

**VANDANA SHIVA'S EARTH DEMOCRACY AND ITS
CONTRIBUTION TO GREEN DIPLOMACY GEARED TO
IMPROVE CURRENT POLITICS OF SUSTAINABLE
DEVELOPMENT¹**

Hari Zamharir²

Department of International Relations
Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Nasional
e-mail: hari_zamharir@yahoo.com

Abstract

As world politics and global communities experience anomaly-type of political and cultural transformation, especially as consequences of the abrupt wind of change in the past USSR and the mystery of 9/11, we have been encountering crucial responsibility to bring our global politics to the better track. This paper is a preliminary endeavor to make an account of Vandana Shiva's conception of Earth Democracy as a social movement and political thought in connection with betterment of green diplomacy for insuring sustainable development. From the civic science point-of-view, Vandana Shiva's epistemology contributes significantly to improving approaches to green diplomacy geared to betterment of politics of sustainable development.

Key words: Theory, green diplomacy, Vandana Shiva's earth democracy

I. Introduction

This Parahyangan international conference provides great opportunities to have the green diplomacy revisited since we have been facing problems of lack of leadership in world politics with subsequent consequences of bad practices of the politics of sustainable development .

¹Paper presented at the Parahyangan International Conference, 8th to 9th May 2015 Bandung, West Java, Indonesia. The theme is G-Zero: The Absence of Global Governance, **Organized by:** Parahyangan Catholic University

²Program head of Political Science Study, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences at Universitas Nasional in Jakarta

With respect to government-to-government diplomacy, especially those strategies exercised by the U.S., we now days find that either the policy level or practices to a greater extent have not been satisfactory. This, it seems, is caused by multi-level factors, some of which include ethno-centric bias of the idea of national interests making the U.S. have a feeling of being “superior”. This paper presents the significance of civic science for betterment of green diplomacy by making an account of one case of civic science Earth Democracy of Vandana Shiva. This paper shall deal with our proposition that diplomacy that is geared to betterment of politics of sustainable development is best done through effective leadership in world politics performed by both Track One actors and those of international NGOs in the framework of increased adoption of “civic science” whose epistemological basis is among others in line with Vandana Shiva’s Earth Democracy. It is argued that current situation of global leadership is very problematic when it is seen from bad performance of G-to-G diplomacy; yet, it has been widely accepted that there is significant leadership of world politics by international NGOs in betterment of the politics of sustainable development. Both Track One and Track Two diplomacy are interwoven. An “exemplary” to and TrackTwo diplomacy may be found in the consultancy services by Paul E Hagen Under Beveridge & Diamond PC’S international environmental practice group (in Wasshington D.C.), Hagen has represented numerous clients on matters related to the negotiotion and implementation of regional and global environmental agreements”. Hagen’s track enters business to business diplomacy and society to society diplomacy. For over ten years experience in mediating environmental conflicts, Hagen finds that there has been a gap in the green diplomacy with special note on the crucial role of status, more attention is given to the U.S. diplomacy. Hagen observes significant drawback of American diplomacy “the reasons for the cantinuing loss of U.S. leadership and credibility are many and related. Neither the executive nor the Congress have made U.S. environmental diplomacy a budgetary priority “ (Hagen, 2000;28). Indicators include the fact that U.S. contribution to organizations addressing environmental problems have fallen drastically. After describing state of the problem faced by global politics, the paper gives highlight of civic science followed by rather depth description of Earth Democracy. Finally discussion is made concerning Earth Democracy’s contribution to betterment of green diplomacy that is geared to improving the politics of sustainable development.

II. Green Diplomacy And World Politics In Perspectives

In his article "Further explanation of Track Two John W Donald (1991) : 201-202) finds Track One is G-to-G diplomacy; Track Two, is citizen diplomacy, which Donald defines it as "un official, non governmental, analytical, policy-oriented, problem solving efforts by skilled, educated, experienced and informed private citizen interacting with other private citizens. Generative to the Track Two above are Track Three (business-to-business), Track Four (citizen to citizen exchange programs of all kinds), Track Five (media to media). Track Five (media to media based efforts "designated **expose and educate larger segments of the population in conflict to the philosophy, idealism, culture, and needs of the other national, social, or ethnic group with whom they are in conflicts.**

From Track One side, G-to-G, state global leadership has been problematic given the little commitment vis-a-vis the strong position of the U.S. in current global system (under to U.S. hegemony). Falker (2005) for example identifies three points that have something to do with the link between strong position and "green" diplomacy the U.S. : (1) strong inclination to **unilateralism** in "green" diplomacy making it less effective in resolution of environmental conflicts; (2) while most nations agree to the importance of global environmentalist's approach, "environment policy" has never been central to the U.S. efforts ; (3) if the U.S. puts concern over global environment conflicts, the tackling of conflicts rests too heavily on the interests of its own domestic level that, unfortunately, are counter-productive to betterment of global environment (Falker, 2005, 586-7)

It is in this setting and value of the U.S. stance to green diplomacy that there has been a decline of the U.S. leadership in global world. Therefore, some scholars and members of the U.S. security community think that diplomacy should re-invert the use of force. As Gen. John M Shalikashvili once emphasizes (1994) "we have found that our global leadership is something we value highly and we have also learned to appreciate that it is probably not possible to sustain our leadership if we are unwilling to use one of our two principal strengths, namely, diplomacy and military force. However, Shalikashvili has added that it is not sufficient that the U.S. diplomacy remain under **unilateralism** "it is not that our strength will decline. I am very optimistic about our prospects in the next century. but because **I am optimistic about others as well**, I think there is a real need for U.S. to build the framework of this **multipolar world.**"

The paper confirms not only is multilateralism to be adopted for betterment of the politics of sustainable development, but also the growth of civic science should be promoted among scientists of international relations.

As regards to the nature of issue in democratic governance and the politics of development, Shiva has the following contention that there are four dimensions of crises-environmental, economic, cultural, and political. All have been taking place as a consequence of non existence of economic democracy and cultural diversity that support political democracy. It is her political thought of Earth Democracy (ED) that Shiva presents as an alternative to fill this gap. Her proposition is that due to the subordination of state governments to global corporations, “representative democracy loses its base in economic democracy. As local and national governments lose control over economic resources and priorities, elected leaders can no longer build a political base by championing programs responsive to family and community needs.” One alternative to this is ED’s idea “to bring decisions that directly affect people’s lives”, in a way different from the one dominated by state and corporations; it is the community that should “take back sovereignty”. Cultural insecurity including the emergence of fundamentalism and radicalism is understood as the negative consequences of present mode of corporation-dominated politics of development and we needs to correct the course.

As Geldner reports, Shiva said “So long as people’s attention is focused on fear and hatred of foreigners or members of a particular religion, such as Muslims, they are distracted from organizing to deal with the system of institutional domination and exploitation; that is the real source of their insecurity”.When summarizing her book *Violence of the Green Revolution*, Shiva described the logic of the existing crises as follow: there emerges a culture of insecurity as the consequences of present mode of globalization and this has resulted in undermining cultural identity prevailing in many societies, and as this anomaly takes place, the formation of politics is catastrophic; in tackling the problems of terrorism (in conventional concepts), catastrophic politics in state structures have created “ a chain of reaction of violence and spreading the virus of hatred. And the magnitude of the damage to the earth caused by ‘smart’ bombs and carpet bombing remains to be seen.” Still in the globalization issue, McGrew (McGrew in Baylis, 2008, 15)wrote, “This process, however, is highly uneven such that far from bringing about a more cooperative world it generates powerful

sources of friction, conflict, and fragmentation.” Similar worry is also expressed by Russett and Starr (1985, 584-575) whose description of current world change listed such problems as population, food, scarcity of food and unmet demands, depletion of natural resources, pollution, interdependence and equity, conflict and threat of war. Russett and Starr then ended up their book by indicating the relevance of state and more important also the crucial role that individuals can play in the effort to promote liberty and peace. What seems to be the core of the problem in world politics and diplomacy from the perspective of social science in general and international relations in particular is that there is a serious need for adoption of what some scholars call it civic science.

III. “Civic Science”: The Case Of Vandana Shiva’s Epistemology Of Earth Democracy

3.1. “Civic Science”

This paper confirms the notion and significance of civic science as described among others by Karin Backstrand (2003) in order to betterment of the politics of sustainable development. More state actors need to adopt civic science. In her article, “Civic Science for Sustainability : Reframing the Role of Experts, Policy makers and Citizens in Environmental governance”, Backstrand argues that international relations has been imbedded with negotiating interest update by advisory agencies involving social science & environment. In diplomacy, there emerges “negotiated science” that involve values of civic global citizen. Backstrand trying to “review the notion of civic science by mapping how the concept is articulated in international relations” (Backstrand, 2003; 25) finds, for instance, that “Civic science is a nascent issue in the discipline of international relations (IR) that primarily has addressed the institutional aspects of advisory science in global environmental politics”. Civic science “is used interchangeably with civil, participatory citizen, stakeholder democratic science and lay knowledge. Civic science has defined as the efforts by scientists to reach out to the public, communicate scientific results and contribute to scientific literacy”. Second, there is a question of “domestication” of civic science in which “democratic participation in science is primarily confined to the context of domestic policy-making” that makes it a bit far distance to IR (Backstrand, 2003; 26).

With its two key issues participation and democratization Backstrand further mentions three rationales for civic science : (1) civic science restores public trust in science (2) civic science and complexity of environmental problems, and (3) civic science as the democratization of science. In short it can be said that civic science is knowledge-based ways of (environment) problem solution in culture context, with the axioms of “rationality” and “effectiveness” that are beyond the ones in the 19th century (Western-secular) scientism, and is becoming part of international relations.

3.2. Vandana Shiva’s Epistemology of Earth Democracy

Let us first describe the nature of philosophical basis of Earth Democracy (ED). In terms of ontology, ED is spiritual-bound in which reality is both what are empirically verifiable and beyond empirical in positivist sense. ED’s approach rests on a holistic perspectives, taking into consideration politics of meaning within a given culture context in contrast to positivism in social science. This brings with it theoretical conception of politics that is culture-bound incorporating religious and spiritual “truth” and reality (compared to the idea of separation of religion from politics). *Demos* in its conventional term has the notion of member of society in a given political system; human-race that no clear conception as to how human society relates with nature. People’s sovereignty in the conventional conception gives free room (that can do harm seriously) to act upon, say, the earth. InED, the sovereignty is nature-bound that includes values.

With respect to political philosophy and political theories, including democratic theories, there emerged (in the past) ideas to view modern democracy developed from its ancient notion of *demos* as a mere positivist, anthropocentric account of people’s interaction in political life of human society. This should have been parallel with the very idea of secularism that counts only the observable and the worldly life. Thanks to Church’s standing position to stay away from the politics of “temporal power”: with this position, the acceptance of this matter-based worldview of politics began to gain its grip among nations with only little interference from non-matter dimensions. And in the long run, we have been exercising this secular politics, especially secular-libertarian democracy, that has gone hand in hand with two major components of modern world, i.e. scientism that put Man the superior position whereas “other” beings were put inferior with its subsequent move towards Man’s extensive exploitation of natural resources

for the sake of Man; and the expansion of capitalism (and colonialism) across the globe, giving larger room for more exploitation of nature with the very intention of fulfilling Man's needs for material affluence and within the pursuit of attaining (material) happiness. Politics of this sort has turned out to be egotistical in that human race, with too little empathy toward the "other", has become the destructor of nature especially, the earth, and been far away from respecting diversity in Culture of Man. The existing paradigm of political science as seen from the bad portrait of our democracy has been deteriorating. In other dimensions, as a long-term consequence of tensions and subsequent separation of politics and religion, contemporary (secular) idea of tolerance has turned out to be intolerant: secularists are much inclined to being intolerant towards adherents of devout followers of a religion in the West.

Thanks to the empathy that has been initiated and developed by varied segments of "Western" communities to the promotion of multiculturalism; however, such credits would be more fruitful if we could improve and modify theoretical concepts related to democratic theory and the politics of development. And to come to this end, there emerges the theoretical conception of ED coming from well-known environmentalist activist Mother Vandana Shiva that really promotes democratic diversity. In contrast to non-existence of theoretical basis for diversity of ethnicity and culture in mainstream current idea of democracy, Shiva's principle concepts do have its basis of acceptance of diversity in cultures and respect their virtues. While Shiva's earth democracy has frequently been associated with the school of thought of Third World eco feminism a category that has misled the real discourse, it is in fact not "regionalized" perspective. ED is, I think, of great contribution to providing discourse on social science for reconstructing new theoretical concepts and developing new paradigm that is necessary to bring our current civilization to the right course. Such an epistemology is needed given the current situation when we living with little knowledge of saving our planet. This is a necessity. Such a necessity is derived, to Shiva, from our commitment to move away from our current lifestyle or "ideology" of economic mode of life. In her book, *Soil Not Oil* (1998), Shiva stresses the prime attention to shift in our mind: Are we able to start giving ecological space for species? The shift is adopting biodiversity economy and stop exercising fossil-fuel economy. "We need to change our mind before we can change our world. This cultural transition is at the heart

of making an energy transition to an age beyond oil. What blocks the transition is a cultural paradigm that perceives industrialization as progress combined with false ideas of productivity and efficiency” (Shiva, 2009; 23)

It is true that some others of theorists of eco-feminism, environmentalism and green politics in general also promote similar ideas; however, Shiva’s basis of biodiversity would include accepting diversity in Man and Culture, and more importantly, with Shiva’s coining the concept “the earth” as the family of man—accepting the interconnectedness of (a) human race democracy and (b) democracy for the earth by Man-with-respects-of-other-beings. One agenda of ED is adopting the idea to let “living (local) knowledge” live. About “living knowledge”, current state of the arts gives us plenty of information of the emergence of “school of thought” of Living Knowledge: a report by Budd Hall (2009) for example revealed this: “Queen University Belfast played host to about 200 participants from 17 countries who participated in the IVth International Conference of the Living Knowledge network, between 25 and 29, 2009”. Living knowledge function as the fundamental of the ideas of eco-development in a very different way from conventional development. One core feature of eco-development is deeply-rooted in culture of human development.. In *Earth Light Magazine*, an explanation of living knowledge was made, along with earth democracy: “Earth democracy is based on earth-centered and community-centered knowledge systems. Living knowledge that maintains and renews living processes and contributes to health of the planet and people...living knowledge is a commons; it belongs collectively to communities that create it and keep it alive...No person or corporation has a right to enclose monopolies patent or exclusively own as intellectual property...”. In 1993, Shiva writes that “Most local knowledge systems have been based on the life-support capacities of tropical forests, not on their commercial timber value...When the West colonized Asia, it colonized her (Asia’s—hz) forests. It brought with it the ideas of nature and culture as derived from the industrial factory. The forest was no longer viewed as having a value itself, in all its diversity. Its value was reduced to the value of commercially exploitable industrial timber....” Again Shiva writes, “There are in Asia today two paradigms of forestry one life-enhancing, the other life destroying....Today in the forests of Asia the two slogans on the of the Himalayan forests, one emanating from the ecological concepts of Garhwali women, the other from the sectoral concepts of those associated with trade in forest

products....”(Shiva, 1993).About living knowledge, an example in developing the culture-based local science is at hand. Together with BhagwatiUniyal, Shiva (2005) writes “Traditional knowledge on medicinal plants among rural women of the Garhwal, Uttaranchal”.

As a consequence, we are encouraged to adopt real politics of democracy whereby no types of democracy is dominating over other forms of democracy; and no economy is dominating other modes of economic systems. In terms of gender sensitive, so to speak, Shiva's biodiversity is affirming women's central position of local knowledge: Biodiversity in Shiva's term rests heavily on the great role of women. This was true especially with regards to the history of struggle of Indian people for independence when non-violence or *satyagraha* movement was done. Inherited from Gandhi, Shiva made extensive study on this. One movement that become popular in 1990s is Chipko movement: “The first chipko action took place spontaneously in April 1973, when the villagers demonstrated against falling of ash trees in Mandel forest. Again in March 1974, 27 women under the leadership of Goura Devi saved a large number of trees from a contractor's axe. After this the government stopped the contract system of felling and formed the Uttar Pradesh Forest Corporation”. (Shiva & Bandyopadhyay, no year, 6)

In the downstream of ED principle, it deals with the politics of development that implies ED's approach to green diplomacy. The principle is let living democracy live in a given culture since culture are diverse, so democracy is inherently diverse. Note that the term biodiversity should include diversity in Man and Culture. New social science of Shiva is called for: the one that would accept local living economies and for the third world nations it implies that nations coming from Africa, or Asia, or Latin America need to demystify their belief that they must **catch up on development**; this point really reflects ED's respect of diversity and guarantees Man-Earth sustainability—the two areas of multiculturalism in cultural sphere and economy. As with current problem within the mode of globalization, in her “The Living Democracy Movement: Alternative to the Bankruptcy of Globalization”,explains that Living democracy is a concept aimed at providing alternative to as Shiva calls the bankruptcy of globalization, whose main task is “to reclaim our freedoms and the freedoms of our fellow beings....The living democracy movement embodies two indivisibilities and continuum. The first is the continuum of freedom for all life on earth....The

second is the continuum between and indivisibility of justice, peace, and sustainability....” Taking back the sovereignty to community as mentioned in earlier paragraph assumes Shiva’s idea that state should be reinvented: “Reinvention of sovereignty has to be based on reinvention of state so that the state is made accountable to the people”. Its epistemology rests on a holistic perspectives, taking into consideration politics of meaning within a given culture context in contrast to positivism in social science. This brings with it theoretical conception of politics that is culture-bound incorporating religious and spiritual “truth” and reality (compared to the idea of separation of religion from politics). Shiva’s rationality is different from that of Western atomistic rationality. What Shiva conveys is the one once termed by Weber as substantive rationality (Kalberg, 1980; 1151-1155) borrowing from Max Weber’s concepts of rationality, Shiva denies only practical rationality being the paramount drive in one’s life or the life a culture; this type of rationality is inclined to practical fulfilling of human needs and wants. What Shiva prefers is in Weber’s term, substantive rationality in which people include non-human needs and wants factors into consideration in reasoning. It is something like value-and culture-bound rationality.

IV. The Contribution Of Earth Democracy To Betterment Of Green Diplomacy

In the context of contemporary world politics, Shiva’s earth democracy is presenting possible ways to cater for inherent problems within existing world politics that is catastrophic. The following recommendation by Russett and Starr does indicate that we need a new philosophy and new beliefs about the way live and interact: “Changes in our conceptions of our interest (including other people in a larger way or long-term way) will make a difference. New social and political structures can be created to channel individual self-interest into collective benefits.” Russett and Starr (1985, 584-575). What social structure and how should such a structure be constructed? Shiva’s epistemology of ED and culture-bound politics of sustainable development with the idea of living democracy, living economy, and living (local) knowledge may give its solution. It implies the call for adoption of civic science among others is the Earth Democracy of Vandana Shiva whose theoretical constructs include the “development” of well beings of human kind, other living beings on earth and the earth, and re-orienting the goals of development towards protecting the earth against destruction by avoiding

greed over consumption and over production. Adoption of ED is relevant with Hagen's contention again in connection to the U.S. diplomacy: of the practical solutions proposed by Hagen to the problems of the U.S. commitment to international governance, two (2) solutions are worth mentioning: first, that the U.S. should "break the log jam of overdue treaty ratifications"; and second, the U.S. should "increase staff and funding for international environmental diplomacy" (Hagen, 2000; 36). How would these be done would be likely to include the adoption of civic science like ED.

With NGOs playing significant roles in environmental diplomacy, it is expected that world leadership can be improved both by state actors and international environmental NGOs. Though the challenge is not easy and global future is hard to predict as Kegley, Jr's and Raymond, put it, more contribution is made by NGOs in global environment diplomacy. Kegley, Jr's and Raymond, after listing such categories as (1) the ecopolitics of energy, (2) the ecopolitics of the atmosphere, (3) the ecopolitics of land and water, made a summary mentioning difficulty forecasting such a prospect given the dynamics of change and of configuration of global trends, also, makes a proposition that "social scientist cannot predict the global future with absolute certainty because world politics is a complex mix of chance and human choice" (Kegley & Raymond, 2010; 404). Shiva's warning also touches upon the horror of "water wars". Quoting Shiva's book, *Water Wars: Privatization, Pollution, and Profit* (or WW:PPP) (2002), Mirtaheri (2010), discusses Canada's position in global leadership in this matter. Mirtaheri wrote: "Strategic resources are becoming increasingly scarce....This is especially disturbing when it comes to two vital resources, namely **water and energy**....(bold from HZ). 'Water wars' are also a reminder that environmental challenges, far from being a lofty concern of the wealthy and the secure, could become a traditional national security threat." (Mirtaheri, 2010; 29). Along with such threat faced by sovereignty of a nation, the poor also want betterment of tackling environment in domestic setting. It is also very likely that transforming grass-roots people into more politically literate with their capability to struggle for (economic) justice is also connected with civic education they gain. A case study on the roles that NGOs play in the Philippines by Board (1994), who conducted an extensive fieldwork in rural communities across the Philippines, reveals something very constructive. He finds that, "as a country where a large numbers of poor people have been transformed into environmental activists, the Philippines offers both a

refutation of the traditional paradigm of poor people as environment destroyers (bold by HZ!); (the case also offers--hz) enormous insights in the conditions under which poor people become environment protectors". The significance of the roles that environmental NGOs has been playing in green diplomacy may not be discussed any longer given so many levels of achievement in global negotiations and international accords have been attribute to NGOs activism. Therefore, it should be right when Princen and Finger eventually realize that as they wrote "as a result, we increasingly view the NGO phenomenon in world politics as critical, fluid, and possibly, ephemeral....We see NGO activity as essential to societies' movement toward forms of governance consistence with sustainability" (Princen and Finger, 1994; x)

With regards to various complex problems that include protracted conflicts I feel that one great cause has been the weak basis of the theory of the politics of multiculturalism. Therefore, we require such conception of diversity of culture and new lifestyle that secure the earth from which we can start improving our contemporary politics of multiculturalism; Shiva's earth democracy can greatly contribute to making the impossible possible. Seen from democratic perspective, Shiva's earth democracy provides a real room for diversified democracy one thing that seems difficult to take place under many other "conventional" democratic theories. ED more fundamentally provides a real room for "preserving" (while at the same "modernizing") indigenous knowledge that has rights to develop their own diversity in reproduction of knowledge for further development of "living economies"the thing that is badly needed to humanize present mode of "globalization"..

How to build political structure in global sustainable development governance ?Gupta (2002) identifies some institutional challenges.Gupta has listed options for institutional design on SD. "There are several different proposals to reform governance at the UN level...". Out of eight (8) models, four (4) are worth mentioning here:the first option would be hierarchical integrated model. SustainableDevelopment enters the intructural body of the UN, being "high up in the UN hierarchy...". The second option is establishing hierarchical single issue model ; that is setting up the environmental security concil. The third option is non-hierarchical focal point. The fourth option would be setting up an advitory body, a high level one "that can advise the secretary to set up a different organisation and the secretary general would use his or her discretion in pursuing these links". This paper would say such a

structural institutional framework would only be fruitful if we adopt the voice of Earth Democracy of Vandana Shiva. The point also involves the more significant contribution of varied environmental NGOs to these efforts. And here, the issue is also about public involvement worldwide whose voice comes from all people. When reflecting on urgent needs for effective efforts of the right path to sustainability among others by changing the way we tackle the development, in 1994, Shiva points to the call on emergence of leadership coming from the people—(this would implies, I think, the significance of the role of international NGOs—hz)“The change cannot be left in the hands of governments only: ‘Leadership must come from the people....The Earth Summit gave us an existing vision of a new and more hopeful future as we move towards the twenty-first century. Only time will tell if this vision will be a deceptive mirage or the dawning of a new era of peace, harmony and progress all people of the earth’ (Shiva, in Baroena, 1994; 135)

Public diplomacy has also been done by Shiva. As I wrote (Zamharir, 2011; 4):

“Not only are Shiva’s activism and scientific work center around organizing social movement and/or writing books, but she also moves one step ahead by speaking before international audience. Now days, her movement and political thought has gained greater audience across the globe. Among the monumental activisms include her observation of the destruction of environment and culture by harsh approach to agricultural development. Some of the events in which she becomes the important speaker are: 27 Oct 2005 at MIT, lecture on “Water politics and Earth Democracy”; 23 Oct 2003 lecture on Earth Democracy di OSU (Oregon State University); in 2009, UTS C Watts Lecture by Shiva during a stadium general at University of Toronto Scarborough.; 07 July 2010 in New York, held by the Center for the Study of Science and Religion. Lecture on Earth Democracy; 24 February 2011 in Oregon, USA, PCC (Portland Community College); on Sept 22, together with Francis Moore Lappe, a dialog on living democracy was held in New York City, NY, co-sponsored by Nation Magazine, Cooper Union, and Nation Books—this event was held in conjunction with the anniversary of two movements—Small Planet Fund and Diet for a Small Planet. From the ups and down of Shiva’s activism and development of her ideas, the followings are some of her books: (1) Stolen Harvest: The Hijacking of the Global Food Supply (2000); (2) Water Wars: Privatization, Pollution, and Profit (2002); (3) Earth Democracy: Sustainability, Justice and

Peace (2005); (4) Manifestos on the Future of Food and Seed (2007); (5) Soil Not Oil: Environmental Justice in an Age of Climate Crisis (2008)''.

V. Conclusion

To sum up, earth democracy has really given light and justification to the emergence of culture-context democracies that have been flourishing, with little burden of adopting or importing other version from other culture. This culture-context is based on the very idea of diversity in culture generated out of ED's fundamental philosophy of biodiversity in which it is argued that not only are plants and animals have intrinsic rights of diversity but also man and its cultures. Such civic science would be fruitful for the development of green diplomacy and eventually make better the politics of sustainable development and enhance more effective leadership of global politics. With so many environmental NGOs playing fruitful role in environmental diplomacy ED of Shiva would give more fuel the performance of NGOs as well as G-to-G diplomacy. The complexity of environment problems would only be overcome among others by betterment of green diplomacy with the mission of redefining the politics of sustainable development.

REFERENCE

- Backstrand, Karin "Civic Science for Sustainability: Reframing the Role of Experts, Policy Makers and Citizen in Environmental Governance" *Global Environmental Politics*. Vol.3: 4,2003.
- Baroena, Alcia. 1994. "An Overview of Follow-up Agenda 21st at the National Level", *Green Globe Yearbook*.
- Board, Robin. 1994. "The Poor and The Environment: Friends or Foes?" (abstract). *World Development*, Vol 22 (6).
- Hall, Budd. 2009. "Report on the IVth International Conference of the Living Knowledge Network". Retrieved from http://www.livic.ca:8080/~ocbrdev/default/LKC_report.pdf
- McGrew, Anthony. (2008). Globalization and Global Politics " in Baylis, John, Steve Smith & Patricia Owens. *The Globalization of World Politics: An introduction to international relations*. Fourth Edition (pp 14-33). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Falkner, Robert.2005" Hegemony and the Global Environment" *International Studies Review* (7).
- Gupta, Jayeeta,2001. "Global Sustainable Development Governance : Institutional Challenges from Theoretical Perspective". *International Environmental Agreements : Politics, Law and Economics*.2, Kluwer Academic Publishers. The Netherland.
- Geldner, Sarah Ruth van. 2002. "Earth Democracy—an Interview with Vandana Shiva". Retrieved from www.yesmagazine.org/issues/what-would-democracy-look-like/earth-demo-an-interview-with-VS. posted Dec 21.
- Hagen, Paul. E. 2000. "The Green Diplomacy Gap", *The Environmental Forum*, July/August.
- Kalberg, Stephen. 1980. Max Weber's Types of Rationality: Cornerstones for the Analysis of Rationalization Processes in History. In *The American Journal of Sociology* Volume 85 (5), March Retrieved from URL <http://linksjstor.org/sici=00029602%281980003%295%3A5%3C1145%3AMWTORC%3E2.0.CO%3B.2,J>

- Kegley, Jr Charles W & Gregory A. Raymond. 2010. *The Global Future: a brief introduction to world politics*. 3rd Edition. Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Mirtaheeri, Mirza. 2010. "Inexpensive Leadership on Canada's Global Normative Position and Its Potentials". *Journal of Military and Strategic Studies*. Volume 12 (4).
- Prince, Thomas & Matthias Finger. 1994. "Introduction", *Environmental NGOs in World Politics: Linking the local and the global*. Routledge: London & New York.
- Russett , Bruce & Harvey Starr. 1985. *World Politics: the menu for choice*. 2nd Edition. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company.
- Shadikashvilli, John M. 1994. "Force and Diplomacy in the 21st Century" *Sustainable Development Report*. Vol 1 (1) December. School of Foreign Affairs Institute for the Study of Diplomacy, Georgetown University.
- Shiva, Vandana. 2009. "Soil Not Oil", *Alternative Journal*, 35:3.
- Shiva, Vandana. 1993. "Monoculture of the Mind", *The Trumpet Journal of Ecosophy*. Volume 10 (4).
- Shiva, Vandana "The Living Democracy Movement: Alternative to the Bankruptcy of Globalization" Retrieved from <http://darewilliams2.tripd.com/aaarg/shiva.pdf>
- Shiva, Vandana & J. Bandyopadhyay. (year?) "Revolution, Structure, and Impact of the Chipko Movement". *Ecospirit*, Quarterly Vol II (4).
- Uniyal, Bhagwati & Vandana Shiva. 2005 "Traditional knowledge on medicinal plants among rural women of the Garhwal, Uttaranchal". *Indian Journal of Traditional Knowledge*. Volume 4 (3).
- Zamharir, Hari. 2011. "From 'Colonized' Social Science to Liberating One: An Account of VS's Conception of Earth Democracy", Paper presented in The Second International Conference on Public Policy and Social Science (ICoPS), Kuching, Sarawak, Malaysia 31 Oct –1 Nov.