue long after the 'euphoria' around the problem has subsided and public focus has turned elsewhere. Another example is the intense public attention sparked by the 1989 Exxon Valdez oil-tanker accident in Alaska Sound, which shook up the previously complacent policy network in charge of the Sound's maritime safety and prompted the establishment of new institutions. The institutional legacy persisted even after the public interest faded, including a regulatory framework established to monitor the implementation of better safety measures in Alaska Sound and a new regional citizens' advisory council that has served as an effective "sentinel" by advocating for additional policy changes to enhance safety[7], [8].

CONCLUSION

The institutional framework of government and the expansionist worldview are mutually reinforcing since organisational structures, administrative processes, and policy networks are created to accomplishthe prevalent beliefs and subsequently uphold and support them. Producer groups are often able to control policymaking even in more pluralistic policy processes by mobilising enough resources to effectively wield first-dimensional power. The need to overcome significant structural and institutional barriers makes it difficult to replace the traditional paradigm, and it likely depends on the ability of significant external changes to undermine the influence of vested interests. Even then, a drastic shift in policy in one area may not be matched by the adoption of a more strategic approach to energy policy, as the nuclear case study illustrates.

REFERENCES:

[1] M. Huettner, A. Freibauer, C. Haug, and U. Cantner, “Regaining momentum for international climate policy beyond Copenhagen,” *Carbon Balance and Management*. 2010. doi: 10.1186/1750-0680-5-2.

[2] L. N. Mills, “The conflict over the proposed LNG hub in Western Australia’s Kimberley region and the politics of time,” *Extr. Ind. Soc.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.exis.2018.08.002.

[3] B. Winarno, “Implementasi Konsep ‘Reinventing Government’ Dalam Pelaksanaan Otonomi Daerah,” *Dialogue Can. Philos. Assoc.*, 2010.

[4] B. C. Groot and T. A. Abma, “Participatory health research with mothers living in poverty in the netherlands: Pathways and challenges to strengthen empowerment,” *Forum Qual. Sozialforsch.*, 2020, doi: 10.17169/fqs-21.1.3302.

[5] F. Sager, C. Mavrot, M. Hinterleitner, D. Kaufmann, M. Grosjean, and T. F. Stocker, “Utilization-focused scientific policy advice: a six-point checklist,” *Clim. Policy*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/14693062.2020.1757399.

[6] M. Burkett, “In search of refuge: Pacific islands, climate-induced migration, and the legal frontier,” *Asia Pacific Issues*, 2011.

[7] N. Kunnamas, “Normative power Europe, ASEAN and Thailand,” *Int. Econ. Econ. Policy*, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s10368-020-00478-y.

[8] H. Varkkey, “Malaysia in 2016: Persistent Crises, Rapid Response, and Resilience,” *Southeast Asian Aff.*, 2017, doi: 10.1355/aa17-1l.

CHAPTER 16

STRUCTURE OF AN ADVOCACY ALLIANCE

Sourabh Batar, Assistant Professor
College of Law, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email id-battarsourabh@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

An advocacy alliance is a collection of businesses, clubs, or people who band together to promote a cause or objective. An advocacy alliance's organisational structure is essential to its effectiveness since it affects how well the organisation can plan and execute its advocacy activities. An advocacy alliance's structure normally consists of a leadership team, which is in charge of framing the alliance's agenda, selecting its course of action, and organising the work of its members. A smaller number of people chosen for their knowledge and leadership abilities may make up the leadership team instead of representatives from all of the member organisations. The alliance may also include committees or working groups dedicated to certain concerns or duties, such as study, outreach, or lobbying. These groupings, which may include members from other alliance organisations, collaborate to accomplish particular advocacy objectives. An advocacy alliance's effectiveness depends on effective communication. Members may keep informed and involved in the alliance's activities by attending regular meetings, receiving email updates, and using online platforms. The alliance's members and the leadership team's open channels of communication aid in ensuring that everyone is pursuing the same objectives.

KEYWORDS:

Advocacy, Alliance, Energy, Government, Policy.

INTRODUCTION

Sabatier contends that it is illusory to isolate agenda-setting from the broader policy process as a significant driver of policy change. His advocacy coalition framework is a thorough representation of the policy-making process that places a priority on the contribution of ideas, information, and analysis to policy change at all ‘stages' of the process. The ACF's primary thesis is that understanding policy change requires a focus on elite opinion and the elements that promote long-term changes in elite belief systems.Like network theory, the ACF focuses on the policy sub-system, which is made up of all the actors politicians, bureaucrats, interest groups, academics, journalists, and professionals - who are actively concerned with a particular policy issue, like air pollution control, and who routinely attempt to influence public policy on that issue. These actors may create a number of "advocacy coalitions" inside each subsystem, bringing together individuals who have similar moral and causal views on how policy goals ought to be attained.

Each coalition's belief systems are organised into a three-level hierarchy: deep core beliefs, which are the overarching philosophical principles that apply to all policy sub-systems; policy core beliefs, which are the fundamental principles and tactics for that particular policy sub-system; and secondary aspects, which are more detailed beliefs about particular aspects of the issue and the implementation of policies. A policy sub-system will often be controlled by one strong coalition, with multiple rival minority coalitions each attempting to force their viewpoint on the policy-making process. Similar to Hall, Sabatier contends that change will

typically be incremental because secondary beliefs are the ones most likely to change. This 'policy-oriented learning' occurs as coalitions gather new information and consider the most effective ways to realise their policy objectives. Core policy ideas seldom change, and they often only do so when exogenous shocks from outside the subsystem, such as macroeconomic changes or a change in administration, disturb non-cognitive elements. A minority alliance has the chance to force its worldview on the political process during these sporadic times. The ACF offers a wealth of knowledge on how policies evolve. The policy network's emphasis on interests and power complements itself by highlighting the significance of belief systems. The ACF has been widely used in North America to address environmental and energy policy issues, such as air and water pollution, where there is ample opportunity for policy-oriented learning through the analysis of quantitative data and its application to natural systems. These issues are those where there is some technical complexity and open political conflict.

The ACF is founded on pluralistic presumptions, which undoubtedly reflects its American roots. Therefore, it might not be as applicable in nations with less open conflict, like the 'etatist French system, or where closed policy communities are more prevalent, like in Britain. Nevertheless, the ACF may be a helpful tool for describing policy results in contexts where policy procedures are pluralistic, as is often the case with environmental concerns. Many environmental policy decisions are decided inside open issue networks within EU institutions, for example, which gives interest groups greater access to policy elites than is often accessible at the state level. Around difficult subjects like the biotechnology, waste packaging, and auto-emissions directives, coalitions made up of lobbyists and politicians have been formed. Each coalition aims to dominate the policy networks in order to influence the results of policy.

According to all these ideas-based techniques, including agenda-setting, the ACF, and even the discourse framework, changing environmental policy is simpler when it is controlled by open policy networks than where it is mostly closed. Even so, dramatic change is uncommon since there aren't many windows of opportunity to provide access to various interests and advocacy coalitions that may promote new concerns and ideas into the policy agenda in the absence of significant external changes.

Communities of policymakers and exogenous change

Although policy network analysis has received much criticism for offering a static model that is ineffective at explaining policy change, its strength lies in its ability to explain continuity and stability. Why would a stable policy community ever offer changes that are not directly in the interests of its members, after all? However, no sub-system is impervious to outside changes. The belief systems of policy elites must be challenged by exogenous non-cognitive factors in order for radical change to occur. In a similar vein, network analysts have identified a number of structural factors that may weaken a highly institutionalised policy community and increase the likelihood that policy change will occur. In other words, outside forces may function as a catalyst for shifting power dynamics. Five outside elements stand out as being especially important in determining environmental policy.

A abrupt catastrophe might destabilise the policy community. The discovery of a connection between bovine spongiform encephalopathy and the newly diagnosed form of Creutzfeld-Jakob disease in humans in 1996 sparked such a massive food scare that the EU outright banned the export of British beef, severely weakening the once-dominant agricultural policy community. The discovery of BSE in other parts of Europe and an epidemic of foot-and-mouth disease during 2000–2001 sparked a public discussion about the ethics of intensive

agriculture that shook agricultural policy communities all across Europe. Local precautions against marine oil pollution were immediately improved after the 1989 Exxon Valdez oil disaster in Alaska Sound.A policy community may also become uneasy when a government is confronted with a fresh issue—such as food safety or climate changefor which the dominant interests within the community lack a quick fix. In these situations, governments may look to alternative interests outside the traditional network for solutions to their policy conundrums. Policymakers are now searching for alternate transport strategies outside of the influence of strong road lobbies in order to minimise carbon emissions from vehicle traffic. In the agriculture sector, the introduction of new technology like GMOs may similarly upend conventional systems of consultation, forcing governments to take into account a broader variety of interests, including those of consumers and environmentalists.

External relations changes have the potential to upset the structural foundations of a policy community. International accords impose additional external duties that may need a national government to overcome the opposition of strong producer interests, such as the ban on chlorofluorocarbons or promises to limit greenhouse gas emis- sions. Some established policy communities have been undermined by the extensive privatisation of public assets since the 1980s, particularly in Britain where, for instance, increased competition transformed the energy market and consequently upended the established energy policy community. Some policy networks have become unstable as a result of EU environmental requirements in areas where policy has been most difficult, including drinking- and bathing-water quality. The combination of regulatory restructuring brought on by privatisation and strict European requirements in the British water industry tore up a previously unified policy community, giving environmental parties a chance to politicise water quality concerns. The government was ultimately pushed by this flux to undertake a number of significant policy adjustments, including a departure from the long-established policy of low-cost, at-sea sewage disposal that was widely credited with contributing to the poor quality of bathing water in many tourist areas.

The creation of new pressure organisations and social movements is evidence of how important environmental concerns are becoming on the political agenda. Politicians, government employees, and even producer organisations today find it more difficult to disregard these challenges, and most governments routinely engage several environmental groups on a variety of subjects. Politicians, especially ministers, have the ability to break apart a policy community and provide entry to other groups by using their autocratic authority. A sub-system may be forced to reform when mainstream political leaders decide that certain strong environmental organisations cannot longer be excluded from the policy-making process. The same thing might happen when a new administration takes office: the Greens' participation in the German coalition government in 1998 strongly influenced the decision to phase out nuclear power.As the following case study demonstrates, a number of exogenous factors have profoundly disrupted established patterns of policymaking to produce a radical reversal of the prior pro-nuclear consensus, though this change may not be permanent. As a result, nuclear power offers an interesting example of policy change [1].

DISCUSSION

Many of the essential elements of environmental policy outlined in this chapter are brought to light by the potential hazards to human safety and the environment presented by the use of nuclear power. There are probably few other concerns that offer a potentially permanent, global, and long-term danger to the environment as nuclear power, even if the actual probability of harm is statistically very low, as the tragic accident at the Chernobyl nuclear plant in 1986 proved. Despite these reservations, the majority of industrialised countries

made significant investments in the development of nuclear energy from the late 1950s through the 1980s as strong pro-nuclear policy groups developed. However, it is remarkable that, during the 1980s, a rare confluence of external circumstances has severely damaged these long-established policy communities, leading to a dramatic reversal of the policy elites' ardent support for nuclear power. Midway through the 1990s, the majority of North American and Western European countries had given up on their intentions to construct any further nuclear reactors, and it looked that the sector was nearing an end. After ten years, there is mounting indication that the government is once again interested in nuclear energy, but under an ironic new guise: as a carbon-free energy alternative to combat climate change[2], [3].In the past, decisions about nuclear power often came from close-knit policy groups or corporatist institutional structures. In Britain, for instance, the Atomic Energy Authoritya government-funded, largely unaccountable hybrid of a ministry and a nationalised industryand its scientific experts dominated the policy-making process, with the Department of Energy playing only a supporting role. The government fully backed the policy community and made sure that it was still under some degree of democratic oversight via Parliament.

Two crucial elements helped to explain why the government supported nuclear power in the 1950s and 1960s. First, the military goal of developing nuclear weapons created a need for plutonium, which could only be produced from reprocessed spent uranium, for nuclear powers like Britain, France, and the USA. Even to its most ardent advocates in the 1950s, this military-industrial connection was crucial in the choice to go through with what was yet an uncommercial technology. Initially, it was widely believed that nuclear energy provided a cutting-edge, technical solution to the world's energy needs. All governments, many of which had no intention of developing nuclear weapons, were persuaded that nuclear power could offer a plentiful supply of cheap energy to support future economic growth. This developing adoration for nuclear energy was influenced by many causes. In the 1960s, concern over pollution from coal-fired facilities was a key impetus for the US nuclear effort. In order to lessen their reliance on oil supplies from unreliable international markets, many European countriesnotably West Germany and Francelaunched sizable development programmes in response to the Middle East oil crisis of 1973–1974. Around 440 nuclear reactors were operating in 31 different countries by 2006, producing 16% of the world's electricity. With 103 reactors producing 788.6 billion kilowatt hours of power, the USA has the greatest nuclear industry. In France, which has the second-highest nuclear capacity, 78% of electricity is produced by the nuclear industry.

However, the nuclear industry has been in a serious crisis since the mid-1990s. There were no reactors being built in Western Europe or North America in 2001, and the development of new reactors was halted in five of the eight nuclear-powered countries in Europe. In contrast to the US nuclear industry, which was at a virtual stop, Britain had no plans for future growth. By shutting down the Barseba ck-1 reactor in November 1999, Sweden began its programme of abandoning nuclear power, which supplies half of its energy. Additionally, the gradual phase-out of nuclear power was started in Germany and Belgium. It amounted to a truly dramatic policy reversal, to put it briefly. It's important to note that each of the five external elements mentioned in the preceding section played a part in the communities that supported nuclear policy becoming unstable [4].

First, a number of significant crises impacted the nuclear sector. The partial meltdown of a reactor at the Three Mile Island nuclear power plant in 1979 sparked a significant worldwide discussion about nuclear safety and effectively ended the nuclear power sector in America, where no new nuclear power plants were authorised after 1978. The Chernobyl disaster in 1986 had a similar effect on the nuclear consensus in Europe: in 1987, Italy had three nuclear

power referendums, the German SPD committed to phasing out nuclear power, and resistance grew in Scandinavia. The only country where a significant pro-nuclear elite consensus resulted in a complacent attitude to Chernobyl was France.

Second, a number of operational issues have weakened the political argument for nuclear energy, particularly since it hasn't lived up to its promise of dependability and safety. Many nuclear power plants have experienced frequent problems that have forced them out of service for extended periods of time. The regularity of unintentional discharges of low-level radioactive material and contentious discussions over the possible risks of living near to nuclear reactors have periodically revived public anxieties. The vast stock of Russian-designed reactors in Eastern Europe caused great worry in the West after the Cold War, which is what prompted the German government to shut down all of the facilities in the former East Germany as soon as the country was united. Austria, a non-nuclear state that shut down its lone nuclear power plant after a vote in 1978, attempted unsuccessfully to make the shutdown of the unreliable Czech Temelin power plant, located near the Austrian border, a requirement for the Czech Republic's 2004 EU membership.

The issue of how to properly store the expanding stockpile of spent fuel and trash, some of which will be operational for 1,000 years, is perhaps the most significant and is still completely unsolved. There have been protracted and unresolved disagreements around proposals to construct a national nuclear waste repository at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, and intermediate sites elsewhere in the USA, where the majority of waste is held on-site. Attempts to secure a long-term store for the 100,000 tonnes of current nuclear waste in Britain have failed despite the identification of several hundred potential locations for storage. Only a small number of these facilities have actually been finished anywhere [5].

Thirdly, the economic argument for nuclear energy has been seriously questioned as a result of external developments that have strengthened pro-nuclear political alliances. Behind the cloak of state ownership and regulatory structures, the policy communities were able to hide the true costs of nuclear power for a long time, but the privatisation and liberalisation of the European electricity markets have made this more challenging. The majority of nuclear power plants now in operation were either developed directly by state-owned corporations or by private developers who received significant state subsidies; today, both alternatives are often unavailable. For instance, plans by the Conservative government to privatise the British nuclear power sector in the late 1980s inadvertently contributed to the division of the nuclear policy community since the industry's actual costs were exposed by the exposure to financial scrutiny necessary for market flotation. Despite the low cost and abundant supply of uranium fuel, it is very expensive to construct a nuclear power plant, which may take 10 years to complete.

Any company considering building a nuclear reactor in the USA runs the risk of having its credit rating lowered and its bonds demoted to junk status as a result of the failure of the $5.5 billion Shoreham nuclear plant on Long Island, New York, to open after the local authorities rejected evacuation plans. Furthermore, the cost-benefit analysis of nuclear energy never properly accounted for the enormous costs of decommissioning reactors. Simply put, it turned out that inexpensive nuclear energy was a fiction.Fourth, nuclear power is sometimes described as a quintessential postmaterial problem; the anti-nuclear protests in the 1970s and 1980s were among the most well-known, tenacious, and effective new social movements, particularly in Germany. They have been instrumental in influencing public opinion against nuclear power and convincing numerous major parties to soften or change their previous pro-nuclear positions. Local environmental and citizen activism organisations' combined resistance has made it almost hard for most Western governments to win approval for a new

nuclear project. The anti-nuclear movement's ability to mobilise people is still a crucial aspect of the nuclear issue.

Last but not least, as green parties have risen to power, their anti-nuclear heritage has led them to spearhead an outright attack on the nuclear business. Nuclear energy will be completely phased out by 2001, according to the 1998 agreement of the German red-green coalition government. In 1998, when Dominique Voynet, a Green environmentalist, was appointed as France's environment minister, the Creys-Malville Super Phenix nuclear reactor was shut down for the first time, albeit it was swiftly patched up. The participation of the green parties in the 1999–2003 Belgian coalition government led to legislation that forbade the building of brand-new nuclear reactors and set a forty-year lifespan for those that already existed. Due to their opposition to the development of a new nuclear reactor, the Finnish Green League left the government in 2002.

In conclusion, external variables have interfered with traditional modes of governing, forcing many Western nations to suspend their nuclear development plans. Even the most powerful policy groups may be destabilised and destroyed, as the collapse of the nuclear lobby shows, even if it required a unique confluence of circumstances to bring about this international demise. According to Baumgartner and Jones, the rise and fall of the US nuclear industry is a classic example of punctuated equilibrium: public excitement about the potential of nuclear technology, followed by years of policy stability and industry growth under the control of a strong policy community, to be replaced by growing scepticism of the nuclear industry that peaked with the Three Mile Island accident in 1979 and the ensuing dissolution of the policy community [6].

The nuclear sector should not, however, be given a premature death certificate since it still seems to have a lot of life in it. Several industrialising countries, most notably South Korea, China, and India, were making significant investments in nuclear energy even as it was in crisis in North America and Europe. Thirty reactors were being constructed in various parts of the globe in 2005, largely in Asia, including nine in India. South Korea anticipated completing eight more reactors by 2015. Governments in other places have discovered that stopping the construction of new plants is far simpler than closing down current ones. Nuclear reactors have substantial initial expenses, but after construction, their operating costs are comparatively low. The nuclear industry will suffer from closure, and many people will lose their jobs. The German government's struggle to agree on a decommissioning plan was hampered by both local and international barriers, which highlights the coalition's ongoing power in the nuclear advocacy space. The likelihood that fresh external variables may shift the case back in its favour increases the longer the nuclear industry in any nation can postpone the execution of a real closure plan. Ironically, the danger of climate change has helped the business since many nations will not be able to reach their carbon emission reduction promises if they shut down their nuclear facilities. An increase in reliance on power produced by fossil fuels would almost certainly be one of the short-term costs of shutting down nuclear reactors given the limited size of the renewable energy industry in most nations. As a result, the majority of nations have postponed more reactor closures by modernising their current nuclear assets, increasing capacity, and extending their anticipated lifetime[7].

There is also mounting indication that Western policy elites are once again in favour of nuclear power. Nuclear energy might help assure the stability of energy pricing and supplies, according to EU Energy Commissioner Loyola de Palacio: "Five years ago no one was talking about it, but now [the debate about nuclear energy] is on the table. There are not many alternatives." In other words, the only way to meet EU carbon emission reduction objectives

is to construct new nuclear reactors to replace ageing ones. In order to replace the Chernobyl plant, Western European countries contributed financially to the building of two additional nuclear power plants in the Ukraine. In 2002, the Finnish parliament gave its approval for the construction of a fifth reactor. In order to replace the outdated French stock starting around 2015, the French government has selected a location in Normandy where the prototype of a new generation of European pressurised water reactors will be constructed. New nuclear power stations would be a significant source of low carbon electricity production, according to a review of UK energy strategy released in 2006. This effectively supported Tony Blair, the prime minister, who had previously stated his support for the building of further nuclear reactors. President Bush supported the new Energy Policy Act of 2005, which specifically encourages the development of new nuclear reactors, after a string of power outages in California. In order to encourage developers to benefit from a new, more lenient permit system that will make it simpler for businesses to get building and operation licences, the federal government will provide significant financial assistance. Consequently, the future of the nuclear industry is still uncertain. Although there is a growing pro-nuclear sentiment among political elites in many nations, most Western European governments, let alone the general public, have not yet been persuaded by the safety, economic, and political arguments for resuming nuclear expansion.

What can we learn about the possibility of radical policy change from the nuclear case study? Undoubtedly, the decision to abandon nuclear expansion represents a radical shift in policy; in Hall's taxonomy, it corresponds to a third-order change. However, a new, different paradigm, such as a dedication to a sustainable energy policy, has not yet supplanted the pro-nuclear paradigm. Notably, despite being frequently characterised as a postmaterial issue, two materialist arguments—the threat to human safety and the failure of the economic case for nuclear power—have been the primary forces behind the radical change in nuclear policy. Furthermore, there hasn't been a social learning process where policy elites have questioned the viability of the fundamental presumptions guiding energy policy. According to Sabatier, the changes have had an impact on one subsystem's fundamental policy assumptions, which has led to a reduction in expectations for nuclear energy's contribution to global energy production. However, in recent years, the need to reduce carbon emissions has rekindled interest in the nuclear option. Importantly, the fundamental beliefs about the larger role of energy consumption and production in the economy are largely unaltered. It is not surprising that few nations have made any serious effort to develop an alternative energy strategy and that the door is still open for the return of nuclear power in a consumerist society where energy conservation is still a low priority and profit-seeking energy utilities encourage increased energy consumption [8].

CONCLUSION

Although the nuclear industry may be hurt, suppliers of fossil fuels continue to dominate everywhere. It would appear that when "armed with a coherent policy paradigm" like sustainable development, policy makers would be best able to overcome the many structural and institutional hurdles to change. Both Sabatier and Hall demonstrate the significance of belief systems by demonstrating how paradigm shift also depends on a process of social learning among elites in business and government policy. The ability of the competing paradigms of sustainable development and ecological modernization to influence policy elites and convince them that their goals are consistent with a sustainable society will determine their degree of success.

REFERENCES:

[1] D. W. Dodick *et al.*, "Vancouver Declaration II on Global Headache Patient Advocacy 2019," *Cephalalgia*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/0333102420921162.

[2] S. Schunz, "The European Union's environmental foreign policy: from planning to a strategy?," *Int. Polit.*, 2019, doi: 10.1057/s41311-017-0130-0.

[3] L. N. Mills, "The conflict over the proposed LNG hub in Western Australia's Kimberley region and the politics of time," *Extr. Ind. Soc.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.exis.2018.08.002.

[4] V. P. Poteat, J. P. Calzo, and H. Yoshikawa, "Promoting Youth Agency Through Dimensions of Gay–Straight Alliance Involvement and Conditions that Maximize Associations," *J. Youth Adolesc.*, 2016, doi: 10.1007/s10964-016-0421-6.

[5] S. Rother and E. Steinhilper, "Tokens or Stakeholders in Global Migration Governance? The Role of Affected Communities and Civil Society in the Global Compacts on Migration and Refugees," *Int. Migr.*, 2019, doi: 10.1111/imig.12646.

[6] G. Basu, R. J. Pels, R. L. Stark, P. Jain, D. H. Bor, and D. McCormick, "Training Internal Medicine Residents in Social Medicine and Research-Based Health Advocacy: A Novel, In-Depth Curriculum," *Acad. Med.*, 2017, doi: 10.1097/ACM.0000000000001580.

[7] B. Boşnak, "Politics of Subsidiarity in Refugee Reception: The Case of Civil Society in Turkey," *J. Immigr. Refug. Stud.*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/15562948.2021.1951417.

[8] E. Berge *et al.*, "Are there opportunities for a closer collaboration on clinical stroke research in Europe?," *Eur. Stroke J.*, 2018, doi: 10.1177/2396987317747456.

CHAPTER 17

MODERNIZING THE ENVIRONMENT AND PURSUING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Sunil Kumar, Assistant Professor
College of Agriculture, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email id- sunilagro.chaudhary@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

Recent years have seen a major shift in the importance of sustainable development and environmental modernization. In order to solve issues like climate change, pollution, and resource depletion, the environment must be modernised by using cutting-edge methods and technology. On the other hand, sustainable development refers to the use of resources in a manner that satisfies current demands without endangering the capacity of future generations to satiate their own needs. The necessity of modernising the environment and pursuing sustainable development is briefly discussed in this abstract, along with the possibilities and problems that these initiatives provide. The abstract also highlights some of the most effective modernization and sustainability-promoting tactics, such as technical innovation, policy creation, and community involvement. The summary ends by highlighting the need of a coordinated and collaborative effort, including all stakeholders, to accomplish modernization and sustainability objectives.

KEYWORDS:

Development, Ecological, Environment, Policy, Sustainability.

INTRODUCTION

Environmental politics are centered on the conflict between economic development and environmental preservation. By demonstrating that it is possible to have both economic progress and environmental protection, the idea of sustainable development makes a direct effort to overcome this conflict. Given the opportunity to have their cake and eat it, it is not surprising that policymakers from all over the world have seized upon the concept. Nowadays, almost all nations have made a commitment to the concepts of sustainable development, at least on paper. However, sustainable development is a vague word with a complicated and contentious definition. This elusiveness serves as both a strength and a weakness because it allows various political and economic interests to band together under one cause while also drawing criticism that it is little more than a hollow slogan[1], [2].

Making this haphazard collection of ideas into workable legislation has proven to be challenging for policymakers. In fact, the more limited notion of ecological modernization has grown in popularity in industrialised nations with the most advanced environmental legislation.In contrast to the conventional model of environmental policy, sustainable development and her half-sister, ecological modernization, provide an alternative policy paradigm. The first section of this chapter looks at the numerous definitions of sustainable development and identifies five key elements that are present in most of them. The second part describes the main aspects of ecological modernization before examining its advantages and disadvantages[3], [4].

Sustainable Growth

Spreading the word Sustainable development has quickly taken over as the primary concept or debate guiding worldwide environmental policy. The World Conservation Strategy, which was created by three multinational NGOs, was the first document to support the idea. This manifesto paid little attention to broader political, economic, or social concerns in favour of focusing on ecological sustainability, or the preservation of living resources. The World Commission on Environment and Development's publication Our Common Future, often known as the Brundtland Report, gave sustainable development a larger social context. The Brundtland Report popularized sustainable development to the point that almost every international organisation, agency, and NGO has now adopted it. The Agenda 21 text defining a "global partnership for sustainable development" was approved at the Rio Earth Summit on the basis of the principles of sustainable development. A plan for achieving sustainable development across the globe is provided by this extensive paper, which covers a broad variety of environmental and developmental challenges. The UN Commission on Sustainable Development was established to oversee and support each nation's implementation of Agenda 21. It presently offers policy recommendations for the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation;however, it has little enforcement authority. Many local governments have started Local Agenda 21 strategies, and the majority of industrialised nations have published national sustainable development strategies[5].

The scope of sustainable development now encompasses industry and civil society in addition to the government. By creating an environmental strategy document called Making Sustainable Commitments, publishing annual environmental reports, hosting semi-annual conferences, and funding research on a variety of environmental issues, the World Bank has attempted to improve its negative reputation with environmentalists. The Global Environment Facility, which is the organisation in charge of directing financial aid for sustainable development from Northern to Southern states, is housed within the World Bank. The World Business Council for Sustainable Development was founded in 1995 and consists of about 180 multinational corporations from 35 different countries and 20 different industrial sectors. It is part of a global network of 50 national and regional business councils that collectively represent more than 1,000 business leaders. To "provide business leadership as a catalyst for change towards sustainable development and support the business licence to operate, innovate, and grow in a world increasingly shaped by sustainable development issues," according to its mission statement. Many trade associations have also stated that they support sustainable development. For instance, the insurance sector released a Statement of Environmental Commitment that was endorsed by over 90 top insurance providers from 27 different nations. These international initiatives have been widely replicated at the national level, where state-sponsored round-tables have brought together representatives from all spheres of society to talk about how sustainable development can be implemented, including politicians, businesspeople, trade unionists, religious leaders, and consumer and environmental advocacy groups. Although there is a lot of enthusiasm for sustainable development, its exact definition is still unclear.

A difficult and Contentious Idea

Its contestability is shown by the sheer number of definitions of sustainable development; Pearce et al., for instance, give a "gallery" of over forty definitions. The Brundtland Report's definition of sustainable development, which is the most often used, is that it is "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." This definition includes the two "key concepts" of needs and constraints as well as the two basic principles of intragenerational and intergenerational

justice. According to the needs concept, the basic requirements of the world's poor, in both the North and the South, should be given "overriding priority." According to the statement "Sustainable development requires meeting the basic needs of all and extending to all the opportunity to satisfy their aspirations for a better life," poverty and the uneven distribution of resources are identified as important drivers of environmental degradation. Importantly, the Brundtland Report emphasises that these objectives can only be met if consumption habits in the wealthier nations are modified. Second, the idea of limitations acknowledges that the environment's capacity to support present and future requirements is constrained by the level of technology and social organisation. As a result, we must control our demands on the natural environment. But Brundtland argues that "growth has no set limits in terms of population or resource use beyond which lies ecological disaster," rejecting the simplistic anti-growth arguments of the 1970s. Brundtland, however, calls for a more "eco-friendly" kind of development that is "less material- and energy-intensive and more equitable in its impact" in order to help reduce poverty and provide fundamental requirements in emerging nations[6], [7].

DISCUSSION

The idea of sustainability, which necessitates a much more complex process of balancing social, economic, and environmental priorities, is a key distinguishing feature of sustainable development as a policy paradigm. It shifts the terms of debate away from traditional environmentalism, with its primary focus on environmental protection. Box 8.4 demonstrates how the Brundtland definition places equal emphasis on social and economic growth as it does on environmental preservation. Development is a transformational process that allows people to reach their full potential by fusing economic progress with more significant social and cultural changes. Due to the physical restrictions placed on growth by ecosys- tems, it is now recognised that environmental issues must be included into all economic sectors and governmental policies. Environmental politics have become more accessible because to Brundtland's unashamed anthropocentrism, which is shown in its concern for human wellbeing and the exploitation of nature rather than an ecocentric interest in saving nature for its own sake.1 The promise of sustainable development is that it promises to provide a way out of the economic vs environment deadlock; growth and environmental preservation no longer need to be traded off. Far from it: development is seen as a "good thing" since it allows less developed nations to thrive and raise the living standards of their underprivileged populations while maintaining the material level of living in the wealthy North. All of these advantages, plus environmental protection!

Like beauty, sustainable development is subjective and holds promise for all people. Sustainable development is a "metafix," as Lele has stated with just a hint of irony, "that will unite everybody from the profit-minded industrialist and risk-minimizing subsistence farmer to the equity-seeking social worker, the pollution-concerned or wildlife-loving First Worlder, the growth-maximising policy maker, the goal-oriented bureaucrat, and, therefore, the vote-counting politician." The perceived ideological neutrality of sustainable development contributes to its widespread appeal. It doesn't provide a clear picture of the ideal state, whether it be a green paradise or something else, and it doesn't advocate any particular political or economic system. Sustainable development, on the other hand, is a process of transformation wherein fundamental aspects of society, such as resource usage, investment, technologies, institutions, and consumption patterns, begin to function more harmoniously with ecosystems[8].

These adaptable qualities draw a broad range of supporters but also make sustainable development a very debatable idea. The eradication of poverty, the pursuit of global equality,

the decrease of military spending, the increased use of relevant technology, the democratisation of institutions, and a move away from consumerist lifestyles are some of the goals that seem radical. Other themes appear to accept the status quo, such as the acceptance of the capitalist economic system and the requirement for ongoing economic growth. The fundamental ideas also raise several old but unanswered political issues. What are some examples of fundamental needs? Should they take into account the requirements of people in Bangladesh or the USA? How much will wealthy industrialised countries' living standards need to change before we have sustainable consumption patterns? Conflicting interpretations of sustainable development are generated by various responses to these issues. The Brundtland Report does not provide a comprehensive framework to assist particular nations in translating these overarching ideas into workable public policy, which contributes to these difficulties. As a result, policymakers have had a variety of frequently at odds concepts to select from in the Agenda 21 text, while the never-ending flow of books and papers attempting to flesh out sustainable development has fueled as much dispute as it has brought about consensus.

The proliferation of meanings is a highly political process in which "different interests with different substantive concerns try to stake their claims in the sustainable development territory," rather than merely an academic or practical clarification effort. Key interests have attempted to define sustainable development to suit their own purposes as it has become more important. Therefore, a transnational corporation may insist that sustainability is impossible without robust economic growth to combat poverty, stabilise population levels, provide for human welfare, and, of course, maintain profit levels, while an African government may emphasise the need for global wealth redistribution from North to South in order to eradicate poverty. In an effort to distinguish between various "versions" of sustainable development, there have been multiple efforts made due to the ambiguity surrounding the term. Most typologies distinguish between "weak" and "strong" types of sustainable development, and others define a transition between weaker and stronger forms. In order to distinguish between various discourses or types of sustainable development, Baker created a "ladder" of sustainable development. The ladder connects various philosophical views of nature to the "political scenarios and policy implications associated with each rung." The lowest rung is the technocentric approach to pollution management, which holds that every environmental issue can be resolved by human ingenuity. It makes the assumption that there is a "Kuznets curve" for the environment, according to which the high pollution levels associated with early industrialization will decrease as economic growth advances into a post-industrial period. Weak sustainable development seeks to combine environmental concerns with economic growth.

It permits substitution between the different types of capital, so that the natural resources may diminish as long as they are made up for by the expansion of human capital. Its goal is to maintain the total stock of human capital and nat- ural capital constant throughout time. It maintains that the best method to conserve the environment is to assign it a value or price, in line with the work of environmental economists such Pearce et al. Strong sustainable development, which views environmental conservation as a prerequisite for economic progress, is the third rung. It states that some types of "critical" natural capital, such as ozone, tropical rainforests, and coral reefs, are vital to life and should never be replaced by technology. The highest level of sustainable development is characterised by a steady-state economy, local social, political, and economic self-reliance, and a redistribution of property rights through burden-sharing. This level equates with radical green politics such as bioregionalism and deep ecology. Of fact, there are significant differences among each group, and these differences often overlap. Currently, the majority of nations have only been able to

take a shaky foot onto the rung of poor sustainable development.How closely do ecologies and sustainable development align? Understandably, many deep greens are wary of a plan that doesn't appear to fit the extreme changes they call for. Richardson thus criticises sustainable development as a "political fudge" that "seeks to bridge the unbridgeable divide between the anthropocentric and biocentric approaches to politics." Others believe that accepting capitalism compromises sustainable development, arguing that much economic growth cannot be ecologically sustainable and that capitalism must be replaced by a more decentralised, self-sustaining social and economic system. These extreme viewpoints are included on the top rung of the ladder, some of which avoid the phrase "sustainable development." The majority of modern green activists, however, are adamantly devoted to the ideas of sustainable development. For instance, the German Greens' original four pillars place emphasis on the significance of development concerns like social justice, equality, and democracy. Views from several greens may be seen on both the top and second rungs of the ladder. A precise definition of ecologism would thus only contain the ideal model, but since the line separating the top two rungs is rather hazy, there is room for ecologism to also incorporate aspects of robust sustainable development.

Does it matter that there are so many different definitions of sustainable development and that there is so much misunderstanding of what it means? According to one theory, without a defined meaning, practically anything may be sustained, reducing it to nothing more than a political catchphrase. A definition that can be agreed upon by all parties is required, together with a set of quantifiable standards that might be used to assess how far society has come towards sustainability. It is preferable to be clear and take the chance of losing a few unwelcome supporters than to maintain a vague "anything goes" attitude. A precise technical definition would aid policymakers in implementing sustainable development. However, this viewpoint might undervalue one of the main benefits of sustainable development, which is that the concept's pliability should be embraced rather than decried. Sustainable development is usually seen as a "good thing" and has a broadly recognised common-sense meaning within broad bound- aries, but inside those bounds there is deeper contestation around its component notions. This is similar to other political concepts like democracy or justice. According to this perspective, there are various benefits to sustainable development's testability. Its ability to be all things to all people has made the message resonant globally and drawn supporters to the flag. The coalition for sustainable development, according to Hajer, "can only be kept together by virtue of its rather vague story-lines at the same time that it asks for radical social change," while insisting on a specific definition of the word is more likely to turn away prospective supporters. Thus, the "motherhood" concept of sustainable development can help radical concepts like equity and democratisation gain wider acceptance.

These discussions may be a lively and helpful aspect of the internal process of transformation. Internationally, the discussion of sustainable development has sparked bitter political conflicts, notably between the North and South, which have elevated a number of environmental and development-related concerns on the diplomatic agenda. The issue has been brought down to the national and sub-national levels by international organisations like the Commission on Sustainable Development. The growth of Agenda 21 and sustainable development roundtables has helped spread the concept across society and led to a number of useful projects. Governments may indirectly bring about change even when they merely give lip service to international agreements by establishing new institutions and spreading novel ideas that have the power to upend old political norms and transform the worldviews of influential decision-makers. Governments were required to create national sustainable development plans as a result of joining Agenda 21, for instance, which gave concerned parties a chance to bring environmental concerns to the attention of other

ministries.Therefore, the ambiguity and contestability that make sustainable development such a difficult idea may also work to its political advantage. Its upbeat message caters to all tastes and enables all of the performers to communicate in the same language. But can this elusive idea be translated into workable policy recommendations? There is still no concise toolbox outlining the policies and instruments required for sustainable development, despite the fact that the comprehensive Agenda 21 document includes many useful recommendations and despite the admirable efforts of many organisations and people. The following section lists five key ideas that seem to support all variations of sustainable development.

CONCLUSION

For everyone to have a sustainable future, the environment must be modernised and sustainable development must be pursued. Innovative answers are needed to the problems of climate change, pollution, and resource depletion that prioritise environmental conservation while simultaneously satisfying social and economic requirements. Promoting modernisation and sustainability necessitates the use of community participation, policy development, and technological innovation. However, achieving these objectives will demand a concerted effort from all stakeholders, including governments, corporations, civil society organisations, and people. Together, we can build a more resilient and sustainable world that will fulfil our needs without jeopardising the capacity of future generations to meet their own.

REFERENCES:

[1] G. Taylor Aiken, "Community as tool for low carbon transitions: Involvement and containment, policy and action," *Environ. Plan. C Polit. Sp.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/2399654418791579.

[2] T. Besley and T. Persson, "JEEA-FBBVA Lecture 2017: The dynamics of environmental politics and values," *J. Eur. Econ. Assoc.*, 2019, doi: 10.1093/jeea/jvz040.

[3] A. Deem, "Mediated Intersections of Environmental and Decolonial Politics in the No Dakota Access Pipeline Movement," *Theory, Cult. Soc.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0263276418807002.

[4] D. W. Orr, "The (Missing) Politics of Environmental Education," *Sustain. (United States)*, 2019, doi: 10.1089/sus.2019.29156.

[5] L. Wallbott, G. Siciliano, and M. Lederer, "Beyond PES and REDD+: Costa rica on the way to climate-smart landscape management?," *Ecol. Soc.*, 2019, doi: 10.5751/ES-10476-240124.

[6] K. Akamani, "Integrating deep ecology and adaptive governance for sustainable development: Implications for protected areas management," *Sustainability (Switzerland)*. 2020. doi: 10.3390/su12145757.

[7] M. Kaika, "'Don't call me resilient again!': the New Urban Agenda as immunology … or … what happens when communities refuse to be vaccinated with 'smart cities' and indicators," *Environ. Urban.*, 2017, doi: 10.1177/0956247816684763.

[8] H. Nasrollahi, R. Shirazizadeh, R. Shirmohammadi, O. Pourali, and M. Amidpour, "Unraveling the water-energy-food-environment nexus for climate change adaptation in Iran: Urmia lake basin case-study," *Water (Switzerland)*, 2021, doi: 10.3390/w13091282.

CHAPTER 18

THE FUNDAMENTALS OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Jaivindra Singh, Assistant Professor
Department Of Mechanical Engineering, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email Id-jainvindra321@gmail.com

ABSTRACT:

The relative disregard of economic and social justice within and between countries is often the cause of our incapacity to advance the common interest in sustainable development. A key component of environmental policy is equity. Governments always take into account the distributional effects of any action taken to stop or lessen environmental deterioration. In other words, the majority of environmental policies produce winners and losers with an emphasis on the Limits to Growth discourse and the need to safeguard vulnerable eco-systems for future generations, intergenerational equality was the primary focus of environmentalism when it first entered the global scene in the 1970s. The rise of sustainable development has dispelled some of the critiques of 1970s environmentalism, which was seen as an elite concept that prioritised environmental issues above the urgent fundamental needs of the world's poorest citizens.

KEYWORDS:

Development, environmental, Government, Growth, Policy.

INTRODUCTION

The poverty-environment nexus's two most important aspects were highlighted in the Brundtland Report. First, the poorest nations and citizens suffer the most severe environmental harm as a result of global consumerism since they are least equipped to defend themselves. Second, the South's expanding population of landless and impoverished people creates a battle for survival that puts enormous strain on the region's natural resource base. By pushing more people into marginal, environmentally vulnerable territories, the ensuing resource depletion—desertification, deforestation, overfishing, water shortages, and loss of biodiversity—continues the downward cycle of poverty. The Brundtland Report brought attention to the environmental effects of important North-South problems including trade ties, assistance, debt, and industrialization by highlighting the interconnectedness between environmental and developmental challenges. It came to the conclusion that poverty and significant social injustices must end for there to be sustainable development. For this reason, intragenerational equality is given as much weight as the more obviously environmental notion of intergenerational fairness.

However, implementing intragenerational equity can lead to significant political conflict, especially along North-South lines. The Rio Declaration's "common but differentiated responsibilities" principle acknowledges that every nation must take action to protect the environment in order to safeguard the common destiny of humanity, but it also recognises that not every nation has contributed equally to the current eco-crisis and that nations have varying capacities to address these issues. The degree to which the wealthy North is willing to take on the political and financial burden of addressing global issues like climate change and ozone depletion—problems that were primarily brought on by industrialization in the

developed world—becomes a major issue in international environmental diplomacy as the policy emphasis shifts to preventing developing nations from making these issues worse.

A problematic equality issue is the idea of sustainable consumption. It's likely that the writers of the Brundtland Report were aware of the political explosive nature of the necessity to alter consumption habits in the North since they kept quiet on the subject. The disparities between mass consumption in wealthy nations and the billion or more of the poorest people in the South whose basic consumption needs are not being met have since come to light as a result of Agenda 21's inclusion of sustainable consumption. Sustainable consumption is the practise of consuming goods and services that meet basic needs and improve quality of life while minimising the consumption of natural resources, the use of toxic materials, and the emissions of waste and pollutants over the course of a product's life cycle so as to protect the needs of future generations. The 1998 Human Development Report states that consumption must be: harmed, which ensures that everyone has access to basic needs; strengthened, which increases human potential; socially responsible, which ensures that the consumption of some does not jeopardise the welfare of others; and sustainable, which does not compromise the choices of future generations.

With the dual goals of reducing the direct effect of Northern consumption on limited resources and enhancing the social and economic situation of the people that provide those resources, several programmes have been undertaken. For instance, the UN Department of Social and Economic Affairs supports more than 300 partnerships for sustainable development. The 'fair-trade' movement, which has gained popularity recently, aims to aid underprivileged and disadvantaged producers in developing nations by establishing direct contact with North American customers and removing middlemen from the supply chain. The establishment of a Fairtrade label ensures that goods satisfy minimal requirements for the price paid, workers' rights, health and safety, and environmental quality.The main goal of fair trade is equity: reducing poverty by giving small producers the ability to compete by guaranteeing that they are paid a fair and consistent price for their goods. As a matter of fact, one of the most popular definitions of fair trade is that it promotes sustainable development by "offering better conditions to, and securing the rights of, marginalised producers and workers - especially in the South." While the explicitly environmental component might only pertain to, say, the maximum allowed level of a pesticide, in reality, many fair-trade goods, like coffee, chocolate, and bananas, are grown organically. Fair trade indirectly benefits the environment by allowing small farmers to compete since they are less likely than large producers to use pesticides extensively. With a set minimum price, advance payment of orders, and a dedication to a long-term trading partnership, a group of "alternative" trading organisations, including Oxfam, Traidcraft, and Twin, purchase directly from farming organisations in less developed nations like Nicaragua. Many of the producer cooperatives then direct their profits towards community improvement initiatives like building new schools. Caf'e Direct has been able to convince and support a number of growers to switch to organic cultivation because to the popularity of many organic coffee blends.

Obviously, equity is not just a North-South issue. According to the UNDP Human Poverty Index6, industrial nations have a poor population that ranges from 7% to over 30% of the total population. Rich countries also experience social marginalisation, unemployment, and homelessness often. The families with the lowest socioeconomic status are the least likely to practise sustainable consumption. In affluent societies, the pressures of competitive spending and conspicuous consumption exacerbate wealth disparities between the rich and the poor by encouraging poorer households to incur more debt in an unsuccessful effort to keep up with rising consumption standards and displacing spending on food, education, and health.

Therefore, achieving sustainable consumption will require both a general reevaluation of consumption levels and patterns in wealthy nations and the provision of basic necessities to the socially excluded poor.Thus, the sustainable development paradigm adds a new set of conundrums to the debate over equity and the environment by highlighting the intricate connections between social, economic, political, and environmental factors. By emphasizing economic expansion, population increase, and the preservation of nature, it highlights how 1970s environmentalism misread the issue[1], [2].

Democracy and involvement

In order to address environmental issues, sustainable development underlines the value of democracy and participation. The traditional paradigm did not see a connection between democracy and environmental issues, whereas sustainable development contends that in order to achieve intragenerational equity, poor and disadvantaged groups must be assisted and given the chance to define their own basic needs. Although this democratic message was primarily intended for developing nations, developed nations can also benefit from encouraging community participation through consultative processes, citizen initiatives, and strengthening local democratic institutions. All local interests must be able to participate in policy and planning choices that directly affect their way of life, whether they come from remote rural communities or impoverished inner-city communities. Democracy may also play a crucial legitimation function, especially in wealthy nations where it's required to win over the populace for environmental efforts that can negatively impact lifestyles, such new eco-taxes or regulations on automobile usage. People may understand the need for action and be more prepared to accept sacrifices in their material quality of life if information is widely accessible and they can participate in making decisions[3].

DISCUSSION

By insisting on the broad use of the precautionary principle, the sustainable development paradigm addresses the complexity and uncertainty that surround so much environmental legislation, especially where technological and scientific concerns are concerned. This concept emphasises that actions to avoid environmental deterioration should not be delayed because of a lack of scientific assurance.

The precautionary principle is in line with the idea of ecological sustainability since it focuses on reducing environmental stress and providing the ecosystem more "space." Because we need to be certain that our actions won't result in environmental damage that cannot be repaired, it is also a concrete example of intergenerational equity. This disagreement is well-illustrated by the discussion around genetically modified organisms. The major promise of GM crops is that by boosting agricultural output, they may significantly help to avert food shortages in the world's most underdeveloped nations in Latin America, Africa, and Asia. However, GMOs are also marked by ongoing ambiguity regarding any potential threat to ecosystems. Should governments use the precautionary principle to justify a step-by-step approach employing strict safeguards on trials and imposing moratoriums on production, as has occurred in Europe, or should companies be given free rein to develop these products, as has largely been the case in North America?

Invoking the precautionary principle directly, the 2000 Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety grants nations the freedom to reject the import of GM agricultural goods. When industrialised nations agree to shoulder the burden of assisting less developed nations in preventing harm, like climate change, that might result from their future economic progress, the precautionary principle is also driven by the notion of intragenerational equality [4].Within the aforementioned UNCED definition, two caveats should be noted. First off, the phrase

"according to their capabilities" suggests that less developed nations may not need to implement the strategy with the same rigour. This thought has influenced the use of the precautionary principle in the ozone and climate change accords. Second, it is unclear what kind of cost-benefit analysis should be used to establish if measurements are "cost-effective". Are these expenses internal or external? Given the uncertainties involved, how should future costs be discounted and at what point in the decision-making process should they be used? Unsurprisingly, there is a great deal of dispute on what the precautionary principle really entails.A compelling interpretation would essentially flip the burden of evidence, placing the onus on the polluter to establish the safety of an activity before it is permitted. Similar to this, if harm has already been done, the responsible industry would need to establish its innocenceguilty until proven innocent! The benefit of this strict approach should be that companies would be less likely to take the risk of releasing a pollutant if it was up to them to demonstrate that they hadn't done so. It is less apparent what this may entail in practise, although a weaker form may simply urge policymakers to behave carefully in line with the proverb "it is better to be safe than sorry." It is significant that strong democratic ideals of transparency and involvement serve as the foundation for O'Riordan's proposed guidelines for using the precautionary principle, which were undoubtedly influenced by the challenges the British government had in dealing with both BSE and GMOs[5], [6].

Modernising the environment as a Positive-Sum Game

Clearly, ecological modernization has a lot to offer. A nation will benefit in terms of employment, income, and a better environment if it takes use of the commercial possibilities it presents, including reduced prices, specialised markets, and more innovative goods. This is really a positive-sum game. The 'development' agenda of North-South issues, inequalities, social justice, and democracy, which can be contentious and expensive to implement, is one of the political baggage that ecological modernization also sheds. In addition, while sustainable development struggles to offer policymakers a clear, precise blueprint, ecological modernization seems to offer a practical set of principles and techniques for addressing the issues. The notion of "gov- ernance" as involving "steering" rather than "rowing," wherein governmental institutions establish broad aims but leave day-to-day execution to other actors, is reflected in its vision of a flexible and enabling state.

The direct focus on the business sector, whose support is essential for any transition towards a more sustainable society, is perhaps the most distinguishing aspect of ecological modernization. The Brundtland Report offers little to entice businesses beyond some mild words of exhortation, such as "industry should accept a broad sense of social responsibility and ensure an awareness of environmental considerations at all levels," even though industry's contribution to environmental degradation is highlighted in the literature on sustainable development. Profit, on the other hand, speaks to business in a language it respects and understands. Ecological modernization could persuade business to take environmental preservation more seriously.

The idea of ecological modernization also takes into account changes in a number of industrialised nations where elites in charge of shaping policy have embraced a more comprehensive, strategic approach to environmental challenges. Ecological modernization provides a useful lesson in 'best practise' environmental policymaking because it has its roots in nations like Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, Norway, Finland, and Denmark, which are frequently singled out as having the best records of environmental performance in the world. While Lundqvist reports parallel developments in Sweden, the Dutch National Environmental Policy Plan is hailed as the perfect example of how environmental considerations can be incorporated into every aspect of government. The growth of the

environmental technology sector in the German economy is another success story. The precautionary principle, the polluter pays principle, and integrated pollution control are all examples of ecological modernization features that have been embraced by all of these nations but have not yet been fully implemented. The concept of ecological modernization was also expressly used in the fifth EU Environmental Action Plan[7].

Ecological modernization's limitations

Critics of ecological modernization do exist, nevertheless. First of all, although being a more focused, realistic, and convincing notion than sustainable development, ecological modernisation is not without definitional issues. Although there is a fair amount of agreement on the fundamental elements of ecological modernization, there are enough variations among authors to distinguish between "weak" and "strong" versions along a continuum. Ecological modernization, in its weaker 'techno-corporatist' version, concentrates on the creation of technological solutions to environmental issues via the collaboration of economic, political, and scientific elites in corporatist policymaking structures. It is a limited interpretation of the phrase "a discourse for engineers and accountants" that essentially disregards consideration of democratic and development-related problems. The more "reflexive" and forceful form of ecological modernization envisions significant democratisation and acknowledges the global scope of environmental challenges, taking a far larger approach to integrating environmental concerns across institutions and society at large.

In this context, it is unclear how much the stronger version varies from sustainable development; in fact, Hajer refers to the Brundtland Report as "one of the paradigm statements of ecological modernization." This robust approach to ecological modernization is perhaps best understood as a unique variation of sustainable development that places special emphasis on the role of industry and the issues facing industrialised nations. In spite of the fact that it is "little more than a rhetorical rescue operation for a capitalist economy befuddled by ecological crises," the weaker version of ecological modernization is more different from sustainable development. According to Mol and Spaargaren, this oversimplified dichotomy reflects an outdated reading of the literature that fails to take into account the explosion of theoretical and empirical investigations that have occurred since the mid-1990s. They specifically contend that the limited conception of ecological modernization as only the addition of "add-on" technology is inaccurate given how far the discourse has advanced to take into account fundamental structural changes to socio-technical systems[8].

Second, even while the narrower emphasis of ecological modernization appeals to Northern political elites since it omits the political baggage that comes with sustainable development, it's possible that the exclusion of social justice problems is its fatal flaw. For instance, "life-cycle assessment" techniques are increasingly being used to analyse the environmental impact of a product "from cradle to grave," taking into account all the energy and raw material inputs as well as all the air, water, and solid waste emissions produced during its creation, use, and disposal. Life-cycle assessment has a huge potential upside but generally overlooks the equity and social justice concerns brought up by the larger sustainable development debate. The foundation of ecological modernization is the utilitarian claim that by making pollution prevention profitable, all stakeholdersgovernment, industry, consumers, and environmental groups—can engage in a positive-sum game in which everyone wins.

The fact that so many people won't be able to participate because their fundamental necessities aren't being provided is one issue. Since most environmental issues involve distributional questions that almost never have winners and losers, social justice issues are frequently discussed in the literature on sustainable development. It may be fairly foolish, as

Hajer points out, to think that ecological modernization can avoid addressing fundamental socioeconomic tensions.With a few notable exceptions, North-South concerns are oddly absent from ecological modernization. It is not difficult to imagine a situation in which huge multinational corporations operate along 'ecomodernist' lines in the North, using effective clean technology and goods, but placing their more polluting businesses in poorer nations with laxer environmental regulations. Perhaps ecological modernization necessitates the use of a sizable portion of poor nations as a garbage dump for the polluting endeavors of wealthy nations?

Thirdly, worries regarding ecological modernization's applicability to emerging nations have fueled the specific complaint that it is "Eurocentric," which, if true, would rather restrict its attractiveness as a workable national-level environmental reform plan. It comes as no surprise that some critics question whether developing nations have enough room to create their own "ecologically sound development path" in an increasingly globalized world of economic interdependence, international political interactions, and standardization of science, technology, production, and consumption. Some observers have also asserted that ecological modernization is only partially applicable outside of Northern Europe's core pioneer states, particularly in the United States and Canada. The questioning of ecological modernization's geo- geographic reach has sparked a discussion about the kind of state in which it may thrive, even if numerous recent studies have shown that aspects of ecological modernization are acting at the local level in the USA[9].Finally, ecological modernization often downplays the significance of consumption, particularly the total amount of consumption, in favor of production and the idea that pollution avoidance pays. It seems that the underlying assumption is that greening the industrial process permits infinite consumption. Ecological modernization, despite its name, is only superficially ecological since it generally disregards ecosystem integrity and the overall effects of industrialization on them. Its technocentric understanding of nature ignores growth constraints and presupposes that all issues can be resolved. However, even if companies do use every available eco-friendly strategy, economic growth is likely to outweigh the environmental advantages. Contrary to the decoupling thesis, the overall impact on the environment might not differ much if ecological modernization, for instance, results in the replacement of 8 million inefficient cars with 10 million more efficient ones. Many environmental issues can only be resolved if every person accepts responsibility for modifying consumption patterns on both a small and large scale.

The emergence of "green consumerism," wherein "knowledgeable" consumers use environmental factors while making purchase decisions with the intention of influencing the economic operations of firms, is one occurrence that is aligned with the ecological modernization narrative. As a result, the "green" customer is the engine behind market change, motivating producers and retailers to promote the environmental friendliness of their goods in an effort to attract the business of a more discriminating and typically wealthy consumer. For instance, The Body Shop had exponential growth in the 1990s thanks to the global sale of its franchises in the 'beauty without cruelty' cosmetics sector. A growing industry has emerged around ethical investing, which is a general phrase for any investment activities that seek to persuade corporations to adopt socially and environmentally responsible business practices. In 2003, there were $151 billion worth of overall ethical assets in the USA, €12.2 billion worth of ethical funds in Europe, and £4.2 billion invested in ethical unit trusts in the UK.

Criticizing green consumerism is simple. Consumers are frequently subjected to false or misleading claims about products. For example, washing powders that never contained phosphates are suddenly marketed as "phosphate-free," and refrigerators are referred to as

"ozone-friendly" even though they contain HFCs that deplete the ozone layer despite being CFC-free. Some of these issues might be resolved by enforcing stricter ethical standards for advertising and eco-labeling. The fact that green consumption is still a niche activity, with too few people doing it too seldom, is a greater issue. The fact that many people cannot afford the higher costs that characterise the majority of "green" items is a significant equality concern. However, a lot of middle-class consumers only occasionally make green purchases, either because they are picky about which high prices they will pay or because they are unwilling to make many lifestyle sacrifices like giving up their second car or dishwasher[10].

CONCLUSION

Green consumerism seems to fundamentally contradict itself since how can we purchase our way out of the environmental crisis? 'Shopping to save the earth' accomplishes little to stop the unabated rise in consumption since it only encourages us to change the kind of consumption, not the amount. In fact, there is a risk that people may continue to lead high-consumption lives while believing they have done their part by purchasing a few green items. Customers must go through a far more in-depth social learning process. But it is universally true what Press and Mazmanian say: "There is simply no visible governmental or corporate leadership devoted to reducing extreme consumption and the perceived need for high-volume, high-pollution, high-obsolescence products" in the USA. Despite attempts to restore the balance, the consumption side of the sustainability equation has received little attention in ecological modernization theory.

REFERENCES:

[1] G. Mitchell, “Problems And Fundamentals Of Sustainable Development Indicators,” *Sustain. Dev.*, 1996, doi: 10.1002/(sici)1099-1719(199603)4:1<1::aid-sd24>3.3.co;2-e.

[2] N. Roorda, *Fundamentals of Sustainable Development*. 2020. doi: 10.4324/9781003052517.

[3] K. Danova, V. Malysheva, V. Rosokha, I. Glushenkova, and N. Popovych, “Maintenance of labor resources as fundamentals of sustainable manufacturing development,” *Eur. J. Sustain. Dev.*, 2020, doi: 10.14207/ejsd.2020.v9n1p432.

[4] X. Yin, X. Xu, Q. Chen, and J. Peng, “The sustainable development of financial inclusion: How can monetary policy and economic fundamental interact with it effectively?,” *Sustain.*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/su11092524.

[5] I. W. Sarlet and G. D. J. T. Wedy, “Some notes on the fundamental right to sustainable development and its subjective and objective dimension,” *Revista Brasileira de Politicas Publicas*. 2020. doi: 10.5102/RBPP.V10I3.7272.

[6] S. R. Mahdi, A. H. Jaber, and S. C. Mashkour, “Fundamental and technical analysis in the context of sustainable development for the Dubai financial market (2008-2017),” *Int. J. Innov. Creat. Chang.*, 2020.

[7] C. Auriacombe and G. Van der Walt, “Fundamental policy challenges influencing sustainable development in Africa,” *Africa’s Public Serv. Deliv. Perform. Rev.*, 2021, doi: 10.4102/apsdpr.v9i1.381.

[8] A. Orjuela and J. Clark, “Green chemicals from used cooking oils: Trends, challenges, and opportunities,” *Current Opinion in Green and Sustainable Chemistry*. 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.cogsc.2020.100369.

[9] G. P. Christie and S. C. Ratzan, "Beyond the bench and bedside: Health literacy is fundamental to sustainable health and development," *Inf. Serv. Use*, 2019, doi: 10.3233/ISU-180037.

[10] O. R. Medrano Pérez, "Overloaded cities: The overexploitation of resources as limitation to sustainable development," *Antipoda*, 2020, doi: 10.7440/antipoda39.2020.01.

CHAPTER 19

ENVIRONMENTAL MODERNIZATION IN ACTION

Kul Bhushan Anand, Assistant Professor
Department of Mechanical Engineering, Teerthanker Mahaveer University, Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh, India
Email id-anand_kb1980@rediffmail.com

ABSTRACT:

Despite some people's enthusiasm for it, there are still very few policy developments that unmistakably fit within the ecological modernization framework, and the majority of them are concentrated in a small number of "pioneer" countries. Some political systems seem to be more amenable to ecological modernization than others; in particular, it has established itself most firmly in nations with significant corporatist elements in their policy approaches, such as a tradition of planning, intervention, and fostering close ties between government and business.

KEYWORDS:

Business, economic,Environmental,government, Modernization.

INTRODUCTION

There may be a desire to work with new environmental and consumer organizations when there is a corporatist heritage of establishing cooperative relationships with strong non-state interests. Thus, by gradually incorporating environmental groups into the majority of the standard policy-making phases, the Norwegian government "has expanded Norway's traditional consensus-corporatist style of policy-making into the field of environment" In Sweden, where the corporatist mentality has historically sought agreement, environmental organisations have intermittently been involved in planning and decision-making. Ironically, corporatist policies that were initially designed to maximise economic growth by granting special access to business and labour organisations have resulted in a consultative politicking approach that is relatively open to environmental interests that question some of those expansionist presumptions. In fact, cross-national comparisons show that corporatism and pluralism both have negative effects on the environment.

Weale demonstrated how German politicians were more open to aspects of ecological modernization during the 1980s than their British counterparts in a comparative analysis of pollution control policies. Elites in German politics saw the connection between economic interventionism and the possibility for expansion of the burgeoning pollution control sector. Therefore, by making significant investments in the green technology sector and enforcing the principle of "best available technology," which requires that a company install the most cutting-edge, environmentally friendly equipment before receiving a licence to operate, the German government significantly boosted the sector. Elites in British politics, however, did not see this relationship. The Thatcher administration was unable and unwilling to accept a proactive developmental role for the state due to its lack of intimate ties to top business organisations and its special ideological opposition to interventionism. Ecological modernization may not be as suitable for English-speaking nations as a whole, such as the USA, Britain, Australia, and New Zealand, where market liberal ideologies have the most sway and where environmental groups typically don't participate in the policymaking process.

However, the pioneer states are not models of ecological virtue, and there is actually very little empirical support for ecological modernization. All of the elites in politics do not yet share the ecological modernization paradigm's worldview. According to a reliable analysis of the Dutch approach to the acid rain issue, conventional, sectoral policy measures coexisted with a narrative of ecological modernization. In order to reduce sulphur and nitrate emissions, the Dutch turned to the remedial solutions associated with the traditional paradigm, such as mandating catalysts in cars, constructing slurry-processing plants, and installing FGD equipment in power plants, rather than tackling the source of the issue by discouraging road traffic, cutting cattle stocks, or conserving energy. The same is true of German pollution regulations, which mostly deploy end-of-pipe fixes rather than making an effort to influence behaviour by, for example, lowering speed restrictions on the autobahn. In fact, several important state institutions, including the Ministry of Industry and Energy, actively resisted efforts to balance economic and environmental goals by enacting a carbon tax, according to a study of Norwegian climate change policy. When "significant economic interests have been at stake," efforts to institutionalise environmental ideals across a variety of Norwegian public policy concerns often fail. Governments continue to provide several irrational incentives that promote pollution and environmental degradation both in the pioneer states and abroad. Finally, while being the preferred policy tool of the ecological modernization discourse, market-based tools like eco-taxes are nevertheless used infrequently.

Industry

If state structures are slow to modernise their ecological practises, there is also little proof of true business conversion. While many business leaders extol the virtues of an environmentally friendly industry, behaviour changes are not always consistent with the rhetoric. There are hundreds of companies for every one that has made a genuine effort to integrate ecological principles into its operationsand there are a growing number of innovators. Many businesses adopt ecological modernization in a selective manner. While their core businesses continue to use or supply enormous amounts of fossil fuels, the majority of major energy suppliers, for instance, have developed a renewable energy business. Electricity supply companies have built wind farms, and oil companies have invested in biomass and hydrogen. While their core businesses have remained unaffected, other corporations have acquired profitable niche "ecologically-sound" businesses. Cadbury Schweppes acquired Green & Black's, the organic chocolate company, and Unilever acquired Ben & Jerry's, the ethical ice cream company.

The meagre results of programmes to encourage environmental development at the firm level serve as an example of the sluggish pace of ecological modernization within European industry. Businesses are required to provide an externally verified environmental statement of their activities as part of the optional EU Eco-Management and Audit Scheme. EMAS is an extremely ineffective eco-audit programme. The external audit mainly serves to ensure that the paperwork is in place since firms may choose the sites they desire to visit and establish their own aims and ambitions. However, adoption is low. Even though EMAS was introduced in 1995, only 3,225 companies had been registered across the EU and Norway ten years later, 1,499 of which were in Germany, where external verification requirements are the lowest in the world. Many European businesses have opted to register with the ISO 14001 international standard, which is even less demanding than EMAS because it doesn't require an independently verified statement. In response to these flaws, the EU passed a new EMAS rule in 2001 that expanded the programme to include all sectors of the economy, including local governments, encouraged more employee involvement and openness, and included ISO 14001 as part of a stricter environmental statement. Although many companies conduct

environmental audits without bothering to sign up for official programmes, the general disregard for initiatives that would allow them to publicly tout their commitment to sustainability shows how little ecological modernization has permeated the industrial sector.

DISCUSSION

Ignorance may be a contributing factor in the overall resistance to ecological modernization. Many industrialists, especially those in small and medium-sized businesses, do not have the means or access to the debate on ecological modernization. Even when the idea that "pollution prevention pays" has been internalised, some businesses may still decide that the expenses of being green exceed the advantages. Undoubtedly, the transaction costs associated with green breakthroughs might be high. For example, investments in new, cleaner technologies are likely to be "lumpy," necessitating a sizable upfront expense in expectation of future savings. Particularly if it jeopardises their ability to gain a competitive edge immediately, businesses may be unwilling or unable to make such a commitment.

As a result, several authors have claimed that sectoral development in the greening of industries is most likely to occur. By sharing the financial burden and integrating technological know-how, it is possible to lower the transaction costs of change in this situation, allowing industry-wide networks of businesses to achieve competitive advantages on the world market. Individual businesses are more inclined to innovate if they feel their immediate rivals will do the same if the whole sector moves in sync, which reduces the challenges associated with collective action. The pulp and paper industry in the USA is one industry where such voluntary initiatives have made significant strides in recent years. Major changes include lowering emission levels and energy intensity, eliminating the use of chlorine and other toxic chemicals, and increasing the amount of recycled waste. The lesson is that by working with the appropriate trade groups and enabling voluntary industry self-regulation, governments may be sensible to pursue an ecological modernization approach that focuses on certain industries[1].

Overall, greening the industrial sector is still a goal. Although many businesses are becoming more conscious of how their operations affect the environment, business elites have not yet fully embraced the ideology of ecological modernization, and there is little proof that ecological criteria are being incorporated into production procedures. Industry has been selective about which innovations are implemented, with significant differences across sectors, even in "pioneer" nations. Close state-industry cooperation continues to be the exception rather than the norm, and the corporate sector has shown little interest in state-sponsored initiatives to promote ecological modernization. Indeed, as the subsequent chapters demonstrate, many industries actively oppose ecological modernization initiatives and the use of novel policy tools like eco-taxes that are intended to implement the 'pollution prevention pays' principle.Conclusion

Questioning the tenet that there must always be a trade-off between environmental and economic goals has been a significant contribution of sustainable development. It has also established a development agenda that may reconcile the sometimes-conflicting goals of wealthy and developing nations by placing environmental problems in a wider social, economic, and political framework. Despite the fact that sustainable development has many different meanings, it has emerged as the dominant paradigm guiding the conversation about modern environmental policy. Despite the fact that all governments assert their commitment to its principles, some North American policy elites have shown a preference for the more limited idea of ecological modernization. They are sometimes referred to as the "half-sister" of sustainable development since they have many of the same goals, values, and strategies.

However, ecological modernization is praised for being more useful and efficient because it directly tackles the problem of producer power. Ecological modernisation expects business leaders to acknowledge the instrumental benefits of enhanced environmental preservation by providing a utilitarian incentive to industry to include environmental issues into the profit equation. By emphasising the state's crucial role in promoting industrial transformation, it also gives the state an incentive to change. Policymakers and citizens of rich industrialised countries are especially drawn to the "discourse of reassurance" that ecological modernization offers since they are presented with less difficult decisions than they would be if stronger forms of sustainable development were adopted. Even environmental leaders, according to a comparative study of ecological modernization, "display major shortcomings in general resource consumption, biodiversity, and inter and intragenerational equity," and they continue to favour "standard solutions based primarily on technical progress." In other words, it's still unclear whether ecological modernization provides a workable plan for attaining sustainability[2].

The universal agreement that sustainable development is a desirable thing conceals intense disagreement about what it means and, therefore, how to achieve it, according to one lesson to be learned from this chapter. The following chapters examine how much the old worldview has changed in favour of sustainable development or ecological modernization. Evidence that the fundamental ideas discussed here are influencing policy practise will serve as one indicator of change.

Environmental Politics in the World

Global and international environmental issues provide significant obstacles to the realisation of sustainable development. An worldwide environmental concern may be identified by the fact that it transcends national borders. Many transboundary issues have existed for a long time, including the preservation of marine life, natural habitats, and endangered species of wildlife. Deforestation, desertification, and water shortages are a few issues that formerly primarily had regional or local causes and effects but now have global implications. A "new" set of problems that impact everyone, such as ozone depletion, biodiversity loss, and climate change, are genuinely global. All nations contribute to issues with the global commons, and all states are affected by the results, however the degree to which each nation is responsible for a given issue and sensitive to its impacts varies greatly.

International cooperation is necessary to address global environmental issues; country governments acting alone cannot do it. Environmental issues can only be handled by individual country governments working together. Environmental challenges are now firmly entrenched on the international political agenda as states become more conscious of their shared vulnerability. UN summits held in Stockholm in 1972 and Rio de Janeiro in 1992 served as significant turning points in this process. Prior to 1972, there were multilateral environmental accords addressing topics like animal protection and marine pollution, but the Stockholm Conference marked the beginning of a broad discussion about the environment in international politics. Twenty years later, the Rio Earth Summit, which brought together the biggest number of global leaders ever as well as a variety of non-governmental organisations and interest groups, put the environment front and centre. With the adoption of two agreements on climate change and biodiversity and the introduction of Agenda 21, the international community committed to the ideals of sustainable development. Around 200 MEAs have been created as a result of today's rising tide of international cooperation, and numerous institutional structures have been born to oversee, uphold, and strengthen them[3].

However, the mere fact that these agreements even exist, which is undoubtedly a significant success of environmental diplomacy, is puzzling because it goes against traditional realist assumptions about how states behave in a system of international relations where, historically, conflict and mistrust have been the norm. Beginning with a brief conceptual analysis of this contradiction, this chapter primarily draws upon institutionalist and neo-realist theories of international relations. The creation of two of the most significant recent MEAs, dealing with ozone depletion and climate change, is described in the next part. The following section offers a thorough explanation of the variables influencing nation states' decisions to cooperate to safeguard the global commons. The ability of states to enforce environmental agreements is inextricably linked to larger issues of international political economy, and the next section evaluates some of the challenges facing their implementation. Although a MEA may represent a diplo- matic triumph, it does not guarantee that the problem addressed will be resolved. An evaluation of the connection between global environmental politics and sustainable development marks the chapter's conclusion.

International Cooperation's Dilemma

International environmental cooperation may be desired, but it is challenging to implement due to serious collective action issues. Can a political system made up of over 170 sovereign nations and countless other players, which is fragmented and sometimes extremely conflictual, accomplish the high levels of collaboration and policy coordination required to address environmental challenges on a global scale? ask Hurrell and Kingsbury. There is no central sovereign authority in the international arena to coordinate policy solutions to problems of the global commons or to guarantee that sovereign nations abide by agreements, in contrast to a domestic political system where a national government may control conduct and charge taxes. Individual sovereign nations operate in anarchic systems where their action is almost completely influenced by concerns of power politics, according to the neo-realist ideas that have long dominated academic international relations. Each nation state's main goal is to survive by gaining greater power relative to other nations. Individual nations are unlikely to work together to protect the global commons because no nation can completely trust the intentions of others. If individual states are unable to address the world's environmental issues on their own, it is pointless for one state to alter its behaviour in the absence of guarantees that others will do the same. Game theory, on the other hand, may be used to demonstrate that it makes sense for states not to cooperate if some other nations are doing so since the advantages of cooperation, such pollution control, will be ensured anyway[4].

Realists see the environment as a security concern first and foremost because environmental issues might lead to conflict between nations. The realist notion that in international politics "Anarchy and conflict are the rule, order and co-operation the exception" is challenged by the increasing tide of worldwide environmental cooperation. According to one theory, actors may cooperate logically when they are certain that others will do the same.2 The mutual understanding that each state will have to interact with others on a regular basis over the long term may help to build the trust needed to give the assurance that cooperation will be forthcoming and that other states will not free-ride if individual states have common interests, such as the prevention of pollution. Realists may also be inaccurate in assuming that power politics is at the core of all international relations; for instance, the assertion that nations want to maximise relative profits may be substituted with the logical premise that they seek absolute gains. Cooperation is more probable since everyone can win if each state strives to better its absolute position rather than continually trying to 'win' every round of the game. These presumptions serve as the foundation for institutionalist viewpoints, which see

environmental cooperation as completely reasonable if self-interested governments determine that the advantages of cooperation will exceed the disadvantages.

Therefore, the apparent paradox of global cooperation may not be as 'irrational' as realists claim. Realist objections should not, of course, be carelessly discarded. Each MEA will serve as a testament to the hard-won diplomatic achievements of the parties involved due to collective action difficulties, including the motivation to profit from others' cooperative efforts. But the fact that there are so many real-world instances of cooperation suggests that the challenges are surmountable. Instead, it is more fruitful to concentrate on the factors that influence the emergence of international treaties addressing issues of the global commons, following the lead of institutionalist writers and also drawing on constructivist approaches.

Ozone and climate change accords are examples of Environmental Regimes

Regimes are "sets of implicit or explicit principles, norms, rules, and decision-making procedures around which actors' expectations converge in a given area of international relations," according to the definition supplied by the World Bank. The fact that a government freely permits external intervention in the way it uses resources inside its own sovereign territory is an important aspect of the significance of a regime. The expansion of MEAs since the early 1970s is proof of expanding international cooperation to address issues affecting the world's commons. The procedures that led to the ozone depletion and climate change treaties' signing are discussed in this section. These treaties offer a comparison between one regime that appears to be succeeding and one that has had little success, in addition to the fact that they address two of the most important contemporary global atmospheric problems[5].

Ozone Defense

By blocking damaging UV light, the stratospheric ozone layer contributes significantly to the preservation of life on Earth. Two scientists with American roots proposed in 1974 that anthropogenic chemicals, particularly chlorofluorocarbons used as propellants in aerosols, refrigerants, solvents, foam products, and halons used in fire extinguishers, could significantly harm the concentration of ozone in the atmosphere. The ozone-depleting chlorine and bromine released by these manmade compounds when they seep into the atmosphere and climb towards the stratosphere. The immune systems of people and animals would be harmed, ecosystems would be harmed, and there would be an increase in skin cancer and cataracts. Due to their safety, stability, and versatility, the sheer amount of these chemicals in the stratosphere is an indication of their importance in contemporary industrialised economies. Therefore, any attempt to restrict their use would undoubtedly face fierce opposition from commercial interests, especially the large chemical companies that produced them, like Dupont and ICI.

The first moves towards global action were hesitant as consensus-building, scientific fact-finding, and policy changes went hand in side. The World Meteorological Society research on the connection between CFCs and ozone depletion was supported by the UN Environment Programme in 1975 because it was first crucial to establish the scientific foundation of the ozone issue. A World Plan of Action on the Ozone Layer was created two years later by a UN conference of scientists from 32 nations to coordinate ongoing research, but it wasn't until the discovery of a "ozone hole" above the Antarctic in 1985which was accompanied by regular springtime ozone decreases of more than 40% between 1977 and 1984that a scientific consensus about the existence of ozone depletion started to take shape. The Northern Hemisphere's ozone layer had decreased by up to 3% between 1969 and 1986, according to the Ozone Trends Panel, which included more than 100 top atmospheric scientists from ten

different countries, concluding that the phenomenon was no longer just a theory but had finally been supported by concrete data. Importantly, the panel also affirmed that the main contributors to ozone depletion were CFCs and other synthetic chemicals[6].

International discussions had meantime started moving more quickly. Together, the United States, Canada, Norway, Sweden, and Finland asked UNEP to take corrective action in 1977; when this did not happen, they unilaterally banned non-essential CFC aerosol usage. The European Community, which produced 45% of the world's CFCs, vehemently opposed such action. Due to intense corporate lobbying, export markets were protected and the expenses of creating alternatives were avoided in the absence of solid scientific proof. The representatives of 24 countries were largely split between the Toronto Group, which pushed for a complete ban on non-essential uses of CFCs, and the European Community, which would only consider a production cap, when multilateral negotiations for a framework convention began in 1982. Without being able to resolve this fundamental disagreement, the 1985 Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer amounted to little more than a commitment to cooperate in monitoring, research, and information sharing. However, the USA was able to secure an important commitment to begin negotiations for a legally binding protocol. Even yet, the Vienna Convention, the first instance of international environmental legislation based on the precautionary principle, was significant since it was signed without conclusive scientific proof that ozone depletion was occurring.

The European Community and Japan went from opposing any production reduction to accepting a compromise proposal to reduce CFC production by 50% from 1986 levels by 1999 and to freeze halon production at 1986 levels by 1992 during the nine months of negotiations leading up to the signing of the Montreal Protocol in September 1987. This sudden change of heart was caused by a number of things. US diplomats engaged in active diplomatic manoeuvre against opponents. Executive director of UNEP Mustafa Tolba handled the discussions well. West Germany, which was under intense internal political pressure to make concessions, disagreed with the other major CFC manufacturers, France, Italy, and the UK, causing a growing rift among European nations. However, the most significant development was the strengthening of scientific evidence in the wake of the ozone hole discovery, which had a significant impact on national representatives and even influenced industrial interests. Again, it was significant that politicians had signed the Montreal Protocol before there was scientific evidence to back up their decision, as the Ozone Trends Panel report showing the connection between CFCs and ozone depletion did not come out until several months after the agreement was made[7].

Dupont said it will speed up the search for alternatives and cease producing all CFCs and halones by the end of the century shortly after the Ozone Trends Panel report was released. Other major worldwide chemical companies immediately concurred. At follow-up meetings of the signatories, this scientific evidence prompted further strengthening of the regime, including accelerating reduction and phase-out dates so that production of CFCs, halons, and three other chemicals had come to an end in developed nations by 1996 and expanding the Protocol to include additional chemicals like hydrochlorofluorocarbon and bromochloromethane.

The need to convince developing nations to join the regime was one of the main issues left unanswered at Montreal. Industrialised countries, which account for 25% of the global population, consume nearly 90% of all CFCs, with a per capita consumption that is more than 20 times higher than in less industrialised countries. It is therefore imperative that the former lead the way in reducing emissions. Without the participation of emerging nations, particularly China and India, where the usage of ozone-depleting compounds in refrigeration

and air conditioning systems would increase with greater industrialization, the regime's long-term success was jeopardized [8].

CONCLUSION

Developing nations argued that they shouldn't be required to pay for fixing a problem that they did not cause and demanded that either they be permitted to keep using CFCs or that they be given financial and technical assistance to create alternatives. Only a few developing states signed the Montreal Protocol because it lacked this facility; Brazil, China, and India, the three largest nations, refused. The USA was especially worried about the potential precedent for future environmental regimes, particularly climatic change, and was unwilling to accept open-ended pledges to pay for a fund. It became more and more clear that the Protocol's success hinged on offering enough incentives to convince poorer nations to join up. As a result, a global fund for financial and technological transfer to aid poor nations was formed at the London summit in 1990. The fund, to be managed by UNEP, UNDP, and the World Bank, was $160 million, with a potential increase to $240 million if China and India joined. The amount was subsequently raised, and by the end of 2005, the multilateral fund had distributed $1.86 billion. The Montreal Protocol and the London Amendments have 189 and 179 ratifications, respectively, by November 2005.

REFERENCES:

[1] A. Machin, “Changing the story? The discourse of ecological modernisation in the European Union,” *Env. Polit.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/09644016.2019.1549780.

[2] G. Taylor Aiken, “Community as tool for low carbon transitions: Involvement and containment, policy and action,” *Environ. Plan. C Polit. Sp.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/2399654418791579.

[3] A. A. M. Davidescu, S. A. Apostu, and A. Paul, “Exploring citizens’ actions in mitigating climate change and moving toward urban circular economy. A multilevel approach,” *Energies*, 2020, doi: 10.3390/en13184752.

[4] R. C. Dias, P. C. Seixas, and N. Lobner, “Sustainable Development and Ecological Modernization: Boundary Discourses between ‘Strong’ and ‘Weak’ Approaches,” *J. Sustain. Dev.*, 2020, doi: 10.5539/jsd.v13n4p268.

[5] N. L. Mihaylov and D. D. Perkins, “Local environmental grassroots activism: Contributions from environmental psychology, sociology and politics,” *Behavioral Sciences*. 2015. doi: 10.3390/bs5010121.

[6] M. de F. Poza-Vilches, J. Gutiérrez-Pérez, and M. T. Pozo-Llorente, “Quality criteria to evaluate performance and scope of 2030 agenda in metropolitan areas: Case study on strategic planning of environmental municipality management,” *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 2020, doi: 10.3390/ijerph17020419.

[7] J. B. D. Câmara, “Governança ambiental no Brasil: Ecos do passado,” *Rev. Sociol. e Polit.*, 2013, doi: 10.1590/S0104-44782013000200008.

[8] S. Goess, M. de Jong, and E. Meijers, “City branding in polycentric urban regions: identification, profiling and transformation in the Randstad and Rhine-Ruhr,” *Eur. Plan. Stud.*, 2016, doi: 10.1080/09654313.2016.1228832.

CHAPTER 20

FACTORS BEHIND THE CHANGING WEATHER

Dr. Purnima Nag, Professor
Department of Chemistry, School of Engineering & Technology, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India
Email id purnima.nag@jnujaipur.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The primary worry with regard to climate change is the "greenhouse effect," a phenomena that occurs naturally and keeps the Earth's temperature high enough to support life as we know it. Carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and halocarbons are among the gases that let solar radiation to flow through but absorb radiation that is reflected back from the Earth's surface and trap heat in the atmosphere. The average world temperature would be around 33 degrees centigrade lower if it weren't for the natural greenhouse effect. The greenhouse effect appears to have been strengthened by human activities, specifically carbon emissions from burning fossil fuels and deforestation and methane emissions from agricultural activities like livestock and paddy fields, by raising the concentration of these gases in the atmosphere.

KEYWORDS:

Climate, Environmental, Global,Government, Greenhouse.

INTRODUCTION

Climate change is the most significant current global environmental problem because of the concern that a human-caused process of global warming is occurring with a number of possibly catastrophic ramifications for the world.Three main issues have been the focus of scientific investigation. Exists any proof of global warming? If so, is it a result of human activity or a naturally occurring cycle in temperature? What effects might we expect from global warming? Huge strides have been made in climate change science in recent years, coordinated by the work of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, but it is still unclear how rising temperatures, increased emissions, higher gas concentrations, and, most importantly, their combined impact are directly related. However, there is now a strong agreement on the solutions to the three issues. The global mean surface temperature increased by around 0.6 degrees centigrade during the last century, and it is anticipated to rise by between 1.4 and 5.8 degrees by 2100, according to climatological data. During the twentieth century, the concentrations of the major gases in the atmosphere have significantly increased.

The majority of experts now concur that human activity has resulted in these increased concentrations of gases and that these gases have led to temperature rises. The effects of global warming might be disastrous if temperatures continue to climb at the same pace.6 Many low-lying areas will be inundated by an increase in sea level of between 9 and 88 centimetres by the year 2100, while the disruption of weather patterns around the world will change how people use the land, lower agricultural yields, worsen water stress, and result in millions of environmental refugees. Although it is still up for informed speculation as to which nations and regions will be hit the hardest, when, and by how much, it is certain that less developed nations will experience the worst effects, in part because the majority of them are situated in tropical and subtropical regions and in part because their infrastructures are inadequate and limit their ability to adapt to these changes.

Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, the scientific consensus gradually grew. Increased carbon dioxide concentrations will result in a significant rise in mean surface temperatures, a

confident scientific conclusion was reached at the World Climate Programme meeting in Villach, Austria, in 1985. This scientific consensus steadily grew over the course of the next five years as the accuracy of the data and climate models increased. Additionally, the scientific community began to engage with the larger political community. Leading scientists and politicians from several nations gathered in Toronto in 1988 to discuss cutting CO2 emissions by 20% by 2005. Toronto sparked a slew of subsequent multilateral meetings and inspired several nations, notably all of the members of the European Community and the European Free Trade Association, to take unilateral steps to stabilise their carbon emissions. The World Meteorological Organisation and UNEP established the IPCC in 1988, and its first report confirmed the scientific agreement that human activities were causing climate change and recommended for rapid legislative action to limit carbon emissions. Growing scientific agreement, multilateral conferences, and unilateral promises all created a political impetus that led to the 1992 Rio Earth Summit's adoption of the international treaty on climate change.

The Framework Convention came into effect in March 1994 after being first ratified by 155 nations, including the EU. In order for the world community to stabilise greenhouse gas concentrations at levels that should lessen climate change, it identified a number of principles, including prudence, equality, cooperation, and sustainability. Developed nations were only given the 'voluntary objective' of bringing greenhouse gas emissions down to 1990 levels; no specific goals or dates were set. Developed nations were expected to take the lead in addressing climate change and to transfer financial and technological resources to developing nations to assist them in doing so, according to the principle of "common but differentiated responsibil- ities" written into the convention. However, no one was committed to anything specific, other than establishing a fund under the auspices of the newly established Global Environment Facility.

However, a complex institutional framework was set up to continue discussions aimed at strengthening what was widely acknowledged as only the first step towards a successful climate change regime. Although the 'Berlin mandate' acknowledged the need to work towards a protocol that set targets and strengthened commitments to reduce greenhouse emissions, the first Conference of the Parties to the Framework Convention in Berlin in 1995 was unable to agree on any new commitments. The Kyoto Protocol was finally reached after ten days of protracted discussions in December 1997. It established legally enforceable objectives for industrialised nations to meet in order to achieve a total reduction in GHG emissions of 5.2% below 1990 levels between 2008 and 2012.

In Rio de Janeiro, Berlin, and Kyoto, the regime strengthening process was met with praise and criticism at equal measure. In response to seemingly unresolvable political conflicts, praise for the environmental diplomacy that helped negotiate each accord was met with criticism of the treaty's lax promises and consequences. These divergent responses illustrated the necessary concessions for agreement between diametrically opposed negotiating positions. However, subsequent attempts to solidify the details reached at Kyoto failed at The Hague in 2000, and the Kyoto Protocol was subsequently renounced by the newly elected President Bush the following year. This decision caused a significant crisis because the Kyoto Protocol could not enter into force until it had been ratified by fifty-five countries, which represented at least 55% of the GHG emissions of the Annex 1 countries. At the time, the USA was responsible for about 25% of the world's greenhouse gas emissions. The Bonn agreement, which Japan and Russia were persuaded to sign as a result of frenzied diplomacy among the other developed nations, was reached in July 2001. However, it wasn't until November 2004 that Russia finally ratified the agreement after hard-bargaining for several

concessions. However, even before the Kyoto Protocol entered into force, discussion about a post-Kyoto agreement that would take effect after 2012 was already under way at the Montreal COP-11 in 2005[1], [2].

The negotiations over the climate regime have been plagued by two core issues, neither of which has been completely addressed. First, the desire of industrialised nations to make firm pledges is not shared by all of them. The opposition has consolidated around US opposition to setting greenhouse gas reduction goals. It goes without saying that the United States' participation in any system is essential to its success as the world's greatest emitter of greenhouse gas emissions. While the US government initially hesitated to sign the Framework Convention in Rio and prevented agreement on targets or timetables at Berlin, the EU and other industrialised nations pushed for quantified targets throughout the negotiations. Prior to ultimately agreeing to a 7% reduction target at Kyoto, the USA obtained significant concessions, including the implementation of a tradeable permit system that would effectively let wealthy polluting nations purchase the right to maintain high emission levels from nations emitting less than their target. The US government's insistence on being able to offset its emissions against its carbon sinks was the key issue during the abortive Hague Conference in 2000. Differences in energy resources and the organisation of the energy sector are the main causes of disagreements between developed nations. The nations that depend on exporting fossil fuels, such as those in the Middle East, as well as those with abundant energy resources, such as the USA, have resisted reduction the most.

DISCUSSION

The USA is the world's second-largest producer of oil, natural gas, and coal, and it has a plentiful supply of fossil fuel energy. The 'gas-guzzler' culture that has emerged in America as a result of the cheap, readily accessible energy breeds fierce opposition to increasing energy efficiency. The US government believes that the costs of adapting to climate change are manageable because the economic and political costs of implementing emission reductions are seen as higher in the US than elsewhere and because climate change is not seen as a serious issue in America as it is across the Atlantic. Additionally, a strong domestic industrial lobby, particularly those representing the motor and energy industries, has exerted significant pressure on American politicians to obstruct the regime-building process. In order to redefine the climate change argument on its terms, the Bush administration has played the role of veto state with considerable panache. For instance, in the face of increasing scientific agreement regarding climate change, the US government has taken advantage of unresolved issues, such as the heavy reliance on scientific modelling.

However, it later changed its position by acknowledging that while human activities had contributed to climate change, it was too late to take action and that Kyoto was unavoidably doomed to fail. Support for emissions reductions was also at odds with Bush's domestic strategy, which included using California's energy difficulties as an excuse to exploit Alaska's oil deposits on the pretext that there was a great need for additional energy. Contrarily, the majority of European governments see the danger posed by climate change as far bigger. The governments of EU nations, who rely significantly on imported fossil fuels and do not have the same gas-guzzling culture as the USA, are more motivated to reduce carbon emissions due to the ripple effects of doing so on their balance of payments. Since government intervention in economic decision-making has a longer history in Europe, governments are expected to take the initiative in addressing climate change, and the EU's proactive role in climate change diplomacy is generally regarded favourably[3].

To the President's unyielding position, there is evidence of growing opposition in the USA. In order to decrease greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, some governments have devised their own climate change policies. For example, California has implemented legislation mandating automobiles to reduce carbon emissions and all large industrial companies to reduce emissions by 25% by 2020. By controlling emissions from power plants, several northeastern governments are aiming to control regional greenhouse gas emissions. There are indications that the 2005 floods in New Orleans, which many have connected to climate change, have changed domestic public opinion.7 In fact, this may be seen in President Bush's evolving stance on climate change, as evidenced by his promotion of the 2005 Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate. This initiative, which included Australia, China, India, Japan, and South Korea, aims to find voluntary ways to reduce emissions by accelerating "the development and deployment of clean energy technologies." It should come as no surprise that detractors like Greenpeace believe it is an attempt to get around the Kyoto Protocol.

The North-South division has been a second key strain that has plagued discussions. Although the Convention enshrined the idea of "common but differentiated responsibilities," there has been strident disagreement over what this actually means. For instance, the US administration has been able to criticise the Kyoto Protocol for essentially exempting poor countries from taking action to decrease carbon emissions by placing objectives solely on Annex 1 countries. The main emerging nations, on the other hand, like China and India, have made sure that themes of development, sovereignty, and equality have taken centre stage on the agenda. Conflicts over the flow of financial and technological resources from the North to the South are at the heart of many disagreements. The idea that rich nations should transfer funds to assist poorer nations in investing in energy-efficient technologies has generally been supported, but putting it into practise has presented several challenging issues. The lack of concrete responsibilities under the Framework Convention and the Kyoto Protocol is a result of developed nations' reluctance to put their hands in their wallets and large private firms' reluctance to cede ownership of technology without economic or financial recompense. It is important to emphasise that the straightforward North-South distinction fails to adequately capture the complexity of climate change politics; just as affluent nations disagree about what should be done, emerging nations also have divergent interests. For instance, although oil-producing governments have resisted them, the Alliance of Small Island governments has campaigned for clear objectives and pledges.

The well-known trade-off between economic and environmental concerns is at the core of each of these important conflicts. Long-term need to address climate change has been eclipsed by immediate concerns about economic growth and development. Governments often give in to producer and consumer opposition to expensive corrective measures like carbon taxes since there is no immediate observable evidence of global warming that may raise public concern. International attempts to slow down climate change have undoubtedly had far less success than efforts to stop ozone depletion.

Considering Regimes

The success of environmental regime negotiating is identified in this section, with a focus on the ozone and climate change accords.The ability of a strong country, or group of countries, to assume leadership by pressuring smaller governments into signing a treaty, aids in the establishment of regimes. A lead state will be dedicated to getting effective international action on a problem; it will speed up the negotiation process and look for other governments' support for a regime. The USA, the most powerful nation on earth, is an obvious choice to play a hegemonic role, much as when it forced the Bretton Woods system of trade

liberalisation and stable currencies onto the globe in the wake of globe War II. Although the United States was a leader in ozone diplomacy, its track record in negotiations for the Antarctic, acid rain, biodiversity, and climate change treaties indicate that it has frequently impeded international cooperation. As a result, it is now the responsibility of other economically powerful governments to take the initiative. Australia and France played a key role in promoting the 1991 Madrid Protocol, which forbade mining in the Antarctic. The Geneva Convention on Long Range Transboundary Air Pollution was established in 1979 thanks to the efforts of Sweden and Norway, and the Helsinki Protocol was eventually agreed upon thanks to Germany. Finland and Sweden first offered the draught agreement during the Vienna Convention ozone discussions before the USA took the lead and proposed the 95% reduction in CFCs. As shown by the Toronto Group's ozone diplomacy and the EU's efforts to get binding carbon reduction pledges at the Kyoto Summit, groups of nations may also significantly contribute. In fact, the EU, a wealthy and strong union of industrialised countries, is a key actor in environmental diplomacy[4].

A veto state, on the other hand, will obstruct talks or delay the execution of an agreement. The importance of veto states is greatest when a certain country's or group of countries' participation is required for the negotiation of a successful regime. Thus, the US government was able to extract significant concessions at Kyoto, just as did the Russian government prior to its ratification of the Protocol, knowing that any climate change agreement would be ineffective without its involvement. Without backing from Britain, the main contributor to acid precipitation in Northern Europe, the LRTAP regime was first weakened. Without the cooperation of Japan, the world's biggest market for ivory, a ban on the trade in ivory is useless. The larger developing nations, particularly China and India, have used their veto power strategically to gain significant concessions, as in the ozone discussions. Key veto states are often OECD countries. Lead states must convince veto states that they are making a mistake. To accomplish this, they typically must offer them a compromise or an incentive to give up their objections, such as the payments made to China and India to convince them to sign the London Amendments on ozone depletion or the acceptance of the American proposal at Kyoto to establish a tradeable permit system.

Veto states often oppose proposals out of a desire to safeguard important economic interests. Because their chemical industries had not yet developed alternatives, European states initially resisted attempts to halt CFC production. Japanese, Icelandic, and Norwegian coastal communities have been protected by defying restrictions on commercial whaling. The British government's objection to an acid rain accord was motivated by a desire to shield its energy sectors from the prohibitive costs of compliance. Governments have faced intense lobbying from significant domestic economic interests that are opposed to the system in each instance. The Global Climate Coalition, one of the most powerful lobbying organisations, played a key role in President Bush's reluctance to ratify the Climate Convention in Rio in 1992 and subsequently in encouraging the Clinton administration to adopt a harsh negotiation approach at Berlin and Kyoto. Economic concerns do not necessarily oppose global environmental cooperation, it should be recognised. Because property damage from rising sea levels and the disruption of weather patterns is likely to result in more insurance claims, the insurance industry, for instance, is relatively sympathetic towards action on climate change.

Furthermore, where it is obvious that environmental regulations are necessary as a result of a shifting political landscape, industry and government may work together to strike a deal that best serves their respective countries' interests. The American chemical company Dupont, which intended to gain a competitive edge over competitor European chemical producers in the development of CFC substitutes, encouraged the US government to continue playing a

leading role in ozone diplomacy beyond 1988. Nevertheless, economic interests generally influence governments to play a supporting rather than a leading role[5].On the other hand, internal political pressure from environmental organisations, the media, or the general public may convince a government to join the lead state club. Early in the 1980s, the West German government changed its position on acid rain from one of veto to one of leading state, influenced by the growing significance of environmental concerns and the rise of the Green Party as a political force. Because of its pro-green posture during the 1987 election, the Australian Labour Party decided to reject an Antarctic minerals treaty and advocate for a ban on mineral extraction. This decision was made in an effort to garner the support of people who were worried about the environment.

The accessibility of useful solutions is another factor. Some issues have clear-cut and workable solutions, such as the restrictions on the trade in ivory, whale hunting, and the exploitation of Antarctic mineral resources. The availability of substitutes helped achieve cooperation on phasing out CFC production, and the development of catalytic converters and flue-gas desulphurisation equipment to reduce emissions from cars and coal-fired power plants made agreement to reduce acid precipitation easier. In contrast, the lack of effective and economical fossil fuel alternatives for energy generation and vehicle transport has been one of the ongoing barriers to progress on climate change[6].

The emergence of a regime may be accelerated by external shocks like ecological catastrophes. An worldwide agreement on handling nuclear catastrophes was negotiated within six months after the Chernobyl nuclear power plant disaster in 1986. The discussions that resulted in the Montreal Protocol received a significant boost once the ozone layer hole was discovered. The advancement of climate change diplomacy, in contrast, has likely been hampered by the lack of any comparable catastrophe or startling revelation. Because governments increasingly rely on expert advice throughout the policy-making process due to the uncertainty surrounding each new environmental issue, scientists may play a crucial role in regime formation. Scientists have a crucial role in issue identification, significance assessment, solution development, and monitoring the efficacy of corrective action.

As happened in ozone diplomacy with the discovery of the hole in the ozone layer and the subsequent hardening of scientific understanding, scientific consensus regarding a specific issue is likely to be a stimulant for international cooperation. Conversely, cooperation may be difficult if there is still scientific ambiguity. The British government refused to restrict acid emissions in the 1970s and 1980s, citing the inconclusiveness of scientific findings as justification. Science did not play a major part in obtaining agreements on whaling, the ivory trade, hazardous waste, tropical deforestation, or Antarctic minerals, proving that it is not always of utmost significance in regime creation.

Additionally, scientists can play a very pro-active role in the development of policy rather than just being passive reporters of "neutral" scientific knowledge and counsel. The concept of "epistemic communities," as defined by Peter Haas as "knowledge-based groups of experts and specialists who share common beliefs about cause-and-effect relationships in the world and some political values concerning the ends to which policies should be addressed," has been used to analyse the influence of scientists. After identifying an environmental issue, groups of scientists are sufficiently inspired to become involved in politics to promote global action. Their ability to have an impact on politics depends on their ability to convince others that their information is reliable and significant enough to warrant policy action. Haas demonstrated how epistemic communities sparked global cooperation that led to the creation of the Mediterranean Action Plan to combat marine pollution. Scientists were first tasked with analysing the issue of oil pollution caused by tanker traffic in the Mediterranean, but

they were able to expand the scope of the policy concern to include a broader variety of pollution sources, such as agricultural run-off, river flows, and atmospheric deposition. Epistemic communities helped convince countries like Algeria that cooperation is beneficial by demonstrating that land-based sources are the primary cause of pollution. Similar roles in pushing worldwide action against ozone depletion and global warming have been performed by the IPCC and the Ozone Trends Panel.

A wider lesson regarding the significance of non-state actors in environmental diplomacy, notably informing, teaching, and creating cognitions, may be learned from the political actions of scientific organisations. International organisations may act as astute political leaders, as shown by Mustafa Tolba's ability to steer and facilitate the discussions that resulted in the ozone protection system. By establishing goals, convincing sceptics, and coordinating policy responses, these "institutions for the earth" may promote cooperation.

International environmental NGOs like Greenpeace, WWF, and FoE are playing a bigger part in global environmental politics, however it may be difficult to gauge their impact. NGOs may undoubtedly contribute at every step of environmental diplomacy. In order to increase public awareness of a variety of international concerns,By disseminating scientific research and organising campaigns against corporations and governments, they have helped to increase domestic pressure on governments to take action. With hundreds of NGO delegates at both the Rio Earth Summit and the Johannesburg WSSD, they have also acquired growing access to international conferences, while Arts disputes their influence at Rio.

Nevertheless, Betsill contends that the Climate Action Network, a global advocacy network, was crucial in Kyoto, both in pressuring the EU to adhere to its stringent reduction target and in convincing Al Gore to attend the talks and give the US delegation more latitude. The International Whaling Commission was able to pass a moratorium on whaling in 1985 thanks in large part to the efforts of Greenpeace and other NGOs, who successfully opposed an Antarctic minerals treaty in favour of a longer ban on mineral extraction. Benedick believes that by presenting important policy choices to negotiators, NGOs played a significant part in achieving the Montreal Protocol. Overall, NGOs have had a rising but seldom significant impact on environmental diplomacy.

The nature of the issue itself could also have a role in regime creation, either by influencing the degree of resistance to cooperation or the selection of remedies. Weale lists three factors that should make it simpler to get agreements on protection regimes for common-pool resources like fisheries stocks and endangered species than for common-sink resources like clean air. First off, it should be simpler to monitor adherence to an agreement as the benefits of common-pool resources may be individually appropriated, but the non-appropriability of common-sink difficulties leads to collective-action issues. There are, however, certain exceptions; for instance, the few CFC producers have made it quite simple to check compliance with the ozone rule.

Second, proxy measures are often developed with the intention of negotiating reductions from that baseline figure when benefits are not appropriate for common-sink concerns, but the inherent arbitrariness of such baseline figures leaves certain nations at a comparative disadvantage to others. For instance, in countries that were in a recession in the base year, the marginal costs of lowering emissions will be greater than in those that were experiencing economic growth. However, the bitter disputes between EU member states over the fishing quotas supporting the Common Fisheries Policy suggest that the problem facing both common-pool and common-sink problems is the agreement of burden-sharing arrangements that are regarded as equitable by all parties.

Finally, the overuse of common-sink resources may not affect those who are responsible for the issue, whereas the exhaustion of common-pool resources hurts those who benefit from them the most. Thus, unlike UK companies whose emissions are to blame for acid rain in Scandinavia, fishing communities who will suffer from overfishing have an incentive to cooperate in order to protect their own livelihoods[7].

Overall, a variety of variables may affect regime development, but none stand out as particularly important. An intricate web of scientific, economic, political, and social variables will influence efforts to achieve international cooperation to tackle an environmental issue. Going back to the ozone and climate change examples, it is obvious that one of the most complicated and puzzling challenges facing policymakers today is climate change. In comparison to ozone diplomacy, achieving international cooperation on climate change has proven to be more difficult due to the numerous challenges that have proven to be more difficult to overcome, including strong veto states, opposing economic interests, scientific uncertainty, a variety of distributive and equity issues, non-appropriability, and the unwillingness of citizens to make lifestyle changes[8].

CONCLUSION

The price and accessibility of solutions are two important distinctions. CFCs were not essential to the economy in ozone diplomacy, and alternatives exist for the majority of their usage. Ozone depletion solutions are essentially technical and can be handled by cooperation between the state and a few major manufacturers with no apparent influence on the general public. On the other hand, the production and use of energy are crucial to the economy. Affordable and workable options, including cleaner technology or renewable energy sources, may not be easily accessible or accepted. Fundamental socioeconomic adjustments impacting economic development, energy generation, transportation, and individual lifestyles will unavoidably be required to combat climate change. On these subjects, there aren't many votes to be gained and plenty to be lost. Unsurprisingly, no nation has vowed to implement such dramatic ideas to yet.

REFERENCES:

[1] H. Zhang, X. Wang, X. Luo, S. Xie, and S. Zhu, “Unmanned surface vehicle adaptive decision model for changing weather,” *Int. J. Comput. Sci. Eng.*, 2021, doi: 10.1504/IJCSE.2021.113634.

[2] G. Bocewicz, G. Radzki, I. Nielsen, M. Witczak, and B. Zbigniew, “UAVs fleet mission planning robust to changing weather conditions,” in *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.ifacol.2020.12.2798.

[3] O. N. Kimambo, H. Chikoore, and J. R. Gumbo, “Understanding the Effects of Changing Weather: A Case of Flash Flood in Morogoro on January 11, 2018,” *Adv. Meteorol.*, 2019, doi: 10.1155/2019/8505903.

[4] M. M. Boer, R. H. Nolan, V. Resco De Dios, H. Clarke, O. F. Price, and R. A. Bradstock, “Changing Weather Extremes Call for Early Warning of Potential for Catastrophic Fire,” *Earth’s Future*. 2017. doi: 10.1002/2017EF000657.

[5] A. Cormont, C. C. Vos, C. A. M. Van Turnhout, R. P. B. Foppen, and C. J. F. Ter Braak, “Using life-history traits to explain bird population responses to changing weather variability,” *Climate Research*. 2011. doi: 10.3354/cr01007.

[6] K. L. Dickinson *et al.*, “Changing weather and climate in Northern Ghana: comparison

of local perceptions with meteorological and land cover data," *Reg. Environ. Chang.*, 2017, doi: 10.1007/s10113-016-1082-4.

[7] G. Radzki, A. Thibbotuwawa, And G. Bocewicz, "Uavs Flight Routes Optimization In Changing Weather Conditions – Constraint Programming Approach," *Appl. Comput. Sci.*, 2019, doi: 10.35784/acs-2019-17.

[8] J. A. Patz, D. Engelberg, and J. Last, "The effects of changing weather on public health," *Annu. Rev. Public Health*, 2000, doi: 10.1146/annurev.publhealth.21.1.271.

CHAPTER 21

THE ENVIRONMENT, COMMERCE, AND GLOBALIZATION

Dr. Deepankar Sharma, Assistant Professor
Department of Chemistry, School of Engineering & Technology, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India
Email id-deepankar@jnujaipur.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The preceding chapter looked at the high politics of international environmental diplomacy, which involves governments negotiating environmental treaties, but it also provided an introduction to the international political economy perspective to help readers appreciate the challenges associated with putting such accords into practise. The interaction between the environment and the global capitalist economy, especially international commerce, is the primary subject of this chapter. The discussion is predicated on the idea that, despite intense dispute about its form and scope, globalisation has had a positive influence on the world economy during the last thirty years. The expansion, extension, and integration of international economies have been occurring for several hundred years, so many of the processes of globalisation are not particularly novel.

KEYWORDS:

Environment, Commerce,Globalization, Organisations.

INTRODUCTION

Some people see globalisation as a beneficial development, while others hold it in the highest esteem. The specific topic of free trade, which is a major factor in globalisation, is the subject of a similar discussion. As a result, this chapter's introductory parts include discussions of the connections between globalisation and the environment and between commerce and the environment. Following that, the chapter analyses the key organisations that currently oversee international trade. It begins by examining how the World Trade Organization—the international organisation in charge of enforcing trade laws—treats the environment. The two most significant regional commercial agreements—the North American Free Trade Agreement and the European Union—are then evaluated for their effects on the environment.Environment and globalisation

The concept of globalisation is fiercely debated. Sharply divergent opinions on the meaning of the phrase are not unexpected given the significant differences about what it even means. While some observers believe that the world has fundamentally changed over the past thirty years, others contest that anything significant has changed.1 There is also a great deal of disagreement on how much globalisation has affected empirical change. Instead of engaging in a definitional debate, the term "globalisation" will be used here quite narrowly to refer to those processes that are integrating the global economy: an intensification of capitalist production indicated by increasing capital's mobility and velocity, the deregulation of economic activity, an increasingly global division of labour, the absence of social protection, a changing role for the state, and the rapid expansion of communication links.2 Additionally, there appears to be general agreement among those who study environmental politics that globalisation is taking place and that battle lines have been drawn regarding whether it is

good for the environment or not. In light of this premise, the discussion below concentrates on how it could affect the environment.

Market liberals like Bhagwati make the strongest argument for the environmental benefits of globalisation. The main thrust of their argument is that globalisation is a "engine of wealth creation" because it increases global wealth that will be used to pay for environmental improvements via trade, investment, and financial deregulation. The Kuznets curve hypothesis persuades market liberals that although industrialization causes pollution to increase initially as societies get wealthier, there ultimately comes a moment when there is a decoupling of economic activity and pollution. They emphasise historical patterns in the manner of Lomborg, emphasising how, despite the world's population's rapid growth, most people today enjoy living standards that are significantly higher than they did in the 1970s. They also argue that the developed world's track record shows that the best way to control population growth is to ensure that everyone has access to education and prosperity. Globalisation will address the social issues that lead to ecological degradation by providing the "development" side of the sustainable development equation; in fact, those who oppose globalisation on the grounds of the environment are labelled "eco-imperialists" for attempting to deny developing nations the right to do so. Market liberals assert the cornucopian claim that there are still plenty of untapped natural resources and untapped waste sinks on the globe, as well as the technocentric claim that history continually demonstrates how human ingenuity has overcome environmental issues.

In contrast, the popular opinion in environmental politics is that globalisation is consistently harmful to the environment. This is shared by both academic commentators and the ranks of anti-globalization political activists. Globalisation is to blame for the overconsumption of natural resources and the overflowing of garbage sinks since it supports fast economic expansion. Without giving any thought to how the communities and individuals affected by the migration or those left behind would be affected, it entails the movement of money, technology, products, and even labour to regions with high returns on investment. Globalisation increases the temporal and physical distance between the roots of an environmental issue and its influence in particular regions. It does this by stretching the chains of production and consumption across vast distances and throughout several locations. For instance, the division of labour brought on by economic globalisation leads to increased transportation of waste, semi-processed materials, components, finished items, and garbage, as well as increased energy consumption and pollution.

There is also a higher danger of serious environmental mishaps. Globalisation not only alters production patterns in ways that are harmful to the environment, but it also serves to accentuate the stark disparities between the North and the South. For instance, a change from subsistence farming to intense cash cropping in poor nations has led to the year-round availability of almost all fruits and vegetables in supermarkets in the industrialised world. Along with the significant environmental externalities associated with shipping these goods to northern markets, cash cropping offers dubious advantages to developing nations. Farming for export, according to Lipschutz, "relies on chemicals for uniformity, machinery for volume, and high quality land for productivity." It is a capital-intensive industry that concentrates wealth on a small number of wealthy farmers and agri-industrial enterprises while creating few employment. Poor farmers are driven to cultivate low-quality, marginal land while agribusiness purchases the best-quality property, causing soil erosion and habitat damage.

In reality, the dynamic and complex nature of globalisation suggests that it will have both favourable and unfavourable effects on the environment. This is evidenced by the existence

of a wide range of viewpoints that neither fully glorify nor denigrate globalisation in between these two polarised positions. Liberal institutionalists, for instance, acknowledge that globalisation will have some negative effects on the environment while generally viewing it favourably. Nevertheless, they think that the majority of significant environmental issues can be resolved by means of the global governance structures, particularly international environmental regimes, as well as through the influence of regional supranational organisations like the EU and NAFTA and the greening of global economic institutions like the World Bank and the WTO. Mol presents a sober assessment of the harmful environmental effects of globalisation, but she also makes the case that it is also helping to green many global production and consumption processes, primarily through the export of eco-friendly practises from richer to poorer nations, using the framework of ecological modernization[1].

DISCUSSION

Even among its most ardent critics, it is acknowledged that globalisation creates new opportunities and venues for protest that have aided in the growth of a thriving global civil society as a check on neoliberalism's dominance, including international environmental groups and the anti-globalization movement.the environment and global trade the influence of international commerce on the environment and the degree to which international trade bodies should include environmental concerns into their operations are at the centre of the discussion regarding the link between globalisation and the environment. Key empirical components of globalisation include the deregulation of international commerce and the rising significance of international agencies like the WTO and regional trade groups like NAFTA and the EU. The sheer expansion of global commerce from 25% of GDP in 1960 to 58% in 2001 indicates the potential importance of its possible effects on the environment. The ongoing reduction of trade obstacles by the government has been one of the main drivers of this development. The average tariff that industrialised nations place on manufactured products has decreased from roughly 50% in 1948 to about 3.7% now.

In fact, many of the arguments overlap, and the link between commerce and the environment is as hotly contested as the globalisation issue.3 Thus, the neo-liberal thesis that free trade promotes economic growth, which produces the wealth required to finance environmental improvements, serves as a central tenet of the argument that trade is good for the environment. Although it is likely that as incomes rise, citizens will demand higher environmental standards, market liberals make the bold and possibly overly optimistic assumption that businesses will spend their extra wealth on greener technologies such as pollution abatement equipment rather than just taking it as profit. Free trade proponents claim that it offers other environmental advantages, including the ability to allocate resources more effectively than any other system, leading to reduced utilisation and, thus, less resource waste. First, it does this by the specialisation of production based on the economic principle of comparative advantage, in which nations specialise in those commodities they are best at producing, which is more effective than seeking national self-sufficiency in a broad variety of goods.

Second, free trade eliminates market-distorting trade barriers like tariffs, quotas, and export subsidies since such protectionism undermines incentives for the development of environmentally friendly technology and promotes excessive consumption by underpricing commodities on the local market. The assumption that poorer nations would adopt the better environmental standards of more affluent nations in order to allow their enterprises to compete in those lucrative markets is another justification for free trade that also feeds the ecological modernisation approach. Vogel offers several instances of how developing nations

have raised their standards, notably in the automotive sector, as a result of the allure of green markets in the US and EU.

However, a lot of environmentalists have strong reservations about the alleged benefits of international free trade. The contribution of commerce to economic development is fundamentally flawed. Even if free trade does make manufacturing more "efficient," as market liberals claim, any benefits from reduced resource consumption would be quickly outweighed by the overall expansion of economic activity that free trade encourages. For instance, the tremendous increase in air passenger traffic has outpaced the consistent advances in aircraft fuel efficiency. In fact, increasing commerce results in more pollution simply because more finished and partly completed commodities are transported throughout the world. Additionally, if efficiency improvements lead to a particular good's price falling, then higher demand for those goods will result in higher consumption. The price a customer pays for an item does not cover the entire worth of the natural resource or of the transportation expenses, therefore increasing commerce results in more environmental degradation. Free trade also neglects to account for the external environmental costs of economic activity[2].

Additionally, economic injustices and environmental harm could be made worse by free trade. Ecological economists claim that the idea of free trade and comparative advantage is founded on the antiquated notion that although labour and capital are largely immobilethey cannot traverse borders—goods are mobile. One of the current characteristics of globalisation is the high degree of labour and capital mobility, as seen by the millions of migrant workers in the industrialised countries. As a result, the specialisation of manufacturing is likely to concentrate pollution in certain areas, usually in developing nations and regions, while the wealthier countries benefit from the products while only experiencing little environmental harm. manufacturing for export in the developing world often relies largely on the unsustainable use of natural resources or on mass manufacturing that takes advantage of cheap labour and lax health and safety regulations. According to the "pollution haven" hypothesis, free trade may in fact enable a developing nation to take advantage of a potential comparative advantage by utilising lax environmental restrictions as a kind of non-tariff support to lure polluting firms there. Free trade opponents contend that this will lead to a "race to the bottom" to the lowest common denominator environmental standards rather than encouraging a "race to the top" or what Vogel refers to as "trading up."

There are other more viewpoints on the free trade controversy in addition to these two opposing ones. Significantly, many observers, including those who support free trade, acknowledge that the international system is out of balance because institutions in charge of regulating trade are much more powerful than those defending the environment, and as a result, the interests of large corporations are given precedence over those of local communities or environmental protection. Therefore, the question is how to best'manage' trade to ensure it minimises environmental harm. Thus, the current conflicts over the development of international trading agreements and institutions, particularly the WTO, provide a useful outlet for the hotly contested discussion about the relationship between trade and the environment[3].

WTO and Environmental Issues

Environmental interests are allegedly discriminated against by the WTO and the international trade laws it governs, according to the WTO's defenders, who assert that the organisation can and does safeguard the environment. This section examines the influence of the WTO dispute

resolution processes and evaluates the connection between the multilateral agreements supporting environmental regimes and the laws controlling global commerce.

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade coordinated and promoted the dismantling of trade restrictions in the post-war period. Formally agreed upon in 1947, the GATT underwent eight rounds of negotiations, culminating in the Uruguay round finished in 1994, which established the WTO as a permanent body to oversee the implementation of the GATT and associated agreements. The Uruguay round also established a quasi-judicial system of dispute resolution that requires consensus among WTO members to overturn any of its decisions. 149 nations are a part of the WTO, which controls 97% of global commerce.

Although the preamble to the Agreement Establishing the WTO does include sustainable development and environmental protection among its objectives, the GATT was established long before any significant global environmental concerns arose. As a result, its rules, which are still the primary mechanism for regulating trade, contain few references to the environment. The general exceptions clause (Article XX), which permits trade restrictions when they are "necessary to protect human, animal, or plant life or health" or relate "to the conservation of exhaustible natural resources," is the only GATT regulation that seems to address environmental concerns. However, there are a number of conditions that must be met for such exceptions, including that they must be required, that domestic restrictions must also be in place, and that any trade measures must not be capricious or unjustifiable. There is controversy over whether it is legal to take actions to protect natural resources located outside of a country's borders as well as whether it is acceptable to discriminate against certain processes and production techniques that, in many cases, are environmentally unsustainable because they produce transboundary pollution or deplete natural resources like fish or timber.

Many environmentalists have criticised the GATT/WTO for failing to protect the environment due to the restrictiveness of these rules, which was apparently reflected in some early decisions of the disputes procedure. They specifically mention the two rulings concerning the tuna-dolphin issue. The first action was taken by Mexico against the US on the grounds that it was discriminatory for the US to prohibit the import of Mexican tuna captured in "dolphin-unfriendly" nets. The dispute panel ruled in 1991 that Article XX did not apply because the USA was attempting to apply national laws outside the scope of its own jurisdiction. In any case, the US ban violated GATT regulations because it treated a product differently based on how it was produced rather than on its own characteristics. A second ruling in 1994 favoured the EU due to the US secondary prohibition on the sale of tuna by third parties being unjustified and unilateral. The 1996 WTO decision against a US legislation on petrol cleanliness, which was judged to be biassed against imports from Brazil and Venezuela, was another case that was comparable. However, DeSombre and Barkin point out that the main reason the WTO has rejected regulations is because "the regulations were not particularly good; they were either clear attempts at industrial protection dressed up in environmentalist clothes, or they were poorly thought through and inappropriate tools for the intended environmental management."

Significantly, later WTO decisions appear to have "changed things fundamentally," particularly the resolution of the shrimp-turtle dispute. This case featured a US prohibition on prawn imports that were obtained by processes and manufacturing techniques that resulted in the death of endangered sea turtle species. In 1998, the disputes panel made its first decision against the USA on the grounds that the rules were enforced unfairly and were excessively strict. The appellate board, however, ruled in favour of the USA in 2001, holding that laws directed at the process and production technique are allowed under WTO standards, provided they are administered fairly and without bias. As long as it could be demonstrated that the

shrimp had been caught in ways that did not harm turtles, the panel was sympathetic to the US's reform of the original law, which allowed shrimp imports to be allowed on a shipment-by-shipment basis, even if the shipments came from nations like Malaysia that could not guarantee that all shrimp was caught in this manner. Not all environmentalist opponents of free trade have accepted the potential significance of this finding for the creation of legislation aimed at cross-border environmental issues[4].

The interaction of WTO regulations and global environmental regimes is a key point of contention in the trade-environment debate. Twenty of the most significant MEAs, out of over 200, include trade-restrictive policies that address global ecological issues. For instance, the ozone convention puts rigorous limitations on the commerce in ozone-depleting compounds and the goods that they may be found in. When different restrictions are applied to parties and non-parties to the agreement, it seems that these restrictions violate a number of WTO regulations. Since no cases have yet been brought against a MEA for breaking WTO regulations, which may be a sign that WTO members are exercising prudent restraint, this tension is currently theoretical. But given that a number of nations, most notably the USA, have refused to ratify important MEAs like the Kyoto and Cartagena Protocols, it might only be a matter of time before a problem arises. The relative standing of the two sets of regulations is still unclear, however.

Additionally, analysts like Eckersley claim that the possibility of a WTO challenge to a MEA has led to a conservative implementation of current MEA trade restrictions and is having a "chilling" effect on ongoing multilateral negotiations. All parties agree that a solution is needed to the conflict between the MEAs and WTO regulations. A Committee on Trade and the Environment was formed when the WTO was founded to examine the connection between trade laws and the environment, but more than 10 years later, it has yet to reach any firm conclusions.

Activist and scholarly environmentalists may easily point the fault upon the WTO. It has served as a rallying point for environmental activists, most notably when the WTO negotiations in Seattle were interrupted in 1999. This is because it is a symbol of globalisation, free trade, and corporate interests, and because environmental NGO involvement in its decision-making procedures is very restricted. The WTO has received harsh criticism from academics for its detrimental effects on the environment. However, as many critics have pointed out, the WTO's track record has sometimes been unjustly maligned. Perhaps national governments' callousness should be held responsible for the lack of strict environmental regulations rather than WTO regulations? Young believes that by overstating the WTO's authority and discouraging states from filing formal challenges, environmental and consumer campaigners hurt the same policies they support. Young points out how little official challenges are filed to WTO rules[5].

The WTO hasn't done much to advance environmental protection, however. It is unwilling to use the precautionary principle, which is significant. The precautionary principle is currently only mentioned in one WTO agreement, on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures. Even this agreement only permits temporary trade restrictions based on the cautious principle, essentially ignoring the potential of long-term or persistent scientific uncertainty on topics like the effects of GM crops on the environment or human health.

Indeed, it is the member state's responsibility to "prove" the existence of a threat using a risk assessment, which seems very challenging given the nature of uncertainty[6]. Therefore, the disputes procedure has ruled against the EU's import ban on hormone-treated beef, and in 2006 it supported the US complaint against the EU's'moratorium' on the import of GM foods.

This decision increased political tensions with the EU, where there is still significant public opposition to GM foods, as well as with the developing world, as it will facilitate US GM companies' access to those markets and reinforce the widely held belief that the WTO represents the interests of the developed world, particularly the USA.

The likelihood of any major WTO environmental rules revision seems remote. At the time this article was written, the Doha round of trade talks had come to a standstill on the need to reform agricultural subsidies, which have a significant negative impact on the environment. The MEA/WTO tension has a low priority even if it is on the Doha agenda. Furthermore, the member states will not come to an agreement on reform[7], [8].

CONCLUSION

The developed world is divided on important issues, most notably the USA's inability to support MEAs that include the precautionary principle; the poor world is extremely sceptical of the environmental agenda and views it as a justification for Northern protectionism. Thus, there is a stark contrast between the majority of states, who want no further environmental compromise of trade rules, and the minority of states, who want clear and explicit rules to exempt MEAs from a WTO challenge. As a result, with little hope of a breakthrough, it seems that, overall, the WTO continues to do a terrible job of advancing the cause of the environment, even if its negative effects may not be nearly as severe as many environmentalists claim.

REFERENCES:

[1] A. G. Postolache, M. Nastase, P. C. Vasilache, and G. Nastase, “Globalization and environment,” *Qual. - Access to Success*, 2019.

[2] M. Savrul, A. Incekara, and S. Sener, “The Potential of E-commerce for SMEs in a Globalizing Business Environment,” *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.*, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.09.005.

[3] T.-J. Chen, “Globalization and E-Commerce VIII: Environment and Policy in Taiwan,” *Commun. Assoc. Inf. Syst.*, 2003, doi: 10.17705/1cais.01009.

[4] W. Koenig, R. T. Wigand, and R. Beck, “Globalization and E-Commerce II: Environment and Policy in Germany,” *Commun. Assoc. Inf. Syst.*, 2003, doi: 10.17705/1cais.01003.

[5] N. X. Trung, D. T. Binh, D. T. Thuy, and D. T. T. Linh, “Research on the Application of E-commerce to Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs): the Case of India,” *Bus. Econ. Res.*, 2019, doi: 10.5296/ber.v9i3.14893.

[6] A. Machin, “Democracy and agonism in the anthropocene: The challenges of knowledge, time and boundary,” *Environ. Values*, 2019, doi: 10.3197/096327119X15519764179836.

[7] J. Odenbaugh, *Ecological models*. 2019. doi: 10.1017/9781108685283.

[8] S. Schunz, “The European Union’s environmental foreign policy: from planning to a strategy?,” *Int. Polit.*, 2019, doi: 10.1057/s41311-017-0130-0.

CHAPTER 22

AGREEMENT ON FREE TRADE IN NORTH AMERICA

Dr. Manisha Sharma, Associate Professor
Department of Chemistry, School of Engineering & Technology, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India
Email id-manisha@jnujaipur.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

How well have regional trading agreements like NAFTA and the EU addressed trade and environmental issues if the WTO has had difficulty doing so? NAFTA, which was negotiated in the early 1990s by Canada, Mexico, and the United States, is often referred to as a "green" commercial agreement since it specifically mentions the environment in both the preamble and numerous chapters of the text. Intense discussions were sparked by the negotiation process, which took place at a time when environmental concerns were at an all-time high.Several environmental NGOs, such as the Sierra Club and Greenpeace, as well as certain trade unions, complained that it privileged corporate interests. Therefore, the Clinton administration was ready to make accommodations for the green lobby. Thus, the agreement makes it clear that certain MEAs, such as CITES, the Basel Convention on Hazardous Wastes, and the Montreal Protocol, have trade provisions that supersede NAFTA.

KEYWORDS:

Environmental, Policy, Sustainable, State,Trade.

INTRODUCTION

The North American Agreement on Environmental Cooperation, a novel side agreement that focuses on the environment and creates the Commission on Environmental Cooperation to monitor NAAEC, is also included. In addition to reporting on different environmental concerns, serving as a dispute resolution panel for the enforcement of environmental laws connected to trade, and having the authority to impose fines or trade penalties for failing to comply with environmental laws, the CEC has some limited authority. Environmental NGOs are permitted to participate, unlike the WTO, by submitting submissions and providing advice to the CEC. The goal of NAFTA is to stop a member state from reducing its environmental protections in order to become a "pollution haven."

Although these environmental measures were incorporated in NAFTA, few of the systems have really been effective as environmentalists had anticipated. There hasn't been much discussion of the linkages between trade and the environment as a result of the environmental measures in NAFTA, the NAAEC side agreement, or the CEC. The prospects afforded for environmental NGO engagement have not been achieved after their first negotiating victory; in fact, environmental NGOs in the United States and Mexico have scaled down their involvement in NAFTA implementation. NAFTA, on the other hand, has empowered corporations and insured that the three federal governments and NAFTA institutions have defined NAFTA/NAAEC rather narrowly in trade terms, seeing the environment mainly as a barrier to free commerce.

The verdict is yet out on how broadly NAFTA will affect the environment. The majority of research tend to provide a mixed bag of results, some favourable and some negative. Transboundary contamination is the main environmental concern between Mexico and the US. Since the implementation of NAFTA, many Mexican standards have been raised,

Mexican businesses have agreed to compliance action plans, and the enforcement of regulations has become much stricter. However, enforcement has since slackened, and funding from the Mexican government to assist businesses with compliance has decreased. Overall, there doesn't seem to be any proof that Mexico's environmental devastation is getting any better. NAFTA hasn't had much of an impact on environmental standards in the USA, and Canada's post-NAFTA performance is even less spectacular. Although it assisted in bringing about an agreement between the three federal governments to phase out a number of hazardous chemicals and pesticides, it is generally agreed that the CEC has had little impact.

Overall, NAFTA has let down the environmental movement despite its initial green image. Its environmental innovations have had difficulty having a significant effect on the relationship between commerce and the environment. It is hardly unexpected that environmental NGOs have serious reservations about President Bush's planned free trade agreement with Central and South America.

Union of European States

In many ways, comparing the EU to NAFTA is fruitless since the EU is a single supranational entity with extraordinary authority to usurp the sovereignty of member states in the sake of the dual goals of economic and political unity. But its primary goal has always been trade liberalisation within a single market, forcing the EU to deal with well-known trade and environmental tensions, albeit with a very different outcome than NAFTA.

The 1957 Rome Treaty, which created the Common Market, pledged to promoting "continuous expansion" and made no mention of environmental preservation, much less sustainable development. European leaders began to see the need for environmental protection measures as they moved up the global agenda in the early 1970s, but since the environment is not included in the Treaty, the European Community lacks the authority to pass legislation in that area. Instead, environmental policy was disguised as a market regulation meant to ensure that there were uniform standards among member states, or a "level playing field," to stop some nations from having lower environmental standards than others and giving them a competitive advantage. A increasing number of environmental protection laws were approved using this integration strategy. Additionally, a number of Environmental Action Plans promoted an environmental policy that was more strategically oriented.

By being included for the first time in the 1987 Single European Act, the environment's informal status was ended, and subsequent treaties established sustainable development as an overarching goal of the EU. However, in order to speed proposals through the convoluted and slow policymaking process, officials still frequently emphasise the'single market' justification in order to win cross-departmental support. A series of environmental laws impacting water, air, waste, chemicals, and nature were enacted starting in the middle of the 1980s. The environmental acquis, which consists of the laws, regulations, and practises that regulate environmental policy, now numbers over 500 legislative pieces and represents a sizable body of progressive and comprehensive environmental legislation. These measures often went above and beyond "any conceivable standards that would be strictly necessary by a concern to ensure a single function- ing market." The growth of the EU to twenty-five member states, with more to come, has directly boosted legislative and regulatory standards across most of Europe by making the environmental acquis an entrance criterion to be satisfied by all accession governments[1], [2].

The EU has increased its influence on the world stage. The Union has attempted to establish itself as a normative authority supporting a sustainable development agenda on the

international scene from its early foot-dragging opposition to the Vienna Convention on ozone depletion. In order to negotiate the Kyoto and Cartegena protocols on climate change and biosafety, the EU has acted pro-actively as a lead "state." By acting as a go-between for a group of developed nations, including the USA, Japan, and Australia, who were pushing an agenda of economic globalisation at the Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development, it was able to keep sustainable development on the agenda. Environmental NGOs are now looking to the EU to take the initiative in foreign diplomacy and advance the agenda for sustainable development.

DISCUSSION

Due to its economic influence on the world economy, the EU may play this function. It is essential to have member state consent prior to discussions in order to carry it out successfully. For instance, the EU was able to exert significant influence in the Kyoto negotiations by agreeing on the emission's "bubble" before those talks. It is more difficult for the EU to exert influence if there are divisions among member states, as there were during the mid-1980s ozone diplomacy. Its lack of a consistent legal identity on a global scale is one restriction. Other nations have sometimes objected to the EU signing international treaties; for instance, it hasn't been permitted to join CITES. The compromise reached in the ozone and climate change conventions is a kind of "mixed agreement," in which the Union and member states sign, but there is still some difficult haggling about who has the legal authority to address a certain issue. Is it the EU or the member states, and which bodythe Council of Ministers or the Commissionrules the EU? It's important to note that the need of finding solutions and coordinating actions adds to the pressure on the EU to "put its own house in order" by adopting a more effective sustainable development strategy inside the Community[3].

Why has the EU taken such a generally supportive stance towards the environment? It is crucial to remember that the EU is a far more ambitious ambition than previous trade agreements, actively pursuing both economic and political unification in Europe. The environment was seen by the majority of Europeans as a 'European' issue that naturally required international cooperation to address transboundary issues like acid rain throughout the 1980s. Success of green parties at home and in European Parliament elections, as well as the rising sway of environmental organisations in Brussels, increased pressure on member state governments to act. Therefore, EU elites identified the development of a progressive environmental policy as a source of legitimacy for the EU and a method to promote political integration, in addition to providing the level playing field required for the single economic market. The willingness of all the major players in the EU policymaking process to take an active part in environmental policy at different points has been a critical enabling element.

The European Commission, which is in charge of initiating the majority of environmental legislation, notably via the Directorate-General for Environment, is most likely the main player. The Commission has a history of being willing to take a proactive stance in promoting stricter environmental regulations than many member states were willing to accept, "thus seeking to conflate "Euro- peanness" and "greenness," although in reality it could only do so with the backing of important member states that were ready to take up the environmental baton. The EU has historically divided roughly along North-South lines, with the richer "pioneer" countries of Denmark, Germany, and the Netherlands, as well as Austria, Finland, and Sweden after joining the EU in 1995, attempting to influence the less developed "laggards" of Southern Europe, including Greece, Italy, Portugal, and Spain, to adopt stricter environmental regulations. Pioneer states often impose strict laws domestically with the encouragement of an ecologically conscious electorate, thus they are eager to remove any

competitive disadvantage by obliging all member states to adopt them. The proactive member state will also benefit from cheaper implementation costs if its national model is accepted as the community norm. One instance of this "regulatory competition" occurred in the middle of the 1980s when the German government made a concerted effort to influence the EU auto emissions regulation to require catalytic converters rather than lean-burn engine technology in new cars. In contrast, public concern in Southern Europe is predominantly driven by economic growth, with the environment often receiving less political attention. The EU established a Cohesion Fund in 1993, with nearly half of its allocation going towards environmental initiatives, to lessen the burden of compliance on the Southern nations. Of fact, this crude North-South distinction is not always correct; in particular, pioneers might fall behind on matters where environmental conservation may result in local expenses[4], [5].

With more formal authority and influence, the European Parliament has earned a reputation as a "environmental champion," particularly through its Environment Committee. It is widely acknowledged that the Parliament has helped advance the EU's environmental agenda, frequently cooperating closely with the Commission. The evolution of environmental policy has benefited from the good influence of the European Court of Justice. Since then, it has emancipated the environment from the single market agenda, most notably in the Danish bottle case, which ruled that the principle of the free movement of goods can be overridden if it helps to achieve common environmental objectives. Prior to the Single European Act, its decisions developed legal norms that established the legitimacy of environmental measures. With a limited, structured lobby of core organisations, such as the European Environmental Bureau, FoE, and WWF, who all with the exception of Greenpeace get some EU money, environmental NGOs have been able to exert considerable influence in Brussels. The lobby focuses its efforts on the policy development phase of the legislative process, lobbying the parliament and member states and providing policymakers with professional assistance. However, it also makes an effort to draw attention to the shortcomings in the execution of EU policies. The corporate lobby, however, has improved its organisation and effectiveness in recent years, making it much more difficult for them to be overruled.

Undoubtedly, there are a number of issues with EU environmental policy that limit its environmental impact. Since the middle of the 1990s, the onslaught of legislation has lost some of its momentum. Additionally, there is some evidence to suggest that it is becoming more difficult to agree on new, strict environmental regulations. For instance, the REACH project on chemicals policy initially featured several comprehensive suggestions based on the precautionary principle that were meant to tighten environmental rules covering a variety of chemicals. However, the Commission's dedication to the neo-liberal aspects of the Council's Lisbon agendanamely, the push for greater economic competitiveness and a more vibrant marketencouraged it to accept business lobbying that many of the proposals would harm economic competitiveness, which led to the significant watering down of many proposals. It is virtually probable that the EU's expansion from fifteen to twenty-five nations in 2004 made it more difficult to come to an agreement on any policy; the accession of many relatively poorer states.

Although it's too soon to say for sure, industrialising countries in Central and Eastern Europe may have bolstered the laggard camp. Both the actual delivery of programmes and the conversion of EU environmental law into national law face significant implementation issues. Numerous measures that harm the environment were developed by the EU. Most significantly, the growth of intensive agricultural methods that have proved very harmful to the environment has been supported by the Common Agricultural Policy, which is by far the biggest budget item for the EU. The EU has come under fire for its raison d'être, economic

integration based on the creation of a free internal market, which has accelerated and stimulated the free movement of people, capital, and goods while doing more harm to the environment than good due to its progressive environmental policies. This discussion about the EU's total environmental effect is a reflection of the larger free trade discussion. Significantly, whereas many green parties and environmentalists opposed European integration in the past, their positions have largely changed in recent years to ones of acceptance of integration but working for the 'greening' of that process[6].

The EU is an intriguing supranational organisation that, over the last thirty years or more, has developed a body of often ambitious and far-reaching environmental policy in an effort to address the complicated interplay between globalisation, commerce, and the environment. There is little evidence that the domestic environmental policies and processes of member states have converged to produce a common European model of policy, despite the fact that a process of "Europeani- sation" can be clearly detected. In fact, the precise impact of "Europeanization," as opposed to other factors, such as domestic pressure from pressure groups and public opinion, is remarkably varied. The wishes of greener pioneer states on any specific policy proposal are seldom totally satisfied since the EU policy process entails hard bargaining and several concessions. However, because businesses seeking access to the European market are required to adopt the same standards, the overall effect of legislation has been to raise environmental standards throughout the Community and beyond.

Too often, discussions of the global political economy are presented as stark binary choices: market liberals hail globalisation and free trade as the only means of reducing pollution, while environmentalists are eager to denounce them as harmful to the environment. This chapter has shown that more nuanced and impartial discussions are required. Globalisation and commerce have effects on the environment that are neither entirely positive nor entirely negative. Positively, globalisation and free trade provide the means to expand the scope of the ecological modernization discourse beyond the borders of the original industrial powers. While the EU has emerged as a progressive environmental force both within the twenty-five member states and as an international actor, the WTO, which is frequently criticised in environmentalist circles, may have been unfairly treated in some of its rulings. On the balance sheet, there are unquestionably negative entries as well. The degree of increase in production, consumption, and waste linked with the rise of the global economy now seems to surpass the environmental benefits of trade. The Brundtland Report's notion that globalisation was already taking place and that ecological sustainability necessitated finding answers to the economic, political, and social issues raised by global capitalism, the unfair international trade system, and the influence of TNCs was one of its strongest points. Recent trends, such as the dominance of corporate interests at the Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development, the likelihood that an environmental agenda will not be implemented in the Doha trade round, and the reluctance of international financial institutions to apply more than a thin coat of "greenwash" to their operations, show that the sustainable development discourse is still battling to influence the state of the world economy[7], [8].

Government Greening

The usual reaction of governments to the pace and scope of global change has been a reluctance to adequately acknowledge the need for change themselves. Institutionally, people in charge of overseeing the economy are separated from those in charge of controlling the environment and natural resources. The interconnected economic and ecological processes that make up the actual world won't change; the relevant institutions and policies must.

The last two chapters shift attention to the nation state where the majority of environmental policy is developed and carried out: The manner that governments incorporate environmental concerns into the policymaking process is covered in Chapter 11, and the tools that governments employ to execute policy are covered in Chapter 12. The growth of "environmental governance," in which governments more often collaborate with other players, such as business, NGOs, and individual citizens, to promote sustainable development, is a recurrent issue.

Even in its more limited forms, sustainable development has a significant impact on how government functions. Institutions, administrative practises, and decision-making processes must all be updated in order to implement environmental governance. In order for environmental concerns to be integrated throughout government and permeate everyday decision processes inside every sector, policy elites need to reconsider how they see the world. In other words, government must change in order to accomplish the environmental policy integration required for sustainable development[9].

This chapter evaluates the transition to more environmentally friendly governance by looking at the application of three key sustainable development principles: integration, planning, and democracy. In the introduction, it is stated that there are two main ways to achieve greater integration: first, through organisational changes like the establishment of new environmental ministries and agencies; and second, through the application of administrative methods like cost-benefit analysis, risk assessment, and environmental impact assessment. The following section reviews initiatives made at the European Union, national, and local levels of government to enhance policy coordination via improved strategic planning of sustainable development. The final section analyses the role of democracy in environmental decision-making within the nation state by evaluating the contribution of public inquiries and other democratic or participatory mechanisms to advancing sustainable development, as a complement to the discussion of democracy in terms of the independence of the sovereign state.

Integration

In recent years, the idea of "environmental policy integration" has taken centre stage more and more. Despite some disagreement over the term's precise definition, two broad definitions of integration can be distinguished. A similar, if slightly more specific, institution-based definition distinguishes between vertical and horizontal EPI, or the degree to which a government sector has adopted and implemented environmental objectives as a key component of its portfolio. Vertical EPI refers to the extent to which a government sector has adopted and implemented envi- ronmental objectives as a key feature of its portfolio. While administrative techniques like environmental impact assessment can improve intrasectoral integration by encouraging policymakers in each sector to regularly and thoroughly consider the environmental consequences of their actions, reforms of the government's machinery, such as the creation of new organisations and committees, are primarily but not exclusively intended to improve inter-sectoral, or horizontal, integration.

Organisational restructuring for Integration

Initial efforts to enhance horizontal integration in several nations resulted in the establishment of a new ministry of the environment. Early in the 1970s, Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, Austria, and Britain saw the formation of the first MEs; however, Germany, Finland, Italy, and Sweden did not do so until the middle of the 1980s, while Iceland and Spain did not create their MEs until 1990 and 1996, respectively.1 The majority of OECD nations currently have a ME, but not the United States. The choice to establish a ME was

often indicative of the conventional paradigm: a clear indication of a government's interest in environmental preservation while cleanly classifying it as a distinct policy area. Separation, however, has often meant marginalisation in real life.

The issues with horizontal coordination have only been partly overcome by MEs. Many blatantly environmental abilities originally remained beyond the purview of MEs, despite the fact that they combine a variety of tasks that were previously handled by different departments and organisations. Although there has been more function consolidation over time, there is still some fragmentation in every country. For instance, in the Netherlands, Croatia, and the Czech Republic, other ministries are in charge of water management. There is more demand to combine certain economic and environmental tasks as a result of the advent of global challenges like climate change, which call for better coordination of plans involving energy and transportation regulations. Because of this, the British government established a new "super-department" of Environment, Transport, and the Regions in 1997. However, in 2001, this cumbersome and internally divided ministry was once again dismantled when Environment was combined with the Agriculture, and Food Safety Portfolios in a new Department of Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs. Sweden's creation of a Ministry of Sustainable Development, which combines energy, construction, and housing with traditional environmental responsibilities, is an example of a progressive initiative. This ministry has the specific mandate to coordinate sustainable development and climate policy across government. However, attempts to increase a ME's authority and jurisdiction frequently get into turf wars with long-standing "economic" ministries, like transport or energy, who are reluctant to give up their positions[10].

There are essentially two types of environmental ministries. One has a solely environmental mandate, which results in a distinct but limited policy emphasis. A risk in this situation is that the ME might become politically alone. A tiny, inconsequential department that often has a weak minister may act as the government's lone, ineffectual voice for the environment. The French Ministry of the Environment, for instance, has a defined objective but limited autonomous policymaking capabilities and relies on collaboration with other agencies to move things forward. Although it frequently acts more like "an internal government pressure group than the central focus of a major sectoral policy domain," the Ministry has been marginalised despite banging the drum of environmental protection loudly. Similar to the German Ministry for the Environment, which is more powerful, it has little to no influence over many fundamental "environmental issues" that are the purview of other ministries, such as transport and agricultural policy, and, like other MEs, it has a little budget. Another generalist ME model calls for the consolidation of several environmental and non-environmental responsibilities under a single department. Housing, local government, agriculture/rural affairs, heritage, and food safety are common partners for the environment. Belgium has a Ministry for Social Affairs, Public Health, and the Environment, to put it more generally. Although a larger ministry may give a minister greater clout within the government, environmental issues may not always be prioritised at the top of the ME agenda.

A number of variables affect a ME's power. The political climate is crucial, especially the degree of environmental concern and the issue's importance, which will greatly influence the amount of leadership engagement. The size of the budget and a strong personnel complement are important internal variables, especially if, as in Norway, the ME has its own field organisation of inspectors, scientists, and other experts. The staff of the ME may need to come from a wide range of backgrounds in order to balance the hard-nosed technocrats, such as engineers, agronomists, and economists, with biologists and environmental managers, who are more likely to be 'environmentalists' by nature and training.

Environmental issues now have unquestionably received more attention from the government and have better policy coordination because to the consolidation of environmental duties under a single ministry. As a result of the rearrangement of operational tasks brought on by the creation of a ME, existing policy networks or advocacy coalitions may be upended, potentially placing policy areas that have historically been controlled by producer organisations under the purview of a ME that is more receptive to the environmental lobby. Where MEs are relatively powerful, such as in Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden, and the Netherlands, they have enough autonomy to serve as the focal point for stronger coalitions of consumer and environmental interests. Territorial warfare may occur from efforts by a ME to challenge control over a certain policy area, especially as it gets more entrenched. Therefore, land use and food safety issues have historically fallen under the purview of agriculture ministries, but MEs have progressively demanded control over these activities due to their significant environmental impacts. But neither the large, all-encompassing model nor the small, narrow model has been able to get rid of the long-standing sectoral divisions of government. Conflict between economic ministries and MEs is still prevalent. The ME often loses in interministerial disagreements since it is politically weak and frequently up against a coalition of opposing ministries, unless the minister is very skilled at forging coalitions. This is a significant issue since in the majority of nations, the ME is in charge of implementing sustainable development throughout the whole government[11].

CONCLUSION

The ME often serves as the sponsor for a variety of regulatory bodies in charge of carrying out environmental law and policy. Similar to the growth of MEs, the administrative history of environmental regulation often shows a growing concentration of duties that were formerly dispersed over several departments and levels of government. The US Environmental Protection organisation, a federal organisation established in 1970 with legislative and judicial support to enforce environmental laws and regulations across states and sectors, served as a model for a strong cross-sectoral organisation. The 1967-formed Swedish EPA, which likewise has a broad range of tasks, has grown to be a significant player in Swedish environmental policy. Other nations have chosen a less robust model. In Britain, a number of agencies that dealt with radioactive, solid, and waterborne waste were gradually merged into the Environment Agency, which was established in 1996.

REFERENCES:

[1] P. Kellogg, “Canada’s National Questions, Free Trade and the Left,” *Social. Stud. Social.*, 2021, doi: 10.18740/ss27317.

[2] A. Choudry, “Struggles against bilateral FTAs: Challenges for transnational global justice activism,” *Stud. Soc. Justice*, 2013, doi: 10.26522/ssj.v7i1.1052.

[3] C. Posada, “Futuro del TPP ante el retiro de EE.UU.,” *Agenda Int.*, 2017, doi: 10.18800/agenda.201701.002.

[4] P. Solón, “A New Alter-Globalization Movement,” *NACLA Rep. Am.*, 2016, doi: 10.1080/10714839.2016.1228171.

[5] K. W. Lee, “NAFTA’s Impact on Korean Exports,” *Int. Stud. Rev.*, 2020, doi: 10.1163/2667078x-00601002.

[6] E. R. Shaffer, H. Waitzkin, J. Brenner, and R. Jasso-Aguilar, “Ethics in Public Health Research: Global Trade and Public Health,” *Am. J. Public Health*, 2005.

[7] M. Warner and J. Gerbasi, “Rescaling and reforming the state under NAFTA: Implications for subnational authority,” *Int. J. Urban Reg. Res.*, 2004, doi: 10.1111/j.0309-1317.2004.00556.x.

[8] S. P. Mumme and D. Lybecker, “The Commission for Environmental Cooperation as a model for promoting sustainable development in the Americas,” *Int. J. Sustain. Soc.*, 2011, doi: 10.1504/IJSSOC.2011.039919.

[9] E. Sader, “The weakest link? Neoliberalism in Latin America,” *New Left Rev.*, 2008.

[10] M. Mendelsohn, R. Wolfe, and A. Parkin, “Globalization, trade policy and the permissive consensus in Canada,” *Can. Public Policy*, 2002, doi: 10.2307/3552227.

[11] M. M. J. Chan, “US trade strategy of ‘competitive liberalization,’” *Tamkang Journal of International Affairs*. 2005.

CHAPTER 23

USING ADMINISTRATIVE METHODS TO INTEGRATE

Dr. Purnima Nag, Professor
Department of Chemistry, School of Engineering & Technology, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India
Email id purnima.nag@jnujaipur.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The use of administrative strategies that integrate environmental concerns into decision-making in a "rational" manner is another way that governments can enhance integration. This will ensure that decisions are based on complete scientific and technical knowledge and expertise rather than on short-term political motivations. The three methods covered in this sectionenvironmental impact assessment, risk assessment, and cost-benefit analysispromise to regularly integrate environmental factors into policy decisions in many policy areas. All are employed quite frequently in policy fields where decisions frequently have significant environmental effects, if sporadically and inconsistently.

KEYWORDS:

Administrative, Environmental,Government,Integrate, Policy.

INTRODUCTION

The only one of the three procedures that was created specifically to detect possible environmental issues and prevent them is environmental impact assessment. An environmental impact statement is a non-technical report that is based on extensive consultation with a wide range of affected government agencies, professional experts, interest groups, and the general public. It offers a systematic process for the evaluation of the anticipated environmental impact of a proposed development, taking into account social, political, and cultural factors. The purpose of an EIA is to persuade the developerwhether a government agency or a private company—to take environmental factors into account when making decisions. When the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 mandated that all significant legislative proposals and federal actions that might have an impact on the human environment be accompanied by an EIS, the USA took the lead in the use of EIA. Since the mid-1980s, the annual number has decreased to about 500 from an initial peak of around 2,000 EIA reports in 1971. An EIA is necessary in the European Union for a variety of governmental and commercial enterprises. In the EU, there are around 14,000–15,000 EIAs conducted annually, while the number in each state varies greatly, from about 10 in Austria to over 7000 in France.

A risk assessment determines the probable effects of exposure to a specific danger, such as lead in the air, nitrates in drinking water, or hazardous waste on a closed industrial site, on both human health and the environment. Risk is frequently expressed as a dose-response assessment, which quantifies the relationship between a substance's amount of exposure and the severity of its toxic effects, or as an overall risk characterization, which evaluates the health risk from exposure to a hazard. For instance, the additional risk of developing cancer from exposure to a specific chemical over the course of an average lifetime may be estimated to be one in a million people. Since it is "the dominant language for discussing environmental

policy in the EPA," risk assessment is now widely used to evaluate environmental risk, particularly in the USA.

Cost-benefit analysis is a well-known economic method that may be used to evaluate practically any choice. To establish whether a proposal would 'objectively' raise or reduce overall social welfare, the costs and benefits of an intervention, such as a plan to construct a new road or control the use of a dangerous pesticide, are weighed. Every prospective cost and benefit are given a monetary value, or shadow price, by CBA to guarantee that like is compared with like. In the past, CBA has a propensity to downplay or disregard environmental costs, enabling several ecologically harmful projects to get through. However, a lot of environmental economists contend that since financial considerations are typically taken into account when making decisions, an extended CBA that accurately values environmental harms can be a great way to protect the environment. Policymakers are compelled to consider a proposal's environmental impact in addition to its narrow economic benefits when the environment is valued in the same 'currency' as other costs and benefits.3 CBA is used globally in all areas of public policy, though it is used for environmental regulation much more frequently in the USA than in Europe. Pearce provides two reasons for why it is still relatively well-liked in the USA. First, CBA has been seen as a tool to increase government efficiency, particularly by Republicans. Second, CBA has been heavily used to decide court settlements due to the prevalence of liability laws and a larger tendency to utilise the courts than in Europe.

In conclusion, there are two environmental arguments in favour of all three techniques. First, they provide a rational way to incorporate environmental factors, particularly those marked by scientific uncertainty, into formal decision-making processes. Second, they should motivate policymakers to routinely consider how their decisions will affect the environment. However, the methods are widely criticised, especially by environmentalists. In fact, many experts believe that these methods might harm rather than serve environmental interests. Five major issues are at the centre of the discussion of their advantages and disadvantages.

First, although each method claims that it is a logical instrument for analysis, none is a precise science. For instance, risk assessment is often empirical and based on epidemiology or animal research, although frequently neither are trustworthy or precise enough to establish convincing risk evaluations. The scientific claims around risk assessment are supported by a purportedly rigorous technique that, in reality, often rely on "a variety of assumptions and subjective judgements as much as it depends upon empirical observation or testing." As a result, many risk assessments are very speculative, rendering them open to dispute from future scientific study, which might have costly and humiliating repercussions for decision-makers. Therefore, government officials ordered all residents to leave the city at a cost of $139 million in 1974 after studies revealed that the diox-ins present in waste oil sprayed on roads in Times Beach, Missouri, may be highly carcinogenic and have contributed to the ill health of children and horses. A few years later, the top official in charge said that while the evacuation was based on the most up-to-date scientific data, it had been unnecessary. Definitive risk assessment is almost hard when the research supporting it is fast moving into uncharted area, as it is with GMOs right now. The conclusion for risk assessment is that "No satisfactory way has been devised of measuring risk to the natural environment, even in principle, let alone defining what scale of risk should be regarded as tolerable," as the esteemed Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution in Britain put it.

The difficulty of placing a price on environmental costs, such as the loss of endangered ecosystems or damage from acid rain, is also a severe methodological issue with CBA. There are methods to try to solve this issue, such contingent value, which asks individuals how

much they would spend to safeguard a vulnerable ecosystem. The worth of a human life may be determined using a variety of methods. They are unable to mask the subjectivity and ambiguity at the core of CBA, however. On the other hand, although incorrect or inadequate data may also damage an EIA, its authority may be diminished by its qualitative process and its findings' transparency. The terms of reference for a specific EIA may also result in biassed results, especially when, as in Australia, it is the private developer's job to conduct the EIA rather than an impartial authority. Each of the three methodologies has inherent conceptual and technological flaws that make it susceptible to accusations of bias, inaccuracy, and imprecision while being promoted as impartial instruments of rational analysis.

Second, these methodological flaws exacerbate the tense relationship between research and politics that underlies a lot of environmental issues. Even risk assessment experts are unable to agree on what degree of risk is "acceptable"; instead, they pass the issue on to policymakers, who may be influenced by public opinion when selecting how to handle a specific risk. Public perceptions of risk, however, are socially constructed and based on a variety of variables, such as an individual's place in society and whether or not the potential consequences of an action are immediate or delayed. Consequently, 'NIMBYism' is often fueled by a great exaggeration of the true danger to health from a planned development, such as an incinerator or land-fill site, yet ferocious public opposition may convince the politician to disregard a scientific risk assessment that finds the idea to be safe. In contrast, individuals are more accepting of hazards they willingly accept, such as those associated with smoking or activities where quitting may result in significant financial hardship, such as automobile ownership.

DISCUSSION

Ecocentrically speaking, CBA is immoral since it assigns a monetary value to nature or animals. It may be argued that because the practise of valuing human life is widespread in the delivery of healthcare, where the distribution of limited resources necessitates comparable challenging trade-offs between priorities, why not apply it to nature as well? While monetary valuation may be significant for some small-scale localised air or noise pollution incidents, many significant environmental goods are simply not commensurable in this manner. How can a threatened species, irreplaceable rainforest, or a healthy ozone layer be valued? Although a CBA may offer useful information for decision-makers, risk assessment's claims to objectivity frequently do not make them any more capable of mediating disputes between competing interests. In the end, this seeming weakness may not be a bad thing since political decisions should never be reduced to a quantitative exercise. Instead, they should be made based on discretion. The advantage of EIA in this regard is that it acknowledges that broader social, cultural, and political considerations must be taken into account, underpinning its longer checklist of potential impacts and lack of a conclusive conclusion, whereas CBA reduces the flexibility for political judgement by providing a clear calculation about whether the benefits of a proposal exceed the costs.

Thirdly, all three strategies are vulnerable to scrutiny and manipulation if they are used in a political context. Risk assessment is a weapon that may be used in disputes between regulators and regulated, or between developers and the public, due to the uncertainties that are inherent in it. Many risk assessment methodologies, including "worst case scenarios" and adding a "extra margin of safety," are criticised for exaggerating the level of risk. Environmentalists applaud the 'better to be safe than sorry' approach to human and environmental safety, which fits well with the precautionary principle, while neo-liberal critics worry that this conservative bias may unnecessarily alarm the public and encourage the government to regulate more than is necessary. A risk assessment might be interpreted in

many different ways in real life. Despite identical risk evaluations, the reason why a specific insecticide is permitted in one nation but not in another may be primarily attributed to the varied lobbying coalitions that have lined up for and against a ban in each country. These coalitions are made up of industrial, agricultural, consumer, and environmental interests[1].

Additionally susceptible to manipulation are these administrative strategies. They may be used by policymakers to defend choices they have already made. Or, when facing public opposition to a contentious project like a new incinerator, civil servants may use an EIA because it "enhances the appearance of rationality and thus serves to undermine environmental opposition to development projects," not because it makes the decision more rational. As a result, opinions regarding how EIAs affect particular agency decisions are split, which is not unexpected. Few projects are actually terminated entirely as a consequence of an EIA in the USA; instead, EIAs "are more likely to compel incremental, though occasionally environmentally valuable, modifications in major federal programmes." Comparably, relatively few projects in the EU are abandoned as a consequence of an EIA. The ring road around Stockholm and the O'Resund bridge between Sweden and Denmark were two significant infrastructure investments in Sweden during the 1990s that were permitted after an EIA failed to provide compelling evidence of their environmental acceptability. They continued because they had the support of significant economic interests, to put it briefly. Nevertheless, as one Danish study shows, EIAs frequently lead to minor design modifications, and in a small number of cases, major changes are required.

CBA is susceptible to political trickery as well, particularly "institutional capture" by the state and other public institutions. In instance, it is quite simple to support judgements based on other factors using the discount rate, which determines future costs and benefits. In spite of substantial environmental opposition, governmental authorities have been able to defend a number of projects, most notably dam and irrigation projects in the United States. Indeed, due to its emphasis on financial cost, CBA has gained support from right-wing opponents of "excessive" environmental regulation who believe that its wider adoption would lessen the regulatory burden on industry and aid in instilling a greater sensitivity to costs in bureaucrats. Early in the 1980s under the Reagan administration, and again under the Republican Congress in 1995, a broader range of problems were included in which federal agencies had to first conduct a CBA before implementing any significant new regulations. The Conservative administration in the UK made sure that the law establishing a new Environment Agency required it to conduct CBA before making any significant interventions, a condition that environmentalists feared would impair its ability to preserve the environment. It is understandable that many environmentalists are wary of CBA given these friends.

Fourth, all three methods have a significant anti-democratic component since their administrative rationality legitimises "governance by the experts" and prevents people from having a say. These strategies favour a select group of elite stakeholders by giving professional specialists a dominant role, such as economists, scientists, or lawyers, especially when the specific analysis is not made public. Conflict over a choice is only allowed when there is something at risk for which one party is ready to pay and who is aware of or directly impacted by the conflict. In fact, CBA may be a mechanism to keep a dispute from becoming public and coming to the attention of democratic institutions like legislatures, political parties, courts, and the press. Sagoff convincingly shows that our choices as consumers may be quite different from our choices as citizens. CBA proponents defend CBA as democratic on the basis of the economic argument that its values are those of the public expressed via their private choices in the market-place. Although we may prefer plastic disposable bottles

for their convenience as consumers, we may decide to outlaw them as citizens because of their negative environmental effects. From the perspective of sustainable development, it could be preferable if decision-makers relied on citizens' long-term concern for environmental protection rather than consumers' short-term individual preferences. EIA, on the other hand, has more potential for democratic participation since it comprises a formal, public process of consultation with a variety of stakeholders, including governmental agencies, business organisations and organisations that represent the interests of consumers, the environment, and the general public. By allowing them access to information, the right to comment on the reports, and the ability to ask for judicial review of the EIA preparation, EIA gives environmental and citizen organisations the chance to participate in the decision-making process. Governments in Australia have utilised EIA to gauge public opinion on projects as well as to put off making difficult choices[2].

Last but not least, if these strategies are used carelessly, they disregard distributional and equitable issues. Risk assessment often ignores any uneven distribution of risk across various groups, but this raises crucial political issues such whether a danger that is centred on a few people is more or less acceptable than one that is uniformly distributed. Concerning how much socially and economically disadvantaged groups are exposed to higher levels of risk, there are also larger environmental justice issues. Heavy polluting industries, incinerators, and garbage disposal facilities are undoubtedly disproportionately found in neighbourhoods that are home to minority ethnic communities in the USA. Few CBAs also note differences in the incidence of costs and benefits on various groups. Theoretically, if the terms of reference are broad enough to include all distributional consequences, EIA is more likely to identify these distribu- tional concerns.

We may go back to the two-fold argument that these administrative procedures make environmental decision-making more logical and, in doing so, urge politicians to take environmental concerns into account more often to determine if they promote integration. It is obvious that methods like EIA are not yet commonly used by governments in most nations; few bureaucrats instinctively take environmental considerations into account in the same manner that they immediately assess the financial cost of new ideas. Indeed, many environmentalists still view the three techniques with ambivalence or hostility because they promise a more rigorous and systematic approach to dealing with environmental factors but are frequently used at the expense of the environment. However, they are merely administrative tools that provide data to enhance the policymaking process. These methodologies are not necessarily intrinsically biassed towards the environment if certain methodological advancements are realised.

Instead, what can unfairly prejudice environmental interests is the way that powerful actors, particularly government agencies representing economic interests, use and manipulate these tools to serve their own political ends. Despite their shortcomings, these techniques, especially EIA, can aid in integrating environmental concerns into the bureaucratic mindset and aid policy elites in social learning. As various American studies have shown, agency policies may have some beneficial environmental effects as a consequence of their involvement in the EIA preparation process. A creative conflict between EIA experts and other bureaucrats may raise everyone on staff's understanding of the environment. By making appropriate changes to plans, policymakers and developers may be able to foresee certain environmental concerns and avoid a necessary EIA. Even if policymakers are merely considering how to overcome environmentalists' objections to a project, the tactics at least make them think about the environment[3].

The fact that these three methods still often follow the conventional paradigm by being applied to particular judgements rather than the underlying policy is one larger issue. Therefore, despite the fact that a number of the specific road projects that sparked anti-road demonstrations in Britain during the 1990s were the subject of an EIA, the environmental impact of the Conservative government's underlying massive road-building programme was never evaluated. There is evidence that the emphasis on individual projects in "tactical" environmental impact assessments is gradually giving way to strategic environmental evaluation. The European Commission views the 2004 implementation of a new EU directive on strategic environmental assessment as a crucial step towards the full integration of sustainable development across core economic sectors.4 One of the most inventive examples of this strategic shift is the New Zealand Resource Management Act 1991, which mandated environmental assessment for all regional policies, regional agendas, and regional plans. Where a national government takes seriously the planning for sustainable development, this kind of strategic framework is most likely to develop.

Planning

Multiple levels of government must plan for sustainable development. Traditionally, sub-national governments have handled other environmental issues, including land use planning, where flexibility and local knowledge may produce better policy. These controversial or dangerous issues include nuclear power, hazardous waste, and air pollution. Federal systems, including those in Germany, Australia, and the USA, have kept strong environmental capabilities by the states. Recent years have seen a change in the location of policymaking towards the federal government due to two opposing influences. National governments are under growing pressure from the supranational level to enact new laws and policies in order to fulfil their obligations under international treaties, such as reducing carbon emissions or, in the case of the EU, implementing environmental regulations. On the other hand, from inside the nation state, the deteriorating health of the environment and its increasing political importance have prompted most national governments to curtail duties that were formerly carried out at the sub-national level. Nevertheless, achieving sustainable development will still require a multilevel strategy, preferably based on the subsidiarity principle, which places responsibility at the lowest effective governmental level. To summarise, subsidiarity comprises a fundamental concept of administrative efficacy supported by a secondary principle of decentralisation, which brings us back to the centralization-decentralization conundrum. This section discusses initiatives to enhance planning at the supranational, national, and local levels of government in light of this multilayer approach[4].

Plans for EU Environmental Action

An innovative effort to coordinate and integrate environmental policies across national borders is the EU's environmental initiatives. When the European Community started approving environmental laws intended to ensure that uniform standards existed across member states, the first Environmental Action Plan was launched in 1973. Despite the fact that the first EAP established a number of significant and forward-thinking ideas, including the need of preventative action, in actuality the first three EAPs adopted a regulatory, end-of-pipe strategy that was firmly rooted in the conventional paradigm. The fourth EAP identified an ambitious nineteen priority areas and made modest attempts towards integrating environmental issues into other EU policies after an integration provision was incorporated in the 1987 Single European Act.

The fifth EAP, notably titled Towards Sustainability and suffused with the language of ecological modernization, outlined a bold strategy to improve integration focused on five key

sectors: tourism, industry, energy, transport, and agriculture. This was done using a variety of policy initiatives and instruments, including sustainable tourism, industrial eco-audits and eco-labels, energy conservation schemes, carbon taxes, and set-aside schemes protecting environmentally sensitive areas. Despite the fact that a number of these initiatives were carried out, a formal assessment of the fifth EAP noted that "practical progress towards sustainable development has been rather limited." There was very little progress made towards intersectoral integration, with the exception of the industrial sector, since it was particularly difficult to convince other Directorates-General within the Commission to prioritise environmental challenges above their own sectoral goals. The EU seems to be failing, much like many national governments, to foster the type of profound social learning among policy elites that may pave the way for broader integration of environmental factors. The assessment study also lamented the lack of "clear recognition of commitment from member states and stakeholders," citing, for instance, how their refusal to reach an agreement on a major overhaul of the Common Agrarian Policy overshadowed any little benefits from set-aside programmes. An attempt to jump-start the integration process at the Cardiff Summit of EU leaders in June 1998 by generating stronger political commitment and identifying key strategies and tools needed to bring it to fruition had some positive effect, though unevenly across sectors. However, 'the commitment of the EU's political leadership to environmental integration remains volatile, especially during difficult economic times,' said one participant[5], [6].

With Environment 2010: Our Future, Our Choice, the sixth EAP, several of its shortcomings will be addressed. It comprises five theme strategies, including the integration of environmental policy and the more effective implementation of current policies, and four priorities: combating climate change, preserving nature and biodiversity, the environment and human health, and resource and waste management. For the Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development, the EU released a separate sustainable development strategy document, A Sustainable Europe for a Better World, which outlined a three-pronged strategy based on pursuing economic growth, social inclusion, and environmental protection side by side. Although some progress had been made, a lot still needed to be done, according to a brief interim review published in 2005. In particular, it called for "clearer objectives, targets, and related deadlines" to provide focus and enable accurate monitoring of progressa request that is frequently made for national and local level plans. Following this, a revised strategy document with four goalsenvironmental protection, social equity and cohesion, economic prosperity, and upholding the EU's obligations abroadwas released in June 2006[7], [8].

CONCLUSION

There is currently no evidence to indicate that the sixth EAP will succeed where its predecessor failed or that the scheme to create a distinct sustainable development plan would provide noticeably better results. While the goals are admirable and there can and will be some small improvements in the way policies are made as well as their content, more than ten years of EU plans that explicitly incorporated sustainable development principles have failed to eliminate the deeply ingrained sectoral divisions. One issue is the lack of member state commitment, but considering that it also doesn't exist in the domestic planning process, this is not unexpected.

REFERENCES:

[1] A. A. J. Venter, T. H. H. Herbst, and C. G. Iwu, “What will it take to make a successful administrative professional in the fourth industrial revolution?,” *SA J. Hum. Resour. Manag.*, 2019, doi: 10.4102/sajhrm.v17i0.1224.

[2] J. M. Evans *et al.*, "Integrating early palliative care into routine practice for patients with cancer: A mixed methods evaluation of the INTEGRATE Project," *Psychooncology.*, 2019, doi: 10.1002/pon.5076.

[3] Z. Baharuldin, S. Jamaluddin, and M. S. N. Shaharom, "The Role of School Administrative Support and Primary School Teachers' ICT Literacy to Integrate ICT into the Classrooms in Pahang, Malaysia," *Int. Online J. Educ. Leadersh.*, 2020, doi: 10.22452/iojel.vol3no1.3.

[4] A. Al-Muallem, M. Elzubeir, C. Roberts, and M. Magzoub, "Development and Initial Testing of an Instrument for Evaluating Needs and Inferring Readiness of Research Supervisors: A Mixed Methods Approach," *Heal. Prof. Educ.*, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.hpe.2016.03.001.

[5] T. Brenton, *The greening of machiavelli: The evolution of international environmental politics*. 2019. doi: 10.4324/9780429273391.

[6] A. K. Winter, "The green city citizen: Exploring the ambiguities of sustainable lifestyles in Copenhagen," *Environ. Policy Gov.*, 2019, doi: 10.1002/eet.1837.

[7] S. Schunz, "The European Union's environmental foreign policy: from planning to a strategy?," *Int. Polit.*, 2019, doi: 10.1057/s41311-017-0130-0.

[8] L. N. Mills, "The conflict over the proposed LNG hub in Western Australia's Kimberley region and the politics of time," *Extr. Ind. Soc.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.exis.2018.08.002.

CHAPTER 24

A STUDY ON IDEAS FOR A GREENER NATION

Dr. Deepankar Sharma, Assistant Professor
Department of Chemistry, School of Engineering & Technology, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India
Email id-deepankar@jnujaipur.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

As the world becomes increasingly aware of the impact of human activity on the environment, the need for a greener nation has become paramount. A greener nation is one that is committed to sustainability, conservation of resources, and reducing carbon emissions. In this abstract, we explore some of the key ideas that could help to create a greener nation.One idea is to invest in renewable energy sources, such as solar, wind, and hydropower. This can help to reduce the reliance on fossil fuels, which are a significant source of carbon emissions. Additionally, promoting energy efficiency in buildings, transportation, and industrial processes can also help to reduce the overall carbon footprint.Another important aspect of creating a greener nation is promoting sustainable agriculture and land use practices. This can include reducing food waste, promoting organic farming, and preserving natural habitats. Additionally, supporting green transportation options such as walking, cycling, and public transportation can reduce the environmental impact of transportation.

KEYWORDS:

Development Strategies, Environment, Greener Nation, Politics, Transportation.

INTRODUCTION

Most OECD nations, including 19 of the EU25 members, have published national sustainable development strategies, or "green plans," since the late 1980s. These plans include long-term objectives, policies, and deadlines that also aim to enhance both horizontal and vertical integration. The most comprehensive initiatives have come from nations like Norway, Sweden, and the Netherlands where the idea that there must be a trade-off between environmental and economic goals had already been contested before the Agenda 21 process propelled the concept of green plans onto the global scene. With its 'ecologically sustainable development' process to create its National Strategy document in 1990, Australia briefly led the pack. Although few commitments were made regarding implementation, many documents were created merely to satisfy the Agenda 21 requirement that all governments produce a national plan. While the German document was not published or even translated there, Agenda 21 has almost no domestic political relevance in the USA and Canada[1], [2].

These plans represent a first step towards an approach to environmental policy that is more strategic and all-encompassing, although one comparative analysis of sixteen green plans found that they are only "pilot strategies" and "a first step towards intersectoral communication." The pledges are hazy, there aren't many new policy efforts, the aims are often unsatisfactory, and there aren't many specific targets mentioned. These plans' timidity often reflects the concessions that governments must make to influential economic sectors and producer interests. While acknowledging the shortcomings and instability of many of these plans, a different comparative study does find two encouraging trends. First, there is a

propensity for objectives to become more precisely defined over time, with quantifiable targets to measure performance, notably in Sweden, Britain, and Canada. In fact, a number of nations, including Sweden and Britain, have now created new or significantly modified policy texts. Second, as governments see the need for broader consultation to find and legitimise answers to difficult environmental concerns, collaborative and participatory aspects of the strategic planning process are increasing in various nations, particularly the Netherlands[3].

The Dutch National Environmental Policy Plan, a comprehensive and ambitious strategy that was generally hailed as a true "success" upon its 1989 unveiling, is the paradigm for a green plan. The goal of NEPP was to enhance both intra- and inter-sectoral integration of environmental factors into daily policy processes in key ministries including agriculture, energy, and transportation. The reorganisation of the government's structure was expressly rejected by NEPP in favour of a strategy centred on developing new procedures for policy making that create coordination and integration. There were 50 strategic goals in all, with more than 200 quantitative targets to be met by different deadlines up to 2010. For instance, the goal of reducing acidification was accompanied by costed targets outlining percentage decreases in the level of emissions of important chemicals like SO2 and N2O, which were then divided into separate targets for various activities like traffic, energy supply, industry, and households.

Other environmental issues, such as garbage disposal, eutrophication, and climate change were also addressed by establishing targets. NEPP gave the environment ministry the resources to coordinate a national environmental plan and the political muscle to enact it when it was approved by the four major ministries of the environment, economy, transport, and agriculture. NEPP obtained a legal foundation in 1993. The collaborative process of coming to an agreement and carrying out the plan helped to more effectively integrate environmental issues across a complete spectrum of public policies and offered a framework for "social learning" so that decision-makers in all sectors frequently "think environment." Target groups were encouraged to take on more responsibility for environmental protection by developing a sense of ownership of the targets, while also being given the flexibility to achieve them in their own way, thanks to the "target group policy" of structured consultation and negotiation of targets in the form of voluntary agreements between government representatives and key industrial interest groups.

According to one analysis, virtually all trends showed improvements over the pre-NEPP era even if objectives were not fulfilled in over half of the cases. According to Hanf and van de Gronden, reductions in significant pollutants such phosphate, SO2, and N2O have "achieved a marked reduction of pressures on and threats to the environment." There is no one factor that accounts for NEPP's relative success, but it benefited from the coincidental occurrence of two phenomena: first, the consensual style of Dutch politics, which places a high value on avoiding conflict and seeking out negotiated solutions; and second, the redefinition of environmental problems, encouraged by the discourse of ecological modernization, as requiring the participation of economic actors who were previously perceived as the cause of environmental problems but are now recognised as their solution This position remained throughout the 1990s, in part because to the persistent political backing given to NEPP by successive Dutch administrations, but also because fundamental conflicts between economic and environmental interests were generally avoided.

One worry is that, especially with respect to the basic adjustments needed to fulfil climate change objectives, business may have reached the limits of its ability to act willingly out of self-interest. As public interest in environmental issues has waned, the government has found

it more difficult to carry out the difficult task of carrying out the ambitious NEPP goals. The fourth NEPP, which was released in 2001, very well might be the last. The environment minister identified a variety of issues impeding progress towards sustainable development, including a lack of public support and issues with the Dutch economy, in a speech announcing that NEPP will be replaced with the "Future Environment Agenda." The minister said that although many of the simpler environmental issues have been effectively resolved, the Netherlands' environmental performance was "only average," with little progress being made in addressing the 'wicked problems' that are insurmountable, like climate change. The NEPP is still a valuable model for creating green policies abroad, however.

Agenda 21 Regional

At the local level, where there are several instances of distinct municipalities undertaking cutting-edge sustainability projects, there is huge opportunity for planning and integration. The Local Agenda 21 movement, which gained traction in various nations, served as a key catalyst. Because local government is the level of government closest to the people, Chapter 28 of Agenda 21 focuses on the role of local authorities in achieving sustainable development. Although LA21 does not offer a single model to adopt, it does make two key recommendations: first that the local government will take the lead in organising and facilitating change; and second, that sustainable development necessitates ongoing partnership with a variety of actors in the local community. To create a LA21 action plan for sustainable development, all local governments were urged to participate in a process of consultation and consensus-building with their residents, local groups, and enterprises. In 113 countries, including more than 80% of those in Europe, approximately 6,400 towns participated in LA21, according to a poll conducted in 2002.

DISCUSSION

The adoption of LA21 varies greatly within and within nations, although overall development seems to be quite slow. However, there are rare outliers, especially in Sweden and Great Britain. In some ways, it seems that there are significant differences in the causes of LA21's relative success in these two nations. In Britain, where the Thatcher period saw a significant decline in local government autonomy, functions, and authority, LA21 was viewed as a chance to provide local governments a new role while expanding on their historical duties for enforcing environmental legislation. Local governments were particularly drawn to LA21 because of its promise to help them regain public support and support for local economic growth. In conclusion, LA21 succeeded in spite of the lack of backing from the national government.

In contrast, many Swedish municipal governments started out with the assumption that they already had enough autonomy and authority to create far-reaching initiatives for sustainable development, including the application of different eco-taxes. Additionally, the Swedish national government gave LA21 a lot more support by allocating funds specifically for LA21 projects and by creating support networks and publicity campaigns. The existence of individual politicians and bureaucrats, or "firebrands," committed to putting sustainability on the local political agenda, is a crucial factor shared by both nations. Both Sweden and the UK, where the central government has supported a change in focus towards the construction of sustainable communities and regeneration, seem to have seen a decline in interest in LA21 in recent years. Contrarily, there is indication that LA21 has begun to gain traction in Germany and Italy after a sluggish start.

The abundance of green policies being developed at all levels of government, in general, demonstrates the universal acceptance of the need for a more strategized, integrated approach

to sustainable development. The majority of green plans have failed to impress in both conception and implementation. In particular, governments all over the world have struggled to foster sectoral environmental responsibility in key polluting industries like transportation, energy, and agriculture, despite hesitant attempts to plan better integration. However, drawing lessons from green national plans that have had some success, like the NEPP, has revealed some important traits of'successful' plans. It is crucial to have efficient monitoring and measuring methods in place, particularly similar to the NEPP sectoral goal system, since it makes it difficult to incorporate relevant objectives in plans and assess progress towards sustainable development. To achieve this, several international groups and national governments have made an effort to create reliable and thorough sustainability metrics. For instance, the British government has released a list of twenty "headline indicators" that are supported by a further 48 core indicators in order to provide a limited but manageable toolbox for tracking progress towards attaining the goals outlined in the national sustainable development plan. In the end, the most significant lesson is that strong, continuous political leadership is necessary for good planning. This leadership may be institutionalised across policy areas via legislation, institutional change, defining goals, and assessing progress. Extending the use of participatory methods in the development of policy at every level of government may be one strategy to boost and maintain this political momentum.

Democracy and Involvement

The main justification for expanding democracy and involvement in decision-making is that common people must play a crucial role in achieving sustainable development, reflecting the green case for democracy covered in Chapter 3. "The law alone cannot enforce the common interest," the Brundtland Report said. It primarily requires community support and knowledge, which calls for more public involvement in choices that have an impact on the environment. A counterargument contends that increased democracy will enhance the quality of decisions made regarding complex environmental issues because, by hearing from a wide array of voices, including those of consumers, citizens, and the environment, the government is more likely to foresee issues and incorporate environmental concerns into policy. The contribution of democracy to environmental decision-making is briefly evaluated in this section[4], [5].

The majority of liberal democracies have long realised that democratic methods may be the most effective means of resolving disputes when significant environmental choices rouse fiercely held opposing interests. Public inquiries are often employed when contentious initiatives cause conflict. For instance, there have been a number of significant public enquiries in Britain into proposed nuclear sites (including a pressurised water reactor at Sizewell B, Suffolk), airport expansions, and various significant road projects. In Australia, such as the planned uranium mining in the Kakadu National Park, and in Canada, notably the Berger investigation against an oil and gas pipeline from the Arctic and an inquiry into the proposed logging in Clayaquot Sound, public hearings into large wilderness ventures have become commonplace.

A public inquiry is presided over by a person who will review a large number of depositions and hear from various witnesses who have a variety of interests before making a decision based on the evidence. The competent government body then takes the inquiry report into account before making a decision on the request. Theoretically, this participatory procedure enables the gathering of all information and the expression of all interests prior to the making of a "rational" planning choice. The terms of the inquiry, the impartiality of the presiding "judge," and the resources available to the various interests providing evidence all play a significant role in whether public inquiries are an open, pluralistic forum where all

viewpoints can be expressed.6 These factors are frequently biassed in favour of the developers; most obviously, a well-researched case will require a significant financial outlay for research, expert witnesses, and legal fees. The UK Central Electricity Generating Board spent £20 million on the Sizewell B enquiry, demonstrating how large firms can often deploy significantly more resources than are accessible to environmental organisations. The formal processes, which are dominated by legalistic vocabulary and cross-examination methods, frighten community organisations and people, which prevents true public participation. A comparative study of public inquiry procedures found that while participation is strongly desired, there is a general perception that inquiries are little more than a'mock consultation' meant to legitimise decisions that have already been made[6].

However, the openness of the forum can still provide a window of opportunity for environmentalists to take advantage of, even when a government uses a public inquiry to justify a decision it wants to make or when developers lavish enormous resources in presenting their case. Opponents may at the very least get media attention and perhaps succeed in getting the proposal modified. Plans are sometimes discarded, as was the case with the idea to mine sand on Fraser Island, part of the Australian barrier reef. John Tyme, a British activist, was able to interrupt a number of examinations into specific road projects in the 1970s by shrewd political manoeuvring and deft use of the media, forcing the government to reevaluate the whole road-building plan. In addition, other democratic processes may serve as "focusing events" around which environmental organisations can organise and employ to advance new problems on the public agenda. Referendums, for instance, which are often utilised in Switzerland and California for specific choices as well as for local planning decisions in many other countries, allow for campaigning by organisations and may increase public awareness of environmental concerns. In fact, the 'No' campaigners who participated in the referendum in 1980 on Sweden's nuclear power plan went on to establish the Green Party.

The fact that major public inquiries and referenda, like the EIA, are one-time affairs intended to settle a specific dispute rather than making involvement in decision-making a regular practise, is one disadvantage. Each choice is distinct and individual, even in countries like Britain where the public inquiry is often employed throughout the land use planning process. A step further is taken by alternative conflict resolution, which is used more often in the USA, by include a wide variety of impacted interests in the mediation process. Once again, this practise often deals with a particular environmental problem, but by including political conflict into the administrative process, it opens the door for mutual learning and compromise solutions that don't completely favour one "side" of a disagreement over the other.

According to the sustainable development rhetoric, "by promoting citizens' initiatives, empowering people's organisations, and strengthening local democracy," this form of learning via discussion and conversation will become a continuous, everyday component of the administrative process. Many of the round-table and advisory initiatives associated with Agenda 21 were therefore created to promote such discussion by offering a forum for representatives from various interest groups to discuss environmental issues and offer solutions.

More radically, there is rising interest in a variety of cutting-edge techniques that improve public debates within the policy-making process based on the tenets of green democracy, such as consensus conferences, deliberative opinion surveys, and citizen juries. The residents are brought together over a period of three to four days, they get in-depth information, they hear the perspectives of experts and interested parties, and impartial facilitators assure the fairness of the proceedings. The number of participants varies amongst the different

procedures, ranging from several hundred for a deliberative poll to merely twelve to twenty-five for the others. While all three methods rely on some form of random sampling to choose participants, citizen juries' small size necessitates stratified sampling, and applicants for consensus conferences are chosen based on socioeconomic factors. Finally, while citizen juries and consensus conferences reach a consensus, a deliberative poll records the individual decisions of citizens. There is increasing evidence of the transformational effect of these different citizen forums, albeit it is still fairly unusual, with members becoming significantly more educated and often altering their opinions and preferences. For instance, Texas public utilities conducted deliberative polls asking voters to choose amongst four resource planning options: fossil fuel facilities, renewable energy sources, investments in energy conservation, or importing energy from somewhere else. Before the debate, the public supported renewable energy; thereafter, although remaining in favour of it, they firmly supported energy saving as the most affordable approach. In addition to proving that individuals are capable of deliberating over complicated topics, citizen juries and consensus conferences both provide recommendations that take environmental concerns far more seriously than current policy. Each of the three methods is susceptible to criticism, such as whether they should be representative, if they are susceptible to manipulation, or whether they stifle conflict. They shouldn't take the place of current democratic mechanisms either. However, by gathering public opinion on complex environmental issues and offering insightful recommendations that can be incorporated into the policy-making process, they do offer a very promising complement to representative structures[7].

However, it's crucial to keep in mind that democratic processes do not always result in outcomes that are beneficial to the environment. Although they may facilitate policymaking, powerful actors frequently sabotage pluralistic processes. This is especially true because producer interests can exercise first-dimensional power by mobilising more resources for their cause. Alternately, radical viewpoints could be subdued and incorporated into the formulation of policy. Even if the 'democratic will' ultimately triumphs against power politics, it may not be a success for sustainable development. Local planning choices may result in conflicts between democratically stated desires of a local community and the sustainable development policy of the elected national government, as the UK wind energy example demonstrates. More generally, as the following chapter demonstrates, elected governments usually refrain from enacting extreme environmental programmes like limiting automobile usage or imposing eco-taxes out of concern about upsetting the majority's will at the next election.

Such contradictions are inherent to democracy and are the reason why ecological modernization and sustainable development are given different levels of priority. While acknowledging democracy's flaws, sustainable development is optimistic about democracy's ability to improve environmental policymaking and teach citizens to be more considerate of the environment. Instead of relying on the whims of democratic systems, ecological modernization puts more faith in the ability of technology innovation and the market to create a sustainable society[8].

Governments have started to alter how they tackle environmental challenges since the early 1990s, pushed on by the Agenda 21 initiative. Mosthave changed their approach to one that is more strategic and at least nods in the direction of sustainable development. Some politicians have clearly started to think about environmental concerns more often as a result of the multiplicity of institutional and administrative changes aimed to enhance integration and planning and to promote a larger democratic discussion around the idea of sustainable development. In other words, there is proof that the conventional worldview is gradually

fading. The majority of changes are still in the early stages and have had little to no influence on how the government actually functions, therefore progress towards environmental governance is, unfortunately, sluggish.

CONCLUSION

In particular, attempts to strengthen the coordination of cross-sectoral environmental programmes throughout government have been impeded by the inadequacy of environmental ministries, agencies, and green plans. It seems that there are numerous ingrained barriers to the effective implementation of sustainable development. Not to mention, few governments have shown a willingness to exercise strong, long-lasting leadership since environmental concerns continue to get little political attention. Without such political leadership, sustainable development may promise to put an end to the trade-off between the economy and the environment, but in reality, policy continues to be developed by sectoral administrative structures where producer interests are dominant, economic growth is given top priority, and environmental concerns are all too frequently treated as secondary.

REFERENCES:

[1] J. J. Schoenefeld and A. J. Jordan, "Environmental policy evaluation in the EU: between learning, accountability, and political opportunities?," *Env. Polit.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/09644016.2019.1549782.

[2] Z. Albertson, "Constructing the Klamath: Nature, Culture, and the Management of a Western River," *Soc. Nat. Resour.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/08941920.2019.1590670.

[3] P. Tobin, "Governing climate change: polycentricity in action?," *Local Gov. Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/03003930.2019.1620523.

[4] H. Sazali and I. M. Firdaus, "Highway infrastructure: Visions & challenges in the next decades," in *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, 2019. doi: 10.1088/1757-899X/512/1/012047.

[5] S. Vujović and T. Vujović, "Sustainable marketing in the function of sustainable urban mobility," *Oditor*, 2021, doi: 10.5937/oditor2103167v.

[6] A. Cerny, "Going where the grass is greener: China Kazaks and the Oralman immigration policy in Kazakhstan," *Pastoralism*, 2010.

[7] IMO, "World Maritime Day - Concept of a Sustainable Maritime Transportation System," *a Concept a Sustain. Marit. Transp. Syst.*, 2013.

[8] B. K. Greener, "International policing and international relations," *Int. Relations*, 2012, doi: 10.1177/0047117812438064.

CHAPTER 25

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES AND POLICY TOOLS

Dr. Purnima Nag, Professor
Department of Chemistry, School of Engineering & Technology, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India
Email id purnima.nag@jnujaipur.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The selection of the policy tool, or levers, by which a government attempts to accomplish its policy goals, is a crucial step in the process of creating and implementing policies. Policy instruments should be enforced, efficient, and educational. They should alter target group behaviour, accomplish the stated policy goals, and support the socialisation of environmental ideals. Regulation, voluntary action, government spending, and market-based instruments are generally seen as the four main categories of policy instruments that a government might utilise to further its environmental goals. The old environmental policy paradigm was distinguished by its dependence on 'command and control', or regulatory, tools.

KEYWORDS:

Country Regulatory, Environmental Policy, Regulation, Socialization.

INTRODUCTION

An extensive regulatory framework was established in most countries during the 1970s and 1980s as a result of new environmental legislation, but as many environmental issues persisted despite this growing "burden" of regulations, the use of regulation came under increasing fire, particularly from economists, businessmen, and right-wing politicians. As a result, MBIs are gaining acceptance as a more effective and efficient alternative to rules. Growing interest in MBIs may be one sign of a wider movement away from the conventional paradigm in favor of ecological modernisation, which is explicitly predicated on the belief that the market will bring sustainability.

The choice of policy instrument is only partially a technical question of choosing the instrument that gives the most effective or efficient method of achieving policy goals, according to a key claim of this chapter. Additionally, it is a very political process where conflicting interests influence outcomes. Given that the goal of policy tools is to change how producers and/or consumers behave, it should come as no surprise that those who stand to be impacted by these decisions would mobilise resources to do so. Political factors have really influenced how the "command and control versus MBI" argument is sometimes stylized as a choice between two starkly different systems even though, in reality, the distinctions are not that stark.

The first section of this chapter examines the advantages and disadvantages of various policy tools while focusing on the main controversy between regulation and MBIs. Additionally, it identifies some significant contextual elements that affect how well they are implemented, such as differences in national regulatory frameworks. To highlight some of the points made earlier in the chapter, the second section offers a wide review of climate change policies in the energy and transportation sectors, which are perhaps the most important and confusing policy arenas for modern policymakers.

Regulation and types of regulation Arguments for Regulation

The most popular tool for implementing environmental policy is regulation. Regulation may be broadly defined as any effort by the government to influence the conduct of individuals or corporations; but, in this context, the terms "command and control" and "coercive" regulation are used very pejoratively by many observers. It entails the government laying up the pollution control requirements that a procedure or product must follow and then utilising state officials to enforce its laws with the support of the legal system. Regulatory requirements often come in one of three shapes. The entire amount of pollutants that are allowed to be present in a certain region, such as a roadway, river, or body of water for swimming, is limited by ambient regulations. Emission regulations provide a cap on the amount of emissions that a single source is allowed to produce. For example, this kind of regulation often applies to the gases emitted by industries, automobile exhaust emissions, and the discharge of agricultural silage into rivers. Design standards mandate the use of certain materials or goods, such as unleaded fuel, or a specific sort of pollution-control equipment or manufacturing method, such as a catalytic converter in a vehicle. Additionally, the disposal of hazardous trash is restricted by strict rules. Many substances, including DDT, which were once widely used as pesticides, are either completely banned or their use is strictly regulated. Some laws are specifically designed to address how certain people should behave. Urban smokeless zones, where the burning of coal is prohibited, have been established as a result of Clean Air Acts. Additionally, cities with heavy traffic, like Florence and Athens, have imposed limits on the number of vehicles allowed in the downtown area. In addition, international systems primarily use regulation to address both common-sink and common-pool issues [1].

The policy tool most closely connected with the conventional environmental paradigm is regulation. Governments focused their early legal responses on the huge industrial polluters responsible for the majority of harmful emissions as the political significance of pollution increased throughout the 1970s. Since there were fewer businesses than consumers, they seemed simple to regulate; industry had the funds to invest in pollution prevention, and factory smokestacks and waste pipes were highly visible signs of pollution. The vast number of active legislative initiatives aimed at reducing pollution continue to make regulation the most popular tool in environmental policy. For instance, eight new regulatory programmes or significant updates to already-existing ones were introduced in the USA between 1980 and 1994. Over 600 regulations that directly impact the environment have been established by the EU. Today's environmental policy is still largely focused on the formulation and application of rules.

The attraction of regulation to policymakers is clear. It seems to give precision, predictability, and efficacy since it establishes a strict standard, informs both the regulator and the regulated of what is expected of them, and ensures enforcement via a regulatory body supported by the full weight of the law. Regulations may be administratively effective since they don't need all the details of an issue, particularly when a drug or action is outright prohibited. They may also be less costly since there is no need to look into every single issue, if there is high compliance. Regulations are often seen as fair by producers and consumers because they apply universal standards and procedures, which theoretically ensure that all polluters are treated equally. Regulations should be relatively immune from manipulation due to the political, legal, and administrative support they get from the state, which also strengthens their validity among the general public. There are several instances of effective laws, ranging from the Clean Air Act of 1956, which significantly improved the air quality in British cities, to the Montreal Protocol, which banned the manufacturing of CFCs in industrialised nations.

However, there has been a growing backlash against the usage of restrictions in many areas. The Reagan and Thatcher administrations' efforts to deregulate during the 1980s were influenced by a widespread neo-liberal backlash against the "regulatory burden," which also served as the inspiration for the Congressional Republican Party's "Contract with America," which sought to burn down "unnecessary" regulations. The majority of those who want complete deregulation have little patience for "environmentalism." Their populist rhetoric has resonated with industry complaints about an excessive regulatory burden in the USA, where they are most active. The many shortcomings of the EPA, the effect of "unnecessary" rules on competitiveness, and the expense to the taxpayer have all drawn vehement criticism. The neo-liberal backlash's use of the phrase "command and control" rather than "regulation" was one rhetorical achievement. 'Command and control' is a misnomer since regulations are seldom enforced coercively in reality, as is seen below. How many individuals will choose compulsion over the "free" market, though? Nevertheless, it constitutes a brilliant political triumph [2].

Not all opposition to regulation is thus partisan. The overall environmental record in most developed nations continued to be dismal despite the number, scope, and strictness of environmental rules constantly growing. The criteria, objectives, and processes outlined in the Act were not met by pollution control programmes introduced throughout the 1970s in the USA, UK, Germany, and other countries, according to research. Although there were sporadic instances of improved environmental performance and some nations clearly outperformed others, generally speaking it appeared that the significant resources invested in regulatory programmes had disappointing results. The US Superfund initiative for decontaminating hazardous waste sites is one well-known example. Due to "extensive litigation involved in determining responsibility for clean-ups, wasteful spending on elaborate remediation plans, and long delays in implementation," expenses have escalated in this case, averaging roughly $1.6 billion per year in the early 1990s. Although the costs were eventually covered by the taxpayer, Congress refused to reauthorize the taxes needed for the Superfund in 1995, and the funds allocated are "woefully inadequate for the task." In fact, cleanup has been finished on just 1,244 locations by April 2006, a tiny part of the contamination-inated sites, despite the program's massive expense. Thus, it could be argued that Superfund has fallen short of its most fundamental goal [3].

DISCUSSION

The two main ways that regulation is criticised are that it is inefficient and that it is ineffectual. The section on MBIs following will cover the purported ineffectiveness of regulation. The main issue with the assertion that it is ineffectual is the implementation deficit, which is simply the inability to accomplish policy goals that characterises so much environmental regulation. The inability of the state to monitor and enforce rules as well as differences in national regulatory methods may both be used to explain why regulation is ineffective.

Lack of implementation and State Failure

Regulations are often ineffective. The monitoring, compliance, and enforcement aspects of environmental control are often handled by the government or a state agency like the EPA. Problems may develop when insufficient financing hinders regulatory bodies from fully carrying out these tasks since they may be highly expensive and time-consuming. Personnel and financial constraints have significantly hampered several agencies' ability to carry out environmental policies in the USA. Congress consistently misjudged the effort created by new laws that resulted in unfeasible timelines, numerous administrative procedures, and

nearly unachievable programme goals as one new environmental programme after another was implemented. The true cause of the underfunding, however, was more evil: the Reagan administration cut the operational budgets of the EPA and other natural resource agencies with the intention of weakening their authority. Where responsibility for implementation is transferred from one level of government to another, problems can become especially severe. The implementation of federal environmental legislation, such as the requirement to issue thousands of industrial licences as required by the Clean Water Act of 1990, has sparked loud complaints from US states about the financial and administrative load they have to bear [4].

A variety of implementation issues have also plagued EU environmental policies. Importantly, there is no "European" environmental inspectorate with enforcement authority; rather, it is up to the member states to carry out EU environmental regulations. It should come as no surprise that the governments of member states treat the environment in quite different ways. One often mentioned division is that between the less developed "laggard" countries of Southern Europe and the "pioneer" environmentally modernising countries of the North. Greece, Italy, Spain, and Portugal, for instance, have historically been slower to implement EU environmental regulations into national law and, more crucially, have been very slack in doing so. This performance partially reflects fundamental infrastructure issues, such as an administrative inability to handle the expensive burden of EU directives. Southern European governments have had to create new institutions and structures since there is no history of environmental management, unlike Northern European states, which have often been able to adjust existing organisations to react to specific demands.

Some analysts also make the somewhat contentious reference to a "Mediterranean syndrome," which refers to a civic culture that rewards disobedient and non-compliant conduct and hinders the implementation of governing laws. Although there is evidence of a divide between the North and South in terms of environmental policy, many observers contend that the idea that the EU's environmental policies have a "Southern problem" is neither accurate nor helpful. Weale et al. note that Spain's'more effective' record is closer to that of the UK than to that of Italy and Greece, while Bo rzel compares Spanish and German environmental policy and finds that Germany has lagged behind Spain on several topics. The Cohesion Fund, which allocated over €18 billion to environmental projects in Spain, Portugal, Greece, and Ireland, as well as the structural grants for underdeveloped areas, have both helped to narrow the North-South divide. If the 10 new EU members join the ranks of "laggards," as some observers anticipate, it is too soon to know.

Implementation problems and Different Country Regulatory Practises

The majority of regulatory systems have a basic administrative conundrum. One benefit of regulation is that standards and norms should be implemented consistently throughout a sector; yet, in practise, this benefit is undermined by powerful forces. It is very difficult to manage pollution because there is an informational imbalance that favours the polluter [5]. Regulatory organisations should develop tight ties with people they regulate only to better comprehend each circumstance. Once a rapport has been built, officials frequently haggle with the polluter over goals, deadlines, and investments in new technologies. Taking into consideration specific local factors including guilt, negligence, and the possibility of future compliance, the regulator will make decisions and use discretion about whether to completely enforce regulations or whether to negotiate compliance. The conundrum is that slippage between policy and implementation may occur if the costs of weakening standards are not evaluated against the advantages of flexibility. The regulatory framework in place in each nation may have an impact on how this challenge is resolved in particular [6].

The degree to which regulations rely on judicial or administrative processes is one characteristic of a national regulatory style. Many European nations take a formal and legalistic approach to environmental regulation. In France, the goal is to provide clear legal frameworks and processes that are supported by government organisations and the legal system. Both Germany and Austria want comprehensive command-and-control laws that impose universal emissions levels and provide clear guidelines. A judicial approach should, in theory, limit the scope for regulatory officials to use discretion when enforcing policy in certain circumstances. By contrast, the approach is more casual, flexible, and technocratic when environmental control is permeated by administrative procedures, as in Britain. Legislation often avoids standards and quality goals that are mandated by law, making it more general and discretionary:When possible, it has long been customary to rely on the local natural environment's characteristics as a responsible method of disposal and dispersal for potential pollutants. This fundamental strategy calls for giving authorities total autonomy and discretion to decide how harmful a potential pollutant is and the best ways to regulate it, taking into account the local environment [7].

The way environmental policy is implemented varies depending on the regulatory style; some systems are more cooperative than others. In a comparison of British and American environmental practise, Vogel noted that, despite significant similarities in political and cultural traditions, common environmental conflicts, and even shared organisational responses, there were significant differences between environmental controls in the United Kingdom and the United States: "Americans rely heavily on for- mal rules, often enforced in the face of strong opposition from the institutions affected by them, while the Britis rely on volu The British draught laws that let officials to make specific agreements with firms that will be recognised by their superiors and the courts because they are "reluctant to adopt rules and regula- tions with which they cannot guarantee compliance."

In order to change industrial and agricultural interests' conduct, government officials try to "persuade" them, and when laws are breached, they often decide not to press charges. In contrast, there is a greater readiness in the USA to use the legal system to pursue polluters and compel compliance. However, the existence of a strongly legalistic administrative culture does not automatically imply that laws will be strictly enforced with a lot of recourse to judicial action. Although one effect of Europeanization is a shift away from this consensual style, producer interests are frequently accommodated in Austria so that criminal courts play a minimal role, allowing the majority of polluters to either go unpunished or pay insignificant fines.

Using the idea of regulatory style requires some generalisation and should be done with caution. Although subsequent studies have confirmed his general findings, Vogel's portrayal of the USA as a nation that is hostile and for- malistic was based primarily on a study of just two policy areas, air pollution and land use. One obvious issue emerges if the concept of a regulatory style has any traction: which regulation style results in the best environmental outcomes?The primary critique of the British approach is that because of its tremendous flexibility, the polluter is able to elude a strict regulatory grip. The ideal environment for "regulatory capture" is created by the preference for administrative discretion over judicial interpretation, the bureaucratic obsession with secrecy, and the fact that secret site-level negotiations between polluter and inspector remain at the core of industrial pollution control. The generally accepted notions of "best available technique not entailing excessive costs" and "best practicable means" of reducing pollution have made sure that regulatory bodies are aware of the financial and practical limits that firms confront. To put it another way, British regulators have accepted the norms and behaviours of the regulated too easily.

So, does a more formalistic regulatory approach offer better environmental protection? Vogel maintained that the focus on voluntary compliance had been no less beneficial than the more adver- sarial and legalistic approach employed by American politicians, even if he did not claim that British environmental measures were especially effective. Although American requirements were higher, there was a significant implementation deficit because of the poor level of compliance. Industries lamented their inability to adopt stringent emission requirements. Due to financial constraints, the EPA usually only prosecuted those who committed the most egregious and severe violations. This more combative approach led to resentment between the enforcement authorities and the business community, which in turn fostered increased lawbreaking.

Despite the fact that Vogel's work is now quite dated, the EPA's ongoing problems, the widespread criticism of the rigid US regulatory system, and the numerous reform attempts suggest that these observations are still valid. Vogel came to the conclusion that differing national regulatory techniques had no influence on policy outcomes after seeing that the more cooperative relationships between the regulator and the regulated in Britain guaranteed that the lower requirements were at least executed well. A different takeaway may be the need for a compromise between these two flawed regulatory regimes. Thus, participation in the EU may have resulted in a limited convergence of national regulatory systems across member states due to the enormous amount of environmental regulation. In Britain, for instance, a broad variety of environmental issues are governed by higher standards, standardised objectives, clear monitoring and evaluation processes, and less discretion for local officials.

The efficacy of laws may be influenced by contextual circumstances, such as different regulatory approaches, but the widespread criticism of command-and-control tactics has spurred policymakers to look for alternate policy tools to accomplish environmental policy objectives. The parts that follow provide quick summaries of volunteer activity and government spending before getting into more depth on market-based mechanisms.

Free Will Action

Voluntary action refers to environmental protection measures taken by people or groups that are neither mandated by the law nor motivated by financial rewards. Individuals may help create a more sustainable society by voluntary action, which entails altering their lives and participating as responsible citizens. People may participate in a variety of voluntary activities, such as recycling, ethical investing, green shopping, and volunteer conservation work. Through a variety of communication strategies, including information campaigns outlining the environmental advantages of recycling drink containers or newspapers, extending citizen rights to environmental information, and making it simpler for individuals and organisations to sue polluters, the government can encourage voluntary action [8].

Despite the fact that the motivation is often to enhance profits, businesses might opt to take the environmental effect of their operations into account. Government-sponsored initiatives have pushed many businesses to embrace eco-management and audit schemes, environmental management standards like ISO 14001, and eco-labelling. The most important tool is the environmental "voluntary agreement," which is a promise made by businesses or trade groups, often after discussion or negotiation with a governmental body.

Normally, there are no consequences if commitments are not kept, although this is not always the case. Since the late 1980s, environmental agreements have proliferated, according to a comparative study of eight OECD nations; several thousand of these agreements are in Japan, and the Netherlands and Germany account for the majority of EU agreements. The Dutch NEPP has produced agreements, or "covenants," in practically all policy areas, but the

majority of other nations have just a few agreements that are focused in a small number of key polluting industries, notably the energy, chemical, agricultural, tourist, and transportation sectors. Some environmental agreements are the result of coordinated industry responses to new laws; for instance, all EU member states have agreements in place to carry out the European Commission directive on packaging waste.

Environmental accords might offer a number of benefits. Because they give producers the freedom to choose the best way to meet goals, encourage prompt implementation, and call for little to no "policing" by the state, they offer a flexible and economical way to accomplish policy objectives. Voluntary agreements may foster beneficial cooperation between government and business along the lines of ecological modernization, resulting in modifications to the environmental beliefs and conduct of both government employees and producers. However, voluntary agreements are not without flaws; in fact, the OECD has found that both their environmental and economic efficacy are questionable. They often lack ambition, comprising commitments that meet the least common denominator and are acceptable to the agreement's least enthusiastic participants. Often, an industry will only create a voluntary agreement in order to avoid the possibility of a stricter regulation or eco-tax. Thus, Swedish businesses only consented to a voluntary ban on the use of chlorine in paper-bleaching when the EPA was drafting laws to do so. This was likely done to generate positive press and develop a future bargaining chip. In general, voluntary agreements struck in advance of legislation are probably going to set softer goals and more lenient timelines than the government would impose via other channels. Additionally, there are no enforcement tools to support voluntary agreements. Implementation might be very challenging in the absence of punishments, with free-riding being a serious possibility [9].

Regulatory philosophies have an impact on the efficacy of voluntary agreements as well. There haven't been many voluntary agreements in the UK, and even those that have existed have often failed to live up to their promises. Most of them have been quite weak and unambitious - "many are more like codes of best practise than what continental Europeans would classify as negotiated agreements," one expert has said. As a result of the continued dominance of closed policy communities in important industries, it seems that the British voluntarist heritage coexists with an established bias in favour of corporate interests.

CONCLUSION

Volunteerism does not, however, have to be as friendly to corporate interests as it is in Britain, despite the fact that compromise is always a part of it. The NEPP was discussed which demonstrated how it has encouraged self-regulation within Dutch industry as a method of achieving ambitious pollution reduction goals agreed upon with specific industries. The Dutch regulatory style is a prime example of ecological modernization because it involves close but open communication between the government and business, creating a framework with high standards and strict target-setting but also the flexibility to adapt to local needs and conditions. However, even in the Netherlands, industry-only voluntary agreements will not be sufficient to achieve sustainable development. Most observers agree that the voluntary agreement is just a good addition to existing measures, despite the fact that business may sometimes see it as a substitute for other policy tools.

REFERENCES:

[1] D. S. Bhattacharyya *et al.*, “Implementing a digital human resources management tool in the government health sector in Bangladesh: a policy content analysis,” *BMC Health Serv. Res.*, 2021, doi: 10.1186/s12913-021-07304-4.

[2] I. D. Ebuenyi *et al.*, "Exploring equity and inclusion in Malawi's National Disability Mainstreaming Strategy and Implementation Plan," *Int. J. Equity Health*, 2021, doi: 10.1186/s12939-020-01378-y.

[3] M. E. Fernandez *et al.*, "Implementation mapping: Using intervention mapping to develop implementation strategies," *Front. Public Heal.*, 2019, doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2019.00158.

[4] E. Baltaxe *et al.*, "Digital health transformation of integrated care in Europe: Overarching analysis of 17 integrated care programs," *J. Med. Internet Res.*, 2019, doi: 10.2196/14956.

[5] A. Tumilowicz *et al.*, "Implementation science in nutrition: Concepts and frameworks for an emerging field of science and practice," *Curr. Dev. Nutr.*, 2019, doi: 10.1093/cdn/nzy080.

[6] E. Pomarici and R. Sardone, "EU wine policy in the framework of the CAP: post-2020 challenges," *Agricultural and Food Economics*. 2020. doi: 10.1186/s40100-020-00159-z.

[7] M. S. Abd-Elwahed and M. A. El-Baz, "Impact of implementation of total quality management: An assessment of the Saudi industry," *South African J. Ind. Eng.*, 2018, doi: 10.7166/29-1-1902.

[8] K. Thoele, M. Ferren, L. Moffat, A. Keen, and R. Newhouse, "Development and use of a toolkit to facilitate implementation of an evidence-based intervention: a descriptive case study," *Implement. Sci. Commun.*, 2020, doi: 10.1186/s43058-020-00081-x.

[9] M. Hamam *et al.*, "Circular economy models in agro-food systems: A review," *Sustain.*, 2021, doi: 10.3390/su13063453.