

Democracy, Development and Environmental Politics in India

Satri Veera Kesalu

Senior Lecturer, Department of Political Science, Narayana Degree College & IAS Academy, Pedda Amberpet, Hayath Nagar, Hyderabad, Telangana, India

Abstract

Environmental considerations are crucial to development. Environmental concerns shall be completely taken into account in all development programmes. Environmental issues in India are a result of poverty, underdevelopment, as well as the unfavourable outcomes of poorly thought out and executed development initiatives. Environment is a broad concept. Everything on this planet, everything that affects man, and every kin are included. Therefore, it is essential to have a thorough policy that can actually safeguard the environment. Environmental deterioration is a global phenomenon, and even the world's developed nations struggle with it. It is therefore improbable that India's new environmental strategy will find a solution to every issue relating to the environment. Democratic Development is fundamentally a method for implementing political institutions for non-political objectives like societal modernization and economic growth. In order for democratic institutions to function effectively, political leaders must reach an ideological and dynamic consensus, and the general public must be politically conscious. Most environmental protection and development programmes are connected to one another. The legislative and judiciary both play significant roles in environmental protection along with the development of the country, despite the need and potential for more initiative to be taken by democratic institutions within the current politico-constitutional framework.

Key words: Democracy, Development, Environmental Politics, India.

Introduction

Environmental politics are both the politics of the environment and environmental policy (Andrew Dobson, 2016:27), and they are a field of study with three main focuses: the analysis of public policymaking and implementation affecting the environment at various levels of government, the study of political theories and ideas related to the environment, the examination of the environmental stances of both mainstream political parties and environmental social movements (Carter, Neil, 2009:2).

According to Neil Carter's seminal work *Politics of the Environment* (2009), environmental politics can be distinguished from other types of politics in at least two ways: first, "it has a primary concern with the relationship between human society and the natural world" (Carter, Neil, 2009:3); and second, "unlike most other single issues, it comes replete with its own ideology and political movement" (Michael Jacobs, 1997: 5)

Additionally, he distinguishes between modern and historical environmental politics, concentrating on preservationism and conservationism in particular. Modern environmentalism was a political and activist mass movement that demanded a dramatic revolution in the values and structures of society. It was motivated by the idea of a global ecological crisis that endangered humanity's very existence (Carter, Neil, 2009:3).

The enormous societal changes that occurred in the United States in the decades following World War II gave rise to environmental concerns. Although there have always been environmental concerns, it wasn't until after the war that environmental conservation gained widespread social acceptance. This began with outdoor leisure in the 1950s, grew to encompass a wider range of environmental protection, then was integrated with efforts to address air and water pollution and, later, harmful chemical contaminants. The 1950s saw the start of the movement, which persisted through the 1990s. Environmental politics became the principal focus of public attention after World War II (Hays, Samuel P., and Barbara D. Hays, 1987). During this time, the Torrey Canyon Oil Spill in 1967 and the Great London Smog in 1952 both had a significant impact on the development of environmentalism as a movement in the UK. "Green politics" is a new political movement that emerged in the West around the beginning of the 1970s.

Democratic challenges

Democracy and democratic institutions play a variety of functions in the development of environmental policy, particularly climate policy, as shown by the discrepancy in environmental advancement produced by various democratic governments (Povitkina, Marina, 2018: 411-412). This discrepancy in environmental development is proof of the contradictory roles that democracy and democratic institutions play in the growth of environmental policy. In contrast to autocratic governments, democratic processes have the ability to bring about significant reforms provided the people supports them. This is due to the fact that in a system that gets legitimacy from the agreement of the governed, there are a number of substantive incentives for policymakers to legislate toward these purposes. Political responsiveness, for instance, is a product of electoral accountability, thus policymakers in democracies have an incentive to agree on legislation to achieve these goals (Burnell, Peter, 2012: 13-18). This viewpoint holds that democracies will probably consider

the consequential effects that climate change will have on most, if not all, of their citizens. In a state that is seen as legitimate, civil unrest and corruption are less likely, all of which seem likely to impede climate action. In a democracy, factors like regime stability and the interests of the ruler or governing official also appear to be more in line with progress (Burnell, Peter, 2012: 22-25).

Contrarily, there is concrete evidence that shows inconsistencies in how democracies have approached the issue of environmental deterioration (Povitkina, Marina, 2018: 414). It appears that a number of features of democratic state organisation appear to contribute to reported failures to act on climate change and other environmental concerns, even though the reasons for this difference are not totally clear. Leaders may instead choose to concentrate their efforts and resources on addressing the policy issues that are most apparent to the people in their individual countries rather than being motivated by a hypothetical public good (Povitkina, Marina, 2018: 415). The political opportunity cost of focusing on this or other less obvious environmental concerns may be significant for democratically elected leaders who are accountable to the people given that climate change is a problem that is primarily intangible, gradual, and global (Povitkina, Marina, 2018: 419).

Economic forces and other external factors may also hinder democratic actors' capacity to bring about true environmental change. In industrialised democracies, businesses and other groups with financial motives frequently continue to have significant lobbying influence. They can therefore obstruct climate or environmental development, which usually conflicts with these organisations' financial interests (Povitkina, Marina, 2018: 424). Environmental changes are generally viewed as lower priorities in developing democracies due to the need to address more pressing societal issues like poverty, infrastructure, and general economic development (Pickering Jonathan, Backstrand Karin, and Schlosberg David, 2020:4). This is due to the significance of responding to more pressing public concerns. Evidence points to the erosion of regulatory capacity and public confidence in state institutions caused by corruption, which is found in various democratic institutions across the globe, which makes democracies less able to successfully reduce carbon emissions and other causes of pollution (Povitkina, Marina, 2018: 426). Outside of the legal system, financial incentives may also have an impact on whether environmental policy is adopted.

Additionally, the issue of public indifference to environmental policy development presents challenges for the prospects of democratic institutions' ability to advance environmental progress. There has been a sharp rise in opposition to pro-environmental legislation during the past ten years in wide coalitions and everywhere in the world (Pickering Jonathan, Backstrand Karin, and Schlosberg David, 2020:8). This is true despite the public's increased understanding of the risks posed by climate change. Populist movements in Western democracies have adopted attitudes that vehemently reject such measures in recent years, especially. Additionally, studies of participatory democracy's deliberative modes have revealed outcomes that reflect the interests of people involved and may not necessarily lean toward a more positive view of environmental or climatic action (Pickering Jonathan, Backstrand Karin and Schlosberg David, 2020:10; Newig, Jens; Fritsch, Oliver, 2009: 197-204). Theoretical and practical improvements of democratic procedures have been proposed as a way to address these possible flaws; nevertheless, these reforms may decrease democratic choice or participation (Pickering Jonathan, Backstrand Karin, and Schlosberg

David, 2020:12). These changes have been advocated as a way to improve democratic procedures, but only as a way to improve democratic procedures.

It's likely that democratic decision-making processes won't offer satisfying responses to environmental justice-related queries. In addition to being at a disadvantage in terms of political interests, members of minority groups that lack meaningful representation in single-member districts or electorates subject to majority rule are frequently those who suffer the most from the effects of climate change and other environmental problems (Pickering Jonathan, Backstrand Karin, and Schlosberg David, 2020:11). The interests of affected conscious agents, which are by definition uninvolved in the political decisions of human society, are consistently underrepresented, according to recent research in the field of non-human representation; solutions to this disparity frequently appeal to reforms that would reduce democratic choice from a traditional perspective, such as by giving biological experts more influence in policymaking, though even Globally, the people who will be most affected by the effects of climate change may not have much influence in the decisions made about the policies that will either try to reduce emissions or in some other manner strive to adapt to the results of the climate. In addition to the fact that people can only influence climate policy within their own state, democratic processes are unable to account for the fact that states with the lowest atmospheric carbon emissions frequently experience the greatest vulnerability to the effects of climate change, while states with the highest emissions frequently experience the least vulnerability (Althor Glenn, Watson James E. M., and Fuller Richard A.) (2016:20281).

When compared to the political cycles of leadership in democratic democracies, the pace of climate change is rather sluggish, which makes it difficult for politicians to respond because they are elected and re-elected on much shorter periods (Guerrero, Alexander, 2014:135). To effectively combat the effects of global warming, some sort of worldwide environmental governance is required in order to accomplish mutually agreed-upon goals relating to levels of energy use and environmental impact (Edmondson and Levy, 2013:51). The effects of climate change on political ideology and practise are complicated by the fact that they have an impact on ideas of responsibility for future societies and economic systems (Edmondson and Levy, 2013:56). Due to the disparity in material wealth that exists across countries, technological solutions are insufficient to combat climate change (Edmondson and Levy, 2013:57). Instead, political solutions have the potential to traverse the particularities of the myriad aspects of the environmental dilemma. The democratic values of wealth, progress, and state sovereignty may be in conflict with climate change mitigation initiatives, which instead emphasise a collective relationship with the environment (Povitkina, Marina, 2018: 428).

The current structure of the worldwide political community is founded on liberal values, which put an emphasis on individual liberties, and capitalist institutions, which make it difficult to respond quickly and aggressively to climate change (Edmondson and Levy, 2013:59). Individual human interests serve as the compass that directs interest-group liberalism (Baber and Bartlett, 2005: 86). The political compromise does not involve any parties that are unable to speak up for their own self-interest, such as non-humans or minority groups that do not have the right to vote. When people in liberal democracies do not believe that environmental issues have an effect on their lives or when they do not have the education

necessary to evaluate the significance of the issue, it can be difficult to find solutions to environmental disasters (Baber and Bartlett, 2005: 91). There is competition between the human advantages of environmental exploitation and protection (Baber and Bartlett, 2005: 161). It is possible for anthropocentric liberal democratic politics to provide a foundation for environmental concerns if one takes into account the ramifications of ecological degradation for future generations of humans.

William Ophuls contends that liberal democracies are not equipped to manage environmental issues, and that in order to prioritise these concerns, a shift to more authoritarian forms of government would be required. Ophuls makes this claim in his book "The Limits of Liberal Democracy" (Ophuls, William, 1977: 38). Others refute this by noting the historical achievements of environmental reform movements in liberal societies, particularly with regard to the improvement of water and air quality (Baber and Bartlett, 2005: 92). In actuality, environmental activism can strengthen democracies rather than bring them to their demise by broadening the scope of democratic involvement and fostering the development of novel political ideas (Paehlke, Robert, 1988: 291).

The conflicts between liberal democracy and environmental goals raise concerns about the potential limitations of democracy (or at least democracy as we know it) in terms of its ability to respond to complex issues on a large scale, its capacity to operate from a holistic societal perspective, and its suitability in dealing with the environmental crisis in comparison to other forms of government (Mathews, Freya, 1991:157). Many people lack the motivation or desire to demand measures that would threaten their immediate economic security, and democracies lack the legal framework to enact environmental improvements without public support. Additionally, democracies are unable to enact environmental measures without voter approval. Politics should be based on either morality or practicality, that is the question that needs to be solved (Mathews, Freya, 1991:158). An crucial element for democracies to possess in order to design a response to climate change could be an environmental ethics, or a system that considers and values the environment beyond its utility to humans (Mathews, Freya, 1991:159).

Alternative forms of Democracy for Environmental Policy

In the realm of political theory, deliberative democracy has been posited as a model for government that is more amenable to achieving environmental objectives. As contrast to a democracy that is founded on the accumulation of interests, a system known as deliberative democracy is one in which political equals who are informed assess values, knowledge, and expertise, and debate priorities in order to arrive at conclusions (Paehlke, Robert, 1988: 296). This interpretation of the term "democracy" places an emphasis on the participation of citizens in the decision-making process, as well as on the encouragement of decisions that are more beneficial to the common good than to individual interests (Baber and Bartlett, 2005: 172). Amy Gutmann and Dennis Thompson made the argument that deliberative democracy is a more just form of government because it prioritises reason over individual self-interest (Gutmann and Thompson, Amy and Dennis, 2004:59). This model's encouragement of a broad perspective, which could lead to a better engagement with environmental concerns, is one of the model's key benefits (Baber and Bartlett, 2005: 182). When compared to non-

democracies, democracies are, in fact, more cooperative in the design of climate change policy; however, this cooperation does not necessarily extend to the outcome and effects of these policies (Battig Michele B., Bernauer Thomas) (2009: 281-283).

This can be articulated in a more comprehensive manner by referring to the idea of democracy at the grassroots level. In contrast to "bigger organisations and rich individuals with concentrated vested interests in particular policies," the approach known as "grass-roots democracy" places everyday persons in charge of politics. Grass-roots democracy also known as direct democracy (Ostrogorski, Moisey, 1902: 39). In the realm of political philosophy, the lottery system is an example of a democratic design that enables governments to solve issues that will have repercussions in the distant rather than immediate future. Environmental policies can be drafted by deliberative groups made up of members chosen at random, and these policies can have short-term costs without taking into account the political ramifications of those costs for re-election (Guerrero, Alexander, 2014:146).

Democratic Development and Environmental Politics in India

The right to development must be realised in a way that fairly satisfies the environmental and developmental needs of both the present generation and future generations. Environmental protection ought to be a fundamental aspect of the construction process. A suitable method should be created in order to restore the environmental advantages of woods that aren't being used for anything else (Padmnabham, B.S., 2004:10). Without a doubt, economic growth has a detrimental effect on natural systems and can cause a range of ecological imbalances. When vulnerable eco-systems are neglected in favour of development, the issue becomes serious and unpleasant. Ecology and the economy should coexist, according to both economic experts and environmentalists. If any potential conflicts between the two pillars of harmonious living are to be avoided, the best way to balance the two is a moot question that must be addressed with prudence and foresight (The Game Master (Chandigarh), 2004: 436). The United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, which took place in Stockholm in June of 1972, developed not only policy concepts but also suggested action plans and financial arrangement in order to make those ideals a reality. It proclaims, among other things, that 1) Man has the fundamental right to freedom, equality, and appropriate conditions of existence in an environment of sufficient quality that enables a life that is lived with dignity and that is lived well. 2) It is the solemn responsibility of man to preserve and develop the environment for the sake of both the current generation and the generations to come (Singh, Hoshiar, 1992: 2).

The Government of India has, over the course of its history, taken a number of legislative and executive measures, all with the intention of better protecting the natural world. Constitutional mandates and legislative requirements imposed by both the federal government and individual states form the basis of our policy framework. A number of the provisions that may be found in Arts. 47, 48, and 49 make reference to the issues and directions that are given to the government. The forty-second Amendment Act led to the incorporation of a number of directive provisions into the constitution. Act 48A and Act 51-A were both passed in 1976. These provisions contain a clear mandate to the state and to the citizen to protect and improve the environment, and as a result, they constitute the basic

policy framework for all legislative and executive programmes in this regard. The mandate was given to protect and improve the environment by the citizen (Singh, Shekhar, 1984:80).

It would be reasonable to ensure that the inclusion of environment protection as a fundamental duty was to involve the public as a partner in the government's efforts to conserve and protect the environment. This would be the most effective way to accomplish these goals. Over the course of the past few years, there has been a remarkable expansion of action in this extremely important sector. What is crucial, however, is that a big portion of the activism is oriented toward safeguarding the environment from unimaginative and short-sighted policies that are implemented by the government in the name of growth. This is an important aspect of the activism. Today, environmental actions can be found being carried out by adivasis, peasants, teachers, scientists, and citizens who are concerned. These communities of individuals have been at the forefront of bringing to light and, if it was feasible, opposing development proposals that were detrimental to the natural environment. Issues have been requested from the government through meetings and press announcements, and when these requests have been ignored, the level of resistance has increased. The use of the legal system to challenge decisions and actions taken by the government has emerged as an essential component of environmental activism (Singh, Shekhar, 1984:89).

The success of the "Chipko Movement" indisputably corroborates the thesis that the most effective method for environmental protection, preservation, and management is through the participation of individuals on a community-based scale. The "Chipko Movement" eventually spread over state lines, and its influence could be felt across the entirety of India, including parts of the states of West Bengal and Rajasthan, as well as Karnataka and Maharashtra. It is not possible for the government to be the most accurate judge of the true burden of the requirements of the human environment. These individuals, and only people, are capable of providing the most accurate assessment of any environmental situation and offering a solution to it (Hoshiar Singh, 1992:260).

Public participation includes actively seeking out the opinions and perceptions of all concerned citizens, keeping the public fully informed about the status and development of plan formulation and evaluation activities, and promoting complete public understanding of the procedure and mechanism by which the responsible agency investigates and addresses environmental problems and needs. A continual two-way communication process, public engagement. It entails fostering a thorough public understanding of the procedure and mechanism used by the responsible agency to examine and address environmental needs and challenges (Carter, Larry, W., 1977: 220).

Information feed forward is the process by which information about public policy is transferred from public officials to the general public, whereas information feedback describes information about public policy that is communicated from the general public to public authorities. In essence, information feed forward and information feedback are both an element of public involvement. Decision-makers should find the information offered in the form of feedback helpful in the process of making wise decisions. A multitude of factors, such as ignorance, poverty, illiteracy, per capita consumption, traditional forms of society, and others, make it difficult for people to engage in conservation. The natural environment's deterioration will be significantly slowed down with the help of individuals and their active engagement. The general public's participation was recognised by the government as being

crucial to the success of any programme intended to promote environmental conservation. In order to ensure that everyone in society is aware of environmental issues and that people develop a sense of personal responsibility, the conservation of the environment was included to the Constitution's list of fundamental obligations.

It is encouraging to note that social workers with a vision for the future and some social action organisations have been quite engaged in the area of pollution management in recent years. The importance of this sector cannot be overstated. The "Save Silent Valley" movement and the "Chipko Andolan" have not only brought attention to the seriousness of the ecological imbalance issues brought on by widespread deforestation and environmental destruction as a result of hasty economic development plans, but they have also mobilised the power of the populace for the cause, yielding the desired quick results.

According to what can be gleaned from the annals of the environmental movement in the industrialised western nations, the organisational responses have been among the most important components that have contributed to the movement's overall level of success. Public organisations in Japan and the United States have contributed to the elevation of the environment to the status of a political problem. On the other hand, governmental organisations in Sweden and Canada have pushed forward with attempts to safeguard the environment.

The people of India are allowed to organise themselves into any group they see fit because to India's unique system of federal, participatory democracy. Consequently, in more recent times, a number of organisations have been established for the purpose of preserving the environment and shielding it from the uncontrolled socio-economic development of the nation. These are created by the people and have the capability of influencing the social and political behaviour of the society in which they exist.

In recent years, regulations have been implemented by both the central government and by state governments with the explicit thrust on controlling environmental pollutions. These laws have been passed by both levels of government. The Water Act, which was passed in 1974, and the Air Act, which was passed in 1981 are two of the fundamental Acts. The Wild Life Act of 1972, the Forest Conservation Act of 1980, and The Environment Protection Act of 1986 are all relevant pieces of legislation. In addition to taking legal action, the government of India established a number of administrative agencies and ministries with the mission of investigating environmental pollution issues and providing guidance on how these issues should be addressed. In 1980, on the basis of the proposals made by the National Committee on Environmental Planning and Coordination, the Tiwari Committee was constituted to provide recommendations. In accordance with the suggestions made by the Tiwari Committee, a distinct Department of Environment was established with the intention of functioning as a model instrument for the environmental evaluation of development plans. The 1991 reform process served as the stimulus for constitutional amendments made in 1994 with the goal of decentralising power and resources to the various regions. The Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF) first drafted "The National Conservation Strategy and Policy Statement on Environment and Development" in 1992 in addition to the policy statement for pollution reduction. This was accomplished in connection with the declaration of the pollution reduction strategy. Both texts discuss economic and environmental growth. The Environmental Action Program, or EAP for short, is a government-sponsored initiative.

Immediately after the organisation was founded in 1993, numerous development activities included environmental management and issues. The first attempt at a comprehensive environmental plan design was the National Environmental Policy of 2006. The article looks into the causes of land degradation and offers treatment suggestions. It is important to assess the unintended effects of several variables, including financial, tax, and sectoral methods, on land degradation.

The basis for these agreements is the requirement for sustainable development in these many contexts. The National Environment Policy strives to increase its range of inclusion and close any gaps by taking into account recently obtained data and information (NEP, 2006). On the other hand, any real policy must come after laws. Environmental protection must be given top priority in any long-term, inclusive growth plan (Ganesamurthy, 2009). In light of environmental issues, the Eleventh Five Year Plan highlights the significance of sustainable development. The Indian government has undertaken a number of initiatives to improve our environment.

It is essential, prior to making an evaluation of the effectiveness of the judiciary in the field of environmental pollution control, to have a comprehensive understanding of the relevant contours of the problem and to have a general survey of the policy framework within which courts are to operate. Only then can an evaluation of the dynamism of the judiciary and its effectiveness be made (Singh, Veer, 1992:158). The judicial system is required to function within the confines imposed by the existing system, which is comprised of the policy framework, the enforcement mechanics, and the procedural prescription. Every law was written with the intention of addressing a certain issue. In addition, planning for future development has been done without first conducting an analysis of how this may affect the environment. The majority of the laws suffer from a lack of clear policy objectives, as well as discrepancies among themselves and inefficient enforcement mechanisms (The Tiwari Committee Report, 1981: 19-24). The punitive provisions that underpin the majority of our environmental legislation are founded on antiquated conceptions of what constitutes an effective deterrence. There are numerous instances detailed in the Annual Report of the Central Board for the Prevention and Control of Pollution.

As a result of the fact that the judiciary is tasked with the responsibility of interpreting laws, and that too, in instances that are agitated before the courts, judicial judgements can at most have only a marginal impact on the greater concerns of environment pollution control. Even the construction of theories and the development of policies, both of which the courts have undertaken in some situations, barely receive any attention from the legislative and executive branches of the government. Extremely frequently, even clear directives given by the courts for the government to take aggressive and positive action in the execution of its necessary legal tasks are disregarded. In many instances, the government takes an adversarial stance, and efforts are made to avoid satisfying duties by citing technical grounds as an excuse.

The legal system has shown its adaptability by coming up with fresh solutions to deal with the difficulties created by pollution control. The public interest litigation doctrine, the replacement of punitive sentencing with a new sentencing policy based on affirmative action, the judicial search for less harmful alternatives of economic development plans, and its attempts to encourage social activists to enforce social rights through cost-awarding techniques are all examples of the new judicial activism.

There have been a few decisions that have really set the bar high for future cases. The new judicial policy can infuse life even in the statutes have remained operationally inactive thus far. Through the use of creative rules of legal interpretation and construction, outmoded precedents, principles, and technicalities are able to be eliminated in a highly effective manner. The question just highlighted leads to certain thought on this relationship between politics and development and more precisely that relationship in 21st century Asia. Using the knowledge and expertise that was accumulated in earlier times. This century's socioeconomic development has been centred on major tendencies over the whole century. This turn of events is indicative of yet another powerful force of this era, and that is the revolution in communication and information, which has made it increasingly difficult to isolate the people of any society, and particularly the more articulate elements of any given society, from events occurring on a regional and global scale (Robert A. Scalapino, 1989: 98- 124).

Politics plays a part in the resolution of certain critical issues that have been exacerbated by the process of economic growth in both economically developed and less developed nations across the world (Seitz, 1980: 1). The political scientists Harold and Margaret Sprout believe that the majority of environmental disagreements may be traced back to two distinct schools of thought. They believe that the majority of people involved in environmental politics adhere to one of two very distinct philosophies or world views: the first one, which they refer to as "exploitive," and the second one, which they label "mutualistic" (Harold Sprout & Margaret Sprout, 1978: 47-48). An exploitative mentality is one that views inanimate stuff, non-human creatures, and even human beings as objects that can be possessed or controlled to serve the goals of the person who is doing the exploiting. In comparison, a mutualistic posture is one that places an emphasis on the interrelationship of objects and demonstrates a desire for cooperation and tolerance rather than conflicts and dominance. This is in contrast to a dominant posture.

According to economist Lester Thurow, socioeconomic strata's significantly varied interests are the main cause of why environmental concerns are typically difficult (Lester, Thurow, 1980:104). He thinks that the upper middle class makes up the majority of those who support environmental initiatives. Now that they are financially secure, these people want to enhance their quality of life even further by reducing the number of environmental pollutants. People with lower incomes, who feel that environmental rules make it harder for them to find work and earn more money. Wealthy individuals feel they can frequently buy their way out of environmental issues and that pollution rules make it more difficult for them to amass even more wealth. He can see both the wealthy and the lower income group on the other side. People with lower incomes, who feel that environmental rules make it harder for them to find work and earn more money and wealthy individuals.

All of the main political parties in India spoke out in favour of environmental preservation during the country's seventh general election in 1980. Before 1980, none of India's major political parties thought that environmental pollution was important enough to mention in their election platforms. Congress-I gave the initial leadership in this direction. Decisions on environmental protection are not always made unanimously, and some of them are merely motivated by political expediency. Others are exceedingly technical and beyond the comprehension of everyday problems, while some are influenced by powerful commercial and business interests. Expecting someone to be environmentally concerned and uphold his

constitutional duties without proper leadership from those who have been elected or appointed to powerful positions is ridiculous.

It would appear that the current multifaceted structure of party politics and the political process has resulted in legislation and Parliament in India being at their most debilitated stage of development since they came into existence (Singh, Shekhar, 1984:83). It should come as no surprise that administrative committees tasked with protecting the environment would not be sufficient on their own if they were not supported and encouraged by a political administration that was educated and committed to protecting the environment. Both will need to demonstrate a high level of self-control in order to resist the temptation and uphold environmental rules at the same time. In order to accomplish what the environmental laws in India are intended to, it is vital to have public engagement both in the process of formulating the laws and in the process of putting them into effect (Singh, Vijay Pal, 2006: 609).

In terms of general development projects and programmes, and specifically with regard to environmental conservation, there are at least three roles that people can play: 1) Assuming a catalytic function, the individuals may be in charge of launching thought and action surrounding particular problems. 2) They can serve in a consultative capacity, advising the government and other organisations on the strategies and goals of certain initiatives. 3) They can have an implementative role by physically taking part in the project's and program's implementation.

It is essential that people understand that the condition of the environment is not the responsibility of the government but rather that of the people themselves. Some people who make decisions, some bureaucrats, some administrators, and some politicians might not be able to understand the idea of the environment. The idea originated with the people, and it still originates with them. Because of the way our social structure and political system are set up, they both tend to disregard the reasonable requirements of the population in favour of the concerns of private businesses.

In consideration of the country's development policy, a fresh environmental policy needs to be established as soon as possible. The matter should be made to fall under the purview of integrated law, which should be enacted by the Parliament. In order to combat the danger posed by pollution, it is necessary to organise the populace and heighten public awareness. It is important that all decisions about the environment be made in an environment that is free of political tension. The environmental aspect must be incorporated into each and every one of our policies, plans, programmes, projects, and decisions.

Conclusion

The domains of politics provide an explanation for a significant portion of the discrepancy that exists between intentions and actual outcomes. The prevention of pollution has emerged as a central concern in contemporary public policy. On the altar of progress, neither the environment nor the underprivileged can be allowed to be offered as a sacrifice. Environmental conflicts are not anti-development in any way. When there is a choice to be made between the environment and development, the choice must be made in favour of the environment. The time has come to examine every project from an ecological point of view, and when there is a conflict between the environment and development, the choice must be

made in favour of the environment. It is imperative that measures to protect the environment be incorporated into the construction process. It clearly expressed that political parties and civil society organisations are played a vital role in conservation of environment in India. It concludes that democratic development and sustainability of environment must go hand in hand.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship and/or publication of this article.

Funding Acknowledgment

The author gratefully acknowledges the ICSSR, New Delhi for funding his Post-Doctoral Fellowship for the research, authorship and/or publication of this article. It is outcome of understanding of Environmental Studies as a TA at University of Hyderabad.

References

- Althor, Glenn; Watson, James E. M.; Fuller, Richard A. (April 2016). "Global mismatch between greenhouse gas emissions and the burden of climate change". *Scientific Reports*. 6 (1): 20281.
- Andrew Dobson (2016). *Environmental Politics: A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford University Press.
- Baber and Bartlett (2005). *Deliberative Environmental Politics*. Cambridge: MA, MIT Press.
- Batting, Michele B.; Bernauer, Thomas (15 April 2009). "National Institutions and Global Public Goods: Are Democracies More Cooperative in Climate Change Policy?". *International Organization*. 63 (2): 281–308.
- Burnell, Peter (2012). "Democracy, democratization and climate change: complex relationships". *Democratization*. 19 (5): 813–842.
- Carter, Larry, W. (1977). *Environmental Impact Assessment*, New York: McGraw Hill Book Co.
- Carter, Neil. 2007. *The Politics of the Environment: Ideas, Activism, Policy*, 2nd ed. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Edmondson and Levy (2013). *Climate Change and Order: The End of Prosperity and Democracy*. Springer. pp. 50–60.
- Frankland, E.G., Lucardie, P. and Rihoux, B. (2008). *Green Parties in Transition: The End of Grass-roots Democracy?*. Surrey and Burlington: Ashgate.

Guerrero, Alexander (2014). "Against Elections: The Lottocratic Alternative". *Philosophy & Public Affairs*. 42 (2): 135–178.

Gutmann and Thompson, Amy and Dennis (2004). *Why Deliberative Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Harold Sprout & Margaret Sprout (1978). *The Context of Environment Politics*, Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.

Hays, Samuel P., and Barbara D. Hays (1987). *Beauty, Health, and Permanence: Environmental Politics in the United States, 1955-1985*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Hoshier Singh (1992). *Environment Policy And Administration: A Study In Environmental Protection in India*, Jaipur: Printwell.

Lester, Thurow (1980). *The zero- sum society*, New York: Basic Books.

Mathews, Freya (1991). "Democracy and the Ecological Crisis". *Legal Service Bulletin*. 16 (4), 157–159

Newig, Jens; Fritsch, Oliver (May 2009). "Environmental governance: participatory, multi-level - and effective?". *Environmental Policy and Governance*. 19 (3): 197–214.

Ophuls, William (1977). *Ecology and the Politics of Scarcity*. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Company.

Ostrogorski, Moisey (1902). *Democracy and the Organization of Political Parties*. New York: Macmillan.

Padmnabham, B.S. (2004). A policy of promise, *Frontline*, Dec. 31.

Paehlke, Robert (1988). "Democracy, Bureaucracy and Environmentalism". *Journal of Environmental Ethics*. 10 (4): 291–308

Pickering Jonathan, Bäckstrand Karin and Schlosberg David (2020). "Between environmental and ecological democracy: theory and practice at the democracy-environment nexus". *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*. 22 (1): 1–15.

Povitkina, Marina (2018). "The limits of democracy in tackling climate change". *Environmental Politics*. 27 (3): 411–432.

Robert A. Scalapino (1989). *Politics of Development*, London: Harvard University Press.

Seitz (1980). *Politics of development*, Bombay: Popular Prakashan.

Singh, Hoshiar (1992). *Environmental Policy and Administration*, Jaipur: Printwell.

Singh, Shekhar (1984). *Environmental policy in India*. New Delhi: Indian Institute of Public Administration.

Singh, Veer (1992). Judicial Activism and Environmental pollution, cited in Singh (Eds). *Environment Policy And Administration: A Study In Environmental Protection in India*, Jaipur: Printwell Book.

Singh, Vijay Pal (2006). Environmental Justice in India, *Pratiyogita Darpan* (English Monthly), Oct. New Delhi.