The purpose of this study was to capture a set of discourses that emanated from the environmental movements in India in general and collective protests in the Valley of Narmada in particular. Such an enquiry, obviously, links to discursive practices that are central to the different domains of social life and once again strengthens the argument on nature-culture sensitivity. To begin with, this chapter gives a brief summary of the study that are organized and arranged into five arbitrary chapters. Secondly, an attempt is been made to revisit again the conceptual categories that, found to be, crucial of the discussion keep going. In the third part, we discuss the significance of subaltern social ecology as a contested sight of dominant knowledge forms. Although such an enquiry led to discourse generation and contributed to discipline progress in general, the final part would examine what are the limits of discourses in a specific context. Apparently, it is the very limit of discourses that led to the displacement of the people in the valley of Narmada both physically and epistemologically.
SUMMARY
At the outset, the first chapter set out methodological frame of reference on how and what way the study was conducted with the help of theoretical reflections of the subject matter from a sociological point of view in general and sociology of knowledge in particular. The first part of this section dealt with contextualization of the problem of study. Subsequently, key concepts were explained and elaborated to conceptualize the problem of study. In addition, in the final part methodological issue, discussed.

The second chapter, indeed, examined theoretical reflections of fround key concepts; science, society, subalternity and New Social Movements. To begin with, there were reflections on, how science an intellectual activity of men is, subjected to the overall development of society. In other words, it is being argued that cognitive domain of social life is critical and reflexive for social action and in turn social transformation. It is in this context, theory of praxis was substantiated to logically connect theoretical propositions with its different dimension of practices. Bringing praxis into the contemporary debates in the social science discipline, the subaltern discourses become a stand point in the on going debates on new social movement paradigm.

To make sense of the structural and cultural changes, people’s protests and mobilization became one of the normative principles in the sociological discipline. Taking cue from the larger reservoirs of social movement scholarship, the third chapter examined how environmental movements redefine concepts, categories and knowledge domains. The main theme of this chapter was to understand how people’s protest on the quest for environmental protection expresses a new sentence of knowledge as eco-sensitivity for critical practice. At one side of the spectrum, there has been a process of redefining developmental agenda to prioritize environmental quest as an urgent and immediate in our times. On the other side,
contemporary environmental movements gradually are challenging dominant forms of knowledge, including natural science paradigm and thereby generating counter discourse for alternative modernity.

In corollary to the third chapter, the next session addressed the questions of how environmental movements began to crystallize in adivasis and rural landscape of India as reactionary to the dominant centralized planning models followed by the post-independent India. These movements, negotiated with diverse, but discursive domains of ideology, value, power and knowledge. As a result of critical discourse generated out of the protests, there has been a change in the cognitive structures of the state as well. It is in this context, this chapter analyses new methods and practices were extended to initiate new governing strategies as greening India.

Epistemologies of counter discourse are grounded on empirical location wherein constant dialogue takes place between the expert knowledge and discursively produced counter discourse through popular protest spearheaded from the margins. The intention of the fifth capture was to chapter the praxis of subaltern voices as new inscriptions of epistemology by locating the protest in the Valley of Narmada. The movement in the valley of Narmada, followed, a systematic, but diverse trajectories of protest and mobilization not only at the local level and who are affected, but outside of the context too.

Mobilization strategies of the movement, in this chapter, were organized into three fold, but chronologically systematized. The first section examined the generic aspects of Narmada protests from its mobilization to institutional stage. This trajectory explained on how local level protest strengthened the arguments of the local people at length at national and international level. In the second, phase, however, the debates moved on to the questions of how discursive practices at different layers of the movement generated discourses of various kind. In the final
stage, we analyzed on how movement and its discourses in the valley of Narmada become an epistemological location for a disciplinary practice. In order to make Narmada controversy as a discipline; universities, research institutions, state institutions, non-governmental organizations, above all, review agencies of the World Bank conducted empirical studies from their own vantage points. The generic aspect of Narmada protests and its collective mobilization being a disciplinary domain was as much as critical, dialogical and reflexive not only for the practitioners of discipline, but also how common people [were] understood/represented through these processes.

REDEFINING CONCEPTS: A methodological enquiry
Praxis, in this study was to examine how knowledge as an enabling domain becomes critical for reflexive thought, ethics and purposive action, in the ongoing trajectories of social transformation. It is the on going debate both in the traditions of critical thinking in the west in the form of late modernity and post-colonial sensitivity in the east in the forms of third-world modernity. These debates reframe a set of epistemological problems, for instance, how conceptual categories are made and their field, what lines of enquiries are drawn, and how methodologies are set. It needs, perhaps, to clarify what are the ethical aspects of intellectual pursuit with the subject matter we encounter with. Such questions appeared to be, for instance, what extent they become useful for our pedagogic process, critical scrutiny, self-reflexivity and above all, frontiers of knowledge production. To this end, praxis remains to be a critical analytical bit for theoretical exploration and their practical consequences. In other words, praxis is a set of discourse produced through discursive practices that would shape the lines of epistemology and opens up possible practical spaces.

Taking a long intellectual journey from Marx to Gramsci, praxis became an empirical canon of historical research to study and analyze the question of how subaltern should arrive at the centre of history, and how they to be represented.
Certainly, without this reflexive core assumption, its historical project would have remained partial. Detour into the subaltern genealogy by historical resources, with fresh idea of self-consciousness, brought about an epistemological shift in the terrain of history. Intelligibly, the subaltern remains an undefined ontological category, while South Asian history writers start writing from below so as to give autonomous epistemological space for the practitioners of this project. However, some categories were deliberatively identified, when the trajectory of this intellectual movement graduated from 'writing history from below' to discourses, to post-colonial sensitivity coupled with responding to the onslaught of late-capitalism. Departing from the initial focus, i.e., in search of peasant consciousness and their insurgence, the analytical tool started foregrounding largely on the specificities of cultural identities based on ethnicity, gender and ecology. In our analytical mode two concepts were conjoined to situate subaltern in a context specific, (a) ethnic as a cultural symbol of resistance and, (b) collective protest as pedagogic idiom of ecological sensitivity. For social scientist, a pertinent question was on how to arrive to this point; with what terms and analytical tools. In this study, our enquiry rather was unraveled to this critical journey from a sociological plain with a conviction that the protest is rooted in essentialities of praxis. Precisely, it is this praxis, we would try to argue, is much critical, reflexive and pedagogy for dialogue and action.

SUBALTERN SOCIAL ECOLOGY: A sight of contestation

Several terminologies discursively played out in the academia, particularly in anthropology and sociology to explain and refer this group to dictate over them in the imaginaries of civilization and development. If the anthropological wisdom began with labeling as primitive and savage, sociologist saw them as backward hindus to fix in the Indian social structure. The politico-administrative regime refers as tribal with a logic on how to govern over these savage bodies. In its latest avatar, at the age of celebrating multiculturalism, they were caught into a diverse cultural stock as indigenous. However from the empirical canon, historical understanding of them
gives an insight that the community altogether subjected to cultural deprivation that extended to cumulative deprivation due to the very historical reason. This led a realization that the subaltern culture remained incapable of mapping the larger landscape of oppression in which they are located. In this context, representation in the history writing business becomes a serious subject matter on the quest for, how to represent, particularly, in the space created by the discourses on nationalism. As a result, there was urgency for writing history from ‘fragmented’ below/misplaced corner. However, in this project how to locate and where to locate the subaltern, as the participants of the collective seems to be ambiguous (autonomous) with a question of Can Subaltern Speak? In fact Kancha Ilaiah locates and acknowledges them as pedagogic practitioners giving tremendous sources of knowledge for everyday life. As he delineates:-

A close examination of the socio-economic conditions and cultural processes of the tribals shows that they taught the ‘essence of life’ to the rest of the society. That is the reason why they must be treated as our ‘teachers’. They laid the foundation of our culture and our civilization. They taught us what to eat and what to drink in order to survive. It is true that human beings do not survive on food alone, but it is also true that they do not and cannot survive without food. Even today, civil society appropriates several aspects of tribal culture without expecting to be asked to give them anything in return. It does not acknowledge all that it has learnt from tribal societies since such acknowledgement itself is an uncivilized act (Ilaiah, 2009: 5).

It is in this common feature/future that the praxis of subaltern social ecology is situated and, essentially a tool for critical and reflexive pedagogy for the so called civilized one.

Music of environmental discourse ‘world out there’ is found well tuned with the sociologies of adivasis, was crucial, in this context, to logically connect environmental movements and subaltern protest in the Valley of Narmada. This was a kind of self-consciousness generated out of the struggles they had spearheaded. Role of the activists, perhaps, to transcend the subaltern culture as a source of
symbolic assertion and cultural deprivation is noteworthy. It is because of the secular
credo of the activists of the NBA, as we would try to argue, the collective resentment
could resist extremism such as naxalism on the one side and hindutva on the other,
as it is noticed among tribal communities elsewhere in India.

However, it is no way to suggest that adivasis do not have self-drive to make
sense of these complexities, instead, let them to realize the same, in other words, was
the tactics of activists, a vital component of resource mobilization in the NSM
scholarship. Living with, and experiencing the sociology of adivasis-life system, there
was a conscious process of articulating experiences and transcending them as
discourses by the activists. As a result, world out there eventually came to know that,
as the adivasis leader CK Janu told to, and written by Bhaskar (in mother tongue)
and translated by N. Ravi Shankar (English, a post-colonial text), *the life cycle of our
people, their custom and very existence are bound to the earth*.... (Bhaskaran, 2004: 47) When
ecological sensitivity of ethnic was consciously added to the ongoing movement
process, protests in the valley of Narmada got new dimension. Since then, new
discourses start foregrounding in multiple directions. Eventually it changed the
course of action, strategy and mobilization of the movement. As a result, there was a
new way of articulating the subaltern politics as it has been organically linked with
eco-sensitivity.

In other words, it is being argued that, global discourses on environmental
questions where discursively practiced when collective mobilization traversed into
the heart of nature-cultural relationship. This new self-reflexive thought on the
generic aspects of every-day life experiences bringing home the idea of cultural
identity of the community. That, in fact, would organically link habitats with cultural
specificities. In normative terms, it was popularly referred as eco-system people. It is
the historical understanding of the praxis of nature-culture dialectic, as we would like
to argue, that shed light on tremendous cultural resources of resistance and mobilization for the movement participants.

On the other side of the spectrum, having understood the developmental implications led by the state of India and its exploitative conditions over the ecosystem of the subaltern group, social activists articulated environmental issues as the larger question of social justice. As a result, environmental movements put two epistemological challenges to the political economy today; i.e.; growth and justice.

Narmada Valley protest, indeed, indicates the conflict over natural resources, which unfolded several facets. It is true that the protest in the valley was conditioned/imposed by the political economy of the state dictated by the World Bank as part of its dominant development paradigm. As a result, people in the valley of Narmada, the indigenous adivasis communities were added with another deprivation variable as potential oustees and to be sacrificed their life and cultural systems for the development of the nation. It is certainly with the support of both national and transnational non-governmental organizations, that the NBA alarmed the voice of the people in valley of Narmada and created a global discourse.

Situating the protest in the valley of Narmada into the orbit of global discourse unfold two consequences. First, from a post-colonial perspective, these non-western discourses are the need of the western academy. It is because, as Leela Gandhi (1998: ix) claims, 'it attempts to reform the intellectual and epistemological exclusions of this academy, and enables non-western critics located in the west to present their cultural inheritance as knowledge'. This post-colonial sensitivity, possibly, led to critically evaluate our second consequence. For instance, the World Bank started reframing its developmental projects towards protecting indigenous people and environment soon after independent review team systematically produced non-western knowledge from the unintended consequences of the
Narmada dam project. For Goldman (2006) it was imperial nature of the World Bank that strategically use these data (not as knowledge) for green governance and to cope up with the questions of justice. This dialectics of reason in the era of globalization, as the Narmada experiences show, perhaps, limits the discourse in itself from the context in which the very discourse generated. In other words, discourses were unable to produce knowledge as it could only reproduce all impossibilities except a possibility for displacement, as if the only solution of adivasis to reach out to modernity.

LIMIT OF DISCOURSES AND RISK OF DISPLACEMENT:

Development Pathology
To begin with the movement was in search of its legitimacy of the discourses as it created not only in a context specific, but also contextualizing reliable discourses that produced out-side of the immediate context too. Through its discursive practices, movement throws open hypothesis to the research enquiry, so as to get back scientific knowledge. It is true that movement leaders keep updating these developments, at the same time, continuously communicating with the movement participants. The strategy of the movement was to be open-ended to an extent to ensure that its activities will remain transparent. This open-ending attitude not only became a handy tool to mobilize people across board, but equally attracted media and academics. As a result, most of the empirical studies, in a sense were either to prove a hypothesis that the question of rehabilitation of the displaced is simply impossible. Otherwise, it could blame the failures of the implementing agencies, or failure of the policies by the state. For planners and economists, in fact, it was to justify the logic for constructing huge dam through their cause and benefit analysis.

Testing-ground of hypothesis, by looking specifically at the implications of the project on ecology and humans, was a major paradigm of the scientific enquiries, as it tunes well with policy formulation. For instance, for Parasuraman, working on
the issues of displacement for the last two decades, was to address the larger questions of how to frame a national policy out of the Narmada tragedy, or elsewhere (interaction with Parasuraman on July, 2007). This has been demonstrated in the leadership of the NBA as well. For instance, Medha Patkar has been a consultant of a national policy frame work on rehabilitation. As she reveals, at least the state is slowly recognized the people uprooted from their habitat as the former start thinking about a national policy (interaction with Medha, December, 2006). In other words, the question of settlement of the displaced became a desirable outcome of the prolonged struggles led by the NBA. Similarly, in a letter written to the members of parliament, NBA in fact appealed that-

.....almost fifteen years now, successive governments have drafted a national policy and bill on displacement and resettlement. The House was informed last a year ago that a fresh draft is with the cabinet. How long do we have to wait for this to be tabled in parliament1.

For the local leaders rehabilitation is the top priority2. That means the limitations of possibilities led to displacement and rehabilitation is the only solution, as construction of dam is at the verge of completion. In other words, the discourses born out from the collective protest of people were to be limited itself with empirico-technical ontology as oustees. There are several exigencies played out to reach out this fixed paradigm of displacement. However, these very imposed limits led to displacement and rehabilitation risk; as if it was self-imposed upon the movement today.

Universal categories/terms used to refer these communities as indigenous but potential oustees, by the World Bank humiliated the communities that once again displaced epistemologically, as a result of instrumental rationalities of the dominant discourses. Certainly, unlike Spivak, these subalterns did speak, struggle,

---
2 Field observation from the protest sights in Delhi, Indore and Badwani, Bhopal and Kandwa, the issue of rehabilitation had been highlighted by the local leaders such as Ram Kaur Rawat, Ghokmuru, gurujis of the Jeevan Shala and Ashish Mandoli.
but in what forms and contents they were represented and whether the act of speech
and struggle changed the conditions of the oppressed is a pertinent question.

An organic leader, who spearheaded the *adivasi ghotra mahasabha* fighting for
self-respect and dignity of life of the adivasi communities, had a point of departure
to explain a fragmented subaltern developmental question.

They [ruling class and power centres] wrote article after article lamenting the state
of the environment. They created fat files out of all research done by them. End of
March they sold panel discussions and painting about the rivers drying up. Editors
put on their glasses and wrote articles on special edition. And in colonies our new
generation grew up without knowing how to read, washing utensils in restaurants,
doing menial jobs in households, becoming unwed mothers, listening to cassette
songs and fooling themselves that they were the black power [adivasi] behind the
red power [leftist] of the ten thousand-strong Party rallies (cited in Bhaskaran,
2004: 49)

This is no way to suggest that subaltern has no stand point; instead, there is a
self-reflection on the everyday tyranny against the dominant ruling class and
homogenization by the ruling parties.

New challenges on subaltern epistemology are the very existential question of
displaced groups that are largely due to the dictums of the World Bank and its
hegemonic idea of development. As the subaltern start protesting and challenging
these dictums to foreground global discourses on the question of how to be eco-
sensitive, the people in the valley of Narmada remained as displaced physically and
epistemologically. Precisely it is in this self-defeating ground that the movement
trajectory was pushed for better rehabilitation policies as an urgent need and created
a popular dictum among the policy makers as desirable discourse. However, the
appearance of desirable discourse, an immediate empirical solution, may not give the
normative dimensions of the movement. Instead, one needs to slow down the
epistemological base to see how the movement resisted by challenging the dominant
paradigm of development as a process of collective mobilization. Thus, producing
counter discourses and convincing the authorities of the World Bank, marked new ways of politicizing epistemology and lesson for new social order. On the other side, Neo-liberal agencies acknowledged the collective voices of people only withstand to prioritize their ambitious projects so that it can continue to follow old paradigms of development.

In the valley of Narmada, time and again, there has been death of critical discourses, as the dominant ideology gave rise to heightened dam and suspend the flow the mighty river. However, displacing community from its cultural roots means cutting their access of sustaining resources and thereby suspending their entire life system. This predicament is not surprising as the culture of speed, efficiency, merit and competition in a market economy decide the fate of subaltern communities. Critical questions need to be answered that, whether emerging new terms, line of enquiry, and methodological challenges for new discourse thereby new epistemology, will transform the material conditions of the subaltern group. In its popular normative domain, the subaltern communities remained to be potential victims of developmental discourses as they were given freedom of choice to displace This is dominant paradigm that gave birth to displace, both physically and epistemologically, the one who struggled to challenge with counter discourses. To that extent, the voices of an enduring form of nature-culture relationship from their own life experiences, still remained to be a critical lesson and a tool for pedagogic action too. No wonder these discourses have potential to recycle the conceptual institutions of different organs of society. It is largely because nature has already been proved to exercise its own way of organizing politics over humans.
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